**Varsity Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Marco Changho (*'22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Nair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**R:** Your points you brought out are very logical and flowing. You are very meticulous and logical in thinking, but I had a hard time or had trouble understanding the way you spoke.

**Sek:** You brought up your points really well and you have researched your main contention very thoroughly.

**Sar:** Your rebuttal arguments are very precise and it appears that you have a thorough grasp of countering the affirmative.

Reason for decision: **Aff won by just the slightest margin.**

1. Economic progress argument was well argued by both sides, but a recession is not caused by a single reason so this slightly tips in favor of the affirmative.

2. Neg primarily focused on

3. Neg's main contention is environmental harm and they argued the point very well but the Aff also rebutted just as well. This is a tie but if Neg offered an alternative clean energy source, this could have slightly gone Neg, but as it stands the point is even. Neg should accept more con (-1 contention).

4. Affirmative showed green initiative & investments
### VPF

**FLIP: 32 Chow - Khanna v. 22 Kantrud - Patel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 406</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Chow</td>
<td>28 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Khanna</td>
<td>28 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Verbal RFDs**

Good round, the pro had quantified economic impacts they linked into since Neg dropped all defense or case.

Neg had no tangible affect on climate change to outweigh Aff benefits

---

### 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: 13 Chollerar - Frausto v. 9 Rosenberg - McCollough**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Lucas Galardi (*7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Room 607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Fri 10/25/19 07:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Mccollough</td>
<td>Points (25-30) 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Rosenberg</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Carlos Frausto</td>
<td>Points (25-30) 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Sohan Chollerar</td>
<td>28</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:**
- Economy
  - Chinese access to markets reduces poverty by 6%, tens of millions of ppl
  - Increased incomes by ~7% likely, higher qual. of life
  - Improved infrastructure creates thousands of jobs
- More free trade good
- BRI creates common health platform
- Improves access to healthcare for EU, helping quality of life

**Con:**
- Climate Change
  - EU funds help Chinese coal investment
  - This will lead to ecosystem collapse
  - Human Rights Violations
  - 2 million Uighurs forced into camps
  - EU against these violating
  - Increasing Chinese power
  - Threatens Indian sovereignty

RFD: Con doesn’t really flow anything through and I dropped cont 2 and 3 bc I don’t see the link or impact. The few impacts that Pro gives win them the 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.
Con Rebuttal:
South Asia has poor infrastructure, making trade more expensive. 270 BRI projects have been put on hold showing weakness of bloc.
China having problems financing BRI, trade barriers being knocked down doesn't mean much.
35% increase in coal production.
What's the impact of the HRV? Why is it unique?

Aff rebuttal:
Global warming non-unique.
China wouldn't force EU to use coal.
Never state CC impacts.
HRV non-topical.
Kashmir non-topical.
Con stated in CX they don't know how much China is spending on it, so they can't say they can't afford it.

CC is non-unique so far.
Still not seeing specific impacts on CC or how the EU joining BRI makes Uyghur genocide worse.

Con doesn't give me a weighing mechanism so I use pro's.
**VPF**

**FLIP: 34 Khan - Wong v. 32 Lal - Parau**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Nadia Jafar (*4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 410</strong></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>30</td>
<td>Lal</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Khan</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Parau</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

**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: 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: **Verbal RFD**

Coal dumping o/w human rights on probability.
**Varsity Public Forum Debate**  
**Bharathi Thodla (*'26)**  
**FLIP: 4 Mukherjee - Panda v. 27 Hays - Oldani**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 845</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Mukherjee</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Panda</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Oldani</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Hays</td>
<td>25</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 Team -**

**Con Team - Good points, can link it.**

Mukherjee → Good points

Oldani → Good points & Good delivery.

Panda → Good points: Need improvement on delivery → slow down.

Hays → Good points, need improvement on delivery.

---

**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>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>26</td>
<td>Schillinger</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gurijalal</td>
<td>29</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? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Better presentation
- Good question
- Strong crossfire
- Strong debate skills
- Strong conclusion

Both teams did great jobs, strong debate skills, good presentation, good crossfire, pro team slightly better conclusion. 2nd speaker is aggressive perspective and eloquent. good job!
Both teams were very well prepared with not only their case but with all contentions mentioned. Con needed to focus on details and data stated by Pro and rebut - use preptime wisely. Con seemed to continually be playing catch up to Pro case. Con 2nd speaker Khan had strong presence and made great case with debt however Con seemed to veer away from pollution/environment. Both teams did a fantastic job debating together. Love the knowledge and passion.

Pro was able to rebut to drop several con contentions or put them in question (banks, Sri Lanka, Malaysia, loss of $ to China). Pro had strong research of host countries making decisions for best of their own countries regarding infrastructure, economy, environment.

Con focus more on your info about coal plants in Africa details and build within the case more ->
Con mentioned this at the beginning of debate and didn't add in any additional data to support - mention again at end with same information.

Con did not refute quality of life with enough fight or research to re-direct. Pro had very strong case with detailed data. Both cases were really good, both teams wonderful to listen to and judge.
# VPF

**FLIP: 26 Ros - Bennett v. 4 Desai - Sarwar**

**Round 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Room 415</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>DESAI</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>SARWAR</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**CON**
- **Economy = Cite** / Debt Ratio / Inflation
  - Example China = 5% Growth w/ High Debt
  - Good Interest & Clarity
  - Deserving of Power / Human Rights Areas
  - Recession / Crashing / Recession
  - High Interest Rates / Cut or Eliminate

**CROSS**
- Renewable Energy (EU x 2) How Change?
- EU to Help Fund / Investment is Strong
- 2/3 Majority of Countries
- B/I / Good Cause, Great Questions

---

**PRO**
- High Growth / Humen
  - Other Economy is Growing
  - 3% Investment
  - EU Protect (China Case) No it Fundamental
  - Good Interest / Clarity
  - B/I Cites / Support
  - Renewable Energy
  - Financial Benefits

**CROSS**
- Decrease in Growth / B/I Debt
  - Over 20%
  - Cuts come, Growth Investments Cut Pairs Past
  - Good Thing on Your Part
  - Great Question on Both Sides
  - B/I Protect / Cites / Pro / Con

---

**CON**
- China: Debt / EU Security
- Sanctions = Manipulate our Economy
- Dollar Crisis / Renewable energy / B/I / Security Debt
- Recession
- No longer going to use the Euro / Dollar Instability
  - Why long? China, Recession

---

**PRO**
- Current Economic / Wages Out of Poverty
  - GDP = Debt Ratio
  - Chinese Interest & Incentive
  - B/I Cites
  - Growth / Future Sustained Growth

---

**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.
Both teams did extremely well and arguments were well researched. The con team used sub-point A but weighed the pro team's contention 2, powerful connection. The argument of slowing economy in China versus the Chinese investment in April 2019 flowed through giving the con team the win w/ regret. The con full argument was better supported by evidence and attacks on pro contentions were superior.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<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>King</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warrier</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Groman</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro  Con
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Both sides had excellent opening arguments. (Pro)
Warrier won the crossfire - was better prepared, handled objections well.

Pro team

Ms. Groman's argumentative and adversarial, condescending. Please be more polite in future debates. You are extremely bright and have potential to be a perfect debater. I was uncomfortable judging this round due to this
1. Trump trade - Trump - global recession "likely" would push ppl into poverty.


Quoted Scientist American - good sources on Natural Geography.

**Pro**

- Cost/Benefit
  - Income trade, 7 economy quoted 99% - good data.
  - 1 poverty.

- Well presented - good speaking skills!
- Good eye contact!
  - Chinese woman -
  - Good job listing transit times as 1 positive.
  - Excellent use of (pro)
  - Very argumentative and aggressive.

- Good job presenting opposition's example about Trump.
- Who has reconstructed? I still don't know.
- China has reduced already coal points?

- Pro

- Presuming Trump's action.
  - Awesome job data, very well prepared.
  - Good attacks on other team.

- Good argument for EU strength.
  - I do like your point about US-EU relationship.

**Con**

- King
**Varsity Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>302A</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Pattipati</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moffatt</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Panayotova</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

I ended up voting for the pro because of their CI on green tech/power grids. Overall, very good 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.
**VPF**

**FLIP: 6 Andersen-Mosher - Haines v. 35 Marks - Milliken**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 601</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Milliken</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Marks</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Haines</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Mosher</strong></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:**

---

### 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.
very close debate

Pro successfully countered Con's Human Rights & KASHMIR contentions.

Pro also clearly listed increased trade as an engine for GDP growth, with impact to Education, Healthcare, Water, Sanitation, in general benefits for EU citizens.

However,

Con expressed doubt about China's ability to live up to its economic promises, find loans and pay bills. Also customs & Trade barriers, not countered by Pro.
CARLSON, TONYA

VPF

FLIP: 22 Chen - Rumsey v. 4 Singh - Mantri

Varsity Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Tonya Carlson (‘29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Mantri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Singh</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>Chen</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Rumsey</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

(Circle Winner)

Pro

Con

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1. EU should join BRI, belt and road, only China benefits, dumping goods.
2. 2013 BRI - 3.5%, China has more trade, 73% US goods increase.
3. Smith, Bloomberg, private investment pours into EU, global poverty.
5. Exports not keeping goods, How much money will BRI, Sri Lanka work? China BRI will not help, too many hotels in Pro.
6. 75% come from local labor, Sri Lanka would not be in the shape, China re-bids, increase in year, likewise India?

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>
</tbody>
</table>

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

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

**FLIP: 4 Chopra - Cheema v. 26 Macariola - Sajith**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Farzana Yasmin (*'8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 609</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheema</td>
<td><strong>(25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chopra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

- **Pro**
  - Good pace, nice eye contact.
  - Good data & evidence at every speech.
  - Clean FF & summary.

- **Con**
  - Good pace, nice eye contact.
  - FF lacked clarity.

**Pro** won the debate by **showing bigger impact with good evidence**.

---

**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 .......... 3 min
- Grand Crossfire (all) ...... 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus ...... 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus ...... 2 min
- 1 minute of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
VARSITY PUBLIC FORUM DEBATE

**FLIP: 33 Echevarlel - Villegas v. 13 Traslavina - Williams**

**Round 4**

<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>Williams</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Echevarlel Villegas</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Traslavina</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Traslavina</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:**

**Con prep:** 1:06 - 1:16
**Pro prep:** 30 sec - 30 sec

**Con:** Well stated; clear stats; Figures
4:00 Excellent answer of questions
1:30 Weak, general, questions given, very vague; good

2: Very strong argument, with excellent counter points. Last train of thought, tidy, less likely to stats.

No Poor time management. Disjointed argument.
Con questions pointed; well said.

**Pro:** Well stated; clear stats, Figures. Better speaker, good flow
Very organized argument, clear listing of contentions.
4:00 Went over time 5 sec after announcement.

Good counter points - rough delivery

2: Very powerful speaker. Well thought-out counter.

Good East v. West argument. Done well.

2 Sec over

Center point to conclusion was well stated
Better time management

Well said Con related. Counter argument's clear; pointed.

**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.*
<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>Chowdury</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Azagra</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ramaswamy</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Balian</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:

Balian: Very good attacks in C/F. You left your opp. speechless multiple times. You are very quick on your feet.

Ramaswamy and Chowdury: Great point bringing up how Sri Lanka is comparable to EU. I wondered the same thing. There were times it looked like you were very flustered by your opponents. Try not to let that get to you because at times it looked like you felt defeated.

You guys made excellent points.

B & A: Very confident, strong debating. You had commanding presence. Often it left your opponents speechless.

In the end, the con won because of the idea that they could avoid supporting the coal usage and EU could fund green initiatives themselves.
1. China spread influence
   - instability would peak
   - subsidies given unfair advantage

2. Impossible loans
   - Germany slowly recession
   - Tanzania pull out or BRI
   - Threat EU into debt

US & China have tensions and EU joining would skyrocket tension.
- pres. Trump is put on a tangent
- China is harming other countries - spreading coal projects - difficult to transition away from coal plants.
- China is using BRI to expand its interests to EU doesn't have interest. EU cannot check power because it will increase its power
- US will take actions if they join China - willing and able to attack EU - hurt globally

- If close to China, do they have bias?
- What will check power?

1. Economy - EU surging
2. Environment
   - Impacts of Tariffs long term
   - trade connections with China take time
   - China can't expand coal power

- Could EU invest in green technology?
  - No Ching?

Debt trap - affect EU million - evidence?
- No on either/or
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Varsity Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Vivek Khanna ('32)</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Berg</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gould</td>
<td>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:

**Pro** (Berg) *Cont 1*: EU would be better off. Very fast delivery.

**Cont 2**: Reducing poverty, 50000 Obs.

**Cont 3**: China: U.S. debt to China will depress China. Germany: China is exploiting the West.

**Con** (Lakhotaia) - *Cont 1*: Authoritarian China, U.S. debt to China will depress China.

**Cont 2**: China will depress the world economy.

**Cont 3**: China, China is exploiting the West.

**Crossfire (1 & 2)**: Pro (Berg) Questions asked: 'not stated by opponent.'

**Con** (Lakhotaia) - How?

**Cont 1**: Good questions asked, but subject not understood.

**Cont 2**: EU will not be dismantled or determined.

**Cont 3**: EU will not be dismantled or determined.

**Clear delivery.**

---

**Crossfire (1 & 2)**: Pro (Berg) Questions asked: 'not stated by opponent.'

**Con** (Lakhotaia) - How?

**Cont 1**: Good questions asked, but subject not understood.

**Cont 2**: EU will not be dismantled or determined.

**Cont 3**: EU will not be dismantled or determined.

**Clear delivery.**

---

**Summary (1 & 2)**: Pro - China working on increasing the value of USD.

**Con**: Rebuttals are strong, clear & logical.

---

**Crossfire (all)**: Pro - asked a question on transparency of China.

---

**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.*
Final Round: 40m people out of poverty - PRO
Opponent using old card from 2018.

Con -
**VPF**

**Varsity Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 612</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:30PM</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>Han</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>McKenna</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Neg**

1. **Rise of Eu. alt.-right**
   - Rise

2. **Collapse of Eu econ.**

**Aff**

1. **Infrastructure**
   - Trade
   - Jobs
   - Loans nec.

Does joining the EU benefit? Does not joining change anything?

The Neg. team built a powerful case on strong evidence about an underserved issue and supported it well throughout. Their attacks were passionate and thorough.

The Aff. team maintained their evidence well and argued several points to their contention; each of which was difficult to dismantle.
### VPF: Varsity Public Forum Debate

**FLIP: 30 Exum - Nair v. 1 Patel - Poudel**

**Doug Self ('6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 604</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:30PM</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>Poudel</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Patel</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Con points out that the negative impacts of the GRI aren't outweighed by any countervailing benefits, and persuasively makes the point that China can't easily divert itself from fossil fuels or focus its investment in developing economies.

---

**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: 34 Goswick - Karanjia v. 11 Kumar - Pendurthi**

**Varsity Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Karanjia</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Goswick</td>
<td>30</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>Pendurthi</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Kumar</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

**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:**

Pendurthi: EU Economic point - East EU and Eastern. Good summary. Included all continents. EU should join as bad or well.


**Judge's Signature:**

Hamilton

School/Affiliation/Occupation

No

Jim Fountain Classic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Evan Martin Cassler (*1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 611</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Moran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Kozari</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Pro**

(Circle Winner)

**No**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Pro**: Strong delivery, strong argument

**Con**: Excellent use of researched evidence and explicit citation of it

**Pro**: Good use of research and powerful delivery with emotion. Good balance of recitation & explanation.

**Con**: Deep apparent knowledge of many facets of topic including examples and cause & effect

**Pro**: Points could be substantiated by more examples

**Con**: Somewhat more consistent in addressing weaknesses in Pro argument

### 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>
</tbody>
</table>

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 4</th>
<th>Aashney Shah (*'34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>WANG 29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>WAHAL 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Speaker

The winner of this debate was

** Pro

(Circle Winner)

** Con

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

---

** Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Booster:**
  - Debt, Oil, byグラフ
  - Write EU Viability

- **Critic:**
  - EU from where? 连接 for infras? + Debt
  - Europe highest bill strength的 money
  - Pro wealth bank

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker 1</th>
<th>Speaker 2</th>
<th>Crossfire (1 &amp; 2)</th>
<th>Speaker 3</th>
<th>Speaker 4</th>
<th>Crossfire (3 &amp; 4)</th>
<th>Speaker 1 Summary</th>
<th>Speaker 2 Summary</th>
<th>Grand Crossfire (all)</th>
<th>Speaker 3 Final Focus</th>
<th>Speaker 4 Final Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

**Con:** All of your responses were insightful and made our case stronger.

---

**U.S.**

- Infras. + be need EU bank to react

---

**Japanese**

- Infras. + be need EU bank to react

---

**China**

- Compt. of infras

---

**BRI**

- For every back climate

---

**Balance China**

- Compt. of infras

---

**3rd growth**

- 500 mppi

---

**PPP turn key**

- A hurt 90

---

**Local government**

-/BRI profit europe

---

**Small share comp**

- BRI maj, few

---

**Author's Signature**

- DESERT VISTA HS

School / Affiliation / Occupation