Kapadya, Bilal

AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

Public Forum Debate

FLIP: 3 Jiang - Pattipati v. 2 Ori - Tehranchi

Semi-Finals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Snaya Pattipati</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ryan Jiang</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- Pro
- Con

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? nope

Comments & Reason for Decision:


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.

Start the nc:

- Ar kinda mishandles by talking about displacement
- Rather than clarifying the link (which happens later)

Disabilities is super muddy, but no impact yet extended so I ignore it away

on the aff:

-holy f--- make it clear please.

- aff clearly extends the impact, they only need to win are warrant
- and i sidestep the firms. Monopolies when because no

weighing on whose worse, same w/ Nexus. They win ID.

so 2x + in binding is the link ev.

aff wins.
**Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pattipati</td>
<td>Teheranchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Jiang</td>
<td>Ori</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Aff makes a clear analysis on squo, a clear extens. gentrification. The M8H = luxury homes, 10,000 homes are rich have out of 3/3. They are acquired by rich. Inclusionary only. AH is a clear exclusion. I wish collapsing your analysis was not needed.

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

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.*
Contentions very clear from both teams. Impactful points stated by both.

I found Neg most persuasive as they pounded on warrant #5 about mandating inclusionary development which is a form of market regulation, and also the point about the rate at which home prices decrease making them affordable (i.e., take them too long).

Also thought the questioning about what % of increased tax revenue from increased market housing would go to the poor was a good one.

The point about removing zoning laws for industrial zoned land and opening it up for housing was a good one by Aff, but I don't have context of that, meaning how much is it to a pot of key urban markets.
### Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>REED</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>SHENG</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>HEYMANN</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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.*

---

The con was able to frame their counterarguments effectively and addressed the con's points. Overall, the con was able to articulate their position more coherently and persuasively than the pro. The pro, however, managed to address the con's points in the crossfire, demonstrating their ability to adapt and respond to counterarguments. The debate was a close contest, with both sides making strong arguments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sheng</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Heyman</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Is this a low point win?

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote Con on the long term inevitability of price fluctuations and the lack of new land on which to build housing.

- Don't think the "10%" card flows off. Only way out
- Don't think the "Zoning Laws" was definitive
- Only answer to "No land framing"

- Diamond/Taxes turns not enough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order/Time Limits of Speeches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 ....................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2 ....................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (1 &amp; 2) * ........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3 ....................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4 ....................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (3 &amp; 4) * ........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 Summary ...........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2 Summary ...........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Crossfire (all) .......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3 Final Focus .......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4 Final Focus .......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minutes of Prep Time per side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.