### Novice Public Forum

#### Daniel Waks (*'56)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>Room 924</th>
<th>Sat 01/27/18 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Epley</td>
<td>Rivera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Montefalcon</td>
<td>Nimbkar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(20-30)</th>
<th>(20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The winner of this debate was**

- **Pro**
- **Con**

*(Circle Winner)*

**Is this a low point win?** Yes

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Con:** Don't cut off partner
  - spoke too fast, left us with second 2st speech

- **Pro:** Don't accept FW w/o absoiling

**RED:**

- pro accepts until as FW
  - ignores social sciences
  - con proves trickle down doesn't work

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Crossfire (1 & 2): 3 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crossfire (3 & 4): 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 2 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.*
Bobcat Bonanza 2018

NPF
FLIP: 7 Montefalcon - Epley v. 26 Nimbkar - Rivera

Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>David Rice (*4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimbkar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Speaker              | Points (20-30)  |
| 1st                  | 21              |
| Epley                |                 |
| 2nd                  | 20              |
| Montefalcon          |                 |

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

* NOT a fan of speed-debating. Your ability to rapid-fire read facts off of a script shows nothing about your ability to actually digest and debate the legitimacy of ideas.

Rivera: you didn't look up at the judges once. Speed-reading is not real debating.

Epley: I can't even understand what you're saying - if why you're saying it. No eye contact with whatsoever. You're shaking the paper in front of your face is very distracting. Stand straight, don't rock on your heels during cx.

Nimbkar: breathe, you swallow, and stutter because you're trying to speed-read. You're incredibly smart, just make what you're saying more intentionally.

Montefalcon: there needed to be more structure in your arguments.

Using your summary and FF to attack their ideas by referring to them in terms of "subpoint A, B, etc" tells the judge nothing about your ideas compared to theirs.

If your coaches are instructing you to debate in this manner, disregard my comments.

Dont interrupt each other. Very disrespectful.

You are on display. Don't look bored/make faces at table. Nobody thought to define capital. I "uhh, yours" gown tax before debating everyone. Remove the words "like" and "um" from your vocab.
**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Rivera</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Epley</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Nimkar</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Montefalcon</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro** *(Circle Winner)*

Is this a low point win? **YES**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Not sure why you go over your case in 1st rebuttal when they have not attacked your case yet. Spend all 4 minutes attacking for 1st rebuttal. I like the taxing inflation argument!
- Are you talking about Bush Tax cuts or the Stimuli and TRIP findings?
- Did I miss something? You all dropped social services in summary...
- **RFD:** I voted off for the Inflation eating gains argument. The tax shelter & lock-in effects are cancelled each other out. Som was dropped in summary (and was defuse upon tax shelters). Small business was a wash due to the dubious Bush Tax cuts & losses in intro argument.
**Novice Public Forum**

**Room 923**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sarwar</td>
<td>Sadeqi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Muraweh</td>
<td>McHenry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro** (Circle Winner)

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**SARWAR** - Pro

- AC: Speed is good
- CX: Did not control against well
- Started to prove opponent's position during summary

**NEG SADEGI**

- INC: Speed is too fast
- CX: Interrogates question
- Summary was a bit of a struggle
- Supports "Art"

**ART MURAWEH**

- AC: Left time and
- CX: Questions are hard to hear
- Concluding mouth
- Limited evidence during GCX
- Better delivery during FF but
- Limited voters provided, don't utilize time as well as could have

**NEG McHenry**

- NC: Speed was pushing it for legibility
- CX: Not able to get opponent to answer first question, was able to conclude on a question
- Good explanations of capital gains tax
- Don't tell your partner to shut up during FF and limited your performance slow down

**RFD**

- Arts first resolution was challenged by neg and never adequately re-addressed.

If did not understand that the elimination of capital gains tax would force the money/earnings to be taxed at a higher rate (ordinary income) and never adequately addressed this point.

**NEG First and second contentions were never adequately countered**
1. **Construct**
   - Increase in real income by rising capital gains
   - Middle class could invest and create

2. **Construct**
   - Small companies do not face capital gains
   - Middle class do not pay further loss due to reduced income, middle class do not pay

1. **FF**
   - Does not understand
   - How capital gains tax works

2. **FF**
   - Long raises

---

2. **Defined Income**

3. **Taxes Benefits**
   - Lower rates than income tax would increase revenue
   - Can not be trusted with

4. **Saving the Economy**
   - Dampens rate of return
   - Low investment leads to slow growth

5. **No causation**
   - Cards show linkage
   - Not supported by evidence (not in code)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sarwar</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sadegi</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Muraweh</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>McHenry</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

Is this a low point win? **No**

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1 .............. 4 min
- Speaker 2 .............. 4 min
- Crossfire (1 & 2) * .......... 3 min
- Speaker 3 .............. 4 min
- Speaker 4 .............. 4 min
- Crossfire (3 & 4) * .......... 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary .......... 2 min
- Speaker 2 Summary .......... 2 min
- Grand Crossfire (all) .......... 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus .......... 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus .......... 2 min
- 2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Muraweh - in your rebuttal, go straight down your opponent’s case w/ responses instead of jumping around. It makes your rebuttal clearer and keeps everybody on track.

McHenry - don’t silence your partner verbally in Crossfire, tap him or have some sort of signal worked out prior to the round.

RFD: I ended up voting for the affirmative because the negative’s interpretation of the resolution wasn’t adequate to get me to believe that the abolishment of the capital gains tax meant that an income tax at a higher level would replace it. That interpretation leaves little room for debate and grows by the affirmative. Moreover, the neg’s only real argument besides that was government waste, but that didn’t seem warranted or substantial. Therefore, I vote on theaff’s econ benefits.
## NPF

**FLIP: 25 McHenry - Sadegi v. 35 Sarwar - Murawe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Nick Leonardi (*3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 923</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Sarwar</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Murawe</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

**Pro**

**Con**

Is this a low point win? **Yes**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Pro:** Your key argument was on resolutions won’t writing to the resolution won’t writing to the resolution. You need to make sure the resolution is being analyzed. Your argument is income tax is worse than food. This will mean if 6.6 is-is isolated, you need to impact your non-resolution arguments to explain why.

**Con:** You need to answer your resolution wasn’t written. You turned it into a higher level of a resolution or you simply write an analysis.

To: This is a difficult decision only the better team

Really addressing your arguments that resolutions won’t write to the resolution won’t write to the resolution. The resolution is simply converted to higher levels. I need to weigh out what the other speaker and their team are as well.

You also need to make their non-resolution argument as much or as a way.

In the end, I can’t see why there is a clear resolution found on the current case. I give winners for both sides. This is not enough explained in reasoning isn’t clear for me to give for it.