

VPF

FLIP: 5 Shih - Shukla v. 22 Edquist - Gallup

Varsity Public Forum			42 Shahi, Meera		
Quarter-Finals			025	Sat 02/08/20 01:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Abhi Shukla	29.5	1st	Tanya Edquist	29.5
2nd	Daniel Shih	29.5	2nd	Larkin Gallup	29.5
The winner of this debate was			Meera Shahi		
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)			Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			Desert Vista H.S. School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Time left: 2:33 18

Time left: 2:12 1:00

Comments & Reason for Decision:

pro wins due better arguments but had slightly better research. Both sides were terrific! in x-fire. - the Pro team just presented their contentions slightly better than con. Really Great Debates presented

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.	

1 - UBI - domestic abuse - 1/5 award great, unable to bare due to violence smooth ex. Kenya  
 2 - economic welfare - stringent 23% on UBI - debt + deficit - wrong! - widespread economic poverty trap - recipient generate income.  
 - net income & on welfare  
 - incentive wear  
 - Rust Belt.  
 - Purchasing power

SR - means tested welfare  
 C1 - UBI with us than parents can qualify - good argument  
 H1 - 50k value UBI - 12 1/4 yr. in creases poverty for children  
 - redistributing wealth upwards high rising inequality  
 - speaker had great arguments on contentions, great smooth speech  
 - used well researched arguments ex. \$ 2T - needed to fund us 1.5 T/yr. - estimate => 64% GDP had great economic data + debt = GDP

x-fire: really great Q/A on both sides. Great back & forth.  
 S2 - made a great Q on austerity cuts

3 - overview & then responds to con's contention.  
 167k die due to poverty - in the US. - UBI - Assume all those who get welfare get all of them - not correct. CPP - 80% only receive all TANF WIC, etc. 75% rec. nothing at

S4: overview & supports con's contentions  
 Tax credits - sharp ↑ poverty 16% ↓ entrepreneurship - good pt. on how UBI change financial power to abused. 667 v/hr work. - Kenya dv - not comparable US DV.

S3 - child poverty ↑; Gov't debt - UBI - replaces all welfare Prog. which funds UBI  
- automation - doubling GDP.  
- Investor - debt

S4 = good arguments against pro's contention.  
- 62% adults on welfare don't work  
- Value deep pov.  
- Med amt of welfare: 28K/yr. is still more than UBI

2nd x-fire: great arguments & Questions/Answers by both S3/S4.  
- great back forth on spending on food cost.

Summary:

S1 - Great summary of the pros contention & rebuttal of Cons contention. Good speed & tone on the speech! Great arguments & rebuttals! Good data used in arguments/rebuttals. GDP/debt ratio use.  
- use Rust belt state ↓ economic stimulus - CASIT transfer - food stamps.  
S2 - Rebutted Pro's contention & summarized Con's well.  
- median - 28K/yr. - welfare - medical - TANF - impacts more people than UBI.  
- 89 prog in the welfare prgms.  
- increased debt cost to people & infrastructure.  
- good argument the DV women don't reach - 8 milli

Grand x-fire: Pros Q/A well researched - however Con's answers were very evidenced & thought out. - Con ~~was~~ did better on this x-fire

FF:

S3 - deep poverty - \$2/wk - 167K die due to deep poverty.  
- UBI - pulls 8 million in deep poverty  
- 28K/yr median welfare - EPI - indicates that is not true.  
- Rust Belt argument | Food stamp cost \$167/month ⇒ UBI would grow 1/4  
S4 - agree on deep poverty. ↓ welfare ↑ child pov. - 8 million plunged in poverty.  
- UBI strengthens abusers & not the women.  
- Affirmation - double GDP in the status quo. - automation.  
- debt ↑ unemployment 4-6% ⇒ 20%

\*

# VPF

FLIP: 5 Desai - Sarwar.v. 9 Neuner - Talamantez

Varsity Public Forum		Prithi Sud (*29)	
Quarter-Finals		024	Sat 02/08/20 01:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker
1st	Talamantez	25	1st
2nd	Neuner	25	2nd
Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)	Speaker
1st	Desai	30	1st
2nd	Sarwar	30	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
Pro <input type="radio"/>		Con <input checked="" type="radio"/>	
(Circle Winner)		Prithi Sud	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		Basis Scottsdale	
		Physician / Gastroenterologist	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The <sup>winning</sup> Pro team weighed in better. Great presentation by both teams.

Desai

Sarwar

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.	

Pros → 1) 40 million in poverty.  
lowest social mobility.

Alaska

- 1) Economic growth.
- 2) Freedom → say No.  
Female murder.

- Cons →
- 1) Survival of the richest.
  - 2) SSI → 2/3<sup>rd</sup> sep. disabilities.
  - 3) Recession
  - 4) E IER.

VPF

FLIP: 5 Chopra - Cheema v. 41 Groman - Warrior

Varsity Public Forum			Aaron Applegate (*35)		
Quarter-Finals			026	Sat 02/08/20 01:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>ROGER VOIYER</u>	<u>28</u>	1st	<u>KABIR CHITMA</u>	<u>28</u>
2nd	<u>Julie Groman</u>	<u>26</u>	2nd	<u>RAJ CHOPRA</u>	<u>28</u>
The winner of this debate was					
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/>			Judge's Signature		
(Circle Winner)			ACP-ERIE		
Is this a low point win? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

12/1. ~~Pro~~ ~~23 prep.~~  
 Reduce poverty to  
 24% with welfare.  
 50% don't participate  
 Benefit-reducing after  
 in chasing income.  
 21 cent ~~pro~~ ~~23 prep.~~  
 consumer spend  
 24 thousand lose  
 24% of economy growth.  
 50% don't participate  
 76% and  
 increase entrepreneurship.  
 FINLAND FAL LED to boost  
 S.B 43% of economy  
 BK, insurance, OBI  
 Job opportunity in  
 other location.  
 Well-known cons. on under  
 with population not  
 expand economy 12%  
 75% 25% of welfare  
 73% of GDP  
 FANF more people  
 are getting on welfare  
 Difference in tax would  
 set or value added  
 tax - Economy grows.  
 Well-known state have better  
 social do bill.

CON - 2:33 prep  
 Over ~~the~~ ~~at~~ ~~minimum~~  
 before ~~the~~ ~~at~~ ~~minimum~~  
 Rich people would  
 get ~~the~~ ~~at~~ ~~minimum~~  
 distribution, ~~the~~ ~~at~~ ~~minimum~~  
 Reduce Benefits for  
 poor  
 50% of ~~the~~ ~~at~~ ~~minimum~~  
 child poverty  
 cannot act as  
 automatic stabilizer  
 4 trillion Dollars  
 Rising deficit  
 Hyper Inflation  
 Interconnection Economy  
 global recession  
 4 trillion world  
 could Break Debt/GDP  
 More income  
 with more welfare  
 98. Inequality  
 Failed to boost  
 FINLAND  
 CHICAGO doing NOT  
 Higher risk leads to success


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.	

12.



**VPF**

FLIP: 5 Pejavar - Mukherjee v. 35 Han - Mckenna

Varsity Public Forum			Wayne Montes de Oca Regu Warrior (25) 25 oca		
Quarter-Finals		027	Sat 02/08/20 01:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Pejavar	28	1st	Han	30
2nd	Mukherjee	26	2nd	Mckenna	30
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Tempe H.S. Teacher School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

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.	

The neg won because they were able to provide evidence that supported their position on VBI.

#1st - Good opening, used evidence to support ~~neg~~ position as Aff.

#2 challenge neg claim of VBI 3T used India as an example.

#1 Great use of sources and evidence. Spoke too fast at times.

#2 Attack on Neg. Frustrated "lies" call for cand.

It seemed like you both gave up on proving your case through Dislog.

I would not recommend making an acquisition unless you present it to the other team.

#1st - Great use of statistics. Sold evidence to support her position.

#2 Good counter request for equal data.

#1. was able to refute the Aff with facts!

Strong arguments, specific and relevant.

#2 Well composed and "unsettled" at acquisition of being dishonest. Confidence & use of evidence was outstanding.

Both Teams 'Awesome'

Prep time used  
 50 sec  
 20 Sec  
 3 min used

Prep time used  
 25 used  
 14/0  
 2:05  
 3:00

