AC: carefulwel. framing the round, China needs benefits now. EU/so BRICan't w/o EU out can EU w/o BRICan't renegoti & debt = debt forgiveness/need cos to say EU influence matters.

AR: good organization of rebuttals ☑

NR: take prep before & a bit more rebuttal attack their case first

NEG: you need to have your cards

Good KV ALL AROUND ☺

CON I vote ☐ ☑ because while the PRO wants to save lives via CC or CC, the PRO proves CC will fail & HRV less mor.
## NPF

**FLIP: 12 Li - Jiang v. 7 Day - Shankar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Greg Stephens (*8)</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Steven Li</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Matthew Jiang</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Daryl Day</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shankar</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I really wish one of the groups would have given a brief summary of what the Belt + Road Initiative actually is - the scope of the project and what it hopes to accomplish.

**Pro - you could have used some additional examples to support your contentions - why would Chinese imports be better quality? Are they bad now?**

**Con - you did a good job pushing back in cross and showing that the Pro side didn't have fully formed arguments. I felt like you didn't really explain why this would lead to recession + you relied a little too much on the climate change argument. It is valid, but on its own, not compelling. I liked your quip about "It's two 100% compelling stories in the same paper." When Pro asked about conflicting different authors when Pro asked about conflicting stories in the same paper.** In the end, Con was better prepared + better speakers, but Pro had more compelling points + refuted Con better.
**VEGA, MIRANDA**

**Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational**

**NPF**

**FLIP: 12 Chu - Nguyen v. 7 Gurudu - Younger**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Miranda Vega ('2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 5203</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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><strong>Cayla Younger</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td><strong>Katelyn Chu</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Rachana Gurudu</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td><strong>Hayden Nguyen</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro  Con

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

-CAYLA: YOU NEED TO SLOW NN DOWN!!!
YOU WERE TALKING SO FAST THAT I MISSED A LOT OF YOUR LINKS AND STATS.
THE EG ARGUMENT IS VERY UNIQUE, SO UNIQUE I FEEL LIKE YOU NEED BETTER LINKS TO THE BRI, THEY MIGHT HAVE BEEN THERE BUT YOU WERE SPEAKING FAST.

-RACHANA: GREAT SIGN POSTING & PACE DURING YOUR SPEECH, JUST BECAUSE THEY DON'T HAVE AN IMPACT IT DOESN'T MEAN THEIR POINTS AREN'T VALID. GREAT RESPONSE TO THE IF/CAN STATEMENT REBUTTAL.

-CAYLA: IT WAS KIND OF ALL OVER THE PLACE BECAUSE YOU DIDN'T HAVE KEY VOTERS. USE KEY VOTERS TO HELP GUIDE YOU & THE ARGUMENTS YOU NEED TO EXTEND

**KATELYN:** NICE PACE!
-TRY AND MAKE MORE EYE CONTACT DURING YOUR SPEECH.
-MAKE SURE YOU HAVE IMPACTS FOR ALL YOUR CONTENTIONS SO I HAVE SOMETHING TO WEIGH.

-HAYDEN:** NICE PACE FOR REBUTTAL, JUST REMEMBER TO SIGNPOST SO I KNOW WHERE YOU ARE IN THE FLOW.

-KATELYN:** THANK YOU FOR GIVING ME KEY VOTERS. ALTHOUGH, INSTEAD I WOULD NARROW IT DOWN TO TWO.

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Time Limit</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>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2 Summary</td>
<td>3 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>

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

**ARIZONA COLLEGE Prep-Erie**

Judge's Signature: 

**Arizona College Prep-Erie**

School / Affiliation / Occupation
## Round 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-35)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (25-35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kinun Cehajic</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Andrew Yuan</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Kinun Cehajic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Yuan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

Wow!! So super impressed by both sides. Kudos to Andrew for having the courage and conviction to go it alone and do such an outstanding job! All three debaters were so bright, articulate and talented debaters with very bright futures. So hard to vote here because not a lot of clash and super compelling argumentation on one side versus the other. My votes are econ and environment. Andrew, you need to go much harder on environment, as it is in your case. I feel that Andrew won on economy and Riley + Kinun won on environment, only because you guys told me that lives w/ econ and you guys are going to do that as well as save the economy, and you pulled them your 900 million lifted out of poverty card. I am voting for the con because you showed the greatest overall benefit, but honestly could have gone either way. You guys are AWESOME!!
**Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational**

**FLIP: 5 Kanyal - Taduri v. 13 Venkatachalam - Moreno**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Harwinder Sandhu (*2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2238</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kanyal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Taduri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner) **No**

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Pro Team**
- Weaker on opening statements theory
- Speaker on other team
- Weaker on cross fire + questioning but speaker 3 strong in his arguments with good supporting facts
- Overall other team was a little stronger and more persuasive

**Con Team**
- Very strong opening argument
- Strong arguments and facts on crossfire
- Speaker 3 very strong facts to back up argument
- Con team good rebuttal
- Overall more persuasive on their position

**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: 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**

**FLIP: 19 Mariah - Starr v. 5 Katikaneni - Penmatcha**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round Public Forum</th>
<th>RJ Heyman (*'9)</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2116</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri 10/04/19 07:30PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>KATIKANENI</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>PENMATCHA</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Judge's Signature**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**PRO:**
- SPEAK UP & W1 ENERGY
- KATIKANENI: STOP SHAKING YOUR ARM LIKE THAT
- STARR: DON'T FEEL DISCOURAGED TO TAKE MORE PREP IF YOU NEED IT
- PENMATCHA: KEEP YOUR COOL, YOU'VE GOT GOOD THINGS TO SAY, TRY NOT TO OVERWHELM YOURSELF

**CON:**
- Y'ALL WHISPER TOO LOUDLY
- CON WEIGHED AND DID MORE WARRANTING
- THAT'S WHAT WON THEM THE ROUND

**CON SEEMED MORE RESEARCHED ON THE TOPIC**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 5204</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Piraino</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Bisson</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Jain</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Manchikalapati</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **Aff 1st**
  - Good job! Clear voice despite being sick
  - Remember, only ask/answer questions

- **Aff 2nd**
  - Remember to ask if room is ready before beginning speech
  - Good use of infrastructure arguments
  - Only ask/answer questions, do not argue

- **Con 1st**
  - Good, clear case on contentions
  - Make sure for practice pronunciation of words

- **Con 2nd**
  - Do not make faces or such when someone is speaking, it is distracting and rude
  - Ask room if ready before any speech

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.

Practice:

- Do not react to your opponents speech. Practice down and remaining calm during a speech.

Reasons: For con, I have to flow to neg, due to longer term impacts.
# NPF

**FLIP: 6 Chakkera - Vishnuvajhala v. 1 Jones - Brock**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Mirsada Kursphahic (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2239</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Joyces</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Satisfaction Brock</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Phinnav Vishnuvajhala</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Shankar Chakker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</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:

> Very good job. Teams are getting better. Both teams presented evidence & arguments. However, the Pro team had a little bit of an advantage.

---

**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**

**FLIP: 12 Ahmed - Kang v. 2 Goon - Shaik**

**Novice Public Forum**

**Jay Ryu ('7)**

**Round 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kang</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>27</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>Shaik</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Goon</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

1. $s_1 < s_2$
   - Crossfire
2. $s_1 > s_2$
3. $s_3 < s_4$
   - Crossfire
4. $s_3 = s_4$
   - 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: 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.

- $s_1$ - Good pace, very informative, and logical for laptop, well organized
- $s_2$ - Good pace, dictation could have been better, effective arguments
- $s_3$ - Good pace, tone, well points, some loose in continuity but good conclusion
- $s_4$ - Good argument at center, both sides at center, pace tone good

Both sides with valid arguments and counters

$S_1 = S_2$ (Both sides with valid arguments and counters)

$S_3 = S_4$

$S_3$ - Good final focus, good saturation of points at center, both sides at center.

$S_4$ - Good delivery at rebuttal. Arguments against

Both sides very well prepared, well coached.

All were within very close in terms of quality.
### Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

**NPF**

**FLIP: 19 Starr - Bartholomew v. 9 Chambers - Gomez**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 5205</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gomez</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Bartholomew</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Starr</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:

- Organization
  - 1st speaker both completely clear presentation.
  - 1st speaker crossfire: Pro is against with voice could not keep up.
  - 2nd speaker crossfire Pro is against Con but voice couldn’t keep up.
  - Attack of audience
  - Summary Con: 1st speaker voice tone
  - Con very convincing.

Grand crossfire: Good cross exam and rebuttal.
**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Elisa Lau ('7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Loi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Joshy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

**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:**

- The winning team was strong and affirmaive in terms of content. Their opening was well-organized and confident.
- The winning team's argument was clear and precise.
- The winning team's arguments were stronger than those of the opponent.
- The winning team's logic was well-established for the winning team.
**NPF**  
**FLIP: 7 Reddy - Sosinsky v. 2 Changho - Saissan**

### Novice Public Forum  
**Round 4**  
**Daniel Waks (*6)**  
**Room 5202**  
**Fri 10/04/19 07:30PM**

<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>Sosinsky</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Saissan</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Reddy</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Changho</td>
<td>27</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.*

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**AFF:**
- Limited case with limited links
- Flow opponents case
- Use evidence cards to prove the point
- No arguments or claim

**CON:**
- Strong rebuttal
- Nice flow long

Both:
- Need case with confidence
- Ask for judge paradigm

**RED:**
- Con far more prepared
- Con extends ideas and opens clash
- Pro only restates part of case
- Pro ideas are hypothetical, needs hard evidence to prove point
### Round 4

<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></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Pro**  | **Con**
---|---
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ____

---

**WINNER:**

**CHUNG - JANDHYALA**

---

**forfeit**

**Sud Moorthy didn’t show**

---

### 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.