FLIP: 5 Katikaneni - Penmatcha v. 19 McDougall - Connelly

**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Joseph Balian ('6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Swapnil Katikaneni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Pranav Penmatcha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Room 2237</strong></th>
<th><strong>Fri 10/04/19 06:00PM</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

GREAT JOB BY BOTH TEAMS.

JUST A FEW OBSERVATIONS.

JACK HAD A GREAT EXPLANATION OF THE ISSUE. I WAS ASKED ABOUT PARAPlANS, BUT SWAPNIL SEEMED TO ACCELERATE THROUGH HIS ARGUMENT.

I ALSO NOTICED THAT DURING GRAND CROSS, KENNEDY ASKED EXPLICITLY IF ECONOMY WAS MORE IMPEDANT THAN LIVES.

PRANAV SAID "NO" BUT KENNEDY SAID "SAND"

KENNEDY IN FINAL FOCUS THAT THIS WAS THE OPPONENTS SAID IT WAS MORE IMPORTANT.

Said IT WAS A PRESCRIPTION THAT THERE WILL ALSO, THERE WAS A PRESCRIPTION THAT THERE WILL BE A RECESS SOON (NOTHING TO BACK THAT UP).
Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 2235</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 06:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Andrew Kang</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Blake Enwiller</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Andrew Yuan</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 was pro both very good presentation. Felt Con did not have enough on the argument, but was a very good presenter. Pro Blake seemed to present better, speaks clearer without hesitation. Pros facts outweighed Con 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiyan Saiissan</td>
<td>Steven Li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Changho</td>
<td>Matthew Jiang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

SPEAK CLEAR, MAKE EYE CONTACT
Jiang - Don't say "you", you're talking to me
Changho - Organize better, don't click pen
Saiissan - Don't use table as a crutch
Li - Slower and more clear

I vote AFF on SA, econ benefits

More oral feedback was given.
Both cases, especially the Pro, spend too much explaining what the BRF is and not enough time establishing a case. On the Con, make sure that you give each contention a title that the judge can flow. All debaters should try to read less, and speak to and persuade me more. This is a hard one to judge.

There was not a lot of clash in this debate and not a lot of compelling wins on either side. That will come with experience! Both sides have great potential and were very impressive given this is their first tournament. I am voting for the Pro, primarily because I believe that Joan displayed the greatest understanding of the facts and offered the best argumentation overall. Good luck to all!
## NPF

### Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Sri Jandhyala (*6)</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 06:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Riley Haveman</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Kinard Cehajic</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? *Yes*

School / Affiliation / Occupation: **BASIS PAY**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Con:**
- Darryl did not use all his allocated time.
- Needs to not be nervous - Practice more!!

**Pro:**
- Riley was also very nervous.

Con did a relatively better job of explaining why Pro did not have good arguments for why EU should join, instead stating benefits to China.
NPF

FLIP: 5 Kurspahic - Ramisetty v. 6 Chakker - Vishnusvahala

Novice Public Forum
Round 3
Room 2116
Fri 10/04/19 06:00PM

Speaker | Pro | Points (25-30)
---|---|---
1st | Vishnusvahala | 28
2nd | Chakker | 27

Speaker | Con | Points (25-30)
---|---|---
1st | Kurspahic | 29
2nd | Ramisetty | 30

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

General - Face judge, not each other. Need to keep time. Went over for cross fires.

Vishnusvahala - Cited points, used facts and statistics. Spoke with clarity and at a good pace. Used a variety of sources. Linked back to E.U. Had a response, though not as confident in crossfire as opponent. Appeared to concede point.

Kurspahic - Cited points. Spoke quickly, be careful not to go too quickly or you will lose clarity. Variety of sources including academic. Emphasis on major points. Very convincing and confident in crossfire. Dominated crossfire. Be careful not to interrupt, let them also have their say. Spoke slower in summary. Better use emotive language. Do not interrupt your own partner.

Chakker - Spoke clearly. Struggled to hear much evidence. First half was therefore unsubstantiated. Debt Trap is a myth, used example of Sri Lanka but not linked back to resolution. Asked to see card but didn't follow up, until overtime. Should have been more insistent.

Ramisetty - Cited evidence in rebuttal straight away. Spoke clearly. Every point was cited, a lot of evidence to support. Good eye contact with judge. Always related back to resolution. Came straight back with evidence on questioning. Supported partner in grand crossfire.

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 | 3 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary | 3 min |
| Grand Crossfire (all) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus | 2 min |

3 minutes of Prep Time per side

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Leia Goon ('2)</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 06:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moorthy</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sud</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was __pro__

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge's Signature**: [Signature]

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**: [Blank]

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Jain**
- Debt trap - Germany - also developed countries
- Need China loans vs. aid ~ non-payment

**Moorthy**
- Slower growth over capacity - China needs help ~ global recession
- Reduced health & poverty

**X Fire**
- US relevant? EU ~
- Why is it economy bad? Both in agreement?
- Civil war vs. nuclear war? ~ Did not answer the question ~ nuclear is a stretch, not convincing to make this leap.

**Man**
- GDP vs. China loans
- Does not impact EU
- China using our workers - does not create job (locally)

**Sud**
- No EU
- Chinese workers - why is this bad? ~ Not an issue/impact
- Sri Lanka helps mitigate debt
- Shillanka - debt renegotiation - past mismanagement ~ great point
- Environmental

Net benefit - strong China = strong global ~ strong point
- WAR agenda - civil war - nuclear war.

### 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: 5 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 5 min

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
BRI - debt re-negotiation → evidence needed? 

Same chance of falling into recession → debt implosion theory would be immature

Poverty - will increase due to non-performing loans → recession

Concedes China global influence - would cause global recession → interesting rebuttal

Nuclear war - good rebuttal on nuclear war - BRI doesn’t increase this likelihood

High may vs low probability

Nuclear war - didn’t get your point

China = global eco.

China pushing environmental change

BRI will cause debt-recession

Increases China’s influence - Hedging

US/China - less impact on EU

Economic collapse - high debt → poverty, interest rates

Nuclear risk - high prob → similar to driving a car.

Civil war -

Nuclear war - worst impact

SAME chance for recession?

Conclusion

Debt trap argument was not well with the same chance for recession argument and debt renegotiation

Net benefit argument was never really attacked and a strong China = strong global economy is great argument

Nuclear war argument was rebuted well with car driving example

Overall, PRO presented better argument

June - nice strong opening

Sud - nice rebuttal on nuclear war

MOORE - laid out net benefit points very clearly

Sud - debt renegotiation was excellent point
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Greg Stephens ('8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2239</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Younger</strong></td>
<td><strong>Shaik</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gurudu</strong></td>
<td><strong>Goon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td>Judge's Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td>Bio Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro team had a stronger and better prepared presentation. Pro argument was supported by facts. Crossfire the Pro team was stronger in questioning supporting Facts. Con team team did not have as strong of a persuasive argument and was weaker on presenting supporting facts. Questioning on cross fire was not as strong as the pro team. Overall their argument was weaker.
NC: do you need to define BR? Why does China have military in Pakistan? is this a reason why China will have mil. in EU?

AR: your Pakistan debt arg? <6+ confusing would go different direction

JEG: if you want to move on in CX, its your job to drive that? D

AS: if in AR you key vote on lives extend this in AS + good job at proving if backup in AT-F

Piraino: great job pushing through! I'll keep it up

RPD: I vote PRO because, PRO wins on argue impacts in econ & improves lives. CON needs to strengthen links on EU country debt increase.
**NPF**

**Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational**

**FLIP: 12 Ahmed - Kang v. 19 Mariah - Starr**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>John Siaissan (*2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri 10/04/19 06:00PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 5202</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ahmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Con**             | **Points (25-30)** |
| 1st                 | Mariah             | 27 |
| 2nd                 | Starr (Ann)        | 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.

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**PRO**

K: cont. was explained clearly

K: cont. in responding to questions and prepared to refer back and got accurate answers.

A: good examples and respond on debt traps

No evidence of China corrupting other countries was given.

K: addressed the cons question very well and pointed out lack of evidence on high rate interest rate, export/import operation proved this will benefit all countries.

K: good answers on crossfire and evidence presented.

**CON**

M: loans end debt within EU and can't repay debt.

M: good questions about EU's debt

S: example was given that was not sufficient to convey the rationale for pressure

Example of Sri Lanka was falling / being of joining this venture

Con: didn't present direct evidence of China's environmental or causing debt trap for EU.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 5200</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 06:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Novice Public Forum</strong></td>
<td><strong>Venkataramana Suggula (&quot;7&quot;)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Venkatachalam</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Mcgone</td>
<td>28</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 has strong point. Con team did not make their more clean. Keep evidence handy. More Prep needed.

Zachary con team to improve.

---

**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: 1 Jones - Brock v. 9 Chambers - Gomez

Novice Public Forum

Round 3

Room 5206

Fri 10/04/19 06:00PM

Speaker | Pro | Points (25-30) | Speaker | Con | Points (25-30)
---|---|---|---|---|---
1st | Jones | 28 | 1st | Chambers | 26
2nd | Brock | 29 | 2nd | Gomez | 26

The winner of this debate was

Pro

Con

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Jones**
- Very good eye contact
- Well prepared the logic
- Ends handmade listeners on the arguments

**Brock**
- Short presentation but precise points - good
- Respond questions very precise & logic

**Gomez**
- Present the logic not convince enough why EU shouldn't join the BRT
- Need to respond with specific answers & have data to back-up the answers

**Chambers**
- Questions are not clear when asked other team
- Good preparation on some statistics

Pro wins: well-prepare statistics and precise question, asked other teams.

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.
FRANZ, SCOTT

Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

NPF

FLIP: 19 Starr - Bartholomew v. 5 Kanyal - Taduri

Novice Public Forum

Round 3

Speaker Pro Points (25-30)
1st Kanyal 28
2nd Taduri 29

Speaker Con Points (25-30)
1st Bartholomew 28
2nd Starr 27

The winner of this debate was

Pro Con

(Circle Winner)

Judge's Signature

Brophy

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.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Kanyal - Slow down "Middle Income Economy" is meaningless to me. You need to explain what that means.

Taduri - Avoid swaying back and forth while speaking. Keep your body calm and quiet and you’ll be more persuasive.

Bartholomew - slow down

Seems like you pre wrote your summary which led to it not clashing well with what your opponent actually said.

Starr - Make sure to occasionally look up and make eye contact with me.
It was unclear when you were going from your words to a source's because your eyes were glued to the laptop monitor.

I vote Aff because of need to keep China from going into recession via B&I failure. They didn't properly respond to Aff args on debt not being a trap or impacts of recession should B&I fail.