### Varsity Public Forum Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 5221</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Saballos 30</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Panayotova 28</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **Comments:** Great job by everyone. Good eye contact + speed + use of data/statistics
- **S:** Very easy to understand.
- **P:** Your speed was understandable, but did not change much when you went to emphasize a statistic, slowing down speed slightly would help you emphasize.
- **J:** Good job supporting evidence in crossfire (could be quicker)
- **V:** Awesome job articulating the construction speech + summary.
- **P:** Strong final focus + rebuttal

**Decision:** Pro team one based on convincing arguments in final focus.

Both teams flowed exceptionally well and was very well organized.
# Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational: VPF

### Round 4 - Kyle Henden (*6)

<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>Reed</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Patel</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shah</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Kantrud</td>
<td>27</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:**

- **RFD:** Key Voters
  - Global Econ
  - Global Peacemaker
  - Benefit
  - What impacts exactly can EU fund it?
  - Who's gonna benefit? (Germany)
  - EU China Other
  - BRI Helps
  - BRI Home/Energy
  - BRI Builds
  - Grids
  - Yes, EU China Other side around
  - Pros/Cons: Bases, 23
  - Helps three world nations
  - Helps China's infrastructure trade (soybeans)
  - Bases can be funded by EU
  - Helps China economy
  - INF
  - Helps 3rd World
  - Swaps EU energy crisis

**Judge's Signature:**

**BASIS Phoenix**

School / Affiliation / Occupation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 5217</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Pro</td>
<td>Wylie Oldani 28</td>
<td>Raghav Warrier 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>William Hays 20</td>
<td>Julia Groman 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Provided a lot of feedback to both teams.
- Ultimately, the Con's lead argument was not believable.

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

* 2 minutes of Prep Time per side
## VPF Report

**Varity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>John Saiissan (*2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</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)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Pro**
1. A) Elaborated China's green technology and spread to other countries
2. Elaborated reasons very clearly

**Con**
1. MS) Harmful environment coal oversupply led to investment in fossil fuels clean energy
2. Con: It takes more time to build BRI

**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.
**Pro**

- Crossfire
- Trade increases
- China pays for financing

**Con**

- Emphasis on coal production
- Increase of 1 degree in temp.
- Undercut EU products and may jobs will be lost in EU.

ps: China contributes to both coal and green technology

The pro had more reason and defended their position well. The con only emphasized one issue and all effort was to support the coal dumping.
**Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational**

**VPF**

**FLIP: 9 McHenry - Schillinger v. 2 Nimbkar - Rivera**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Amal Cehajic (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 5208</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Rivera  29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Nimbkar  29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Schillinger  30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>McHenry  29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

BASIS PhD Geneva JOURNALIST

Comments & Reason for Decision:

THIS WAS AN AWESOME DEBATE. BOTH TEAMS BROUGHT PASSION BACK!

BY KNOWLEDGE AND RESEARCH.

IT WAS REALLY CLOSE TO CALL!

FEW ITEMS MAKE SURE YOU HAVE RESEARCH UP YOUR CANS TO BACK UP YOUR CAND. ADD 3 MINUTES OF PREP TIME PER SIDE.

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
### Round 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Aragam</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Zhong</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>Blue</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Cai</td>
<td>28</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**

- 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.*

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Relative conditions leading to poverty -> Human trafficking
- Responded to China
- China helping Malaysia
- All BRI member states will benefit from growth
- Card on debt trap being a myth
- Card on debt trap could be used for dress
- Card on merchandise losses & Pakistan falling in debt trap
- BRI trade imbalance & export trade time
- Cheap Chinese goods lead to negative impact
- Many examples for China beneficencing Pakistan in debt to China from BRI loan
- Effect will be worse due to possible recession
- Con was able to show negative impact on EU economy with impending recession
- and showed clear data for 2015

---

**Judge’s Signature**

---
# Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

**VPF**

**FLIP: 12 Das - Hirsh v. 5 LaCrosse - Khanna**

## Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Leia Goon (*2)</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Room 5212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>DAS</td>
<td>Points (25-30) 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>HIRSH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Points (25-30) 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>LaCrosse</td>
<td>Points (25-30) 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Khanna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Points (25-30) 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

*Pro* / *Con*

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **[ ]**

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

**DAS**

- **Poverty reduction**
- **Infrastructure**
- **Environment**
- **Energy**
- **Trade**

**LaCrosse**

- **Infrastructure**
- **Environment**
- **Energy**

**Hirsh**

- **Environmental**
- **Energy**
- **Infrastructure**

**Khanna**

- **Infrastructure**
- **Energy**
- **Trade**

### 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 | 3 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus | 3 min |

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.*
China will choose coal to fund but they actually need EU funds
EU banks should have control → **good point**
Biomass vs. coal - biomass is worse to environment than coal - interesting
Poor countries will stay poor and continue to pollute - great point

2020 - green technology will be cheaper
Poorly projects doesn't help in rural areas to reach the poor
only in urban areas
Jobs - China workers not local

BRT
Impact EU to control projects -
EU is divided as a collective group

Eu policy + investment ↑ control over China
Urban areas will still receive benefits of poverty reduction

Evidence of China's lack of transparency
EU needs unity
1600 coal plants - China prefers coal plants
Overpriced + rural areas only → no benefits to EU

**Conclusion**
- **Strong** PPP argument
  - Make your case
- **CON argument** - Realize that China creates coal plants - but if EU has more control this would negate. Plus coal stated green tech.
  - Would be cheaper in 2020 - why wouldn't China go green then?
  - Poverty in urban areas - but there is poverty there too.
**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 5209</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Astiazaran</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Mayundo</td>
<td>28</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>Pendurth.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Kumar</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:

Pro seemed confused, saying con focused only on the negative, did not come off strong on arguments. Each team had a strong presenter. Con as a team came off stronger. Mayundo spoke clear, seemed informed, made good eye contact, did not just read a script; felt she was the strongest presenter. Needed stronger arguments all did a good job.
### Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

**Round 4**  
**Room 5220**  
**Fri 10/04/19 07:30PM**

<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><strong>Ahmed</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Lakhota</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Hollmann</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Hudson</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Aff** - FII Yen is Japanese currency - **Yuan**
- Need to support better in rebuttal. Toug to follow begin/end of that speech
- **Probilaly should have your phone alarm on silent...**
  Also applies to you

**Neg**
- Two fast on constructive. Your enunciation is good but speed is hard to keep up with
- Careful of the "different plan" of infrastructure. Aff doesn't have to prove BRIC is the best
- How much debt would you assume...? Not a great line of questioning...
- I said in my paradigm I don't like it when people say "time starts now." Just **START THE TIME YOU DON'T NEED TO ANNOUNCE IT**

I vote **Aff** because of lack of EU funding & trade efficiency impacts

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</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>

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 5210</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kalra</td>
<td>28.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Nair</td>
<td>27.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Huda</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro ☐ Con 
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ☑

Comments & Reason for Decision:

well delivered

Con Team provided evidences
### VPF

**FLIP: 5 Lal - Parau v. 2 Han - Mckenna**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Rhiannon Hastings (*'19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 5219</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Lal</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Parau</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Judge’s Signature**

Salpointe Catholic High School

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:**

**Lal** - Spoke with clarity and really good pace. Points were cut from range of sources. Good eye contact. Rant was clear and concise. Emphasized specific points, words, phrases. Had information to hand for crossfire but not and introducing new arguments in grand crossfire.

**Han** - Explained the terms within the resolution. Range of sources including academic. Clear and really good pace. Very strong opening. A lot of information. Had information for crossfire. Off top of head. This argument was impressive as demonstrated depth of knowledge for resolution. Summary was strong and related back to resolution.

**Parau** - Quite quick, had to really concentrate to ensue. Caught everything. Detailed rebuttal with relevant evidence from a range of sources and own was put forward in a concise manner supported by evidence. Talking during opponent talking, don’t talk a couple of times. It’s distracting to the judge. Don’t do it.

**Mckenna** - Made valid points finding fault in opponents argument. Makes point about human abuses and how EU can make things better, but no evidence to support so generalized. Brought it back to resolution when opponent tried to talk about the rest of the world. Interrupted opponent on crossfire. Uses emotive language in final focus.
**Varsity Public Forum**  
**Round 4**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chen</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumsey</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zou</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenzmeier</td>
<td>27</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:**

**Chen** - good and energetic but need to let opponents a chance to speak.  
- Provide some good back up statistics but not convincing enough.  
- Need to control speech momentum.

**Rumsey** - Present good statistics especially on people out of poverty. Need more statistics data to back up on quality of life improvement.

**Zou** - Calm and steady speed presenter.
- Provide some good arguments and response.

**Lenzmeier** - Need to improve astir questions & response.  
- Seems lacking preparation in statistics to back up.  
- Provide good summary on why EU student should not join BFJ especially pressing issue on pollution increase.

**Con wins**

**Judge's Signature**  
GCS / Project Mgr.

School / Affiliation / Occupation