## Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Lacrima Parau (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Room 5208</strong></td>
<td>Fri 10/04/19 06:00PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>Rayhan Rizqi</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hollmann</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sana Yasmin Suggula</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Nihat Ahmed</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Is this a low point win? ❌

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The winner is **Pro Team**.

Great job everybody!!! Love the heat and energy. Really nice, simple, good info, points for the affirmative.

The **Con** Team had valid points but our view toward the final.

Love to hear more about how Transparency works in your world. Fraud and corruption, human rights, workers rights, your influence over multiple countries, etc.

Good debate!!
## Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Daniel Waks (*6)</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 06:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Lal</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Parau</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Lakhotia</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro [Con]

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

---

**Comment & Reason for Decision:**

**Con:**
- C2 makes no sense at this speed, simplify

**Pro:**
- Summary was jumpy at points, not clearly linked
- SE Asia. Influence ce not blessed
- Pro daught adding. They +
- 2 billion wrote off not enough
- They not want to win but it is

---

**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.
### Varsity Public Forum

#### Round 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Rivera</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Nimbkar</strong></td>
<td>29</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><strong>Ryu</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Cai</strong></td>
<td>28</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.

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Excellent job for both teams. It is hard to say that someone was clearly a winner, well prepared, good arguments, a lot of evidence. I will pick Pro team as the winner.
**SUBRAMANIAN, SARAVANAN**

**Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational**

**VPF**

**FLIP: 18 Groman - Warrier v. 7 Vicente - Jiang**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Saravanan Subamanian (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>VINCENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Jiang</strong></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><strong>Warrier</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Groman</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **Sp** - Weak flow of speech, content clear & precise, major.
- **Sp** - Great flow, content & validation.
- **C & Sp** - Great first topical question.
- **C & Sp** - Needs data, point & validation.
- **Sr-2 C** - Excellent factual provision in main case. Points validated.
- **Sr-2 Sp** - Great control, delivery & validation.
- **C & Sp** - Excellent questioning to set the opponent.
- **C & Sp** - Needs data, point to answer counter points.
- **Sp** - Great summary with counter & concede.
- **Sp** - Carter was good, needs more relevancy to cite the case.

---

**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>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 5209</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 06:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Azagra</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Balian</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kalra</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Nair</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Both teams were excellent presenters.
- Great eye contact and use of hands.
- Easy to understand.
- Talking fast, clearly defined main points.
- Stumbled one time in which could not clearly articulate your ideas.
- Excellent rebuttals. Almost have everything memorized as you read from PC 1-2 times.
- Everyone was really good, but you were best and most convincing.

**Decision:** Based on the final focus, the Con team gave a more convincing 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

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

**Great job by both teams!!!**
**Varity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Nicholas Sitzman ('19)</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 06:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>La Crosse</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Khanna</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pendarthi</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Kumar</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Pro**

- Economic downturn + BRT will help
- Chinese Jobs Questions
- Question about Chinese economy being tied up w/ cheaper products could be phrased to make it clear that cheaper products mean less spending
- No card on Chinese expert facts stated by cross
- No card on China re negotiating debt
- Job training from Chinese factories

**Con**

- AT first uncle
- That issue being discussed is BRT
- EU can invest more
- Doubt of jobs for local workers
- Workers come in instants
- Chinese mass transit Power initiatives (Dams) had detrimetal effect

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.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Miranda Vega (*2)</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 06:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 5217</strong></td>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Shravya Aragam</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cindy Zhong</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td><strong>Riley Oldani</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Will Hays</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Shravya: you still had a minute left so make sure you fill it.
- for your contention 1 your said sub points & but I never heard a sub point
- please state your first con argument. I was waiting for a sub point & never got it.
- your speaking voice is very quiet & unclear.

Cindy: be more confident! you know what you are saying now make me think it!
- also you need to read more cards in your rebuttal because Hays had an argument amount

Shravya: your logical arguments are good but you need stats to back it up
- thanks for giving key voters!

Riley: great summary! your extension of the summary was the best. I would have liked you to pick more voters that align with your case.

Reason for decision: I voted con because of the tariffs, paint was turned to the reg because they were able to prove if we negate today's resolutions we will save 900 million people from poverty; thus, saving them from human trafficking. The environment also

ARIZONA COLLEGE PREP
School / Affiliation / Occupation

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>
just because China says they are going to follow on sustainability doesn't mean they actually will.

infra dropped
standard of living dropped
## VPF

**FLIP: 5 Saravanan - Sekandari v. 2 Huda - King**

### Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Yang Li (*7)</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 06:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Room 5210</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huda</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Saravanan</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sekandari</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge's Signature**

Basis Scottsdale

School / Affiliation / Occupation

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **Organization & confid...**
- **Presentation & speech style:**
  - Pro side: King gave detail
  - Con 2nd speaker: voice is convincing
  - 1st speaker: Saravanan is more clear
  - Pro just ask repeat questions
  - Crossfire (1&2) & Pro & Con side
  - Con: 1st speaker have more sharp question.
  - Con's argument have ability to defend itself against attack.

### 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.
Speaking 1  4:109

Speaking 2

Speaking 3

Neg

cue contrast taking

4.
Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

VVF
FLIP: 2 Kanrud - Patel v. 7 Zou - Lenzmeier

Varity Public Forum

Round 3
Room 5212
Fri 10/04/19 06:00PM

<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>Patel</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Alex Zou</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Kanrud</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ethan Lenzmeier</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

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

Judge's Signature: **Bioscience**

School / Affiliation / Occupation:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Pro:**
- Executed many key points
- Didn't provide a data for the BRI completion (crossfire)
- Presented statistics and evidence on their opponents key points.
- Answered with all the crossfire questions with compelling evidence
- Lack of providing a solution to their opponent
- Wasn't able to answer why China will forgive the debt.

**Con:**
- Very clear points
- Lack of providing analytics for their question (crossfire)
- Lacked the ability to answer questions with statistics and accepted they didn't have it
- Lack of providing a solution to their opponent
- Provided a point that their opponent didn't provide concrete evidence on what could happen, and a timeframe

Summary:
Overall, both teams brought up very clear key points and counterarguments. My decision was mainly based upon how much more evidence the team presented with statistics and facts.
## VPF

**FLIP: 9 Reed - Shah v. 2 Chen - Rumsey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Elisa Lau (*7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</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:

- **Organizational clarity** was orderly and clear for both teams.
- Use of argument was strong, enough to convince the opponent.
- Cross examination used facts to against the argument.
- Presentation styles were used mostly to convince audiences.
- Voice was good and strong.

During the Grand Crossfire, the argument and questions to ask the opponent were strong enough to convince the audience.

---

### 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

**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Patrick Nobby (*'12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Saballos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>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:

**Aff**

- Good clear voice in case reading, but hard to follow case structure.
  - Remember to only ask/answer questions in crossfire.
- Interesting trying to call out their wording, but careful as what your said was confusing.

**Con**

- Good job on crossfire, but remember to not ask questions, and answer theirs.
  - Don’t use phrasing like “called them out”.
- Good job bringing out key voters, but make sure they are clear.

Reasons:

For tech advancements; I flow to the con due to the issue of espionage and risks of the 5G programs. The economic argument flows through for pro, but I have to give environment to con due to the long term impacts they cite. For those reasons, I vote neg.
Con #1 - Schillinger contended on environmental impacts, citing quantified data on greenhouse gas emissions. Fossil fuels, Arctic exploration, and climate feedback were discussed. Han’s points on China’s renewable technologies were countered with the EU commitment on climate change.

Con #2 - Rebutted that China faces challenges despite environmental concerns. Argued that China’s commitment to renewable energy is sufficient. Han’s points on China’s carbon emissions were countered with the EU’s commitment on climate change.

Pro #1 - Han - EU-China collaboration. Emphasized coordinated development and strategic partnerships. Highlighted benefits of joint ventures in renewable energy.

Pro #2 - Schillinger - Focus on coal mining as a viable option. Highlighted the economic benefits of coal mining.

Crossfire #1 - Both adapted their arguments to address the对方’s points. Round 2

Crossfire #2 - Both expanded their arguments, focusing on the need for sustainable energy solutions. Han’s points were rebutted with the EU’s commitment on renewable energy.

Speaker 1 Summary - Emphasized the importance of sustainable energy practices.

Speaker 2 Summary - Highlighted the EU’s commitment to renewable energy.

Grand Crossfire - Both emphasized the need for renewable energy sources and the importance of cooperation between the EU and China.

Pro #3 - Schillinger - Highlighted the EU’s role in promoting renewable energy. Emphasized the economic benefits of renewable energy.

Pro #4 - Han - Highlighted the EU’s commitment to climate change and the importance of renewable energy.

Speaker 3 Final Focus - Emphasized the economic benefits of renewable energy.

Speaker 4 Final Focus - Highlighted the importance of renewable energy for the EU's commitment to climate change.

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.