# NPF

**FLIP: 32 Kanyal - Taduri v. 4 Chaudhary - Ancheril**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Jamie Wynn (*'30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kanyal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Taduri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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:

Con flipped entire case on climate change. Pro did not continue with their contentions. Pro put on defense and lacked proper research and evidence to substantiate the case. Speaker 1 - con - great tone and speech!

Work on confidence levels and fight for your case. Slow down – project clear contentions and rebuttles. Great job!

*Add Off-Time Road Maps - super helpful for judges. Keeps your case clean and in order.*
**NPF**

**FLIP: 32 Katikaneni - Penmatcha v. 5 Jayyusi - Garcia**

**Novice Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1209</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>KATIKANENI</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>HUGO GARCIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>PENIMATCHA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>JAYYUSI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Is Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

PRO TEAM WAS EXCEPTIONALLY PREPARED WITH CLER ARGUMENTS AND SUBSTANTIATION DATA. BOTH SPEAKERS WERE VERY STRONG PRESENTERS.

CON TEAM HAD A LOT OF RESEARCH AND COULD BENEFIT FROM ORGANIZING IT INTO ACCESSIBLE SUPPORTING EVIDENCE. SPEAKERS WERE UNABLE TO QUICKLY REBUT PRO ARGUMENTS.

RED CON WAS UNABLE TO REFUTE PRO CONTENTIONS.

GREAT JOB!:)

**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.
CHANGHO, MARCO

NPF

FLIP: 4 Hakkal - Lo v. 28 Ameneni - Stenmark

Novice Public Forum Debate

Marco Changho (*22)

Round 1  Flight 1  Room 1205  Fri 10/25/19 03:00PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Lo</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Ameneni</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Hakkal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Stenmark</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro

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:

1. Very detailed-oriented
2. Has a lot of cited data
3. Will be good to cite sources
4. Very logical in thought
5. Projects strong debate preparation

Reason for decision:

1. Escape recession is contended/argued successfully
2. Infrastructure argument held up
3. Human rights argument was validated
4. Supporting by neg/con but not enough to beat the pros

Both teams are very respectful.
NPF
Novice Public Forum Debate
Marco Changho (*22)

Round 1
Speaker | Points (25-30)
---|---
Pro 1st | Kapadia 29
Con 1st | Vishnuvajhala 27

2nd | Narotam 29
2nd | Chakkera 28

The winner of this debate was Pro

Comments & Reason for Decision:

K: very well prepared & knows his research very well & confident

N: very well prepared and very good debater in refuting arguments

C: spoke very well & confident as well but having more research would likely increase

Reason for decision:

1. Last hope: A trade & infrastructure was not refuted
2. Impossible debt payment from con was well argued and both sides argued their points (tie)
3. China's monopoly of jet engine argument was well argued by both sides (tie)
4. Environmental effect was not well argued

Both teams appear to have prepared very thoroughly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Pod B</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Hsu</td>
<td>Kang</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Enwiller</td>
<td>Hsu</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)  

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Hsu**

- Very fast in sometimes not able to understand & won Impact one.
- Good summary. Able to convince that Pro cards not any way Con ones.
- Good in Grand crossfire.

**Enwiller**

- Roadmap provided. Clear direction, clear.
- Able to clarify in Grand crossfire.
- Very clear & clarified both positions & rebutted.
- Best speaker in this debate.

**Facilitates**

- Needs more focus and look at big picture.
- No stats provided. Very subject in Pro. Need more objective point. No method of conclusion & rebutted.
- Needs Improvement.

**Con**

- Was a lot more giving.
- Nice stats & may of their content above their.
# NPF

**FLIP: 27 Carter - Braun v. 32 Kurspahic - Ramisetty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Pod B</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Haris Kurspahic</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Nagasriya Ramisetty</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?** ☐ ☒

---

**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:**

Kurspahic: clear, difficult good points very persistent in X-Fire. Good points on Green Tech. Summary + EU can help to save lives also for China but we do exist. Good in Grand X-Fire.

Braun: many sets. Agreed with Pro on counter discourse points. Good comm. Good summary. Agree with point of Trump partly more talk about EU in EU join BREXIT.

Ramisetty: Good speed for understanding. No slats provided. Subjective points that are Pro China. Some may not hold due to China's past perf. Unable to find card to support Trump reelection chances. Excellent points on FF. Global economy.

Carter: won 1st point in X-Fire. Unable to counter 2nd point from Pro. Good point on more tariffs on EU will hurt them more than us. New Reps are pro reelection of no card and did not support end of Brexit outside China. Not convinced on anti-crisis policies. There is an effect globe wide because China is affected.

**Pro made more convincingly**

**Agreed that provided**

**outside China**. Not convinced on anti-crisis policies. There is an effect globally. More option for global settlement.
# NPF

**Novice Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 1206</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jagdish</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th><strong>Con</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flores</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lazna</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></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 - Could provide their points cleaner & deliver in a methodical way.

Con Team - Needs their points delivered clearly, and it supports their "Con".

---

**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: 29 Moorthy - Sud v. 30 Desai - Weissman**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Bharathi Thodla (*'26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Moorthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sud</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

[Signature]

**T. S.**

School / Affiliation / Occupation: **BASIS AHWATUKEE**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Con Team** - Can delivery valid points supporting "Con". They can link their ideas very clearly.

- **Pro Team** - Didn't provide valid points to support their "Pro".

**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 Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Pod A</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Chirravuri</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Balabhadra</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **Affirm**
  - Boost economy. EU access new markets
    - Decrease trade cost
      1. Imports of infrastructure
  - Stronger trade agreements
    - Must favorable
    - EU's economy can flourish again
  - Increase other countries growth
  - The BRI sponsors railway - increase trade
  - If EU joins, number increase
  - Conflict non unique to BRI

- **Con**
  - Debt traps - many projects, massive debt risks
    - More interest in countries than savings goals
  - China able to give fear to India
    - 12 million casualties from nuclear bomb
    - Human extinction
  - Countries around India are improving relations with China
  - If EU joins, shows that project is legitimate
  - No evidence it will improve stats
  - Railway could fail and cause demise of econ.

**Grand Crossfire (all)**

- India will not join BRI; US & EU will stick with India
  - BRI will increase; no evidence
  - Deaths greater than economic increase
  - India stated will not join BRI or China
  - Sri Lanka port - 2012 only received 39 ships
    - Only drew 30 ships in Sri Lanka
  - No role in India - why would we want to support India if there are radical rulers?
  - Put pressure in both countries - history
  - Debt traps - Laos debt doesn't matter; disregard

**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>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>

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.*
Based on the con's hypothetical situation between India & Pakistan and only having hypothetical situations as well as very little connection to the issue, the affirmative won. The neg also brought up a point about Indian radicals and the support of India, but that raised a red flag that I was curious why the other team didn't bring up.

I thought the aff's point about the 32 million being more realistically beneficial than hypothetical 12 million flamed through.
Affirm

- EU's trade will increase tensions
  - Priority on trade - China needs EU
  - EU's trade will increase trade
  - Poor countries fix employment
  - Economic - poverty will improve

- Surveillance issues - China can access anyway
- EU could increase diplomatic relations
  - Helps human rights violations
  - EU doesn't matter if you're the product of green revolution

- Trade will be fast and speed up economy
- Trade across Europe

Con

- Funding gap - China needs EU
  - Legitimacy crisis - BRICS militant
  - Coal plants could cause climate change
  - Authoritarianism erodes democracy
  - Infrastructure projects spread empire

- Can fund BRICS without joining
  - EU already trading with BRICS
  - Patting out fires in countries in debt
  - No human right issues but authoritarianism
  - Climate change is more important
  - Not wealthy money or holding countries in debt
  - Immediate return so prevents not school policy gap
  - Exploits issues and climate change will be here before
  - Economic

Both were very present, thoughtful and attractive during the debate.

- Excellent job attacking
The arguments about the climate change being greater in magnitude than the economy weighed more heavily and seemed more...
**Novice Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>RJ Heyman (*'27)</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>YOUNGER</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>GURUDU</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1. Trade decision ability to question China
2. China only cares about itself
3. Would rather help with legitimacy
   - Projects selected for self gain
   - China barely funds it
   - Trillions needed

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) BRI def.
(2) Fails
- BRI setbacks
- Flaws
- Infra failure
  5 years after US pullout
- Lack of major funding
- Infra not even used
- Running behind schedule
(3) Debt Traps
- Seize prop.
- Target weak countries
- Sri Lanka example
  - Backline
  - Port to China on debt
- Dev countries at risk
(4) US backlash
1. US tariffs
   - Trump hostility + desire for tariffs
   - Hurts EU more than BRI helps

1. Sri Lanka
   - Significantly
   - Not profitable
2. Not trapping Pakistan
3. EU economies are larger

BRI countries at high risk?
1. Debt isn't always bad
   - BRI income outweighing

1. Trump has re-election
   - Hurt econ.
   - Hurt campaign
2. Recession are impossible to predict
   - Not reliable
   - Probability happening in 2020 anyway

Weighing
+ Magnitude
  - 32m out of poverty
  - 7% GDP
+ Sales recession
  - Global GDP

Why bother? EU $ saves
INVESTMENT NOT RELIABLE
## NPF: Heyman v. Khanna

**Novice Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>RJ Heyman (*'27)</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Jayaganesh</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Khanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sinha</td>
<td>30 (29)</td>
<td>Fink</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

1. **Drugs**
   - New drug markets
   - Supply
   - Trade
   - Global world takeover
   - Can't protect themselves

2. **China Hegemony**
   - Leverage
   - Africa
   - Challenge U.S.
   - China most powerful

3. **China VQ**
   - EU only solution
   - China huge economic power

---

### 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.
Econ

1. Debt Traps
   "What if?"
   "Hegemony"

BRI working
   2x trade in 3rd world
   
   + income
   + poverty
   > 32m out of poverty
   + help the migration crisis

Financial Stability

+ Green financing
   + Green wave

+ EU legitimizes BRI
   -> More investors

1. Infrastructure
   -> assures capital
2. Emissions
   > 50% reduction saves 100m lives

Don't say your!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 804</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Jiang Day</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Nguyen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Wolfe</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Mata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes

Comments & Reason for Decision:

---

**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.
Day - very good opening argument. try to use eye contact, pauses, inflexion

Nguyen - good eye contact.
1. excellent argument for ecosystem endangerment
2. Sri Lanka, debt trap
   not sure if crossfire questions were adequately answered

Tiang - very organized response.
   excellent job! good references to support points.
   excellent eye contact & presentation skills!

Mata -
   good job emphasizing known facts vs. possible outcomes.
   good argument - Sri Lanka unable to grow economically.

Crossfire - Tiang was "Obviously". Not sure the conclusion she made was obvious - back with facts (regarding China adopting EU's concept for green tech)!

Day - job provision +
   very good arguments "Coal plant now..."

Nguyen - great with oral presentation, needs more confidence when on the spot.
   good job asking opponent for example to support his point

Mata - good emotional appeal at ends
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 804</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Estrada</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Lafayette</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? __________

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

"**Con**" team was excellent in initial and in crossfire - Miss Burns is a very strong debater and Ms. Ramani made good use of contact, did very well under pressure, made very good points.

"**Pro**" team - Miss Lafayette well prepared, recovered well from opponent's attack. Miss Estrada had excellent points, well prepared.

**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
1. Dead to ↑ in drug trafficking. ↑ in large guns. referenced quotes. Good research.
   Thanks to Cline.
2. "Fetal debt" - great references, quotes. Good inflection. Good emphasis.
   Some concerns during unclean BRs.
   Budget.

Estada
1. robust economy, low rates of poverty. ↓ in economy.
   Good issues.
2. Asian immigrant workers vital to economy.
   Example - went to Burn for better preparation.

Kamani
Good eye contact.
Reinstated her partner's position.

LaFayette
Good addressing control of drug trafficking.
Good eye contact.
Excellent arguments for immigration.
Excellent preparation. Be careful when comparing a
human issue vs. an economic one - but nice recovery.

Summary (Burn) - very good summary. Used emotional persuasion, but
   also called out opponent's comments. Can be a little aggressive.

Summary - Estada - excellent arguments. Could exude more confidence.

Summary - Kamani - good summary.

LaFayette - perfect rebuttal to opponent's attack. Kept coming back
to our grade argument.
Novice Public Forum Debate

Aashney Shah (*34)  

Round 1  
Speaker  Pro  Points (25-30)  Speaker  Con  Points (25-30)
1st  JAIN  28  1st  Pham  27
2nd  MANCHIKALAPATI  29  2nd  Sreeprasad  26

The winner of this debate was  
Pro  
(circle winner)

Is this a low point win?  No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CON - Pham - Had a good question on China becoming more powerful by joining the coalition between EU & Asia. 

CON - Jain - Not very clear on how the other countries could avoid that.

CON - Sreeprasad - Needs more clarity on topic. Not as coherent.

CON - Needs to ask questions more clearly. to question carefully.

CON - Final focus - Not clear on how China will outweigh the EU. Brings out lack of unity within EU with tally joining the coalition with China.

CON - Decrease in trade costs, increase in jobs, reducing poverty.

CON - Nett Troop, leading to no increase in jobs. VR & DP.

PRO - Cleaner topic as to why China will not take over EU countries.

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.
More jobs → More spending → Better economy
Debt in short term good for growth to spur economy
Will help EU in long run by decreasing poverty
## Novice Public Forum Debate

**Aashney Shah ("34")**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1204</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>SUTMAR</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>SAISSAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>ALFARO</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>CHANGHO</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 - SUTMAR (SPK 4)** - Teriy BRI with 16.2% better infrastructure, more/better morements within BRI in investible.

**Con - SAISSAN** - Chinese will pour jobs due to outsourcing.

- China will subsidize their business
- Unfulfilled spending top epis scale to China
- China becomes more influential due to billions in trade deficit.
- China will exploit and gets more power.

**Crossfire (3:4)**

**PRO - ALFARO** - Speech delivery needs to be more effective.

**CON - CHANGHO** - Clear speech, uses statistics with reference to support contention.

**Crossfire (3:4)**

**PRO - ALFARO** - Decrease in Ebola aided by ALFARO, more infrastructure helps decrease disease.

**CON (SAISSAN)** - Speaker/presents logic clearly based on numbers

**SUMMARY**

**PRO (SUTHAR)** - Not very clear on logic, needs to be more assertive.

**CON (SAISSAN)** - Speaker/presents logic clearly based on numbers
FINAL FOCUS

**PRO (ALFARO)** - Points out weaknesses in opponent's case, needs to link weaknesses in their contention with proven facts

**CON (CMANGHO)** -
The pro side team put together their arguments coherently and put together a strong case. Overall, they did a better job of putting the case together and also refuting the "con case".

Both teams did well but Shaik confidently

Shaik from the con team had good arguments and feedback for how to speak with impact. This will benefit him to put a stronger case.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 1203</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Johnson</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: Basis Peoria

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- The pro team made a very clear case and refuted the arguments with solid counterarguments.
- The speakers did very well. Specific feedback for the pro speakers:
  - Present arguments clearly and be confident.