The winner of this debate was

Pro   Con
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1. Con
   
   BRI, EU, U.S., Environment
   Infrastructure
   Trump
   Auto.
   Renew energy
   
   Environment, Global
   Pro well defend Trump
   warming, poverty, economy
   BRI invest in infrastructure
   does not argue
   that [Pro] didn't argue
   the argument.

   Environment issue creates
tension with future perception
   that's not quite persuasive

   on coal energy and emission

   poverty vs. economy, it's tough for Con to argue
   to solve the conflict between

   Comment: How environment/climate change and poverty?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>Heidi Aldrich ('28)</th>
<th>Room 604</th>
<th>Sat 10/26/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Wahal</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **China slowdown, draw down in BR1/EU, no room for US boom in BR1.**
  - **Tariff trouble:** US would see China publish gap, no other bodies can.
  - US would see China publish gap, no other bodies can.
  - US would see China publish gap, no other bodies can.
  - US would see China publish gap, no other bodies can.
  - US would see China publish gap, no other bodies can.

- **Tariff trouble:** US would see China publish gap, no other bodies can.
  - US would see China publish gap, no other bodies can.
  - US would see China publish gap, no other bodies can.
  - US would see China publish gap, no other bodies can.
  - US would see China publish gap, no other bodies can.

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Speaker 5: 4 min
- Speaker 6: 4 min

- Crossfire (1 & 2): 3 min
- Crossfire (3 & 4): 3 min
- Crossfire (5 & 6): 3 min
- Grand Crossfire: 3 min

- Speaker 1 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 3 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 5 Summary: 2 min

2 minutes of Prep Time per side

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

### Jim Fountain Classic

**FLIP: 30 Groman - Warrier v. 29 Wahal - Wang**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Ted Braun (&quot;34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 604</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Pro</td>
<td>Wang 28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Pro</td>
<td>Wahal 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Judge's Signature

Hamilton

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.

---

**AC:**

- Kick PI
- On RTT:
  - the question here is Trump's actions
  - the analysis on non-mutual exclusivity of runs is admissible, marginal offense
  - the signed statement is specificity or Trump's response means I prefer we're
  - Ever Dropped Eniwetok
  - the affidavit can't respond to us interposed

**NL:**

- C1
  - no response on shallow reception, TD
  - weak link
- C2
  - 55% is kind of TD, but also the card was specifically on your answering

---

**G**

Guy, my

written RFD is

bad, very

sucky
**VPF**

FLIP: 4 Mukherjee - Panda v. 32 Gurijala - LaCrosse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum Debate</th>
<th>Taylor Mittelstedt (*2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Finals</td>
<td>Room 605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Mukherjee 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Panda 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature: Taylor Mittelstedt

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: 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: I end up voting for the affirmative b/c of the lack of frontlining and extensions coming from the negative. Aff was cleaner throughout the round and ended up being the only ones who extended links into impacts and subsequent impacts.
**Pro**

- Economic impact
- Free trade
- Housing development

**Con**

- Climate change
- Coal
- Infrastructure
- Energy consumption

**Pro**

- Effectively rebutted the **Coal** argument.
- Increase in green energy.
- Good argument with the hearing crisis and the economic impact.
- Not China has gotten rid of the anti-dumping laws.
- Italy increased GDP by 4% because of BRI.
- Good argument with China dumping coal and other cheap goods.
- China uses cheap workers to build houses and it doesn't help the economy in the country.
- Exp strongly Cool China dependencies for the longer term.
**VPF**

FLIP: 4 Mukherjee - Panda v. 32 Gurijala - LaCrosse

**Varsity Public Forum Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>Room 605</th>
<th>Sat 10/26/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Mukherjee</strong></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Panda</strong></td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</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:

**Pro:** 1. Free Trade = Exports vs. less trade = T5
   - Hoarding in EU = cheap supplies
   - Exports to China, India, etc.
   - Benefits globalization
   - Reducing EU manufacturing
   - 95% of coal price involved in T5
   - Inability to change coal
   - China banned 100 coal
   - Destroyed coal古怪 in T5

**Anti:** Dumping: Better evidence indicates how many prices/crisis
   - Home = Response / No coal investment continues

**Con:** 1. DEI leading bill 812. Needs support from int. firms
   - Helps boost the legitimacy through ISS
   - DEI reversed trend of coal decrease invested
   - China imports DEI plans into deals can be canceled

2. Infrastructure - decades of carbon emissions & roe at world roe
   - Decrease GDP 1.5% in EU due to cheap chinese goods
   - 300 x put asset points due to global recession
   - DEI issue will pro argue
   - China policy for served in ants issues on regulatory regs.