<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>Sarah Albright (*'13)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Ryu</td>
<td>Andrew Kang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shembekar</td>
<td>Blake Enwiller</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Ryu: "This entire debate is based on hypotheticals" - Very good rebuttal.

Overall Pro team seem better able to respond in cross, more articulate

Con team - speak more concisely, even if you have to slow down, you are rushing.

Both teams were polite, professional in presentation & debate.

**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.
Both the teams presented their arguments well and backed up good data points. However, the Pro team wins this round. They focused on infra, influence of FDI on poverty (impact on the) how it could reduce poverty. How China was forgiving loans. Pro team from China

More poised, confident, a clear & their data points

Second team focused on hegemony of con China, global recession, countered pro's points. Had a weak pt. on loan & containers but could not defend effectively

Pro team did better in rebuttal & crossfire.

Pro team brought out the increase in influence of FDI on economy. Leans on con v.
**NPF**

**FLIP: 22 Enwiller - Kang v. 29 Ryu - Shembekar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Arnav Bawa (*4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 205</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gina Ryu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Madhura Shembekar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

All in all a vote Aff. Their debt on infrastructure arguments flowed. They answered Neg on climate.

. . . . . A vote Aff.