**Varsity Public Forum**

**Speaker**

1st: Luke Oldani
2nd: William Hays

**Pro Points**

1st: 29
2nd: 27

**Con Points**

1st: Yibo Chen
2nd: Madie Rumsey

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 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 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 2</th>
<th>Room 5212</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Aaron Hirsh</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Risha Das</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Ananya Lakhota</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Skyler Hudson</td>
<td>23</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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Time</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>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The **Con** team went over in their prep time. Pls watch that.

The **Pro** team - speaker 2 needs to substantiate claims/points & show linkage between cause & effect.
### Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

**VPF**

**FLIP: 6 Kumar - Pendurthi v. 12 Zhong - Aragam**

**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 5211</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Shravya Aragam</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Cindy Zhong</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

Bioscience

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Pro:** Did a great job explaining the benefits. Really good job answering questions, however, did not ask as many questions.

Great key voters: lives, debt relief, specific evidence

Has daily benefited - Requested to answer later.

**Con:** Organized and prepared. Presented very good evidence.

* Asked many difficult questions,
* Great job presenting information on the impact of the environment.

Unable to provide evidence on impact of BRI Debt

Unable to answer the question on "discrimination" on hiring

Attain only Chinese workers.

**Summary:**

- Good eye contact
- Really good questions
- Very good counter arguments
- The winner was picked based on how well they were able to answer their opponent’s questions. The Pro team did a really good job "firing" back.

**Notes:**

- Key voters: economy - more debt, instability.
- Environment - global warming, more debt + poverty.

**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.
# Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

## VPF

**FLIP: 2 Huda - King v. 5 Lal - Parau**

<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</td>
<td>Parau</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Lal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Huda</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge's Signature**

Basis: Scottsdale [signature]

School / Affiliation / Occupation

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Voice/volume was strong use of voice and expression was clear.
- Evidences were good enough to support the argument.
- Organization & clarity was clear and orderly presented.
- Use of cross-examination and defense was excellent.
- Use of argument was somewhat convincing presentation style features convincingly.
- Have the facts against the 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: 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

**Danielle Delgado (*'22)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 5209</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Patel</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Kantrud</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Schillinger</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>McHenry</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:**

NC: CC impacts should extend in NR so expand on BRI points in CCR

AC: I need dates w/ sources / Don't drop FUs!

NR: **good, well-structured NR**

AR: messy stat to AR / need influence cards

CON: need more direct impact of RE & jobs to strength arg of make EU & w/o BRI

PRO: strength influence arg / EU & w/o BRI to make vote pro next imminent

AS2: talk in GCX

CON: impact pov. made in Son/Rectal

---

**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.
**Round 2 Forum**

**Speaker**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Rizgi</td>
<td>1st Warriner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Suggula</td>
<td>2nd Groman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Con</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* #1: Should EU join BRI

**Con** #1: Infrastructure, Social Housing, Clean Speech delivery, gave specific quantified data, covered wide variety of benefits. Asked for World Bank data.

**Con** #2: Delivered arguments confidently, very clear, fry with against trade routes, new angle of climate change, South China Sea, use of Force/Refr, environmental disaster. Cited clear examples. Global emission.

**Crossfire 1 & 2:** Example of Indonesia #1 was not relevant. Con was more convincing in Crossfire 1 & 2.

**Pro** #2: Countered several points made by *Pro* #1.

**Con** #2: First counter-argued arguments on FDI and trade across the world. Example of wealth. Consistently delivered strong arguments. Climate change -> strong arguments, project.

**Crossfire 3 & 4:** Con #2 very convincingly arguments, strong questions by Con #2.

**Con** #2 win the crossfire, not convincing on speaker #1 summary. Summarized arguments, not convincing on some points on South China Sea.

**Speaker #2** summary -> Argument in arguments summary.

**Ground Crossfire** -> Con Team provided stronger arguments.

**Speaker #3** final focus -> came out with some stronger points.

**Speaker #4** final focus -> South China Sea and Environmental concern.
### Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 5219</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Saballos</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Panayotova</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Ryu</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Can</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:

Loss internal link, couldn't access impacts. C3 flows through for the Con, so that is where I vote. Altogether a great round =)

---

**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.
Stephens, Greg

Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

FLIP: 22 Ahmed - Hollman v. 7 Vicente - Jiang

VPS

Varsity Public Forum

Greg Stephens (*8)

Round 2

Room 5221

Fri 10/04/19 04:30PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Vicente</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Hollman</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Jiang</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro Con

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No (even)

Judge's Signature

Bio science

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

All 4 were great speakers and a joy to listen to!

I decided based on my understanding of your arguments and their impacts.

Aff

BRI

G. Infrastructure

Impa C.C

Improves lives & poverty

Links to impacts were directly double and more significant.

Neg

BRI

Infrastructure

Improve C.C.

Improve Poverty

Neg some of your arguments (claims) weren't believable but you supported them. ok.

Links to impacts were less direct, and I believed them to be reduced.

Nice Job!
My suggestion to the Aff might be to put the environment in your case. Do you know it is going to come up clearly if it is the greatest impact. Why not nip it right away? I liked the Con case better, especially the moral imperative framework with the environment. V1 for me.

Environment and Death Trap. At the end of the day, Pro outdebated the Con on both of these issues and I think the Con had many missed opportunities to make compelling arguments to win. Con - make sure you can pronounce all words in your case. You are both great speakers with a lot of potential. Pro - excellent persuasion & argumentation - Well done!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 5210</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Speaker | Pro       | Points  
(25-30) | Con      | Points  
(25-30) |
| 1st     | Azagra    | 20                  | 1st     | Lacrosse | 23 |
| 2nd     | Balian    | 42                  | 2nd     | Khanna   | 15 |

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

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

**Judge's Signature**

**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
- 2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Pro**

1) Fast speaking - environment
2) Good speaking - good pace & loudness - coal supply

**Con**

1) Crossfire - win - even
2) Good eye contact - solver

Crossfire - +Pro - provided better & more convincing
discussion.

**Summary**

**Pro**

1) Good convincing presentation!

**Con**

1) BRE failings - coal in abundance - green technology

6) Additional crossfire: **Pro** did the better job

2) Sweet + short

**Con**

2) Cool plans - growth vs. green tech
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Nicholas Sitzman (*'19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 5215</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Han</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Mckenna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Is this a low point win?**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Pro**
  - China will need coal projects with EU
  - Funding reduction
  - Fossil fuel emissions

- **Con**
  - China will build clean tech
  - China will continue exporting coal even with EU funds

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

*I vote **Con** due to agreement that China will continue habits of selling coal within BRI and argues that China still sells coal to Vietnam and will not transition from coal.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Christine Theile (*1) Theile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Alex Zou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ethan Lenzmeier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Pro team presented a great argument and met/challenged all contentions from con team but con teams contentions were more detailed and harder to refute. While taunt impact might have been exaggerated I believe the evidence and argument stood stronger than pro.

Con attack of pro contentions was also stronger.