**Novice Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Room 501</th>
<th>Sat 10/26/19 12:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>KURSPAHIC</td>
<td>Points 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>RAMISETTY</td>
<td>Points 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>VISHNU VAJHALA</td>
<td>Points 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>CHAKKERA</td>
<td>Points 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge's Signature**

ACP ERIE

School / Affiliation / Occupation

### Order/Time Limits of Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</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>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.

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Made cogent arguments on why both EU & China would benefit.
- Would have liked better arguments for EU going into recession, typically infrastructure spending would help in a recession.

**RFD**

- The pro side did a better job explaining why the EU needs to join BRI.
## NPF

**FLIP: 29 Jiang - Day v. 30 Setia - Esposito**

### Novice Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Room 507</th>
<th>Sat 10/26/19 12:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Daryl Day</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vincent Esposito</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Catherine Jiang</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

**No**

Is this a low point win?

---

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Day**: Economic Benefits. Is Trump's promise some of the time. Good summary able to flow points well.

**Esposito**: Spoke clearly and good speed. Pointed question in point. Average summary. Overemphasizing the point. Had nuclear. Don't have with China.

**Jiang**: Counted all 20 points. Explained holistic way. Able to satisfy card request. Explained BRI with better economy, more trade, more jobs. Very good speaker. Good FF. Brought clarity to open points and reasonable options.

**Setia**: Counted all 20 points. BRI can't point to nuclear war. Nuclear was mentioned again. X-fire all about nuclear. Good FF.

---

**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>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>Estrada</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Kang</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Enwiller</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: Economic impact
- Bad loans
- Ineffective projects

Con: Good economy
- Immigration

Reason:
Pro could not defend the effects on the economy with bad loans and ineffective projects. Also the pro argument about immigration would not be substantiated.

Also pro argument about the project failing will benefit the con also was not effective.

Con was able to show the economic impact with bad loans and ineffective projects with clear examples. Here Con wins.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crossfire (1 & 2): 3 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.
Jim Fountain Classic

FLIP: 34 Garcia - Johnson v. 29 Ryu - Shembekar

Novice Public Forum Debate

Heidi Aldrich (*28)

Octo-Finals

Room 503

Sat 10/26/19 12:00PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Johnson</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>Ryu</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shembekar</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:**
- In CX, set trop, don't give away the turn
- Get more comfortable with going down flow in rebuttal
- Great density, very clean narrative!
- "Johnson" Strong Cx, grand Cx was messy

**Con:**
- Strong Case!
- Many rebuttal responses don't address what was presented
- Rebuttal misunderstands many points of opponent, restates incorrectly
- You contradict yourself in Cx compared to case

RFD:
- Pro doesn't explain how unity helps
- Pro dropped many arguments in sum.
- Pro PF not linked to points

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: 32 Cehajic - Haveman v. 4 Kapadia - Narotam

### Octo-Finals

<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>Haveman</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kapadia</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Cehajic</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Narotam</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

**Is this a low point win?**

**Judge's Signature**

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Prep:** 1:15, 1 min, 15 sec

Neg. 1. Debt traps: Corruption - NFS govt to China
- Bilateral trade necessary

Ref. 2. China's coal use up 12a chine jobs lost to coal
- China has good deal with debt deals, int debt is relieved
- Disjointed argument against economic damage to China's dependency on key markets (refugee countries)

Def: 1:04, 1:03, 51 sec

**Pro:** 1. Ind overcapacity - excess production in China.
2. Middle income trap: 3rd world countries should increase domestic production to solve China

Middle income trap explanation: few Chinese

No source through US debt super cycle -> clarified, not understood

**Argues that debt relief trumps debt traps for states in economic growth:**
- Both EU's CH support (OE coalition)
- Coherent argument, coherent

**Endnotes:**

- The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

### Order/Time Limits of Speeches

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Speaker 3: 3 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Speaker 5: 3 min
- Speaker 6: 3 min
- Speaker 7: 2 min
- Speaker 8: 2 min

**2 minutes of Prep Time per side**
Novice Public Forum Debate

Octo-Finals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gurudh</td>
<td>28.5</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>Jagdish</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Griffen</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? [Yes]

Judge’s Signature

Desert Vista

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Jagdish - look at the judge when answering.

1 vote for Aff because none of the neg arguments are well linked or directly tied to the EU. Because of this, I don't have a super compelling reason to favor any of the negative arguments over the more clear affirmative ones.

I would prefer actual citations as opposed to name + yr

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.
EU join the belt road initiative:

Con:

1. Debt, Recession (good catch-up resources)
   - Poland, Jordan - ultimately hurt the EU
   - Result in war, American economy will fall along with global recession. Crazy China's response.

2. Economic benefit, trade war will fall - increase trade, will reduce trade deficit. These initiatives are complete, will provide new infrastructure, provide employment, trade will increase by $300 billion dollars. Raises world GNP.

3. China countries could pay 71% debts due to joining BRI. 
   - Pro could not confirm.

Conv:

1. EU will not be able to pay back loan. They will not benefit from the infrastructure.
   - BRI employs not many locals but mostly Chinese. Exports Pakistan very good!
   - EU-Japan agreement is better for the EU than the EU-China agreement. These BRI projects are not eco-friendly.

2. We have the stats to back it up. Fewer people in poverty, debt allows for growth. Good rebuttal tool each point tried to negate it.

Pro:

1. Conv = Pro. Equal this harm.

2. Conv - well laid out. Pro - more stats, but not clean. Pro did hit all the points.

Summ-

Conv - Final:

- Debt, authoritarian, political instability (will summon). Will chosen evidence.
- They keep saying debt is good for the economy - but that card was not relevant to this case.

Pro - had better, clearly explained relevant points. Speakers are clear & made more eye contact.
PRO: good points with stats to back them up. One point
+ card that they kept using was not relevant to the case

They were making.

Could have better eye contact.
**Novice Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room 511</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td>Fred Jain</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Arun Moorthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Ram M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sand Sud</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 made good argument against war in summary.
- Contention was very well researched.
- Pro's fast but clear delivery made it easy to follow.
- Pro's well-organized argument helped maintain audience interest.

**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

(Note: 2 minutes of Prep Time per side.

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

**Winners:**

Logic on war was not sound. Team made several arguments against war. Pro used internet research during crossfire, which helped maintain audience interest.
1st Week
Speaks too fast

1) Reduced health
Nervous system

2) WMD
Civil war

Cross
E.U.

WMD locates

Not sound
explosives

Famine

Poor crops
Food scarce

No exports or food trap

Seems valid no debt trap

Civil war 1st cause warming

Reduced health
and not affect 1st health

WMD - aid conflict

Spreads to 8 ft. fires.
<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>Abraham Vishnuvajhala</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Brandon Pham</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shankar Chakkera</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Niranjan Sreeprasad</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Pro** - Confident and well presented with supports.

**Con** - Presented well but weren't clear on crossfire. Could not support our 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>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Jayaganesh</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Esposito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sinha</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Setia</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: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min
- Grand Crossfire: 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Prep:** 32 sec 13 sec 36 sec 40 sec

**Con:** 1. Dept. trade

**4:00**

**2:30** 2. Conflict India/Pakistan

**2:04**

**1:54**

---

**Prep:** 1 min 56 sec 10 sec

**Con:** 1. Econ outlook: potential high, more trade

**4:00**

**2:01**

**2:03**

---

**Cross:** great response to stat question

---

**Si Lanka not part of B & L? Legitimacy for China**

---

**Began with wrong argument**

**Con team better prepared, more organized**
Novice Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Double Octos</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1002</th>
<th>Sat 10/26/19 12:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Arun Moorthy</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kamley Braun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sahil Sud</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lauryn Carrrie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro: Lucas Balardi

Con: Perry High School

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro:
1. Save the World
   - China needs stronger credit growth ✓
   - BRI hugely benefits China, EU needed to prevent recession ✓
   - Recession would hurt people’s health ✓
   - Threat of civil war could bring about dangerous regime ✓
   - This could lead to nuclear war, creating an extinction ✓

Con:
1. Tariffs
   - EU joining BRI would result in Trump imposing tariffs on EU
   - EU hardline stance big part of relationship
   - Tariffs would risk 100,000 US jobs and 900 million global jobs

2. Climate
   - BRI dying, squaw will kill it
   - BRI lets PRC export coal factories abroad
   - BRI exclusively lets China export coal
   - 3 degrees increase, huge flooding and damage to agriculture

Impact of tariffs?

RFD: I gave this to pro because they were able to turn climate change and they extended their link chain. Tariffs were a wash. Con could have won with better defense on climate and if they defended tariffs better.
A lot of time wasted on CX on tariffs
Cross hasn’t seemed very productive

Pro Rebuttal:
- Nuclear war worst impact, probability unimportant
- Opponents couldn’t answer why tariffs won’t be imposed on EU countries already in BRI
- Card about Trump not wanting to do tariffs, re-election
- CC inevitable, turn it by BRI has plan to reduce fossil fuels, critical to mitigating CC

Con Rebuttal:
- Chinese debt will cause recession under BRI
- EU is already investing in their own infrastructure
- Opponents’ card on overcapacity non-unique, or turn it, overcapacity creates unemployment
- Would cause US-EU trade war

If pro can prove a recession will happen, they win

Final Focus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRI solves</td>
<td>US would put tariffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese overcapacity</td>
<td>on China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China investing 6 trillion in green</td>
<td>China wouldn’t owe debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trump wouldn’t impose tariffs</td>
<td>to anyone else</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NPF

FLIP: 32 Kurspahic - Ramisetty v. 22 Enwiller - Kang

Novice Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter-Finals</th>
<th>Room 205</th>
<th>Sat 10/26/19 01:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kurspahic</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ramisetty</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kang</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Enwiller</td>
<td>27</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:

Pro:
- Ramisetty: Can't hear you, turn up volume - Strong CX
- Confusing responses during rebuttal
- Could've extended much more cause I didn't see the link
- Case not very united to EU
- Summary needs key voters, lacks the elaboration to prove

Con:
- Overview your rebuttal
- try to link the narrative better
- way to address dropped points

RFD:
- Link to EU benefit lost/confusing
- Con proves China not new recession which delinks pro case
- Climate change is a wash/extended too late

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: 11 Jain - Manchikalapati v. 29 Gurudu - Younger**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Heidi Aldrich (*'28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarter-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 210</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>(25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Younger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gurudu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Jain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Manchikalapati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

**Is this a low point win?**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The main contention of Con was debt, but was changed midway to debt-to-GDP. Con did not respond to Pro contention at all.

No clear definition of loan by Pro. Good rebuttal about SL. Global recession not very well articulated by Con, based on EU.

Argue Con, China took over debt in SL, which was never repaid.
## NPF

**FLIP: 29 Ryu - Shembekar v. 11 Chung - Yuan**

### Quarter-Finals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gina Ryu</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Madhura Shembekar</td>
<td>30</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>Bill Chung</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Andrew Yuan</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

**No**

Is this a low point win?

### 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

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

---

**Chung**

- Not like EU - so may not be comparable.

**Ryu**

Very good speech. Better Foreign FDI 24%.
- Don't write. Agree Explicating. Answered all points in X-fire. Very good summary. Content all points.

**Yuan**

EU - Japan deal better option. Had tough time to explain how BRI not as help in X-fin. Good summary. Agree that BRI is detrimed to EU.

**Shembekar**

Good start. Good answer in X-fire. Able to explain well in X-fin. Quite convincing.

**Jim Fountain Classic**

**Sarah Albright ('13)**

Room 207

Sat 10/26/19 01:15PM

**Judge's Signature**

Hamilton

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:
**Pro:** Excellent arguments with regards to importance of economic growth and decreasing costs of trade. Good rebuttal to pollution argument by demonstrating GPP argument by demonstrating GPP growth leading to more application of green technology. Weakest rebuttal to debt trap issue is no real evidence that China will reform. Need to argue balance between development and assuming foreign debt obligation.

**Con:** Best argument was related to debt traps—effectively documented many examples. Pollution argument was only based on a narrow study and failed to take into account increases in efficiency created by Belt initiative. Tended to overplay points such as claim that everyday points such as claim that