<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>David Rice (*4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**.

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? __________

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.
CHUNG, EUGENE

Bobcat Bonanza 2018

VPF

FLIP: 7 Talamantez - Neuner v. 47 Williams - Thompson

Varsity Public Forum

Eugene Chung (*'38)

Round 1

Speaker Pro Points (20-30)
1st Talamantez 7 29
2nd Neuner 7 29

Speaker Con Points (20-30)
1st Thompson 47 27
2nd Williams 47 26

The winner of this debate was Pro
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Eugene Chung
Judge's Signature

Scottsdale Prep
School / Affiliation / Occupation

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:

Talamantez
delivery: confident delivery
could engage audience more, read less
evidence: excellent
logic: easy to understand
cross X: excellent distinction between income and capital gains, taxes, discussion of liberal curvilinear cross X, very strong

Neuner
delivery: engaging, confident
evidence: excellent, numerous relevant citations
logic: easy to follow
detailed, methodical
organization: excellent
cross X: very strong performance, asks pointed questions, points out inconsistencies, quick and articulate during grand cross X

Williams
delivery: several pauses, could engage audience more
evidence: could use more
logic: easy to follow
organization: prepping more would help in cross X
Cross X: can improve this area, difficulty seems to arise from need to reframe better prep

Thompson
delivery: can engage audience more
does not read
several pauses at times
evidence: good evidence
logic: easy to understand
organization: could improve in cross X, see below
Cross X: issue is to keep or abolish capital gains tax, not to subject capital gains to income tax as an alternative.

RFD: Pro side had better arguments and counterarguments, and was better prepared. Conside: lack of prep was apparent. Can also work on anticipating opponent...
## VPF

**FLIP: 35 Kemeny - Shih v. 25 Fyan - Pacioni**

### Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Aashney Shah (*29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Room 706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Fri 01/26/18 03:45PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1st     | PACIONI             | 27 |
|---------|---------------------|
| 2nd     | FYAN                | 27.5 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Room 706</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Fri 01/26/18 03:45PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1st     | SHIH                | 28 |
|---------|---------------------|
| 2nd     | KEMENY              | 28.5 |

**The winner of this debate was**

![Circle] Pro Con

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

it comes down to FDL needs to be more interaction b/w the frameworks rather than just flawed your responses, that means I buy AFF FW and no thy 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.
TRISTANO, MIKE  

VPF  
FLIP: 14 Rolfness - Bhaskara v. 29 Aberg - Gustin  

Varsity Public Forum  
Mike Tristano (58)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 708</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 03:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>BHASKARA</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>ROLFNESS</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speaker | Con      | Points (20-30) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>GUSTIN</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>ABERG</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was  

Pro  Con  
(Circle Winner)  

Is this a low point win? No  

Judge's Signature  

{'School / Affiliation / Occupation': '

Comments & Reason for Decision:  

RFD: Framework provided  

Con was more effective + valued lives.  

More application on economic fairness. Economic growth on pro side was needed.
## VPF

**FLIP: 53 Martinez - Fay v. 3 Potter - Cross**

### Varisty Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Ryan Robinson (*'51)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Abigail Potter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Alaina Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Madelyn Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sean Fay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge's Signature**

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

### Order/Time Limits of Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Type</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 5 Summary</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 6 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.*

---

**Con:**

- Give a clear story of the many free cat gypsy responsibilities.
- Give a clear story of the many free cat gypsy responsibilities.

**Pro:**

- Give us an agenda & explain the even grow on Detroit. Years new story at our time turns again.

---

**Pro:**

- Pro gives a clear story on lack-in-effect & even growth that con does not explain how they don't live.
- Pro gives the clearer position in favor, containing analysis.
The Con argument makes the point that 88% of the revenues from abolishing the capital gains tax would go to the wealthy, but never counter that everyone does indeed benefit, particularly as Pro points out with a significant increase in employment. As Speaker 1 said you must weigh the impacts, which is too vague.

The Pro argument successfully defends that capital gains are a barrier to investment in inner cities.

The Con argument never proves that capital gains serving as a tax shelter is unique to this situation.

The Con team did successfully show that the capital gains tax does not harm agricultural productivity nor serve as the primary problem faced by small farmers.
1st Con

Cl Abolish worsen inequality
- Cap gains concentrate in wealthy + 99% over $100,000
  - Negative impact stability & growth
  - Tax shelters that hurt economy
  - Reduced productivity

Cross

How much farmland converted?
- Weigh impact (agriculture)
- Cuts in cap gains impact
- Decrease govt revenue

2nd S
Farmers hurt
- Nay big vs. DA = production
- De-centralizing = bigger protests
- Poverty = no impacts of over-better budget, spending stated
- Cap gain = huge revenue boost
- 1980's = increase correlation not causation
- Buffett = no decisions on cap gains
- Conflict reiterated...
- IMF = income inequality bad

Cross

Overspending? Problem with govt decisions
- Farmers doing fine prices
  - KVI = 1990's
  - Lack of evidence it benefits
  - Investors use other criteria = refuted

Re-allocation is barrier
- Decreases or of gang
- 95% of benefits

2nd Pro

Cl Agriculture = 75% of farms value lost in taxes when transferred = lost farms
- Rise in food prices = poverty
- States over-estimate revenue from cap gains = increase investment
- Tax shelters = lock capital
- Could help inner cities

Cross
- Investment bad?
  - 2nd S = violence leads to ii
  - Inner city voting goes away
  - Avg person benefits from cap gains = 73 million new jobs
  - Slow growth hurts poor most
  - 2012 GDP ii now: no conflict
  - Cap gains = already a tax shelter
  - Still would be a problem
  - Other ax's

Cross

Volatility = welfare cuts B = Invert two cuts
- Cap gains fluctuates
- "Welfare" removes structural barrier to inner cities
- Polling not responded to = violence
- Reallocates economy = better govt cuts
- All money reinvested
- Structural barrier to ic

2S
- More jobs = never addressed
- II is bad now
# VPF

## FLIP: 38 Felton - Robson v. 56 Narayanan - Mooney

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 728</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 03:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Robson</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Felton</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

## Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Clear outlining and strong backing of first contention w/ concrete evidence
- Weak response and poor communication in first cross
- Strong response to contention on one side
- Strong and contentious response
- Strong crossfire (34) but a little rude
- Strong pointing out of opposition tax, winning economic gain short with app during grand crossfire

Clear outlining of contentions took too long on the first 2 contentions in start, hurting your third motion response and attacking in first crossfire, little proof of response to first teams contention weak speculation.

- Strong crossfire (34)
- Pointing out educational dependency is a strong point

Reason for win

Close debate till grand crossfire when you successfully got Con to acknowledge some cards they had missed on speculation and/or little numerical data.

## 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>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 424</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 03:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Durado</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Perez</td>
<td>27</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:

- Asymmetry
- Lower tax rate
- Reduce return on investment
- $ reward for entrepreneurs
- GDP (31.21)
  2nd Speaker
  - Main pt -> Other team also not
  - Give details, only overview

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 4 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.*

- **Pro Obstinate Capital Gains**
  - Short termism
  - Corporate buyback
  - Kills ObamaCare funding
  - - NO instances of go CG
  - 2008 eco. crisis
  - Not invest more -> Invest Worse

- **Con**
  - Weak Arguments
  - Did well in Final focus
  - Well prepared speeches
  - Addressed question raised by other side

- **Strong T**
  - Raising strong arguments about GDP and CG
  - This team has managed to address their opponents arguments very well.
  - Both speakers were very persuasive
  - Showed the scope of their impact was greater.

- **Keep C#**

- **D**
  - Good Speaking skills, seemed well prepared
  - Needs to look up from computer more.
  - Try to speak with more authority.
  - Did well in Final focus.

- **P**
  - Good speaking skills, seemed well prepared.
  - Needs to look up from computer more.
  - Try to speak with more authority.
  - Did well in Final focus.
  - Well prepared speeches
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Brad TenBarge (*15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 726</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st</strong></td>
<td><strong>Frank</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delgado</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Pro Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Good use of evidence - a little opening summary
- Strong
- Jargon

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.
VF

FLIP: 48 Galardi - Gould v. 44 Lu - Sahnan

Varsity Public Forum  
Shawn White

Round 1  
Room 724  
Fri 01/26/18 03:45PM

<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>Galardi</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sahnan</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gould</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Lu</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Con

Pro (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

1st Speaker: I really like the & I don't abol WCR arg. I didn't buy the counter plan & the Wi.

2nd Speaker: I would have attacked the FW, but using it a sense to show why your winning was good.

NEG

1st Speaker: I really like the & I don't abol WCR arg. I didn't buy the counter plan & the Wi.

2nd Speaker: I would have attacked the FW, but using it a sense to show why your winning was good.

Summary: Spend more time on your other than that pretty good.

FF: New arg, new background, and new flow those Awesome final focus

I voted NE because the best proved why it is bad for all classes, better than AFF proved it is good for all classes.

Both teams need impact & calc

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order/Time Limits of Speeches</th>
<th>Time</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.

RFD: The AFF's framework was a bit abusive, but went unchallenged.
I voted NEG because they best proved why it is bad for all classes, better than AFF proved it is good for all classes.

Both teams need impact & calc
## VESCHIO, LEAH

### VPF

**FLIP: 2 Diaz - Callies v. 44 Insalaco - Rajaboina**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Leah Veschio (*'30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 722</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</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:**

- Diaz appreciates last speech but keep in mind it can loose it effect as you slow down a little your convnincing will sound more Convincing as you are a good speaker.
- Great questions in crossfire.
- Speaker 1: Good into work
- Speaker 2: Broader
- Rich benefits
- 83 mil loose the long term invest.
- Shift LT case into strong rebuttal during 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: 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>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 526</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 03:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Stratton</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Jazo</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

**Judge’s Signature**

- **Comments & Reason for Decision:**
  - Stratton: -can be hard to understand (nunble) - didn't get much of 2nd contention - strong 1st contention - yet goes up against short tenurism
  - Jazo: - hard to argue for inequality - good pt on cross - housing bubble
  - Rao: - good speaking voice - very clear 1st speech - strong pt on grand cross => 401k not impacted
  - Khan: - strong on cross - strong pt on the rich reinvesting - 4-7 statistic could be turned against your case

*3 contentions outweigh Pro's case => more data, clear impacts*  
*1st contention - hardest to prove*  
*be ready to connect housing bubble to capital gains tax*
VARIVY PUBLIC FORUM

PRO

1st: Zhou
2nd: Chung

CON

1st: Vittal
2nd: Wahal

The winner of this debate was:

Pro

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Did a good job convincing me that we should stop the G2T. Need to improve U.S. Global Competitiveness - stimulate 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.

Vittal

+ Good cross talk question
+ 2017 United States News
+ Strong finish

Chung

+ Nice loud voice
+ Strong finish
+ Forbes, PPI Holding Assets
+ Strong finish

Zhou

+ Nice job speaking
+ Helpful class
+ Improves U.S. Global Competitiveness

Wahal

+ Good cross talk question
+ Forbes, PPI news
+ Harvard study

+ Slow down; see that you are passionate but hard to follow your points

Pro

Con
Varsity Public Forum | Chris Flores ('42)  
---|---
**Round 1** | **Room 727** |  
**Speaker** | **Pro** | **Points (20-30)** | **Con** | **Points (20-30)**  
**1st** | **GEORGE CERVANTES** | 24 | **1st** | **AKILA BANLORA** | 27  
**2nd** | **TATUM BALL** | 26 | **2nd** | **ANUSHKA KATHIRAVAN** | 28  
  
**The winner of this debate was**  
Pro **(Circle Winner)**  
Con  
  
**Is this a low point win?** NO  
  
**Comments & Reason for Decision:**  
**PRO**  
- Respectful  
- Evidence - Good  
- Delivery - Too fast, late  
- Contention presented: 2-3 Canadian workers (FAREWELL)  
  
**CON**  
- Respectful  
- Evidence - Strong  
- Delivery - Reasonably good  
- Contentsions presented: Multiple  
  
**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.*  
  
---  

**Rebuttal:** Not clear on  
- Canadian workers  
- What was Bush Tax Plan?  
- 15% capped  
- Not able to answer the current rate of capital gains  
  
**Crossfire:**  
- Good answer for reason for recession  
- Schools will go unfunded - fair answer 60/40 evidence - lack of time  
  
**Utilitarian View:**  
- Growth in economic growth and national income  
- Entrepreneurship, success  
- Not very clear of the issues in explaining  
  
**Cost Effective Approach:**  
- Addressed each contention of fellow Pro team  
- All made were supported by evidence  
  
**Capital Gains:** Rich can circumvent  
- Could not respond effectively on how abolishing them takes away income inequality, arguments presented not conclusive  
  
**Effective Delivery:**  
- Arguments can be stronger
Provided food overall argument

do not have abductions and

overall it why they're opponents

should rebuttal offered to argument

abductions offered in proxy their

evidence more focused on proving their

Overall counter- factual healing in the end.
### Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 525</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 03:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>ZHOU</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>PATTIPATI</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>HARRISS</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>STEINER</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

**Pro**

ZHOU - Good flow, lead less, look up and speak, you know the info well!

PATTIPATI - Improve your flow, work on transitions between points

**Con**

STEINER - Well thought out, good job disputing opponents' contentions

HARRISS - 1st round you read to me, summary round was much better, you spoke to me not the screen - you know the info, be confident and speak!

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**CON HAD BETTER EVIDENCE FOR THEIR CONTENTIONS & DISPUTED THE PRO CASE BETTER**

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.
## VPF

**FLIP: 20 Walsh - Bordchartd v. 3 Singh - Chow**

**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 423</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 03:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Singh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Chow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Bordchartd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Walsh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Judge's Signature:** Ajay Shukla

**School / Affiliation / Occupation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Con Team Prepared a Different Topic and chose not to debate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 701</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 03:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>RAsor</td>
<td>Wedge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Caciola</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Rodriguez</td>
<td></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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Pro</td>
<td>Shukla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Con</td>
<td>Singh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Flip:** Shukla - Good headway, prepare well in advance

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Judge's Signature:**

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker 1</th>
<th>Speaker 2</th>
<th>Speaker 3</th>
<th>Speaker 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crosfire (1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td>Crosfire (1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td>Crosfire (3 &amp; 4)</td>
<td>Crosfire (3 &amp; 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School/Affiliation:**

**Judge's Signature:**

**Points:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- The flip is decided by the judge.
- The debate is conducted in English.
- The debate format includes Crosfire rounds where each side has 3 minutes for their main arguments and 4 minutes for their crossfire rounds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 707</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 03:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Wong</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Neuner</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gonzales</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Vaughn</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

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

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Wong:** Good eye contact, give away your annoyance.
- **Gonzales:** Nice job incorporating sources in a way that was natural.
- **Neuner:** You spoke like an orator - a good vocal presentation, rather than speed-debating. You know how to speak publicly.
- **Vaughn:** Slow down and breathe, you sound incredibly emotional.
- **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.

All of you, as soon as you get rid of your script you go from speaking as educated adults to teenagers. Keep your speech consistent. Remove "like" and "um" from your vocabulary.
**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>Salamatin</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Bakshi</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Cardone</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cooley</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

The pro side had a more developed argument and were confident speakers. Both spoke clearly and at a good speed. Both were familiar with the topic and were able to clarify their contentions.

The con side needs to be more familiar with the topic. Both need to slow down a bit. 2nd speaker was clear, but 1st speaker needs to work on clearer speech. Some questions seemed tedious. Both speakers will gain confidence with more practice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Garret Mooney ('22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Vicente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Agrawal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sheng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Li</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

"Everybody spoke way too fast!"
# Varsity Public Forum

**FLIP: 25 Ramos - Heyman v. 35 Kapadya - Bawa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 705</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 03:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>KAPADYA</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>BAWA</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was PRO

Judge's Signature

PARADISE VALLEY

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**PRO**

- GOOD VOICE & EMOTION.
- NO BODY MOTION/HAND GESTURES, CONSTANT SWAYING, NERVOUS TIC?
- IN CROSS: MUCH MORE HAND MOTIONS, GOOD.
- MENTIONED FALLACY BY NAME, BONUS POINTS.
- REALLY LIKED THE EMOTION AND CONVERSATIONAL SPEAKING, GOOD BODY LANGUAGE/EYE CONTACT.

**CON**

- GOOD VOICE, A LITTLE BIT OF STUTTERING/NERVES BUT THAT'S GOOD, TOO GRIP.
- IN CROSS: GOOD HAND GESTURES AND CHARISMA.
- MAYBE SHOULDN'T HAVE MENTIONED HOW HIGH THE HILLS ARE.
- GREAT PRESENCE AND URGENCY, A LITTLE PANICKY, WITH SHARP BREATHS. ROOM TO IMPROVE, BUT VERY GOOD. LOTS OF HAND GESTURES AND EYE CONTACT.
- TOOK DOWN EACH CONTENTION SOUNDLY, OUTWEIGHED THE THIRD WITH IMPACTS SO FAR I AGREE.

**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.

**K:** GOOD SUMMARY, UP UNTIL THE END. HIT THE HEAVY POINTS BUT THEN TRIED TO CRAM IN EVERYTHING AT THE END AND WAS DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND.

**H:** SUMMARY HIT THE IMPACTS AGAIN, BUT TRIED TO COVER TOO MUCH GROUND, GAVE UP
PRO

B: ENTRENCHING THE RICH NOT BAD?
MORE INVESTMENTS WILL HELP THE POOR
DROPPED DEFICIT SPENDING
INVESTMENT & STABILITY

CON

R: VERY FOCUSED!
GOOD.
HAMMERED THOSE KEY POINTS
DIDN'T FOLLOW YOUR LAST POINT BECAUSE OVERTIME

RFD: STRESSED YOUR IMPACTS AND DEFENDED THEM WELL. GREAT REBUTTAL, KEPT OPPONENTS ON THE BACK FOOT.
SUMMARY & FINAL FOCUS HAMMERED IT HOME.
I was very impressed by both cases. I thought your arguments on both sides were compelling and had strong evidence. Crossfire was probably too contentious and not enough back forth questioning, but it was polite and engaging and enjoyable to watch. I thought you were all bright, articulate gentlemen with excellent argumentation skills. I had a very hard time deciding here as I believe the topic is complex and something got lost a bit in the meat of the debate. I voted Con based on final focus summary. I bought the arguments here because I felt they were empirical and real world. Specifically, that Republicans are about cutting taxes, not replacing them i.e. new tax reform just passed. This triggers all the harms. Also the poor voters frustration = right wing voting which also triggers harms, as is currently happening in status quo. Good luck to all!
**V PF**

FLIP: 14 Groman - Exum v. 7 Rosal - Vaillancourt

**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Jill Beckis ('20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Exum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Groman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Vaillancourt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Rosal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Aff**

- refresh on basic macroecon principles, line effects of raised interest rates, b/c a huge warrant of reg's for deficit was through higher interest rates but in macroecon, interest rates lead to more economic development/activity/growth
- this latter case, strongest part of argument is how more tax revenue comes in, which nullifies their deficit. Take more about how tax revenue went up.
- also respond to actual reduction, attack their line of referring to framework

**Neg**

- you should spend more of your rebuttal on debt and deficit. That's the biggest part of the case for sure
- prove to me that everyone becoming homeowners is bad, especially with dire economic US econ is going
- only up your framework or at least one more time, you drop it
- hole in your logic about infrastructure:
  - loans/interest rates
  - talk about Switzerland earlier
- you contradict yourself with saying how much investments belong to rich but then you have default to middle class even though you said it harms investors and Wall Street the most

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 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>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 523</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 03:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gadiyar</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gadiyar</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**.

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

*Coal Critique*

Voted neg because neg extended clearly that there is no correlation between a ↓ in capital gains tax and an ↑ in investment, mitigating economic impacts of Aff. Also the education point on aff was not properly rebutted.
### VPF

**FLIP: 25 Shah - Kaira v. 7 Ly - Armenta**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Jacob Cordero (*40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 704</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tay Ly</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exquisite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd</strong></td>
<td><strong>90.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Armenta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIN Shah</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Valliantcourt</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eshan Kaira</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**

**Desert Ridge**

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order/Time Limits of Speeches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1....................4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2....................4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (1 &amp; 2) *..........3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3....................4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4....................4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (3 &amp; 4) *..........3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 Summary............2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2 Summary............2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Crossfire (all).......3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3 Final Focus........2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4 Final Focus........2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minutes of Prep Time per side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Matches were very close. In the end Pro was able to make the best case for the bigger picture while Con invested much of their argument on the fact that the poor would remain worst off. Additionally, Con was not able to convince that investment and economy would increase.

Low point win due to the fact that Con spoke well and seemed to win most all arguments but did not convince that there would be enough benefits to abolishing CB.

---

**Tay:** Be sure you understand a question before asking it and if you say you will explain something at a later time, it should be clear that you are doing so.