# VPF

**FLIP: 7 Neuner - Wong v. 29 Aberg - Gustin**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Sherry Meng (*'57)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Room</strong></td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>Sat 01/27/18 12:30PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gustin</td>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Wong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Aberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Neuner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- **Pro**
- **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

- **Sherry Meng**
- Judge's Signature

- **Corona del Sol, Coach**
- School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The risk aversion argument from Con was not holding up, so Pro got to access 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.*
**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>Rajaboina</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Heyman</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Insalaco</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ramos</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

**Pro:**
- Ask for paradigms
- Lots of logic, use cards to prove theory
- Don't bring new ev, in summary (Swiss)
- Use cards in rebuttal
- Use taglines
- **Con:**
  - Must accept pro FW
  - Don't answer own questions

**REDS:**
- Pro lacks cards
- Pro rebuttal drops many points
- Con protects most Americans

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker 1</th>
<th>4 min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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.
### VPF

**FLIP: 58 Steiner - Harriss v. 35 Li - Sheng**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>David Rice (L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octo-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 708</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sheng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Harriss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Steiner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Outstanding debate. I see why you all made it to Octos. Con was more convincing & able to provide all data. Great job, tough decision!**

**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: 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- 2 minutes of Prep Time per side

---

**Pro:**
- Great opening, well spoken, good sources
- Concluding Sp1 Summary
- Again, great job
- Nice way to explain ST + LT LGT

**Con:**
- Love your passion! Great Rebuttal
- Rebuttal -> reframe pro contentions -> realism in contentions
- Strong final focus -> nice flow thru
- Aff didn't flow Real Estate thru

---

**Additional Notes:**

- Remember what side your on mentioned neg in final focus when your Aff
  - in 1st rebuttal you almost made Aff say neg again -> looked @ Sheng for what side your on
  - have all your evidence ready, you had great data but I needed you to prove Obamacare + corporate tax prev. evidence

Li
- Great passion, also did well w/rebuttal + add ins from your contentions + rebutting theirs (on)

- Remember what side your on mentioned neg in final focus when your Aff
  - in 1st rebuttal you almost made Aff say neg again -> looked @ Sheng for what side your on

- have all your evidence ready, you had great data but I needed you to prove Obamacare + corporate tax prev. evidence

- I couldn’t, when I asked for data, you appeared to be whispering to Sheng about what to show (appeared deceiving)

- Lay judge but Tanner {
  - need to prove LIE if you want to cover side

---

**Judge’s Signature**

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

Mr. South High School
<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>Rao</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Frazey</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jiang</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro.

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature: Hamilton HS (35)

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Middle class only invests ZA1. Rich would invest less, more influence in government.
I like the heck in effect argument but you started to lose me at the end of case on the Taiwanese stock market analysis. It must have been the first time you read the material, but you were going so fast and not explaining your arguments fully. This harms your analysis. When I started at your rebuttal I thought you were extending your C1 but you were actually just attacking mine (even though they were similar).

RFD: The Con won that comparison would hurt lead to crowding out of small business which outweighs (in my view) the impact of middle class investment in housing. Studies on Affirmative action also have a negative impact on the Negroes' wealth and the SS condition was shown to be politically acceptable.
Comments & Reason for Decision:

Zhou: - very clear initial speech  
- didn't need to give up your framework  
- be prepared for counters to China pt

Chung: - strong pt -> rich can afford tax -> hurts middle class more (should emphasize in 1st speech as well)  
- great speaking voice  
- should research 401(k)s

Ref: can had more concrete data -> many of your pts need to be expanded

Talamantez: - remember to continually link back to capital gains tax  
- relax during cross - not a race (had some strong pts)  
- great speaking voice  
- never heard anything about how rich spend extra $ -> invest or hoard?

Neuner: - strong pts in initial speech -> taxes not impacting investment  
- you created jobs & tax breaks for long term investments  
- perfect as 2nd speaker  
- very effective on cross  
- don't back down on taxes & spending - CGT is cliff from income tax  
* had more empirical evidence
**VF**

FLIP: 3 Parau - Ram v. 35 Kemeny - Shih

**Varsity Public Forum**

**Kat Fowler (*25)**

Ron Stigall (7)

**Octo-Finals**

<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>Kemeny (3rd)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ram</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shih (1st)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Parau</td>
<td>24</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** provided a more convincing argument and asked better questions in cross.

**SHIH** - Good job establishing your contention. Vary your gestures (bouncing hand).

**KEMENY** - Good job rebutting the con contentions. Good answers in cross strengthening your case.

**CON**

Work on clearer answers in cross, don't take over your partner.

**Ram** - Good job establishing your contentions.

**Parau** - Well thought out rebuttal.

For both work on more natural gestures, you're both intense speakers with intense hand movement/gestures.