<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Carolyn Evans (*'17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Finals</td>
<td>LL272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:22</td>
<td>Greg Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Affirmative) Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>Calvin Tyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Negative) Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1AC - I would read full cites or at least more than saying 'an in-depth study'.
Both - I hate flex prep. Ask your Qs in CX. Manage your 3 minutes.
1NC - I'm interested in this CP text. I love CP debate.
Both - Be nice in CX. CX should be very cordial.
1AR - You were pretty efficient on the flow, but you need more time in the CP. Also, this line about "CX was embarrassing for him" crossed a line for me. That feels both personal and rude. If this was a pre-lim, it would seriously impact your speaks.
NR - I thought the NR was a little messy. I would go down the flow to re-establish links to the DA + then spend a lot of time using CP extensions. I want to be compelled to vote on the CP, but you're neither utilizing the flow or performance to convince me.
2AR - I would be more clear with ballot directing language.
Both - Everyone can do better showing me the two worlds.

LD: I'm not sure I buy the CP. The aff seems to have some risk of coercion.
NEB: retain
NC: Value Justice
maximising well-being
Metanomism - greater good.
1. Inflation - % economy + goods
debt
disposable income
> recession [why % GDP bad]
more # inflation
2. Long term economic collapse
- # of people receiving $ from gov
- suggest negative income tax
  - cheaper than basic income
  - simpler than income tax
  - less guilt & bureaucracy
  - no stigma

AC:
Replace welfare - similar to (-) tax
Ak example - funded by oil
Income equality - some must to
  everyone
[shared card]
Job creation - poor sticky design
Small businesses - not too small to
  make it happen
where poor spend $ - big business
but still spend $ &
Raised sources ... conflict of interest

Rebuttals
AFF: Ak - a good example regardless of $ since

NEB: Same card
Too much personal attack

Rebuttals: homes can't pay taxes
current unemployment trap

AFF: ?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Marion Jr. (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Finals</td>
<td>Jonathan Lifshitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Miller</td>
<td>Calvin Tyler</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**AFF:** clear 5 point in favor of the value of justice, where income replaces welfare + other social services.

- excellent structure to points with 2/3 pieces of evidence in support.

**CROSS:** AFF able to hold ground while asked about finance and cost of services. We did not change or sway the argument.

Rebuttal: outstanding. Point by point to extend support and attack validity of neg argument.

Excellent demeanour throughout the debate.

**NEG:** trying to argue for a negative impact on economy primarily through an inflation. On cross, this could not be supported. Proposed that negative income tax was better without taking away the basic income argument. This approach did not work in favor of the neg argument.

**CROSS:** examination was superficial of the AFF case. E.g. the Alaska example.

Rebuttal: focus primarily on an economic argument and not evidence for or against the social & behavioral AFF argument. HFF presented & supported this position.
Remember, getting rid of all welfare income for UBI, pp.1 will have to pay for health insurance, social security, and etc. all UBI money. Is this enough, given the soaring costs in private healthcare? And living?

If automation is such a dire threat, why has the U.S. unemployment shrank in the last 12 months?

Ask him about Inflation IRL, like it's inevitable and not necessarily a bad thing. B/C inflation = short-term investment.

Your memorable Shostock (the inflation cost), the Fed stepping in = not possible, it turns back into the Pettinger ending about a lack of trust from debtors which is the real impact of consumer inflation.

RFD: AC turn on CP flow through so NC loses aff. AC response to wildog is inadequate so cast goes to AC and control all internal how to econ growth.

- What is the warrant on Shostock (the econ ↑ = inflation)?
- Pettinger assumed that poor folks are the main source of investments (this isn't true)
- Jumping around too much in INT
- You mentioned
- Need to do better on FW: 1) We need to 1) show that he needed to use what B/C the USF6 is the actor on ACP and 2) show that NIT satisfies UHL best. The link between FW and contextual level is missing.
- No new arg (the turn) in ZNR
- Dropping the turn is key - he becomes strong and even though I think the same critique can be applied to UBI, if you drop it then I can't give scoring to the CP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Krishna-Murugan (*’12)</th>
<th>Jimmy Qian *’12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Finals</strong></td>
<td>LL 269</td>
<td>Sat 03/10/18 03:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30) 20</td>
<td>Points (20-30) 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton John Marfori</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative (Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win? No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Why go so fast? And of all to the judge in the back. We all should have been fine if you’d stayed slower. Not a fan.

- Good line of questioning
- With you more clear on the other names.

FLIP: 5 Aatmik Mallya v. 10 Clayton John Marfori
# LD

**Lincoln Douglas Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lauren Barney (*'13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>LL24 Z69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (20-30)</td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clayton</td>
<td>Aatmik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ______

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Focus on differentiation between tags and the actual content of the card. You might want an econ up now card.
- I think it was strategic to just go for aff will pass rather than responding to all of the INC answers on case—maybe go more work on the CP although I do have a cross application.
- Also the aff just completely disappeared :

- You definitely couldeve gone more in depth on the methodology of your study.

---

- You need to be clearer in the INC. I wish you did more framing work.
- Spend more time on establishing competition of CP.
- I think maybe this was not the right strat for this panle.
- Please fix organization of the ZNR. You jumped around a lot.
- Start with making it explicit what paradigm I should operate under.
- Try to write my ballot at the end of the ZNR.

---

At the end, I buy that the aff will probably pass. Neg needed to do more line by line work.
**LD**

FLIP: 5 Aatmik Mallya v. 10 Clayton John Marfori

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Andrew-Ching (*15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Finals</td>
<td>LLBAA 2-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat 03/10/18 03:30PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marfori</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aatmik</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

**Judge's Signature**

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: Did you hear my view on speed? I don't handle speed. I missed most of your AFF case. In your speaking I could hear your happiness as value. I could not understand criticism. You made this very difficult for your position by ignoring myadenardian. NO SPREAD.

NEG: Great Q&A - collapse and stage shift. QM - you spread for.

Rather debator adjusted to my explicit instruction not to spread and we did not advance speed. This was so unfortunate as to make a decision based on a less than complete view of the argumentation.

Ballot: Both debaters asked paradigm, I said no speed, no spread. Aff spread so I judged only on arguments I could understand. Process clearly this evaluation was QM (I could understand those adams).

Neg ballot on counterplan & arguments on economic.