**Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Reghu-Warrier*18</th>
<th>Don Steiner (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finals</td>
<td>Room 2116</td>
<td>Sat 10/05/19 04:00PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Schilling Sekandari</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Saravanam</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Schilling</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>McHenry</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:

CX: 1st Pro - I think you can claim some long-term job growth from capital investment along w/ short-term from construction. You can also push Maradon on whether the BRI increases Chinese dirty energy output (upward trend) - make them show how EU in BRI makes this worse.

Pro - Good linkage to the EU piece in your argument on the recession. Capital flow arguments. Good pressure on long vs short term growth & GDP impact.

Con summary - good time was a focus on key issues & issues/point. Keep the pressure on about how many surplus steel plants new jobs in China.

Key issues influencing my decision - 1) Where besides China will investment in EU come from? 2) How will the use of surplus steel increase production of new steel in China? 3) China's reforging effort enough to affect reforging for BRI construction. On each point the key provides clearer analysis and better links.

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: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min

3 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
# Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

**VPF**

**FLIP: 9 McHenry - Schillinger v. 5 Saravanam - Sekandari**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Glen Uehara (*'12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2116</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>Sekandari</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Saravanam</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>Schillinger</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McHenry</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge's Signature**

12

**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**

- Made a great case for the motion with reasoning & evidence.
- Defended arguments with great reasoning.
- Answered arguments by the team.
- EPA / plant
- Answered question greatly to the point.

**Con**

- Presented great arguments against the case of data/evidence.
- Great crossfire questions in short-term.
- Did not refute opposition's argument effectively.
## Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st: SEKANDARI</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCHILLINGER</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd: SARAVANAN</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>MC HENRY</td>
<td>30</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**

- **Sekandari:** Nice speed
- During questioning, you asked the same question 3 times. It kind of wasted time because you were trying to get a response, they weren't going to give.
- **Saravanan:** Slow down. I just gave you my paradigm and you just ignored it. Anyone should be able to understand you. And at times I got lost. In grand crossfire, you got kind of tangled around at times.

**CON**

- RDF: Pro's arguments & impacts were all laced & turned against them. The biggest thing for me was that there was no link into showing that economic growth would be significant enough to stop a recession. Also Con clearly defended their environment point & won on scope & magnitude.

**SCHILLINGER**

- Good responses during cross
- Great responses & hammering environment also good economic growth question.
- You didn't use key voter.
- But this is fine! Your summary was very organized & you weighed which is really what I care about most.
- Great re-question during cross.

**MC HENRY**

- Great evidence & cross.