Pro:

- Very good eye contact
- Wasn't able to answer some of the counter team's questions.

Con:

- Very good eye contact
- Did a very good job answering to counter team's questions.

Conclusion:

- Both teams presented very good eye contact.
- Very compelling evidence coming from both teams.
- The winner was picked mainly on how well they answered the counter team's questions.
- Very difficult decision. It was very close!
Pro: Clearly outlined the resolution.
Aragram - Cited sources. Spoke with clarity.
Prepared responses for crossfire.
Responses were detailed reaffirming their point. Some mis-pronunciation of keywords.

Reed - Cited sources. Points were convincing and clear. Paused to highlight important issues.
Had information to hand for crossfire. General "Eurasia area"
Making assumptions - talking about Pakistan and China no longer doing what Europeans did. Strong second speaker.

Zhong - "Corrupt nations" but only mentions China's organisation could be more crisp, concise.
Point made about indigenous populations but did not cite evidence. Pollution which did not correlate.
Highlighted irregularities in argument. Able to recall information accurately to answer questions.

Con: Shah - Rebuttal was convincing and clear with evidence.
"He may never do this though he will threaten it." Can't read the minds of others said Bel was failing but didn't give evidence for it. Couldn't respond to "why?" despite being asked twice. Making assumptions without evidence. Some contradictions in points and rebuttal responses. Generic "Every country has corruption."
Final focus was very good, spoke a little slower.
**Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational**

**VPF**

**FLIP: 5 Gunjala - Khanna v. 9 Kalra - Nair**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Jay Ryu ('7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gunjala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Khanna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(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.*

![Diagram](image-url)
### Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 5209</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Oldani</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Hays</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? 28

---

**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.

---

Contention not blocked by the opponent it flowed through, cannot trusted and false BRF reports and helps billion peoples.

Both teams are well done very close to win, answers almost every contention.
# VPF

**FLIP: 2 Nimbkar - Rivera v. 7 Vicente - Jiang**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Mirsada Kurspahic (*5)</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Room 5211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Rivera 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Nimbkar 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con Points (25-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Jon Vicente 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Catherine Wragg 26</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.

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

R.F.D. I gave the win to the Pro team, they had come with more logical, stronger, good arguments for their stance. Great debate, great job both teams!!!

For the con team, need more evidence to attack their arguments, make inquisitive points, but I love the energy and eye contact.
## VPF
### Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

**Varsity Public Forum**  
**Jen Groman ('18)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Jen Groman ('18)</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Room 5212</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Vinodh K.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Pranjal K.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Room 5212</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Giaa R.</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Katelyn C.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

**Judge's Signature**

---

**Excellent debate with two well matched adversaries.** I really enjoyed watching and judging you all.

Vinodh - Use C-X to critically question them instead of canned arguments. You clearly know your stuff and I think you agree with bringing out Pranjal - you are an excellent speaker. Your constructive was the best speech of the debate. You used evidence + excellent argumentation to refute their whole case.

Katelyn - you are an outstanding speaker + an exceptional debater. You were logical, persuasive, and organized and you persuaded the 1000%.

Giaa - you have such a bright future! Outstanding first debate! You are a natural and I know you will be a success.

I am voting for the Con bc Aff dropped environment + I think this harm clearly 0/w economy. I also think Katelyn's Summary very adequately related economy and so I can't vote any other way than Con.

Good luck! You guys rock!
**VVP**

**FLIP: 6 Azagra - Balian v. 2 Chen - Rumsey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Danielle Delgado (*’22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Room 5221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Azagra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Balian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NC: more clear when citing cards  
CL: more clear when citing cards  
CX: look at judge during CR  
NR: label your points/take more prep before NR/your point was clearly not well understood  
CR: you neg point makes sense but esp 6P EU compliance grants EU oversight - you did the good 10B & 4E EU are very diff?  
CR: is the AU still working w/ China?  
CX: look at judge during CR  
CR: EU will turn autocratic? / need 4E or 6P to solve some others  
IFF: need strong response to China 10B & not EU

RFD: Logic **PRO** because they are the only team to provide offense. Both teams outline the issues in the EU but AEP is only to provide a possible solution. We are close to re-buying from turno but 1 general job & infrastructure...
# VPF

**Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational**

**FLIP: 2 Huda - King v. 22 Panayotova - Saballos**

## Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Joseph Balian (*6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>N. Saballos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>V. Panayotova</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

> GREAT PERFORMANCE BOTH TEAMS.

A FEW THINGS I MENTIONED TO SLOW THINGS UP SO I UNDERSTOOD.

THAT WAS KEY IN THIS DEBATE.

MOST EVERYONE WAS ABLE TO ADJUST EXCEPT W. KING. TOO FAST.

AS THE DEBATE DRAGGED ON.

W. KING - I LIKED YOUR ARGUMENT ABOUT THE MILITARY MIGHT.

AND N. SABAALOS - YOU HAD A GREAT REBUTTAL ON HOW YOUR OPPOSITES!

ARGUMENT WAS FLAWED IN THE END, THE PRO ARGUMENT RESTED EVERYTHING ON 5G AND DID NOT DO ENOUGH TO REBUT THE MILITARY 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: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 5 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min

1 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Lakhotia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warrior</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Groman</td>
<td>30</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:

Both second speakers excellent & did great job. Both teams well prepared & did excellent job. Good debate between teams.

Content: L. War in SE Asia & road to disaster w/climate change. Not clear enough on how bad & if it will lead to war. Was concluded by end. What was crucial. Economic growth will happen. Trade benefit good for Pro team. Overall issue was important to Pro. Small victory. Very close. Economics made sense of Pro only. Some impact W/game not all & lead facts true.
### Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 5218</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points 25-30</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Astiazaran 28</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Mayundo 27</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Pro** - I was convinced of many of your arguments and much of what you presented was sound. But I decided to use Neg Framework of Environment since you both argued its relevance.

Since Neg case on Env is well supported, Pro args on Environment were welcome but not as convincing. Pro - Be bold & confident.

Nice job!! I enjoyed the Round.

**NEG Wins**
VARSITY PUBLIC FORUM

Res: 7 Suggula - Rizqi v. 5 Lal - Parau

Fri 10/04/19 03:00PM

SF: Scott Franz (*9)

Room 5215

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st 1</td>
<td>Lal</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Parau</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st 1</td>
<td>Rizqi</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Suggula</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner) No

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Lal - Hands in pocket & lazy holding. Don't tell me the card in cross ex. of debt. Unprofessional & unpersuasive. Partner is going to say it anyway, I can't flow you say it.

- Rizqi - Some lazy holding of PCs too. I highly recommend printing at least the const. so you can actually present & perform the 1 pre-written speech you got.

- Parau - Speaking at a rate in Debate that I find unnecessary. You trip yourself up at that speed, plus I don't know where to focus on with the verbal machine gun fire coming my way. You have got to cut down on using the words "like" and phrase "wish of solvency."

- Suggula - Thank you for listening to my paradigm!! You gave credentials for a citation and a good one (no less). But then didn't use it how you could've.

I vote aff. because of a clearer case & because they provide proper evidence when asked for it.
SCHNEIDER, DEBBIE

Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

VPF

FLIP: 2 Han - Mckenna v. 7 Zou - Lenzmeier

Varsity Public Forum

Debbie Schneider (*'12)

Round 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Yoqin Han</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shannon Mckenna</td>
<td>30</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>Alex Zou</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ethan Lenzmeier</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

GCA

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Yoqin - strong, economy, stability, green development, greener, lower carbon, poverty, more
Ethan - less China b/c, roads, no use of ped., climate change, pollution

Alex- less Europe, - doesn't want EMU, - unemployment will not get EU, - energy crisis, to create clean energy jobs, - go to Africa, - not EU, - temporary, only infrastructure

Shannon - fully gap, rich countries invest in BRI, no statistics, US, African countries, ahead in BRI

Sri Lanka's debt not only because of China, BRI needed to 'kick start'

Yoqin - no, China's fault 100%

Shannon - not China's fault, 100%

Alex - need better eye contact less "uh"

CF - Yoqin

CF - Shannon

GCF - Pro but...