### Round 2 Forum

**Pro**
- Kanyal
- Taduri

**Con**
- Kang
- Ahmed

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:**

**Pro:**
- Your case doesn't advocate for EU, only China
- Rebuttal needs review
- Way to attack the whole flow - Chinese Steel is confusing
- Summary: Good rebuttal

**Con:**
- Your case needs new cards that prove damage
- You don't say why China is evil
- Stick to your defensive plan that pro doesn't help EU
- Keep up with the news, EU & America aren't going well

**RFD**
- Con misunderstand key arguments of Pro (trade war, consumer pricing)
- Con doesn't extend climate
- Con doesn't defend land seizures & dropped cause Aff couldn't find the card
# NPF: Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

**Novice Public Forum**

**Round 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Loi</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Joshy</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rhiannon Hastings (**19)***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Moorthy</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sud</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was __Pro__

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**


Moorthy - Talking whilst other team is speaking is not okay! This is rude. Look at judge, not partner or opponents. Cited evidence to support points. Spoke with clarity. Did relate Afghanistan to relevance to EU and how this is relevant. Human trafficking was not related back to EU so not relevant. Expended effort in points but no evidence was given. "Unrenderable due to come back" what come again? How do you know? Repeated points.

Joshy - Made a lot of generalised comments. Always look at judge, not opponents. Used World Bank as evidence. Facts and statistics to support points. Did a good job as speaker 2, not easy. Response was linked to EU and was cited, was able to counter. Spoke with clarity and with a good pace. Didn't really participate in grand crossfire.

Sud - Talking whilst other team is speaking is not okay! This is rude. You need to ask if everyone is ready, never asked once. Its Evidence, Crabtree, used to support. Argument was convincing though didn't link back to EU. Eventually mentioned EU but not as a major point, concentrated on if-ica Pakistan & Afghanistan. Repetition of point - Taliban and treatment of Pakistani women but no link to relevance. If read Responses were cited. Your consistent talking was disrespectful and meant I missed valuable points. The other team was trying to attack.

**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.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Con

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Great job for both teams. But the Con team was a little bit better. More evidence and better arguments.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (3 &amp; 4)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 Summary</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2 Summary</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Crossfire (all)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3 Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4 Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
Novice Public Forum

Round 2

Speaker | Pro | Points (25-30) | Con | Points (25-30)
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
1st | Akshay V | 26 | 2nd | kinan Cehajic | 27
2nd | Sophia Moreno | 25 | 2nd | 1st Riley Haveman | 26

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1 min prep time.

40 sec prep time.

40 sec prep time.

1 min prep time.

Akshay - Great confidence, articulation

Sophia - Don't repeat points

Kinan - Excellent personal oration points

Riley - Great confidence

- Emphasize points

School / Affiliation / Occupation

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.
1. Akshay
   Beltan → China → EU

2. Riley Haveman
   Kinan Cehajic
   BFI? Climate change?
   Crossfire
   Akshay
   1st Q. Good answer
   2nd Q. X
   Riley
   1st Q. X
   2nd Q

3. Sophia
   Refute
   #1 Sophia

4. Kinan Cehajic
   BFI is coming to EU
   Crossfire
   Sophia 45 sec. question
   Only 3 min.
   Con 1st
   2nd
   Pro 3rd
   Good

Akshay Summary
   Infra → Climate change.
   $3.5\text{ GDP growth}$?

Riley Summary
   No new facts.

Final focus
   Sophia → BFI not about climate change
   Kinan - lives? or economy?
Novice Public Forum

Round 2

Speaker | Pro | Points (25-30) | Con | Points (25-30)
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
1st | Bill Chung | 28 | Ananya Kaur | 25
2nd | Siddarth Jandhyala | 26 | Blake Enwiller | 27

The winner of this debate was **Pro**
(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.
### NPF

**Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational**

**FLIP: 7 Day - Shankar v. 6 Andrew Tyler Yuan (TEAM)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Scott Franz (*'9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2239</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2239</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Fri 10/04/19 04:30PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shankar</td>
<td>Yuan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Pro** (Circle Winner)

**Con**

Is this a low point win? _No_

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Yuan**
- Rushed the pace, made environmental pt hard to keep up with.
- Good cross application of foreign workers point (4% local managers) to their response on authoritarian influence. Clean up the delivery on that and it's such a good pt.
- Need to spend more time in speech giving me the link from Germany's stagnant economy to why BRF will exacerbate that.

**Shankar**
- Need to clean up const delivery. It's a good case but need to execute it well to get the most out of it.
- Avoid terms like irrelevant when talking about points. Giving some credence to your opponents' arguments helps your credibility, because it shows you recognize the complexity of the topic.
- Have faith in yourself up there! Your summary started in the exact right place on why the increase in trade will still bring great benefit even if locals are not getting the construction jobs.
- Recommend taking the pen out of your hand when speaking. Distracting for both of us.

**Day**
- Don't go line-by-line in FF. That's the time to address links/warrants in the context of weighing, that is, giving voters & why your voters mean the most.

I vote _no_ because of Chinese authoritarianism & the impact that would have on fragile EU.
## NOBBY, PATRICK

### Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

**NPF**

**FLIP: 5 Kurspahic - Ramisetty v. 9 Chambers - Gomez**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2 Forum</th>
<th>Patrick Nobby (*'12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Room 5204</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri 10/04/19 04:30PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong> 1st</td>
<td><strong>Kurspahic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ramisetty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gomez</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Chambers</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Att 1st**
- Make sure to study the pronunciation of all source names.
- Polite, but 1st speaking team should generally take 1st question.
- Remember to look at the judge during crosstime.

**Att 2nd**
- Remember to ask upp/judge if ready before speech.
- Good use of terminology like flow/drop.
- Remember to look at judge during crosstime.

**Con 1st**
- Interesting environ argument.
- Remember, only ask/answer question in crosstime, and look at the judge, not opponent.
- Good use of flow calculus, stating they didn't reply to your first contention.

**Con 2nd**
- Remember to use full speech time in rebuttal.
- Good flow on environment & causal argument.
- Be careful to not be trapped in crosstime around wording in your argument.

### 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.
# Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

**Round 2 Forum**

<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>Noah Sosinsky</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Steven Li</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sainath Reddy</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Matthew Jian</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Pro Team is the winner.**

Pro side showed a clear affirmative impact:
- How joining the China clean project can produce a massive spurt in productivity => theoretical increase => efficiency => expand environment, economic and political.

Con team showed not a clear impact towards their base line in how China
- economic means, death traps and lack of laws to influence and manipulate workers' rights / human rights / world economy.

Good job both teams!

Great debate!!
### NPF

**Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational**

**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Jay Ryu (*7)</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>McDougall</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Connelly</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro** (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.

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **S1 = S2**
- **S3 > S2**
- **S3 > S4**
- **S1 > S2**
- **Grand Cross**
- **S1S3 > S2S4**
- **End Focus**

- **S3 = S4**

- **S5** - Good clear introduction of the argument, belief statement, and good pace and inflection.
- **S2** - Good presentation of stance, good tone and pacing, story time into laptop and looked up with left arm to right arm.
- **S3** - Good content and story: "Do we still have NП喀?" Don't need to undermine yourself, let the other speaker verify what they stated in their introduction. Shut on context at 1:30/4:00.
- **S4** - Good rebuttal but used at refutation on human rights but stated in ways that didn't hurt. "Abuse of powers is China" "Human right violator" - gave final cheer to the other side.

**Great work, just need to be more confident and relaxed. Thank your judges.**
## Round 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Saisan</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Changho</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Vishnuvaihala</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Chakker</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

### 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.
## Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Harwinder Sandhu (&quot;2&quot;)</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Cayla Younger</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Rachana Gurudu</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? 26

---

**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.

---

Con impact a) GDP
and higher magnitude Debt trap flowed through, not blocked by the opponent team. If BRI loan comes in what they can do, it's slowed...
**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Clayton Guy (*1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Katikaneni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Penmatcha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points (25-30)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katikaneni</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Chu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penmatcha</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Nguyen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(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.

---

Good debate. Everyone will improve & get better.

Debt trap flowed to end - Nguyen had very good reasons to end. Debt lead with 6 of 5 countries all high debt ratios. Pro did not mention any econ statistics from 1st speech. Con brought back micro and macro to sum up. Pro did not mention debt at the end. Con rebuttal flowed, Pro had no rebuttal flow. They did not mention - not stopped. Pro had good rebuttals at me.
BHATTACHARYA, ABIR

Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

NPF
FLIP: 2 Goon - Shaik v. 19 Starr - Bartholomew

Novice Public Forum

Abir Bhattacharya (*7)

Round 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Shaik</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Bartholomew</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Goon</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Starr</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Con Team**

1. Team was better prepared
2. Defended their position better in X-fire
3. Offered a strong case of Pakistan
4. Need to improve X-fire strategy
5. Stats will help to back up arguments

**Pro Team**

1. Was good with stats, but did not quite use it to their advantage
2. Did not challenge a core contention of opponent on China's human rights & environmental record
3. Shaikh can play better and set the right tone

Speaker 3 stronger than Speaker 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>China</th>
<th>Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China is the world's largest economy, and its growth is key for global economic stability.</td>
<td>European Union (EU) is a political and economic union of 27 countries in Western Europe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This economic activity is set to continue, with forecasts of strong growth in the coming years.</td>
<td>The Union's current debt levels are manageable, but there is a need to watch Europe's overall growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stagflation</td>
<td>Normality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In China, the economy is growing rapidly, with expectations for further expansion.</td>
<td>In Europe, the economy is recovering, with inflation rates on the rise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7% annual GDP growth</td>
<td>2.5% annual GDP growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37% from domestic demand</td>
<td>37% from domestic demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% from exports</td>
<td>5% from exports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>