# VPF

FLIP: 4 Tambe - Sanyal v. 27 Hays - Oldani

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Doug Self (*6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Oldani: 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Hays: 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Tambe: 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sanyal: 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</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:

Pro points out that benefits like housing and legitimacy can only happen with EU investment, which gives the EU a great deal of leverage in deciding where money goes. In the short term, developing economies are able to use profits to their benefit and then develop long-term renewable solutions.

**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

**FLIP: 6 Andersen-Mosher - Haines v. 32 Lal - Parau**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 410</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Destiny Haines</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shelley Andersen-Mosher</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Vash Lal</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Samuel Parau</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**AC:**

- wey has a turn on the west
- wins the weighing in L1, the bat lines into creation
- not into the alt advocacy
- caunt t2 are provd disavowed
- input not extratet

**WC:**

- VQ extended domain
- look-in is terminal protien on the coal argument
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 603</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>McCollough</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Rosenberg</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Berg</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gould</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Big RFD verbally given
- Quantify your impact, show me how to weigh unique links from EU vs China to world
- Both team's C2's were weak, depth kicks out of them

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

**FLIP: 11 Kumar - Pendurthi v. Pertovsky - Sarfati**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Priti Sue (*'29)</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 408</strong></td>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pendurthi</td>
<td>Sarfati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Kumar</td>
<td>Pertovsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was
- Pro
- Con

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge's Signature**

Hamilton

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Key Voters**
  - **Security**
    - Neg: You need a rebuttal abt security other than “The EU isn’t Africa” Cite poll theory abt mutual interest or something if you have to. Be it weaks your case.

- **Econ**
  - Neg: Good point abt interest loans.
  - Neg: Nice emphasis abt debt / econ growth.

- **Ethics**
  - Neg: Good card w/ coal production
  - Aff: Climate change point was asked out of nowhere.
## VPF
### FLIP: 34 Khan - Wong v. 32 Gurijala - LaCrosse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Matt Flores (*'17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 605</td>
<td>Fri 10/25/19 04:30PM</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>Wong</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>La Crosse</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Khal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Gurijala</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I voted for the Con on environment: Should China expand coal outward? Net harm & on env.

Also, Con won (or Aff lost) on FW, unity is not the resolution. St. on to answering the resolution unless it's beneficial to change it. In this case, real AFF minimized/avoided clash with this FW.
**Varsity Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 403</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Panayotova</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Schillinger</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>McHenry</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:**

RFD: Con won on climate change and the effects a Pro world would have.

---

**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**

**Speaker**

**Pro**

1st: Yibo Chen

2nd: Meddie Rumsey

**Points**

(25-30)

2B

28.5

**Con**

1st: Fieri Halley Moran

2nd: Sedona Korzay

**Points**

(25-30)

28

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:**

**Con:**

- Good organization and presentation
- Good arguments but I would like to have seen more data supporting
- Good rebuttal to "nationalism happening anyway"
- Maybe too dependent on argument that EU economy will crash
- Germany will leave EU

**Pro:**

- Good data on trade & shipping costs are persuasive
- I like the attack on their lack of data for strong European economy will "crash"

**RFD:**

- Good job by both. Close call but winner was Pro B/C.
- They had more and better data and I felt Con made too many big assumptions w/o backup data.
VARIOUS PUBLIC FORUM DEBATE  

Phil Walls (*5)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 415</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Wahal</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Chow</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Khanna</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro   Con
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  

The EV should join the Belf and road initiative.

50% of investment going to renewable energy wins climate change impacts.
### VPF

**FLIP: 22 Nimbar - Rivera v. 30 Groman - Warrier**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Evan Martin Cassler (*1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 832</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (Pro)</td>
<td>Speaker (Con)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivera</td>
<td>Warrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimbar</td>
<td>Groman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Judge's Signature**

BASIS Flagstaff/Tuscon

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

This was a very close round. All participants were professional, showed experience & expertise, and were clearly well-prepared. Con inched ahead by responding more directly and thoroughly to more of Pro's arguments. Pro occasionally focused on negatives or defining Con's points, and occasionally was too invested in specific points, possibly neglecting more salient & vital parts of the Con arguments. Still, very close.

**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**  
**Jen Groman (*30)**  
**Round 2**  
**Room 845**  
**Fri 10/25/19 04:30PM**

<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>Shravan Pejavar</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Carlos Frausto</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Daniel Shih</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sonah Chollera</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I think this was truly an excellent debate. All competitors were talented and on an equal footing which kept me engaged and undecided until the very end. I am voting for **Pro** because I feel they provided the most clash, countering their opponents as well as supporting their own case. I loved the Power Grids argument, the impact you gave me telling me why it was a loss. All other arguments were very solid so I vote **Pro**. Daniel, you are a great and creative thinker. But all debaters were excellent. Very impressed by all, especially Shravan and Daniel compelling styles. Great job!
## VPF

**FLIP: 22 Hudson - Lakhotia v. 11 Fernandez - Kathiravan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>302A</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kathiravan</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Fernandez</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
- 9 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Pro**

- Good pace, good eye contact, clear speech.
- Good job on bringing data & statistics.
- The green technology was brought in late in the speech.

---

**Con**

- Good pace, good eye contact, clear speech.
- Very good rebuttals.
- Thanks for presenting data.

---

Con won the debate as both of their contentions flew well. They supported with evidence. They convinced me that the funding gap is real & Pro could not justify why not. The death trap was also presented clearly with data.
**VPF**

**FLIP: 32 Saravanan - Sekandari v. 4 Chopra - Cheema**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 1002</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Habir Cheema</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Raj Chopra</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Pro**

1. Spoke with conviction, nice card on the coal & needing to dump

2. Good rebuttal, need to push more for speak time

**Con**

1. Spoke clearly & slowly & confidently

2. Nice conclusion, slightly over time

**Voted for AFF**

- Why is 50 days at the border a problem? Clarify this point
- Give clear cases & China not backing their word
- Green shows where EU pushed other nations to be more green
- 500 billion gap - tve this is a problem how is it still sustained
- Good rebuttal

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</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>Bennett</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Singh</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ros</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Judge's Signature**

**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

- GDP: 3.5%
- 75,000,000 new jobs
- Current rate
- Modern tech
- R&D in Pakistan
- US and Russia

**Crossfire**

- put any in not so good reasoning.
- curtail coop
- contract 2 million jobs

---

### Argument Points

1. Economic incentives
   - after economic growth
   - stimulate growth
2. demographic
   - destroys support
   - contains and e
data
3. Difficult to come into
correlation
4. Higher common core
5. Int rate

---

### Final Score

- Pro: 45
- Con: 40

---

### Final Decision

- **Impediment**
- **climax** → **right**

---

### Notes

- Unstable govern
- Strategic goals
- Miniaturize corruption
- Cannot talk at last
clear conclusion.
Reasoning for Better Decision - Con - Wind

1. Better presentation of data
2. Better arguments to support their points
3. Calm & slow presentation
4. Better reasoning / research
1st Speaker: Fantastic statement. Very well written.

2nd Speaker: Also very well-written.

Great balance between speed and substance. Well-structured arguments. Good way to start the debate. Well-organized arguments. Great emphasis on the negative. Good point that China will always have a larger GDP than the USA.

Overall, very well-written, organized, and well-thought out. Well-structured arguments. Great emphasis on the negative. Good point that China will always have a larger GDP than the USA.

3rd Speaker: Good arguments. Great emphasis on the negative. Well-structured arguments. Good point that China will always have a larger GDP than the USA.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Is this a low point winner? Yes. Why? Important for the negative team.

1st Speaker: Points were interesting. Very well-written. Interesting how you addressed "job". Works well to connect to our argument. Good point that China will always have a larger GDP than the USA.

2nd Speaker: Great arguments. Good way to start the debate. Well-organized arguments. Great emphasis on the negative. Good point that China will always have a larger GDP than the USA.

3rd Speaker: Great arguments. Good way to start the debate. Well-organized arguments. Great emphasis on the negative. Good point that China will always have a larger GDP than the USA.

4th Speaker: Points were interesting. Very well-written. Interesting how you addressed "job". Works well to connect to our argument. Good point that China will always have a larger GDP than the USA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Speaker:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Well done in pointing out the arguments you made the opponent did not address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Again, good job with evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Try to minimize &quot;ums&quot;/filler words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good job addressing the &quot;defining notions&quot; point, succinct and clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Speaker:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Very solid pace, as long as you can fit in what time you have, your tone and pacing were very well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Still noticeable stuttering/interrupted argument flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Well-made point about electricity, addressed opponent's points well in the short time we had</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Keep track of time better</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Speaker:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Very good point made for biodiversity drive the point home very well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Used opponent's lack of &quot;point&quot; addressed very well, kept pressure on the opponent to answer these points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1st Speaker:  |
- Important appeal to intuition, works better than the evidence to support intuition |
- A bit of dissonance, separate points made but each had a different purpose - try to agree on a point |
- Some stuttering here, maybe better to think seriously for a bit then speak? |

1st Speaker: |
- Interesting you also addressed the lack of addressing your points, well done |
- Draped home your own points, as opposed to the opponent, and attacked opponent's points, well done
Pro was more clear and easier to understand. Specific contentions were stated up front in the opening Constructive Argument.

I was a bit confused about the Con argument after the opening round.

Both teams did a great job of presenting counter arguments.

My decision came down to the argument of either China just exporting dirty coal and keeping green (Con) over China partnering with other countries to develop and export green.

I believed the Pro argument provided more convincing argument.

I was also confused about the Con's debt argument. I thought the Pro's CDP case was stronger.
### Varsity Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Aashney Shah (*'34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>CHOWDURY 21-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>RAMASWAMY 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>MUKHERJEE 7-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>PANDA 26.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Pro**
  - Economic growth in China & India
  - China & India coal consuming countries
  - China coal cheap & rents & labor & 2004
  - 2004-2006
  - Chychea U.S. Boba
  - China coal cheap & rents & labor & 2004
  - 2004-2006

- **Con**
  - U.S. & China trade deficits
  - China needs more oil & gas
  - China is not vulnerable to trade matters
  - China can protect itself
  - Chinese coal cheap & rents & labor & 2004
  - 2004-2006

---

### 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.*
**Varsity Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Kim Haveman ('32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 610</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Pro</td>
<td>Azagra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Con</td>
<td>Balian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**1st Speaker**

Pro - great use of documents to back up statements

Con - speeches were very unpersuasive when speaker makes any contact

**2nd Speaker**

Pro - speaker was very well spoken. Concise and committed to theme

Con - facts were presented well and were very compelling.

Great job all!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 406</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Karanjia</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Goswick</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pattipati</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Moffatt</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was:

**Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

First Crossfire argument for unified EU goes to Pro. Con does prove point that tariffs will hurt EU. Goswick first argument about "Will there be tariffs?" is a good point. Also a unified EU can push more progress is believable.

Moffatt great response to all of Pros points. Trump wanting to do tariffs is not proof it will happen.

Great 2nd Crossfire. Good questions and responses! Pattipati changed my mind that tariffs are possible.

I love Crossfire, very good debate.

I believe that the Pro argument that a Unified EU will have more influence is stronger.

Pattipati and Moffatt watch Time!
## VPF

**FLIP: 8 Hossein - Zawilak v. 27 Nair - Reed**

**Varsity Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Room 311</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Zawilak</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Hossein</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></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>Reed</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Nair</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Pro**

(Circle Winner)

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

1. **A. Reed** - con
   - Energy
     - Advance en. grids, ben. clim. poor areas
   - Co-financing to save Saudi Arabia
     - Revenues falling
     - Falling SA oil export toward

2. **A. Zawilak** - pro
   - World bank already solving
   - China grids unreliable (2018)
   - Locks in countries to coal
   - Lead to nat. dis.
   - Lower inc. can't afford.

2. **Saudi Arabia**
   - Surplus of oil, don't have incentive to invest
   - Add of devotion to SA slim
   - Subs. FDI required
   - Increase coal. emit.

3. **A. Hossein**
   - Energy, coal
     - Changing to green tech
   - Incent. to switch to green
   - Saudi Arabia
     - If falls, crackdown will increase
     - CPAC is losing steam

---

**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

3 minutes of Prep Time per side

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.*
Both sides performed well, but provided stronger evidence, pro dealt in more hypothetical.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Daniel Waks (*'11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 418</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Speaker**

**Points (25-30)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st</th>
<th>Sajith</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Macariola</td>
<td>27</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:**

- Many arguments didn't apply to EU
  - Case lacks hard evidence
  - Williams: Ask clearer questions
  - Link rebuttal to case
  - Rebuttal has little offense
  - Find min of offense was confusing
  - Speech by judge, not opponent
  - Start summary with key voters

**Con:**
  - Attack on health wasn't clearly linked
  - Identify dropped points
  - Summary should collapse the argument, emphasize clearly
  - Health response super scattered
  - Link concerns
  - Strong density, way to cover the whole floor

**RFD:**
  - Pro focuses on Our. country, not EU
  - Pro is projections
  - Pro struggles to use examples to prove weight of joining
  - Pros points came off unclear
  - Global influence against the West not addressed

**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 Prep Time per side

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

**FLIP: 35 Marks - Milliken v. 22 Han - Mckenna**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Lucas Galardi ('7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 609</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri 10/25/19 04:30PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutch Milliken</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammy Marks</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoojin Han</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Mckenna</td>
<td>28</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:**

- China needs EU money
- China is funding BRI on their own
- BRI reduces world poverty
- 31% of BRI projects in danger, with EU money many developing nations would take on cost of these projects
- Chinese economy in danger of crash

**Con:**

- Fossil fuels
- Chinese banks invested $130B into energy, most is fossil fuels
- Most BRI-funded factories incredibly polluting
- 460M Asians lack access to electricity
- BRI will essentially accelerate climate change

---

**RFD:** **Con won because they effectively flowed their case through and convinced me that climate change is a pre-requisite. Simply, less industry means less pollution and Con proved that the majority of Chinese investment is coal. They also flowed through their point of pushing debt onto other countries.**
Yoojin has great command of cross

What does the UN do to help climate change exactly, and how do they enforce this?

Why does the failure of BRI mean recession? How much money is China gambling on this?

Excess of coal in China means that joining BRI means your economy will be much more coal-based.

Good response from China to poverty

Good extension from China about pushing debt onto other countries

After second Ck, so far China has addressed some

Necessary to figure out which side has more impact: recession or climate change. Need to see more from both teams on this.

Concise impact calc from Han in summary

Important to remember that you can’t have an economy w/ a destroyed planet

Dropped UN signatory argument b/c pro failed to link this effectively

Con also answers pro concerns about ED economies by saying Chinese investment will hurt local ED economies

Pro needs to prove that the UN can enforce environmental regulations

On dominated grand cross, pro should be more assertive in the future

Pro must win both impacts to win at this point

How will climate change get worse from less industry in SE Asia?

China putting debt on other countries is vital
### VPF

**Varsity Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Chris Thiele (*3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Room 612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Waldo King 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ryan Lancaster 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gianna Echevirel 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Adrian Villegas 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:**

Pro team efficiently attacked all the con contentions and arguments. Pro team well prepared and great great responses to all issues raised. Con team seems green and while contentions were well presented the pro team countered and the pro team left areas of without attack. Con team can work on using all time given and shoring up their arguments.

---

**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>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 611</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Poudel</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Patel</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Harriss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? no

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Vote ran due to dropped Impacts coming out of the final focus.

Additional comments were given in 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.