## VPF

### FLIP: 25 Ramos - Heyman v. 35 Kemeny - Shih

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>Shawn White</th>
<th>Sat 01/27/18 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro 2nd</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con 4th</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kemeny</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shih</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Heyman</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ramos</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ______

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Both teams need to greatly improve their cases; 4th you need to let them answer especially; just caused more confusion.
- People are going to be investing in SB; not the higher up companies; they have the word saying that involves like Apple; rich will invest in riskier areas; so SB not Apple
- This takes away the Neg's offense and attack on all; don't see the 60P fall and I think jobs are better than indirect investment

### Order/Time Limits of Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Time Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (3 &amp; 4)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 Summary</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2 Summary</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Crossfire (all)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3 Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4 Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kemeny</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Heyman</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shih</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ramos</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro.

Is this a low point win? Yes

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Pro Team:**
- Good opening framework with many arg points.
- Shih: Good counter argument spend too much effort on stock psychology.
- Kemeny: Good who and impact.

**Con Team:**
- Good intro clear arg with details.
- Ramos: Good development arg.

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>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kemeny</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Heyman</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shih</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ramos</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:**

- **Pro** spent most of their time complicating the argument rather than directly addressing **Con**'s case (specifically the infrastructure argument) - **Pro** did not provide sufficient evidence for the following:
  - A) Increase in jobs - they say 1.3 million but did not adequately show that this was from a cut to C6
  - B) Investment in small business - there was a general assumption that C6 would lead to small business investment - but this is merely conjecture
  - C) Evidence for people not buying inflated stocks - people claimed to buy FB, Twitter, Snapchat despite inflated prices/share.

- Both teams could have handled grand crossfire better - focusing on clearly articulated arguments
- **Pro** needs to spend less time interrupting **Con** and more time thinking through their warrants.

**Con**

* Adding irrelevant info and complicating argument unnecessarily and failure to provide solid evidence means **Con** wins the round.
* **Con** could also sharpen responses to point 3 from **Pro** about the positive feedback loop.
### VPF

**FLIP: 58 Tehranchi - Ori v. 57 Jiang - Fazey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Isaac March ('25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Finals</td>
<td>Room 911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Speaker**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Fazey</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Tehranchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Jiang</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ori</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Crossfire (1 & 2): 3 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crossfire (3 & 4): 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 2 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- 2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

I felt the arguments of Tehranchi + Ori were more convincing. Jiang and Fazey made arguments for which they had no evidence and Tehranchi + Ori pointed that out.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Frazey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Jiang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Tehranchi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ori</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: On-case - Great idea of juggling with building upon arguments to stagger contentions. It permits for arguments to be fully developed. Depth over Breadth is a great approach especially with a topic like this. Beautiful CX! Just try to avoid argumentation in CX. Focus on trying to either a) get them to cede b) poke holes in their cases. Breathe... I don't like relying on arguments w/out planted. OH. I like the de-link. Careful with your turns. Try to specify the type of turn (i.e. link turn, internal link turn, & impact turn).

Jiang: I buy the non-unique argument. Avoid not true arguments. Last speeches should be used for synchronization... I advise the multiple calls for evidence for more prep. Pro strats.

RFD: This is a pro ballad. I buy the turns placed by the Con speaker. I washed the judging was due to the non-uniqueness aspect.

**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 earlies speaker.
### VPF

**FLIP: 58 Tehranchi - Ori v. 57 Jiang - Frazey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Scott Woods (*'44)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 911</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><em>ori</em> 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature: **BASIS Scottsdale**

School / Affiliation / Occupation: **BASIS Scottsdale**

---

**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:

**Aff - Short-termism - Solved by**

- **RFD - Howmen Solver for LT Growth**

**Pro - Agrees**

- Aff → ↑ GDP by 20% or so, apparently
- ↑ revenues, solvers for lost revenue for ACA
- Solvers for 'lock-in' inefficient allocations → ↑ GDP
- Short termism, volatility - Washy.