The winner of this debate was [Affirmative] [Negative].

Is this a low point win? [Yes] [No]

[Comment & Reason for Decision]

[Redacted text]

[Redacted text]

[Redacted text]
I'm the only one with a ticket at the station tonight.

I'm feeling very new. I woke up on Boston Road in the dark. I've never been here before. I'm definitely not used to it. Absolutely not. I don't have to

AF: This round is

Call.

I can't read a single line in the talk. You should ask me to read the whole thing. Your handwriting is a bit difficult.

Neg

Clear

Aff

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Is this a low point worth affirmative negative

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative

Negative

Harris Shadmany

Liam Huggins

Semifinals

Varisty Lincoln-Douglas

Meadownia

Meadowia

WLD

SWDPR 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Harris Shadmany</td>
<td>Judge's Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td>O’stacky School Affiliation/Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Interesting case - No doubt UBI increases living for those receiving it. This would seem to be only one side of the equation. There must be feedback from the user as well as holding the money and claim benefits of helping better oppressed women on the other hand.

RFD: Affirm too hide behind the ought in the resolutin on one hand and claim benefits of helping better oppressed women on the other. 

FLIP: 25 Harris Shadmany v. 19 Liam Higgins
Community

Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Amherst Cooperation</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Washington</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia Zanetta</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commend & Reason for decision:

The winner of this debate was

Bill Kimsey (17)

Varisty Lincoln-Douglas

FLIP: 18 Silvia Zanetta & Calvin Tyler

SWDTII 2018

W. Curtis / B. Smith
**FLIP: 18 Sylvia Zarnescu v. 42 Calvin Tyler**

**Varsity Lincoln-Douglas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>A209</th>
<th>Sat 03/03/18 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALVIN TYLER</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>SYLVIA ZARNESCU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge’s Signature: 

**Hamilton**

School / Affiliation / Occupation

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

NEG framework was the appropriate one for this topic. NEG correctly linked Utilitarianism to Morality, for a Constitutional Government actor, through Consequentialism. Governments are not chartered to speculate on good based upon aspirations. The moral position for a Gov't is to act based upon anticipated consequences. Both sides agree that the resolution has a high social and economic cost. However, NEG convinced me that the desired benefits are uncertain and have no credible model or precedent. The con & res argued for the U.S. Government to reject the resolution. Though AFF convinced me that acceptance is possible, NEG convinced me that the U.S. should not act without better understanding of the consequences.
VLD

Varisty Lincoln-Douglas

Semi-Finals

42 Calvin Tyler

Affirmative (Circle Winner)

A209

Points

20 (30)

Affirmative

Negative

Judge's Signature

Odyssey Institute/Coast

School: Affiliation: Occupation

Is this a low point win?

No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF - An over study of FAW is not something that can be considered misrepresentation. As both value and weight, AFF has some good opportunities of

RFD - AFF is correct that LTI is not something that can be considered misrepresentation. As both value and weight, AFF has some good opportunities of

TFD - In the next round, if we are going to continue to use UNL, we should try to make the argument that we are not losing the "point" when we refer to the work on eliminating thre