**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>Daniel Kang (*'12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Jones 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sebastian Blair 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kijan Saissan 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Frederick Changho 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Pro team has stronger statement in their contentions and EU contrive can walk away with no obligation. While Con team think the BR1 only has negative impact.
- The one of data Con team used is from CNN in 2016 which is a little out dated.
- However, the Con team seems has better chemistry between each other. very well time control. Well done on both teams!
### NPF

**FLIP: 2 Changho - Saissan v. 1 Jones - Brock**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>Jason Sturgis (*5)</th>
<th>Sat 10/05/19 02:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2220</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Saissan</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</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? **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:**

Speaker 1 made valid points with United States non-involvement with China over EU.

Speaker 2 stated Chinese will regulate work with a signed deal.

Speaker 4 showed no interest in crossfire.

Speaker 1 made serious valid points in benefits of the deal or negotiation.

Also made strong point towards the E.U in free will of the EU in the negotiation process.

Speaker 4 made a strong argument in first address & Greece involvement in system.

Speaker held little composure in first address.

*Pro Stance appeared better prepared, due to evidence.*
### Novice Public Forum

**Room 2220**  
**Sat 10/05/19 02:00PM**

<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>Jones</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kiyan Saissan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>AbasthayBlocked</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Frederick Changho</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:**

**PRO**

- Pro did an great job highlighting key issues, like low energy & GDP.
- Repeated same content & arguments over & over again.

**CON**

- Con teen was more balanced.
- Most important organ was 2nd contention.
- Pro effectively refute the various parts of the argument.
- Con did a great job retorting pro's arguments.
Novice Public Forum | Venkataramana Suggula ('7)
---|---
**Semi-Finals** | **Room 2222** | **Sat 10/05/19 02:00PM**

**Speaker | Pro | Points (25-30)** | **Speaker | Con | Points (25-30)**
---|---|---|---|---|---
1st | Kang  | 29 | 1st | Chung | 35
2nd | Enwiller | 25 | 2nd | Jandhyala | 20

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ______

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Affirm:** Be more confident and make sure you are refuting the opponents' case. They spoke to many points (monopoly on goods) which you didn't address. You won the point on the 'local jobs' which is great but speak to their other points as well. 2040 is a long time away. Find other statistics to refute their claim.

**Con:** You were confident in what you were saying but you could certainly press more on what your strong points are. Explain the 'Juniper Plan' more in depth - tell us more how it's different than the other. Like I said, I don't have a dog in this fight, and I want to know why you should vote for one over the other.

Over all good round. Just make sure to hit one another's points more - don't bring up new info at final focus - bring it full circle. Know what you're talking about! Own it!
FRANZ, SCOTT

Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

NPF

FLIP: 6 Chung - Jandhyala v. 2 Enwiller - Kang

Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>Scott Franz ('9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Enwiller</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- 2nd cross X got really muddled. Try not to get bogged down in the mud so much & really know what kinds of Q's you want to ask & responses you'll plan to give.
- Saying "extend McKinsey 10" means nothing to me. I write tag lines on my flow, not citations.
- Simple date diff is not a sufficient weighing mechanism. It's a part of it, but you've got to do more than that.
- Kang: I said, in my paradigm, "don't say 'time starts now'". You've said that for each of your speeches.

Even if you give a roadmap "Our case, their case" is a bad roadmap. Still annoying & a waste of time.

I vote aff b/c neg didn't respond to arguments on debt financing & attitudes from Chung not being problematic, which undercuts the hegemony/monopoly pt enough to where that offense doesn't clearly extend for me. So optimized trade wins.
**HEYMANN, RJ**

**Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational**

**NPF**

**FLIP:** 6 Chung - Jandhyala v. 2 Enwiller - Kang

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>RJ Heyman (*9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2222</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANG</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHUNG</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>JANDHYALA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</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:**

I VOTE CON BC THEY DID BETTER TIME FRAME WEIGHING AND CO-OPTED ALL UMW Super Offer. ADDITIONAL CRITIQUES WERE GIVEN ORALLY.

**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.*