# Novice Public Forum

**Room 825**

**Speaker** | **Pro** | **Points (20-30)** | **Con** | **Points (20-30)**
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
1st | lazna | 27 | schmidt | 28
2nd | changho | 29 | chekanov | 27

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

Is this a low point win? 

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crossfire (1 & 2): 3 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.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro 1</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Riley Haveman</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Joan Joshy</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Kiron Cahajic</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hayden Nguyen</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro 1
(Circle Winner)

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

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both cases are lacking in terms of warranting. I am not sure what the con case is really trying to do and why the ADF is relevant. The ADF is a weak analogy and nobody ever challenged them in ADR. People need to work harder and sleep more. I don’t see why sleep is lumped in as a bad thing. Keep in mind what the con case says. Most comments are necessary things I wrote on; none is just general feedback. I really wish we had extended the 1AK bene right now. I agree that the automation case is a weak case, nobody really wins what to prefer, and 2 ships passing in the night. The laziness case isn’t impacted quite for me. The con case was repetitive and doesn’t work. But doesn’t show me that ADR is better. Like, I voted neg based on scope.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Pro**

(Circle Winner)

**Con**

Is this a low point win? 

Judge's Signature

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: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
The arguments of preventing/reducing poverty of UBI program (₹ 1K per month for everyone) and the evidence stated impact. With this money, everyone (rich and poor) boosts economy/productivity.

Con: Good argument of how to fund the program. Give rich UBI and tax them more may not make sense.

Not convincing that UBI cause everyone able to afford college -> take loan -> inflation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Frida Jain</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Zeenath montgore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Rach Munchikalapati</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>TPK Jansh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Judge's Signature:**

Deer Vista High School

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Based on speeches summary, Pro did well on making good arguments but X-fire not so strong in

- Welfare programs keep people below marginal tax rate 50-60%
- Welfare income mutually exclusive
- Speaker had great delivery of speech made eye contact
- Sentence structure matter
- Work hard for families
- Social program outcomes
- Speaker should make eye contact at least once during speech
- Good delivery

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
speaker 1: very good arguments during xfire
speaker 2 - had a hard time finishing questions and was too fast in responding to q's & not fully answering the q's.

summary:
- con 1.1: bad consequences - did a good job on summarizing
  - addressed pros' contentions - VAT is not allowed; covered pros
  - contentions on labor is not implemented.
  - UBI - failed in finland
- pro 1: well on summarizing + addressing con's contentions
  - good arguments on addressing finland's attempt of ubi

rand xfire: good q's! response on fixed income.

EITC - de-incentivize people from working? - UBI - minimal gov't inter
welfare in a poverty trap - by pro

feb: better summarizing; good argument on con's contentions.
- good pt. on children not getting ubi -
- high good points on con's contentions + points where pro did not
  address.

- speaker had a little stutter at beginning of speech - it got better.
- made good arguments on inflation/market
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Octo-Finals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Bisson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Piraino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vaidyanathan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yuan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order/Time Limits of Speeches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>Speaker 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>Speaker 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>Crossfire (3 &amp; 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 Summary</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>Speaker 2 Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Crossfire (all)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>Speaker 3 Final Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4 Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>3 minutes of Prep Time per side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pro - 15 speaker - good statistics on social effects of women - pay gap # in poverty. Good rebuttal speech. Good job on index fraud. Debt answer - good speech.

Con - good research, good debt, cost #5. Cost of welfare & programs today - good information. Rebuttal speech framework - improving lives. Good with debt not sustainable.

Very good debate - both strong teams - good respectful teams. Based on framework most lives affected. Pro win with impetus. 65 million women gave money. 15% people are poverty. More exits via framework. Key is not cost sustainable. 47% of pay is debt. 2 min points. Pro refer 60. 0% of debt. We are in debt. Not in debt. Debt stopped program. Very close. Good lead.
Novice Public Forum | Thomas Ateeshim ('38) | X44 Yasmin, Farzana
---|---|---
**Room 828** | **Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM**
**Speaker** | **Pro** | **Con**
1st | Jagdish | Curtis
2nd | Griffin | Flores

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

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

---

**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 |

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.*

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Pro**

1st/2nd
Very clear voice. Nice speech. Good reply in FF.

**Con**

Very clear voice. Nice speech. You could ask to see the automation card against your second contention.

---

Pro won debate with their **impact on entrepreneurship** of 11% jobs were not defended. Con did not defend the 25% under poverty not welfare point.

Overall the debate was great!
Delivery is a bit fast for both sides, which makes it hard to follow.

Both sides use a lot of citations to support their arguments for or against. Not enough explanation is provided as to how these stats were arrived at, making these arguments less effective.

Again, too much reliance on stats. Need to appeal on a more emotional level, such as the human and psychological impact of either UBI or Welfare.

Since UBI does not yet exist, the "Pro" side is more at a disadvantage. The "Con" side was able to attack and put them on the defensive.

"Con" side was slightly better attack and delivery.