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The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? __________

Comments & Reason for Decision:

TD: The aff gets rooted in CR and undermines truth testing in the CR.

The aff needs a more thorough understanding of how the KC functions - does it get there? How does the plan cause a resolution? Most importantly, are there pre-fert reasons to affirm simply for reading the KC? If so, why?
AFF

/ challenging

* Vote for dismantling colonialism
  * Sett-col/freedom+eq - opposed who rec of first
    * Still happening, still in systems
  * Settlers sep. from ind - priv. to work w/ indig.

Welfare = sett-col. outgrowth, maintains settler control over indigenous (ex: capitalism)

  * col. says it make prod. use of land
  * state overall

Welfare state = racist, post, lift up whites, poc underrep in welfare programs, not allowed to reform or run it

UBI hurts welfare state & feeds settler-state > indig.

Grants ss and medicare

* UBI financed by getting rid of welfare programs
  * This is good bc welfare is bad

Oversimplification, work w/ state to dismantle it

= disorientation + resistance

* Aff leads into neg (perm: do both)

* Aff can never be anticap or revolutionary
  * (Still w/ state)

NEG

* access imparters both F/W
  * must be accessible to everyone

* for endorse best method to fight inequality
  * BC = capitalist
    * BC can never be good bc state still does it
  * state = ruling class
  * Subsidizes low wage work, weapon to keep whages low

3) Workers+ negotiate income + unions
4) Prevents critique of capitalism

- Cap. causes extinction, inequality = opp. for profit

- # fix environ by cap.
- embrace collective ownership
  * Abolish poverty
  * Free society = incnt. for new work

* If neg wins point, aff
  * ethically win
    * structures will still hurt indig.
  * Indig. resistance must be anti-capital
    * 6. workers’ movements can include indig. movements

alt = collective party movements

* neg & do enough by just anti-capitalism
Great presentation and links from both of you. Define IBC, especially if there are real-world or historical examples of it — real-world impacts always strengthen your arguments. Impact role of the ballot more — why should I care why I vote one way or the other? How does it link into your solvency and positions?

RFD: Neg showed that IBC is still welfare and any indigenous supporting action is still working within a settler-colonial capitalist state. Aff did not have a convincing defense for IBC still working as a function of the
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**PCDS**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

INC - I wouldn't run 15 minutes of pre-empt, make arguments on case or run another off or slow down and do some weighing.

1AR - I understand the 50 states CP theory, but you didn't ask about conditionality or the status of the CP in CP, you didn't prew in the 1AR. I'm not sure what those responses mean to set you up for in the 2AR? Also update your theory shell so it's not about healthcare.

Both teams - There is no reason this needs to be a theory debate, we'll need to engage one another.

2AR - This was a great ZAR, but I felt like you were being more clear about how to evaluate, and I'm not persuaded.

R2D: I vote on the disad because the negative told me to if I don't like the theory debate.
Thank you both for a fantastic quarter round! It was definitely a nail-biter until the very end. While I bought into Aff’s framework, I found myself leaning towards Neg’s overall case. Ultimately, what sold me was that Aff forgot to flow through his untouched points, you let them all drop! This led to Neg’s success.

* Neg didn’t give a definition of UBI though, so be careful of that in the future.

P.S.: You both are so fidgety during cross-X. Chill out! Relax!

Great job, guys!