<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>Speaker 1</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Speaker 2</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Speaker 3</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Speaker 4</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Can there be a coauthor?
- Can I win as Pro? Can I lose as Con?
- Why on the flip plot?
- Why on the flip plot?
THAT LEAD TO KNOCKOUT POINTS.

ROSSFAIR WAS WOULD, BE PREPARE QUESTIONS

YOU MIGHT NEW HOW TO TURN DOWN WHEN CONFUSION

AT ANOTHER LEVEL. YOUR VOCAL MODULATIONS WERE NOT PURPOSED

BOTH SIDES NEED TO IMPROVE POISE + SPEAKING STYLE TO COMPLETE

PRO AND NO SUFFICE ANGRY OR ATTENTIVE;

THEIR PHRASE THAT MOSTLY, CON ALSO WON BY SHOWING SUFFIENCE

ABILITY TO REMOVE AMGRE. PROS & STRENGTH

CON WINS BECAUSE THEIR DEPENDED CONGRESS

+ FACTS. PLEASE STICK TO THE RESOLUTION.

ON ABUSES OF POWER AND INSTEAD ADHERED TO STRATEGY

BOTH SIDES A TIME, LOST THE MAIN THREAD OF THE ARGUENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School / Affiliation / Occupation</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If this a low point win? (Circle Winner)

The winner of this debate was

26

Semifinals

Speaker: Karem (26)

Ncar (26)

Mariana Gutter (26)

NCF

Novice Public Forum

SWDST 2018

M. CARLEY "AN

GURLER, MARISSA

NP
Read 36 to 40

From the speech, what the respondent intended for performance most of the 15% facts. Instead, the

adolescent, her standing requests. The region across stable which precede their

thesis context that will shift in relevance on which

The reasoning that was stable which precede their

The reasoning that was stable which precede their

...
"The museum for what? Why?"

"Good. Nobody really focused on painted into Converses more than them power thing, but that doesn't mean I don't really get the idea much."

...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPF</th>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>Speaker 1</th>
<th>Speaker 2</th>
<th>Speaker 3</th>
<th>Speaker 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>A219</td>
<td>Frank Wang</td>
<td>Karim</td>
<td>Hsu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Points</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro Con</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Orders**: Order of Speakers

**Pro Con**: Pro Con

**Judge's Signature**: Scott Woods

**Points**: 22

**School/ Affiliation**: UNSW

**Order/ Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Speaker 3: 3 min
- Speaker 4: 3 min

**Pro**: Both sides agree that AMIF is in favor of U.S. sentiman
towards Taiwan. However, if AMIF doesn't give much power to Taiwan, it doesn't seem to matter.

**Con**: This doesn't seem to matter. The AMIF treats all although.

**Main Error by Con**: If AMIF doesn't give much power to Taiwan, it doesn't seem to matter.

**Reasons for Decision**: Pro wins by Con.

**Comments and Reason for Decision**: Pro wins by Con.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>The winner of this debate was</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skinner</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruiz</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Crosstown 1: 3 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Crosstown 2: 3 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crosstown 3: 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Summary: 2 min
- Grand Crosstown: 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.*

---

**FLIP: 42 Justice - Hays v. 36 Skinner - Ruiz**

**NPF**

**GIOVANNO SHANNON**

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Crosstown 1: 3 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Crosstown 2: 3 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crosstown 3: 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Summary: 2 min
- Grand Crosstown: 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:**

- Justice Con 1 - "technique: I was short, I not long wish not ice".
- Justice Con 2 - "opposition: the case to avoid answering, CF etc. times"
- Skinner Pro 1 - "crosstown: not effective, keep, keep to questions always"
- Skinner Pro 2 - "crosstown: we didn't, CF, but not effective in that sense"
- Pro: reading that senate card in every speech was eye-rolling by the end. 4x didn't make the point any stronger
- Pro: need to find them, use them
- Pro: looking forward, use asLennon if you have potential - congrats. Pro bal"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A217</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Skinner</td>
<td>Ruiz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Con</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hays</td>
<td>Hamilton, H. S.</td>
<td>Hind, H. J.</td>
<td>Judge's Signature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Speaker 3: 2 min
- Speaker 4: 2 min
- Speaker 5: 2 min
- Speaker 6: 2 min
- Speaker 7: 2 min
- Speaker 8: 2 min

*The first question is asked by the same speaker.*

---

**FLIP: 42, Justice - Hayes v. 38, Skinner - Ruiz**

**KING, JEFF**

**NPF**

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Is this a low point win?** Yes
- **The winner of this debate was:** Pro

**KING, JEFF**

---

**Additional Notes:**

- Too much power doesn't equal delegation
- Abuse = more than delegated powers
- Abuse of power
- Power costs under presidents
- Pro: Congressional oversight has not been working
- Neg: Congress has no checks and balances