<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 706</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Suresh Ram</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>David Parau</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Alex Tam</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Kabeela Afework</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:

**WINNING ARGUMENTS OF PRO TEAM**

1. **DROPPING CAPITAL GAIN TAXES FROM 49% TO 20%**
   - Increased venture investment by 700% (Evidence was given by the team)

2. Removing capital gain will help in agricultural and biotechnological research and thus help with global poverty and global health and will help more number of people (as the benefit is global)

3. Poverty is a bigger problem than obesity as poverty is coming from a forced condition while obesity is a behavioural problem. Innovation will solve poverty while con team debated that removing the capital tax will increase obesity.
### VPF

**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Tim Cornwall (*'42)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steiner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Speaker 1 makes good eye contact and strongly supports her position on innovation and biotechnology.
- Speaker 2 supports position with good Crossfire Attack and good rebuttals with sound reasoning.
- Good team delivery.
- Both speakers make good eye contact and articulate their position very well. Their cross X rebuttals successfully showed weakness with their opponent's position.
- Impact flows through the argument. They had the best argument.

---

**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.
The debaters from both teams spoke very well, concise and clearly. However the con team had a very clear understanding of the topic and refuted the double taxation contention very well. In fact all the contentions of pro team were very well argued. So I voted for con team.

The final focus by the second speaker in con team addressed all contentions.
# VPF

**FLIP: 47 Rodriguez - Joshua v. 25 Shah - Kalra**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Ryan Robinson (51)</th>
<th>Tanya Martinez (53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 704</td>
<td>Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Shah</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Kalra</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Rodriguez</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:**

- Feit Pro had better arguments
- provided more evidence & sources than Con.
- Pro more convincing, especially when Con 1st speaker identified w/ Aff.
- **Pro**

**Shah**
- good data & sources
- smart to re-use summary
- $2.62 trillion
- good summary; now contains

**Kalra**
- re-state contentions & sources
- final focused & no rebuttal to agriculture
- good flow & thorough

**Rodriguez**
- spoke well, presented well, eye contact
- reaffirmed speaker 1 contentions, related Pro

- need to identify sources to provide evidence during rebuttal

**Judge's Signature**

**Mesquite High School**

**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 |

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Shukla</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Bakshi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Singh</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Cooley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></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:

- How is international trade related to this topic? Answer: It isn’t.
- RFD: The Pro won by showing inequality was non-unique & can coexist, & the 2nd speaker defended that taking money from social program was bad for the poor. The Pro won by showing some people would benefit.
### Varsity Public Forum

**FLIP: 44 Insalaco - Rajaboina v. 25 Durado - Perez**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 421</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM</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>1st</td>
<td><strong>DURADO</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>PEREZ</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**CON DID A BETTER JOB REFUTING THE PRO CONTENTIONS**

**PRO**

**DURADO - GOOD JOB ESTABLISHING YOUR CONTENTIONS. EFFECTIVE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS IN CROSS.**

**PEREZ - GOOD REBUTTAL. FORMULATE CLEARER QUESTIONS IN CROSS. BOBING HAND CAN BE DISTRACTING, WORK ON MORE NATURAL GESTURES. SAY "LIKE" MUCH LESS**

**CON**

**RAJABOINA - GOOD JOB ESTABLISHING YOUR CONTENTIONS. READ LESS, SPEAK TO YOUR AUDIENCE MORE. STRONG SUMMARY.**

**INSALACO - GOOD REBUTTAL, WELT THOUGHT OUT. DON'T SPIN YOUR PEN WHILE TALKING. GREAT JOB REFUTING THE AFF'S CONTENTIONS**
### VPF

**FLIP: 3 Khan - Rao v. 7 Neuner - Wong**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 703</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM</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>1st</td>
<td>Rao 24</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Khan 28</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Is Circle Winner)

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- THAT WAS AWEsome
- KHAN - RAO GOT IT W/ THEIR UNDISPUTED STATS & SUPPORT
- VERY CLEAR DELIVERY & Fun to Follow

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: 48 Galardi - Gould v. 42 Flores - Knorr**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 701</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Knorr</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Flores</td>
<td>29</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>Galardi</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gould</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:

Both negs and affirm had organized arguments and framework. However, crossfire dynamics offered the Pro speakers the opportunity to convince their side with confidence & consistency. I enjoyed this debate and at different points I truly vacillated between who I found most convincing. At the end, the Pro team stayed focused, confident & compelling.

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>
<tr>
<td>2 minutes of Prep Time per side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Jen Groman (*'44)</th>
<th>Anitha Jagadeesh (14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 705</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Vaillancourt, Simon</td>
<td>Robson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Rosal, Gilbert</td>
<td>Felton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- S1 - Blamed the failure of great plant, consumption -
  facts to abolish with numbers & increasing revenue
  only 4% 60s, decreased, the economy. Only 1% is decreased
  income in jobs, showing ways to how it can help
- S2 - Started with prep, starting with negative
  starting people during their explanation of capital
  starting people during their explanation of capital
  with gathering. people lacking. It should be
  gathered, starting with negative

**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.

**Cases First:**

- S1 - Did his answer by stating how jobs can
  reduce poverty.
- S2 - Answered the difference in Capital gain & tax on income.
- S3 - Capital gain decreases in consumer spending, which decreases.
  The investment gain can put back money in the market, decrease poverty.
  The speaker rebutted the points of the opposition with his backup
  capital. ignored & productivity. Explained how the capital
  & productivity. Explained how the capital
- S4 - Opposition continued to reduce the investment, capital gain.
  The quality of life will increase no evidence, unemployment.

**Judge's Signature:**

P. V. High School / Architect

School / Affiliation / Occupation
Speaker 1: Summary - Pointing to the facts they have shared and reasoning, increase in employment, reduce poverty.
- Tax cuts & revenue x, decrease capital gains & Tokes.
- The opponents did not touch our rebuttals. Taking extra time.

Speaker 2: Summary - Investment does not change - referring to Card.
- Social Security & healthcare - 17% income tax money but did not show it was capital gains, again mentioned income tax.

Counter - pro team asked on income tax, but team did not answer to the point.

Speaker 3: Final focus - Starts with validity coming from president Trump & other key people, suggest using more economic backing than a statement.
- But moving on talking about opponents points & not making sense. Again using some logical reasoning.

Speaker 4: Summary - Giving an example of how incorrect tax codes come in & pointing on facts that are based on team.
### VPF - Varisty Public Forum

**Round 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vicente</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrawal</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Con**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhaskara</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolfness</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Notes:**

- Speaker 1: Try not to swing. Humm... Tricker.
- Single implementation was skewed due to an unbalanced income skew. It is difficult to just drop.
- Speaker 3: Nice turn. Not just a weak argument. Have another try and say what you didn't say that.
- Have some questions planned that will aide your case.

**Order of Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 2 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: 38 Zhou - Chung v. 3 Galan - Khanna**

## Round 4

<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>ZHOU</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>CHUNG</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

![Pro](Pro) ![Con](Con)

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Unfortunately, I buy that the bubble has already started to be on the verge of popping which means a recession is basically inevitable. That means I weigh the impacts, Niked it-ism but the main impact wasn't broad enough. The constructive which meant it wasn't a factor. So, I vote Pro on their economic impacts. I also think they win that a cap gain exacerbates income inequality.

---

**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: 56 Bandlora - Kathiravan v. 29 Xie - Gill

Varsity Public Forum

Round 4

Speaker: Bandlora, Kathiravan

Points: 28 (26-30)

Speaker: Xie, Hill

Points: 29 (26-30)

The winner of this debate was

Pro: Bandlora

Con: Kathiravan

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Scott Woods ('44)

Room 527

Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Con

Great argument for not abolishing CGT.

Clear and evidence that such will benefit over lower middle classes. Lack of investments b/c such will hold onto their money. Suggest try to find more relevant (newer) statistics.

Pro

Also great argument. Concentration on small business benefits not overwhelmingly proven. Need statistical evidence year over year to prove.
# VPF

**FLIP:** 44 Lu - Sahn in v. 29 Aberg - Gustin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Eugene Chung (*38)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gustin 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Aberg 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Gustin:**
- Delivery: confident, articulate
- Evidence: excellent number and quality of citations
- Logic: easy to follow, nuanced arguments.
- Organization: well organized.
- Cross X: excellent initial cross X

**Aberg:**
- Delivery: confident, composed, engaging
- Evidence: excellent number and quality of citations.
- Logic: cogent, nuanced arguments excellent Final Focus
- Organization: methodical rebuttals, well organized.
- Cross X: strong initial cross X, excellent response to question re: 0% point on Laffer curve, excellent grand cross X.

**Sahn in:**
- Delivery: articulate can engage more evidence: good number and quality of citations.
- Logic: easy to follow organization: excellent
- Cross X: some pauses during initial cross X

**Lu:**
- Delivery: composed, can speed up a little could engage more. strong Final Focus.
- Evidence: could use more
- Logic: excellent
- Organization: well organized
- Cross X: good questions asked in grand cross X.

**RFD:** Pro side had slightly better arguments / contrar arguments.

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</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 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>
<tr>
<td>2 minutes of Prep Time per side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
Both agreed that cost benefit should be the framework. Pro argued and Con agreed that abolishing CGT benefits everyone, but Con thinks the benefit is greater for the rich. This does not change the fact that all benefit.

On whether abolishing taxes with hurt social programs, Con didn’t refute Pro’s argument that CGT is irrelevant in this issue.

Con agreed that lower CGT helps investment, but abolishing does not. However, Con could not define what is lower tax and why 0% is not lower tax rate.

Con also totally ignored Pro’s job creation impact throughout the round.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Nadia Jafar (*35)</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Room 525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Nico Pacioni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Jack Fyan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Showers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Venkatachalam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nadja
- your summary off-time road map was kinda useless
- you don't really extend warrants in summary
- the rebuttal is super messy, like you spend half of it extending your own case
- you never address their sneaky FW! sad

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

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

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

Both teams had really disorganized rebuttals — read more ev+, but I don't think the NEG really understood it, so I have the edbay arg...
**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Leah Veschio (*'30)</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Smith</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hughes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(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:**

**Pro**: Strong arg. & strong evidence & support for his points.

**Con**: Excellent speaker & used arguments & were heard in other debates. nice work.

Crossfire

- Both sides argued well.
- Strong questions & responses from both sides. Pro won crossfire.

Rebuttal

- Both sides did a great job. Both arguments were equal.

**Summary**: Wanting to hear why the gap in income matters? From **Con**.

**Crossfire**: Con keeps saying rich are going get richer but is no answering why it matters or welfare benefits. Pro brought up good point about rich investing practices - why would we encourage lower income to invest as they probably need the extra. Not true.

Final Focus: Con answered question about why income matters but Con needs stronger argument to pool compared to Pro arg.
Con:
- Income Gap
- Rich reports capital gains they must lead
- Re Pe inequality
- Income inequality = 1%

Pro:
- Farming - capital gain drains up food
- Revalue real - universal source of income to you
- Locking in investments
- Arg racial inequality = from con case
  Sust econ growth
V PF
FLIP: 56 Narayanan - Mooney v. 53 Martinez - Fay

Varsity Public Forum
Mike Tristano (*58)

Round 4
Room 707
Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM

Speaker
1st
2nd

Pro
MARTINEZ
FAY

Con
MOONEY
NARAYANAN

Points (20-30)
28
28
26

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

Is this a low point win?
Yes

Judge's Signature
PCDS

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD:

Con Proved Impact of Fire Quality
Greater benefit to their Cost Benefit Analysis Framework

How Point 2 Win Because the Con's Performance of Debate Occurred did not feel genuine or sincere to their audiences.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Order/Time Limits of Speeches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Exum</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Speaker 1 ................4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Groman</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Speaker 2 ................4 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

**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:

Con was able to keep their main concern alive throughout, even though their second card of “Reducing being hard to understand how this fits into the scope of the resolution.” Con started out with pretty good content, but was never able to make them materialize in terms of their overall effects (in a way that was totally believable or easy to conclude).

Pro had to knock out Con’s content to have a chance to win; instead of making a case for how health care would be affected (to the extent that Con said it would be), Pro should have tried to convince audience that it would not be cut + money would come from somewhere else.

Williams: Keep up the good work, great job for being so clear!

Groman: Great job, took advantage of all opportunities, quickly & effectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 725</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Shruti Singh</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Amber Chow</td>
<td>25</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: 44 Vittal - Wahal v. 7 Talamantez - Neuner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Joel Zolondek (*'54)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 424</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Talamantez</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Neuner</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** Abolish
- **Con** Keep
- Income inequality
- Increases power of Aamer
- Tax revenue will lose this
- Medicare cuts
- Crime victims fund will be lost
- Reagan tax cuts, lower crime

**Speaker 2**
- Lock in effect
- Inc. consumption helps economy
- Reagan closed loop holes with his tax change

**Strong arguments - touched many of the opponent's arguments**

Pro showed that the scope of their impact was greater by eradicating poverty & helping all economic strata

**V** Very professional, focused & empathetic speaker.

**W** Strong argumentation skills.

Great round! Every participant did an excellent job. Takes a tough decision for me.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gavissa Salamatin</td>
<td>Eric Sheng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Vic Cardone</td>
<td>Li</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

**Judge's Signature**

**Basis Phx**

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

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

**Pro**
- Good definition of case structure
- Good questions
- Good restatement of homework
- Strong arguments clean and effective
- Good compare and contrast arguments
- Clean and concise answers to both sides

**Con**
- Well presented strong arguments with good support
- Sound answers factored
- Very strong, effective attack on pro arguments
- Clean and concise answers to both sides

**Reason**
- The **Con** side did a better job of presenting focused and clean arguments.
- The **Pro** side was also strong in their arguments, but good support.
- In the end, the **Con** side was more convincing with arguments, reasoning, support, impact and economy.
### VPF

**FLIP: 35 Gadiyar - Gadiyar v. 25 Ramos - Heyman**

**Varsity Public Forum**

**Corey La Crosse (**3**)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 522</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>AD Gadiyar</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>AR Gadiyar</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Heyman</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ramos</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:**

Some comments orally.

Neg had more current evidence and pointed out a couple of misstatements by Aff regarding capital gains on housing being exempt.

I particularly liked the "New Invesing for Opportunities Act" card.

Both sides did great, best round I judged today. Thank you.

**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: 7 Jazo - Stratton v. 2 Diaz - Callies  

Varsity Public Forum  

Round 4  

Speaker  Pro  Con  
1st  Stratton  Diaz  
2nd  Jazo  Callies  

Points (20-30)  
26  27  

Room 722  Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM  

Judge's Signature  

School / Affiliation / Occupation  

The winner of this debate was  

Pro  Con  
(Circle Winner)  

Is this a low point win?  No  

Comments & Reason for Decision:  

Pro 1: When the timer goes off, wrap it up quicker in constructive  

Con 1: Reading off your phone doesn't help you to be honest.  
I don't know why people still read cases off computers, instead of printing.  
It may be old school, but whatever it is rolled up sleeve looks sloppy. I'd recommend a wardrobe change.  

Con 2: Middle of your rebuttal just kind of left the flow, didn't know where to go.  
Tone it down with the "it's not a new concept" in cross.  

All: Time management needs to improve. Rebuttals were all over the place.  

Con 2: Too long of a roadmap. I just expect to know what part of the flow to look at, not how you plan to do impact calc. That's for your speech.  

I vote nay on the 5% v. in your revenue that comes after voting off. No other econ impacts were extended cleanly.
Pro - Free up more money for the poor
- More economic growth for inner city
- Gain jobs - poverty
- Crime rate decreases

Felt the pro team spoke quick but still clear.
I was not thinking that their thoughts were as organized as the con team. I was not convinced by their arguments - it seemed more like speculation.

* Con - Great points about where money would actually go?
- No proof that money would better the community.
- No safety barriers - investors would invest where most profit to them.

Felt much more convinced in their argument about not having any proof about where the money would actually end up if we were to abolish the tax.
- Spoke quick and clear - felt like it was a conversation directed with me.