Jim Fountain Classic

Varsity Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter-Finals</th>
<th>Room 408</th>
<th>Sat 10/26/19 01:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1st</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mukherjee</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Pandu</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1st</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarfati</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Pertovsky</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

No

Judge's Signature

Desert Vista

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both teams' contentions are clear. Nig prioritized EU > Found Nig's contentions in total to be more persuasive.

Aff E/U Last Resort Aff's first speaker many facts but loose ties to points. For ex: $1 bil exports leads to 2 mil jobs, taking some leaps to assume EU can fill in.

Aff found that Nig's questions were more clarifying than knocking down the other teams points.

In total, I found that the Aff side had more impactful facts cited to bolster their case.

Having said that, Aff side needs to watch to not over exaggerate their points.

Also, Aff side watch the professionalism got a slightly chippy at a few points, not over the line but close to it.

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.*
McHenry, I really liked how you were able to address all of the Con's contentions. The 1st crossfire really set up the case for both sides. Gurijala, you make a lot of good arguments, but I think you need more citations.

2nd Crossfire: I find the PRO argument for FDI stronger and I'm confused how Russia plays into the whole thing. Schillinger, you did convince me environment is more important than economy. Lacross, you make a good point that more money can help green energy.

If China has an oversupply of coal won't they sell it with and without the BRI?

The PRO argument that economy growth will help green tech swayed me.
<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>Reed</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Warrier</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Nair</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>Groman</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Taylor Mittlestedt**
Judge's Signature

Horizon HS
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.

---

**KFD**: I ultimately vote neg for two reasons:

1. Deck 19 is really explicit about the lock in effect of coal and the 50% emissions.
2. Even if the Saudi contention links it is outweighed by environment but that being said, it’s non-unique.
## VPF

FLIP: 29 Wahal - Wang v. 4 Singh - Mantri

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Ali Weber Cubias (*37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter-Finals</td>
<td>Room 403</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>Mantri</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Singh</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Wang</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:**

In buying the bubble chutzpah argument, which takes out the motivation for China investment and brings up recession. Neg's recession argument seems more pressing than Neg won on import debate.

_Very enjoyable debate - both sides have skills!_

### 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

3 minutes of Prep Time per side

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

**FLIP: 22 Hudson - Lakhotia v. 27 McHenry - Schillinger**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Ethan Fiber (*'34)</th>
<th>Sat 10/26/19 12:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lakhotia</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Hudson</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Schillinger</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd McHenry</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge's Signature**

**Horizon HS**

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**RFD:** I ultimately vote **Con** b/c of the lack of front lining and extensions that comes from the pro side. The debate comes down to who controls the link into the environment. That team will garner the offense off of lives and econ. In this case, **Con** controls that link when they show that infrastructure projects amount for 70% of CO2 emissions + deforestation increases 4x.

---

**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**

- Be able to pull up full cards immediately.
- Great arguments towards the end. They just came a little too late.

**Con**

- Great speakers!
- Make sure not to bend over when you speak as you go faster.
- Be able to pull up full cards immediately.
**Varsity Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Room 408</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Sat 10/26/19 12:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Oldani</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>1st Mantri</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Hays</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Singh</td>
<td></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:**

- **Main Point:**
  - EU legitimacy

- **Comments:**
  - Could have answered better how many of 1.1B people in EU need housing. And why EU should help. Lack of housing.
  - Should have provided good rebuttal on NAFTA, tariffs, not being dependent on China.
  - Debt trap, rebuttal - other inhibitions were a good point.

**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.*

---

**RFD:**

The [con side] did a better job explaining the risks of EU joining the BR1 and the harm tariffs could cause. They also explained to the world.
**VPF**

**FLIP: 29 Wahal - Wang v. 35 Harriss - Ori**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Ninad Tambe (*4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octo-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 406</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Wahal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Con had only the causality to go with, no real evidence. Also Germany backing out of EU is very unlikely. Populism has already existed since 88 and is not going to change. As per Pro, growth will actually stifle all-right.

Con also took more time in all rounds.

---

**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 Debate**

*Ali Weber Cubias (*37)*

### Octo-Finals

<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>La Crosse</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Zawilak</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gurijala</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Hossain</td>
<td>29</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: 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:**

**La Crosse**: Good answer in K-frie. Explored co-workers’ and animal cont. very good speech. A con clar answer to K-frie. Knew material well.

**Zawilak & Vietnam & GT was a major argument.** Minted Survey. Put together all points clarified con arguments and counted pro. Very well. Did jobs vs. Chinese labor explained, cool cog. Change to Env due to B2B was too bad.

**Gurijala**: Answer con at 2nd K-frie. Good questions. Some con could not explain. FT was clear and clarified about dropped points for Cows. Their argument made clear sense. Some items were dropped by con.

**Hossain**: Continued all of pro contentions. With stats & cards. FP was OK but weak in response. Some say.

---

Voted **Pro** as their argument best explained how EV can help Env as well as stop chinese question. Some stop decision.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Sudati Nadam (*'32)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 403</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>KING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd</strong></td>
<td><strong>1st</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lancaster</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NAIR</strong></td>
<td><strong>REEF</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

Judge's Signature: **BASIS PEARL**

School / Affiliation / Occupation:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both teams put forth strong arguments, but the Pro side was more confident in expressing their views, spoke up in understanding, had right usage of cards, basically had more conviction in their argument.

Pro - Spoke a lot on infra development, housing improvement in developing countries, energy / power grid. Did a good job in cross. And speaker was particularly very well prepared a effective.

Con - Had good data points. 1st speaker fell in couple of places, closed weakly. Spoke a lot on how China is controlling Nile river, minus it is authoritarian vs. democratic, death, traps etc. Env, Economics, energy, increasing Chinese military expansion.

Cross - Both teams brought up good points in cross. Both teams stressed on small scale, panel of Gov being more than China, worth of pearls, Indian ports etc. Pro team was more convincing, more confident, better prepared & to the case.
**Varsity Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Room 409</th>
<th>Sat 10/26/19 12:00PM</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>Mukherjee</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Panda</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Han</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>McKenna</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**
- Good pace, good eye contact
- Thans for presenting with quantifiable data
- Try not to interrupt so much during cross

**Con**
- Good pace, good eye contact
- Good data in presentation

---

The **Pro** won the debate as they proved that the BRI has enough funding to pursue and EU not joining will not solve climate issue. Also, con could not convince me about the housing trickle down.
### Varsity Public Forum Debate

**FLIP: 9 Pertovsky - Sarfati v. 32 Chow - Khanna**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Priti Sue (*'29)</th>
<th>Sat 10/26/19 12:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 410</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECOND</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st</strong></td>
<td>Chow</td>
<td>Sarfati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd</strong></td>
<td>Khanna</td>
<td>Pertovsky</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></th>
<th>Sarfati</th>
<th>Pertovsky</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

1. **Road blocking recessions**
   - Prioritize EU
   - Debt crisis: Chinese debt helpful
   - 26 trill. in oil to meet infra needs of
     Asian Pacific
   - Can't join BRI
   - Worsening economy of EU
   - China would need China loans + debt crisis
   - Slow econ growth, Europe neg. inflation
   - Poverty = poor health + death

2. **EU Security**
   - China dominates global cyber space, etc.
   - Subject to US surveillance
   - Tie Asia to Russia - China
   - China prob. backdoors, etc. like in past
   - EU infra from China, funnelled into
     intel prop. at risk by Chinese quit
   - EU already laws re: Huawei
   - EU nations not forced by BRI to use
     Huawei

---

**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:** You need to focus on the existence of private investors in case. This is your big offense impact.

**CON:** I need cards about Huawei and whether the BRI mandates usage in the EU.

**CON:** Might pro-trade lines more + climate change prevention.

**CON:** Jobs was a wash.