**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Jiang</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ramos</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Frazey</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Heyman</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:**

Feel that Con proved that CGT will help invest in innercity. Act was passed in Dec 2017 that will guarantee money dedicated to poor & boost our economy. We need to reduce poverty to 4% GDP. Feel Con was able to convince us they could. 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 |

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

**B. Key note: Inner city investment**

**Pro**

- Strong opening, good content, good sources
- CGT will bring more money into inner cities
- $1.2 billion with ACT held up (Bernstein 2015)
- $1 CGT $1.2 GDP
- $12 billion now

**Con**

- Solid content
- Presented well
- Investment recently passed
- Solid final focus
- Pro

**Heyman**

- Reiterate $2 trillion going into innercity (Act passed Dec 2017)
- Guaranteed investment incentives to invest in innercity
- 3x more poverty & $3.87 GDP

**Overall good debate w/ humor + professionalism!**

**Thank you!**
ROBINSON, RYAN

VPF

FLIP: 57 Jiang - Frazey v. 25 Ramos - Heyman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Ryan-Robinson (51)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finals</td>
<td>Room 862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Jiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Frazey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Ramos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Heyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature: Ted Braun

Desert Vista Parent

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Pro**

- Agricultural apocalypse
- Decentralize poverty

**Con**

- Ending tax incentive
- Stabilizing of economy

**Pro** → How do we know no capital gains will lead to that money being invested in inner cities? This point is not clear to me. The poor will invest? Rich who now have no capital gains would? Why? When has this proved to be a good investment.

Inner city investment act - described well by con side. If provides incentives to invest in inner cities it may actually occur.

A little disappointed that the entire debate turned into focusing on the impact on inner cities. As this is only one of multiple many outcome impacts of the legislation.

Having said that, the fundamental argument that the Pro/Aff side makes that an increasing pie will lead to wealthy people deeming the inner cities one of the best places for them to get return on investment seems dubious to me. And not enough direct ties were presented by Pro/Aff side to substantiate this.
**VPF**

**FLIP: 57 Jiang - Frazey v. 25 Ramos - Heyman**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Nick Leonardi ('3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 862</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Frazey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**
(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:**

ultimately, Pro sort of argued trickle-down economics, but that’s not a clear warrant. There’s also the act in December that passed, under Ch 6 rule, which would argue that it is stable. I also don’t buy that incentives must be paid for. The tax cut that just passed certainly was not.

It’s a hard lift to argue a tax cut that primarily benefits the rich will ultimately help the poor → look at income inequality. Pro has a difficult path proving their impacts on just money into inner cities, and I don’t think they managed it here.
Pro

A. Agricultural Apocalypse
- farm value lost greatly (75%)
- food prices ↑, poverty ↓

B. Decentralizing Wealth
- Even out tax revenue
- Lock in investment (free up capital to inner cities)
- Increase ROI (past precedent)

Con

A. Removes tax incentives (donation
- pay it forward (tax deduction)
- Economic Inequality (inner city)

B. Stabilize the Economy
- Taxes short term (stock volatility)
- Deficit = automatic stabilizers (social programs)
- Entrenches poverty

Private people funnel money into inner cities?

Recession = more political participation

Any revenue better than none
not all investment is good
(money to & income = better)
capital gains money goes into poor areas

Investment in Opportunities Act =
increase in investment

Repeal = non-unique advantage
Long-term stab. > instant liquidity