ROBINSON, RYAN

VPF
FLIP: 29 Xie - Gill v. 44 Vittal - Wahal

ROBSON

Varsity Public Forum

Ryan Robinson (*'51)

Round 3

Room 722

Fri 01/26/18 06:15PM

Speaker Points

Pro

1st XIE

2nd 71

Points (20-30)

24

27

Con

1st Vittal

2nd Wahal

Points (20-30)

26

32

The winner of this debate was

Pro

Con

(Circle Winner)

No

Is this a low point win?

Judge's Signature

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:

Pro: First summary speech should address the non-O programming may give to social programs

Con: Pro's main benefit is from lowering and one issue in the four focus speeches for instan
clear发音 or entire social care. Pro final focus speech needs more convincing in your argument.

Pro: First focus was giving the most clear analysis that I could have hoped would have been given throughout the round. They gave me a probability is the in

Con: Go after social programs would cut. They do a good

Pro: Enough programs mitigating for claims in economic and I vote can

based on cur to measure social security.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Aashney Shah (*29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 708</strong></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>SMITH</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>TALAMANTEZ</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>HUGHES</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>NEUNER</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Judge's Signature**

**DESKTOP VISTA HS**

School / Affiliation / Occupation

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

*I don't buy middle income investments because the pro never respond to the fact that income taxes are lower than cap gains taxes. That means that in a middle income person shoule already want to invest. Neg wins overall economic harms with clear links to vote on that.*

**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 3</th>
<th>Room 523</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 06:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Ram</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Parau</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Steiner</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **Ram**: They have a weak case, but you let them get by only cross apply the analysis of your contention I.
  - So buybacks happen in the 50-60, the differential so they must be an attempt to casualty. You guys should have Hummel that.

**Steiner**: They have a weak case, but you let them get by only cross apply the analysis of your contention I.

**RFD**: The Pro won every argument on the flow except that some buybacks would continue. The Con team spoke well but had zero substance. Do your research @ home will help the Con & find a core warrant to go for an off & clean up the explanation in case will be the best help for the Aff team.
**Round 3**

<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>Gustin</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Aberg</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Armenta</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Con 2nd:** Going back to your case not necessary when your team speaks first. Better to lay down more offense in rebuttal.
- **All:** "Going over the major voters" is also not a roadmap. Where are the major voters? Tell me that in your off time roadmap.
- **Pro 1st:** Watch how many times you say "like" hurts your presentation.
- **Pro 2nd:** Your volume went like this for FF / be mindful of that

I vote off because they mitigated income & neg flow to extend their entrepreneurship impacts in their case.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>David Floyd (*'16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 701</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Pro</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandolra</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathiravan</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Pro</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajaboina</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Con</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insalaco</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This was a difficult one to call; all contestants were poised, professional and well-prepared. Points were addressed and countered well, though in the end CON, it felt, was more adept at weaving their finer threads into an argument, creating a more integrated response.
### VPF

FLIP: 44 Vicente - Agrawal v. 47 Williams - Thompson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 522</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 06:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>1 Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30) 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>1 Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30) 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Shivank</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Agrawal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

Pro **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature

Hamilton

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

A major problem I had was the AFF rebuttal, as the AFF spends a lot of time extending their own case. The AFF rebuttal doesn't actually interact with the NEG case at all, it's very disorganized. It's a note for AFF: both partners should be flowing the summary for AFF was also very disorganized and doesn't actually engage with the logic of the neg's arguments. It also, try not to laugh in exec, take debate seriously. The neg should do a better job of explaining answers in rebuttal more clearly. The neg summary also needs to be more organized - grouped better, w/ more sign posting. but overall the neg does more w/ responding to argo - tries to do more warranting, it does a bit more weighing.

Both teams need to do more with extending cards.
# VPF

**FLIP: 2 Diaz - Callies v. 53 Delgado - Frank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Corey La Crosse (*3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 524</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Claudia Frank</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Danielle Delgado</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>John Diaz</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Jacob Callies</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Both teams need to do some Economics 1st research. Econ topics are hard. Talk to a teacher who can help you with the fundamentals.

- Mr. Diaz - watch how you present yourself. You tend to come off dismissive and a bit rude - especially in crossfire.

RFD

- Pro demonstrates that eliminating the CDT is likely to cut GDP by $51 billion annually and generate 55,000 jobs.

- Con counters that Feeds will lose $137 B in revenues and that states like Massachusetts will see harm to programs such as their pension fund.

- While con clearly overstates the pension impact, the federal revenue loss is documented and exceeds any benefit claimed by the Aff.**
### VPF
FLIP: 48 Galardi - Gould v. 35 Gadiyar - Gadiyar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Chris Thiele (*'20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 424</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20/30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gadiyar Aditya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gadiyar Arjun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20/30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Galardi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gould</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Wow! You guys were all wonderful! You showed great understanding of the topic and its complexity. You were all polite, respectful, and hard driving. Excellent debate! I had a very hard time deciding. I voted for the neg on homework, gov funding, and latte effect. Only neg had homework so that was the deciding factor. I think best showed all classes benefited from removing cop gains because I bought the argument that decreasing cop gains taxed the notch effects. I bought the 9% argument of the latte effect.

Also... all did a great job of analyzing evidence and making very clear, coherent arguments. I wish you all much luck!
## VPF

**FLIP: 38 Felton - Robson v. 2 Salamatin - Cardone**

### Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 706</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 06:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Nic Robson</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1st Salamatin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd MacKenzie Felton</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2nd Cardone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(Circle Winner)

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

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.
## VPF

**FLIP: 14 Groman - Exum v. 3 Singh - Chow**

### Round 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Singh</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Chow</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Judge's Signature**

**BASIS PHX / Coach**

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Pro:** clarity in rebuttal
- **Con:** C2 confusing

---

**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.

---

**RFD:**

- Gov. Superbikes overall caputlist
- No Bio Card gives Auto to Con
**Varsity Public Forum**

**Round 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Rao</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Showers</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Venkatachalam</td>
<td>28</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:**

**Pro Team wins on ->**

**Con Team said that lacking effect is not there!** That shows that people are irrational, but they could not substantiate why lacking effect is not there.

**Pro Team's claim that cutting back on capital gains taxes will help on innovation and people will be willing to take the risk and this will help in new biomedical research that will help with saving human life.** This was most athealing argument.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Pro Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Cervantes 29</td>
<td>Shah 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ball 30</td>
<td>Kaira 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:**

**Pro** kept to stated objectives for abolishing CGT, with well rounded argument covering diversified evidence.

**Con** gave a good argument but only touched one limited side of lower class and how they can be helped. Nothing said w/ evidence about upper and middle classes.

---

**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 3</th>
<th>Room 526</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 06:15PM</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>Sahnan</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Lu</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:**

**Sahnan:** - understand the economics in your own words
- make sure you have all evidence

**Lu:** - try to work on the flow of your voice
- poor -> more opportunity in volatile market?

*↓ advancement was weak & countered
*could not explain/prove double taxation
*dropped evidence

**Heyman:** - strong on cross (double taxation)
- need to emphasize links

**Ramos:** - explain link from poverty to CGT in 1st speech
- strong response to ↓ investment -> ↓ taxation for venture capitalism
- lock-in effect -> good use

*could add house-flippers to con (evidence of entrepreneurship)
# VPF

## FLIP: 25 Durado - Perez v. 29 Bakshi - Cooley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Kyle Henden (56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Chris Durado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>David Perez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kay Bakshi</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Jeanna Cooley</td>
<td>25</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**
- Good presentation, but arguments not as clearly structured; difficult to follow
- Fewer support for arguments
- Confused on effective of both arguments — no pointable answers

**Con**
- Both speakers are clear on arguments presented, but arguments are strong
- Difficult to follow
- Answered questions. No pointable answers

Summary: Good rebuttal arguments

Judge's Signature: [Signature]

School / Affiliation / Occupation: BASIS Phoenix

---

### 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 teams were hip, clean up, and in possession of arguments.

In the 2nd round, the was more convincing in their arguments with the support of those arguments.
# VPF

**FLIP: Rolfness - Bhaskara v. 7 Jazo - Stratton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Leah Veschio (*30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 705</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro 1st</td>
<td>Stratton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro 2nd</td>
<td>Jazo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con 1st</td>
<td>Bhaskara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con 2nd</td>
<td>Rolfness</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 Team I**

Speaker 1: Excellent Speaker - Very Articulate.


**CON Team II**

Speaker #1: Excellent Argument.

Great intro. Opened up a good supporting evidence. Made good points to support Con.

1st Speaker: Excellent preparation & answers prepared. Equal work.

Speaker #2: I like that she talked to me, and not at me. Her words, tone, & presentation actual made her argument more convincing. Very believable.

You are really good during crossfire. Great job!

Crossfire #2 - Won by PRO

Summary: Con win

Crossfire: Grand Conclusion

Final Focus =

**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.*

---

### Judge's Signature

[Signature]

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

### Comments on Speeches

- Crossfire: Both sides prepared & equal work.
- Crossfire: Win by PRO
- Summary: Con win

---

### Additional Notes

- Speaker 1: Excellent Speaker - Very Articulate.
- Speaker 2: I like that she talked to me, and not at me. Her words, tone, & presentation actual made her argument more convincing. Very believable.
- You are really good during crossfire. Great job!
Assets
1. Spend more areas
2. 75% + raise more revenue
   LTE + 725%
3. Wealth - benefit from more taxpayers

Crossfire: Proved points from both sides (Speaker) - Using

PRO
1. Open to def.
2. Greater good for greater America
3. Tax - leads to double in effect
   - hurts econ. growth
   - lock in - allocate to almost equal
   - 2014 - loose extra output

Con: Arqued Pro points well. Pointed out their weaknesses clearly perceiving.

Cost Ben. Analysis: lock in proved as an all. than doing away to tax
# VPF

**FLIP: 42 Flores - Knorr v. 57 Pattipati - Zhou**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Tayna Martinez ('53)</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 06:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 725</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>1st</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhou</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Knorr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Pattipati</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td><em>Pro</em></td>
<td>Flores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

*Very close round; enjoyed watching jobs at convinve me that their case would benefit economy overall w/ $300 billion in economy, exp inner city + increase jobs.*

**Zhou**

- Lots of evidence supporting contentions
- Inner city, black ownership 33%
- $2.26 trillion budget revenue
- Stressed on summary

**Pattipati**

- in sync/partner
- Both answer questions identically simultaneously = more convincing
- Driving $2.26 trillion reinvested into economy
- 1.3 million new jobs
- $1.82 in GDP
- Slow down, a lot of data to cover, but hard to follow at times

**Knorr**

- Good speaking voice
- Gave lose min 9/12/61

**Flores**

+ Good rebuttal, refuting contentions
+ 2016 Con Card vs 1978 Harvard Pro card
+ Solid speaker, convincing
+ Readily presented evidence

- Appeared to be dismissive at times during cross fire
# VPF

FLIP: 35 Li - Sheng v. 47 Rodriguez - Joshua

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Ushunda Schulz (*'14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</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**

Paradise Valley H.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Speaker 1 took too much time forming how to word his argument but had good cross x that helped to support his argument. Exuded confidence.

Speaker 2 - Appeared confident well spoken. Good arguments and cross x. Summary and rebuttals was clear, solid and strongly supported his position.

Both speakers had strong, supported arguments. Good eye contact. Good communication. Both did an effective job comparing and contrasting their position. Stronger argument overall.

**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.
Con made a strong case to keep CG present, opening contentiously. Pro spent much of their time on the defensive, trying to convince the audience that Con's case was not valid but there was little ground gained near all the while. Con spent much of their continuing to build their case, as a direct result of Pro's case being weak (as it relates to facts or even tangential arguments that could easily be followed to allow the audience to see how getting rid of CG would be best).

Furthermore, Pro failed to explain how the current status quo of redistribution of Con's case worse.
**VPF**

FLIP: 3 Potter - Cross v. 7 Neuner - Wong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Aamirah Chisti (*10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 525</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Potter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(20-30)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Wong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Neuner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(20-30)</strong></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:

**Pro**

- Speech was well structured, organized, and articulate.

- Speaker 1 had good evidence in favor of their argument.

- Speaker 2 was strong and forceful in presenting their arguments.

**Con**

- Speaker 3 was well organized in presenting their arguments.

- Speaker 4 had strong points, but needed to clarify their arguments further.

- Speaker Summary did not talk about opponents' arguments.

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.*

Comments: It was a very contested debate. Both teams had very good arguments making their case, and counting opps case. But had to pick cons cause they were little more articulate in presenting their case while showing how the pros contentions did not hold.
**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 703</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 06:15PM</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>Daniel Shih</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Aleks Kemeny</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:**

**Pro:** I voted for the Pro due in part to both debaters very strong and well-defined arguments in support of the (CGT) argument. Both debaters were pointed in several defined situations that by cutting the capital gains taxes (CGT) hurt the economy more than it helped. Both debaters were very articulate in their vocal, very smooth in their delivery of research materials with no slip-ups. They both were very convincing.

I did not vote for the Con not because both debaters did not present well—they did—but the Pro was overwhelming. My observation of the Con was slow, convincing, sticking to their belief in their argument. Sticking to their belief and game with no direction.

**Con:**
**VF**

**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Eugene Chung (*'38)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pacioni: 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Fyan 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Room 721 | Fri 01/26/18 06:15 PM |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Frazey 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Jiang 57</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:**

**Pacioni:**
- delivery: confident and articulate
- evidence: good number and quality of citations
- logic: easy to follow, interpretation of resolution is debatable
- organization: well organized

cross X: good initial cross X, paused at times during grand cross X

**Fyan:**
- delivery: confident, composed
- evidence: could use more
- logic: easy to follow, interpretation of resolution is debatable
- organization: excellent

Cross X: strong initial cross X, nuanced discussion re: income vs capital.

**Jiang:**
- delivery: confident, engaging, composed
- evidence: excellent number and quality of citations
- logic: excellent, correctly questions Aff's interpretation of resolution
- organization: excellent, well-organized

cross X: very strong initial cross X.

**Frazey:**
- delivery: composed, articulate
- evidence: good number and quality of citations
- logic: easy to follow
- organization: excellent, methodical, effective

summary:

**RFD:** Con interpretation of resolution, and arguments/counters arguments were more convincing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Mike Tristano (*58)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>VAILLANCOURT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>ROSAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro.

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Rosal and Gonzales, I would have liked you both involved in grand cross – it turns into only 2 people and really only one question asked.

This was a good round, ultimately I think the Pro held the burden of proof so low it would lead to their impacts...
# VPF

**FLIP: 56 Narayanan - Mooney v. 35 Kapadya - Bawa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Kellie Roberts (*2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 726</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Pro</td>
<td>Mooney (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Pro</td>
<td>Narayanan (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Con</td>
<td>Kapadya (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Con</td>
<td>Bawa (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:**

- Narayanan
- Great counterpoints
- Confident and makes points strong but relax a bit

**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: 58 Tehranchi - Ori v. 3 Galan - Khanna**

## Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Scott Woods (*'44)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Khanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Galan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Just be that is "capital" doesn't mean there is innovation - needs to be better about this link (they refuse this)
- Healthcare innovation ≠ actual healthcare (gout, healthcare isn't ineffective yet the tech isn't there). Bear in mind that pharma companies have massive profits but HC is still expensive
- Left a lot of the NC unrefuted
- Dropped all their impacts, this is almost an auto-loss for you. If you concede an economic crisis (?) it's hard to vote for you
- Bottom line: you can never adequately link an increase in capital to more investment union is why the neg 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

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.