### Novice Public Forum Debate

**RJ Heyman (*'27)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Pod B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Bill Chung</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Andrew Yuan</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:

- Presentation style
  - 4070 Brian
  - Bus
  - Ads
  - Slow eye contact

- Good speaking
  - Slow eye contact

- Addressed Health
  - Crossfire

- Misuse of evidence
  - Pearl Harbor
  - Pearl Harbor

### 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
- 2 minutes of Prep Time per side

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Pod B</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:30PM</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>&quot;PAKPAK+&quot;</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>&quot;IAY TAO&quot;</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? **Yes**.

Comments & Reason for Decision:
- Cheek opening
- A bit fast but strict
- Cuts of facts
- Client reaction: INF fund
- Answer by money
- + Inference
- Arguments clear
- Really used only 1st constructor: start after 45 on environment.
- Good responses in 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.
Novice Public Forum Debate

Nadja Jafar (*4)

Round 2
Speaker
1st
Kurspahic
2nd
Ramisetty

Flight 1
Room 1209

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

Con
1st
Nguyen
2nd
Mata

Fri 10/25/19 05:00PM

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? no

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Industrial overloading
- Surplus
- Climate change
- Economic
- EU leverage over Chinese actions
- Global recession

US relations with China worsened
Cancled
Wrong
Achieved

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

Speaker 1
Speaker 2
Crossfire (1 & 2) *
Speaker 3
Speaker 4
Crossfire (3 & 4) *
Speaker 1 Summary
Speaker 2 Summary
Grand Crossfire (all)
Speaker 3 Final Focus
Speaker 4 Final Focus

4 min
4 min
3 min
4 min
4 min
3 min
3 min
2 min
2 min
2 min

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

CARD:
- CO2 production
- 20 coal plants
China's economy slowing - GDP down 5%. Restructuring but BRI failing currently, not going to succeed without stable institutions backing it. 10% of trade globally. Debt super cycle. 900 million people in poverty. 500,000 people died last year.

China fighting climate change - understanding why. Funding up, GDP, sustainability. 1% P = 4% growth. Green tech - CARD?

Leverage chain US relations already. Source: [Note]

Air pollution. Sri Lanka Mauritius. From China.

Status quo includes - climate change. Aff = sovereignty. US already shifting Chinese relations. BRI ending with aggression.

Chinese will accept reforms from EU.

No specific green tech change.


Defeat US relations. All stats/impact should include framework.
# NPF

**Novice Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1209</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Jayyusi</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pakistan not in EU therefore irrelevant

China needs EU, EU can back as China improving economy

---

**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.
Economic prosperity, millions of jobs, ½ mil. jobs currently from China
Free trade between participating countries
We need economy!
Debt trap - sphere of influence
economic failure
by these countries, recession in Asia
Loans = recovery
Sri Lanka = 34 ships
India & Pakistan tension
重点领域

Loose grip because of
State debt traps

Way too
hypothesis
52 vs. EU
Seem to many
debt traps would
not help China

Debt traps is
failed to benefit
countries who
Invest, increasing
sphere of influence

12 mil. deaths
### Novice Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Pod A</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:30PM</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>Lovelace</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Pro**
**Con**

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Con**: lots of evidence, need stronger connections between evidence & contentions

**Pro**: good evidence, needed to critique the other side more frequently

---

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Pod A</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Shaik</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sankhla</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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:**

Con: stronger evidence, passionate presentation

Pro: good evidence, new info during Final Focus,
**NPF**

**FLIP: 29 Estrada - Lafayette v. 4 Hakkal - Lo**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Craig May ('22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Hakkal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Estrada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

1. Good presentation. Conclusion not finished.
2. Good argument. Didn't finish the question. Conclusion?
3. Good argument.

Both teams do good presentations. Need to be prepared more for conclusions as well. On team slightly better delivery. 2nd speaker from opposite doing good with crossfire.
Eu is 7% possibility heading toward recession?

Infrastructure will increase Eu's GDP 50%?

Biomass create 10 times emission than Coal?
# NPF

## Novice Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 1204</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haveman</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
<td>1st Parimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Cehajic</td>
<td>25.</td>
<td>2nd bobba</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**

1. Good conclusion, need more prepared and organized.

**Pro**

1. Good presentation, with supporting details.
   - rebuttal ??

2. Need to be more prepared and organized, need more supporting details.
   - better rebuttal ??

Both teams are doing good jobs. The pro team slightly well prepared, better presentation and better delivery.
Eu crisis 20% in 2017 cause global global recession

BRI lending

OBOR
# Novice Public Forum Debate - Corey LaCrosse ('32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1206</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:30PM</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>Moorthy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sud</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Proved Case
- Good clear speech
- Cards given
- Cose Not Aven

---

**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: 7 Mutha - Shenoy v. 4 Kapadia - Narotam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 1206</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:00PM</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>Mutha</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kapadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shenoy</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Narotam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Anusha Mutha
Anjali Shenoy

Taneesha Kapadia
Krish Narotam

Proved the Case

### 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: 4 Balabhadra - Chirravuri v. 27 Carter - Braun**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Katasha Robins (*34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 2 813/815</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kamlebu Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Leoyra Carter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Points | 26.5 | 25 |
| Points (25-30) | |

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Rebuttal questions
Confidence
Quality of speaker's ability
Familiar with reference material

---

**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 Ryu - Shembekar v. 4 Griffin - Jagdish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Pro</td>
<td>Rohit J.</td>
<td>Points (25-30) 27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Pro</td>
<td>Mathew G.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Con</td>
<td>Ryu</td>
<td>Points (25-30) 27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Con</td>
<td>Shembekar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Is this a low point win? **Yes** NO

Judge's Signature: Desert Vista

School / Affiliation / Occupation: Desert Vista

**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:**

- Rebuttals: Question
- Confidence: Familiar with reference material
**Novice Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1205</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:30PM</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>Sreeprasad</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Pham</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

1. Drug trafficking, BRI debt, 992 million (our eye contact) clear
2. Stable w/BRI, efficient trade, consensus (political stability)
3. Winners into losers, China in construction, 2018 trade, EU-China strong
4. Pro should go to Europe, China projects, EU not fall in debt

CF=CQ:920

---

**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 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 1205</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Chakker - Vishnu</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Chakker - Vishnu</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Pro 1st: Very fast telling
- Pro 1st: Clear
- Pro 2nd: V
- Con 2nd: VC
- VCF
- Con 2: Investment
- Pakistan would have debt if join EU
- Trade V
- Environment

**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>Novice Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Vishnuvajhala Subrahmanyam (*11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1st</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfaro</td>
<td>28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2nd</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suthar</td>
<td>28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desai</td>
<td>28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weissman</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:

RI → good points to start. GDP (2.6 → 3.9) stop falling into recession. [EU → 7.0%. Chance of recession, jobs shrinking anyway.]

CF1 → how will EU fall into recession? [T2ICs] > Ti

.S3 → good articulation and questioning of rebuttal of S1, S3. Proof's [Sir Land's, 99 years]

Environmental issues, sweatshops.

CF2 → why lower income in a way say if it is sweatshop → not.

→ Ti [was] very strong in questions and points.

S1 Speaker (T2) → She good stop start but stopped abruptly. [used less than 1.5 min]

S2 Speaker (Ti) → debt trapping.

Final CF → Question Strong form Ti 1.

T2 → Question good.

T1 → Summary of principal BRI will not → good explanation of Ti.

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

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
T1: Well articulated summary and questions.
  
T2: Summary was good, but did not follow up with facts/examples.
  
T2: Sometimes team stepped on each other.

R2 → R1 → T3 → R1 → Very good start with facts. China control debt trapping.
  
T1: Excessive labor, sweat shops, poor conditions.
  
R2: Questioning of rebuttal of T2 is great; environmental impacts not clearly stated.

T1: Rebuttal of T2 questioned opponents but no conclusion.
  
R1: Sri Lanka rebuttal but was no closed by T2.
  
R1: Final summary of T2: Questioned opponents but no conclusion.
  
(T1): Sri Lanka rebuttal but was no closed by T2.
  
Argument has flourished things.
# Novice Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 1203</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Jiang</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Changho</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Saissan</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge’s Signature:**

**School / Affiliation / Occupation:**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- This was a very close round and both teams were very well prepared. The judge heavily weighed their arguments. The judge felt the prep time was helpful.
- The opening speaker was very well prepared and started strong.
- Round 2: Very good questions, stopped after strong answer.
- Round 3: Very strong start; good points. Questions on content were well placed. Very strong response.
- Round 5: Eliminate poverty, 63 BN dollars projects: good points. TI study.
- Round 6: Good question. 63% of Automakers are Chinese: Not strong response, not strong comeback by T1.
- Round 7: Good start to line, final rebuttal, outweights with good economic points, specific.

**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.*
Notes:
Cons

- facts stated firmly.
- clear articulation of points.
- 30mm. debt →
- China gets foothold to EU
- Hungary did not

1st Centennial → Many negative impacts
→ get back with good point

R2 → Not profitable → 270 projects stopped (VOP), dropped 89%, Center of economies → GDP ↓
Contention → Not stated facts.

EU → human record. No debt traps in rebuttal?

R4 → Not solid proofs provided during crossfire.
Not strong questions.

R5 → EU projects are not successful (strong points not highlighted).
- Only concentrating on China - few advantages.
- US high trade deficit

R6 → Middle Eastern point is not valid with support.

R8 → 10% economy and poverty. [awesome conclusions]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Erin Granilo-Walker (*35)</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:30PM</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>29*</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
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature: PCDJ

School / Affiliation / Occupation:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Great job handling questions. Try to ask more advantageous questions in crossfire.
- I'm not sure I buy the argument that China does not want to be a global hegemon. Clarify the solvency argument.
- Nice job asking a question on this.
- Your argument that jobs created in a proto-world would be temporary does not have a warrant.
- Conceded key pro arguments.
- Conceded pro link turns + no clear link chain by the con.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Erin Granilo-Walker (*35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Flight 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Room 804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Katikaneni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Penmatcha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

"Would've liked to hear strategic impacts early. Make sure to always cross time. Reuters is pronounced "Ray-ters". Spread of coal ≠ spread of renewables. Try not to get caught up on semantics in cross. Use all of your speech time!"

"EU ≠ Eurozone. The Balance not a great source to use. Make sure to always cross time. Try not to spend so much time explaining the other team's arguments when rebutting them. Numbering voters can also help."

"RFD: ultimately I buy the opponent's analysis as to how they get to their impacts."

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.