

NPF

FLIP: 35 Lazna - Changho v. 5 Schmidt - Chekanov

Novice Public Forum		JJ Zhang (*41)	
Octo-Finals		Room 825	Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker
1st	<u>Lazna</u>	<u>27</u>	1st
2nd	<u>changho</u>	<u>29</u>	2nd
Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)	Speaker
1st	<u>Schmidt</u>	<u>28</u>	1st
2nd	<u>chekanov</u>	<u>27</u>	2nd
The winner of this debate was		JJ Zhang	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____		41 School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:


[Handwritten scribble]

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.	

Emily Su (5)

NPF

FLIP: 4 Joshy - Nguyen v. 38 Cehajic - Haveman

Novice Public Forum			Deepak Cheema (#5)		
Octo-Finals			Room 820		Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
Speaker	Pro 1	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Riley Haveman	27	1st	Joshy	27
2nd	Wesley Kinan Cehajic	27	2nd	Hayden Nguyen	27
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Hamilton 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:

Both cases are lacking in terms of warranting. You need to explain how & why things happen. Also, I don't think the neg needs to specify a cost-benefit analysis be nobody ever challenged that in PF. The AFF's observation really isn't a framework; it comes across like a partial contention. I also kind of have a problem with the NEG evidence about ppl spending more time sleeping & watching TV than upgrading work skills — dude, people need 8 hrs of sleep, I don't get why sleep is lumped in as a bad thing? Keep in mind that not all these comments are necessarily things I voted on; some is just general feedback. I really wish neg had extended the 19K bene 2nd loss in summary & so I give the 2-4 mil vs 500 bil thing over to the neg, since the AFF ends up misconstructing the marginal tax rate arg. The automation arg is a wash; nobody told me what to prefer, it's 2 ships passing in the night. The laziness arg isn't impacted out for me. The AFF tells me welfare doesn't work, but doesn't show me that USG is better? Like, I voted neg based on ~~the~~ scope

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.	

NPF

FLIP: 9 Mensinger - Webb v. 50 Chambers - Gomez

Novice Public Forum		Hao Hao Yuan (*1)	
Octo-Finals		Room 822	Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker
			Con
			Points (20-30)
1st	_____	_____	1st
2nd	_____	_____	2nd
The winner of this debate was			
Pro Con			
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? _____		_____ Judge's Signature _____ School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

School 50 forfeit

8 22

50 - chambers


*Gomez
forfeit*

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.

NPF

FLIP: 5 Kapadia - Zhang v. 28 Ramkumar - Mahey

Novice Public Forum			Kathleen Wong (*35)		
Octo-Finals			Room 821		Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Utkarsh Mahey	27	1st	Zhang Charles	25
2nd	Vidyuth Ramkumar	26	2nd	Kapadia Taneesha	27
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature ACP School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Pro) Con (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? _____					

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.		

Pro :

- The arguments of preventing / ending poverty of UBI program (\$ 1k per month for everyone) and the evidence stated impact. With this money, everyone (rich and poor) boosting economy / productivity.


Cons :

- Good argument of how to fund the program. Give rich UBI then tax them more may ~~de~~ not make sense

Not convincing that UBI cause everyone able to afford college → take loan → inflation
 I don't think that this is a good argument

NPF

FLIP: 49 Jones - Montoya v. 1 Jain - Manchikalapati

Novice Public Forum			Meena Shahi (*42)		
Octo-Finals			Room 827		Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Frida Jain	29	1st	Zenobia Montoya	28
2nd	Roni Manchikalapati	38 57	2nd	TRX Jones	28 56
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Desert Vista High School School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>					

optime
100
0

prep time
had
0

Comments & Reason for Decision: Pro won based on speech & summary. Pro did well on making good arguments but using X-fire - not so strong in answering.

1st - welfare programs keep people in poor though marginal tax rate 50-60%

1st B - welfare & income mutually exclusive

speaker had great delivery of speeches made eye contact.

incentives marriage - marital coup

led more in welfare.

1st B - reverse ineffective welfare program

allow families to work hrs & family flexibility, poverty ↓ - ↓ child pov. 40%

irel: → Con S1 - need a little better thought out Q's. otherwise both speakers I did very well in questioning & answering. Pro Speaker 1 - good Q's on welfare & will come from.

∴ → U1B uniquely will hurt immigrants what kind of immigrants not eligible?

T - U1B on rich - inflation.

competition; Te U ↓; ↑ Inflation whole.

it is not.

B - pos. effect on productive

good argument against Con's contention

speaker needs to slow down a bit - had good arguments.

S1 - U1B - legal residents

C2 - increased inflation

U1B - transferring wealth to lower income

C3 - SSI - 1K/m hurt family

SNAP - EITC - infants health/child outcomes ↑

Speaker 1 had dated outcomes of gov't social program.

Speaker should make eye contact at least once during speech.

Good smooth delivery

S2: C5 - reduction in workforce retention - 14% labor participation.

U1B - does not apply to children - welfare applies to children/adults & women.

C2 - U1B useless - bc 1K/month - landlords/can't rent/food prices etc.

C4 - tax - to fund U1B - all top/mid/lc Class - EITC

→ Speaker had too many gaps in thought & speech.

X-fire: Good arguments Q/A on con S1

Both sides made arguments. S2 on pro had inter... S2 on con

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.	

X-fire 2: Speaker 2 ^{con} ~~presented~~ very good arguments during X-fire
Pro 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 S1 - see. Con's Contentions - did a good job on summarizing
- addressed pro's contentions - VAT is not allowed; covered pro's contentions on India has not implemented.
→ UBI - failed in Finland.

Pro S1 - well on summarizing & addressing Con's contentions
- good arguments on addressing Finland's attempt of UBI
immigration.

Grand X-fire: Good Q's / response on Forsebelt Card.

EITC - de-incentivize people from working? - UBI - minimal gov't entay
welfare is a "poverty trap" - by pro
↳ fixed income.

Con show

FF:

33 - better summarizing; good ~~arguments~~ on ^{con} pro's contentions.

→ good pt. on children not getting UBI -

34 - had good points on con's contentions & points where pro did not address.

→ Speaker had a little stutter @ beginning of speech - ^{it get better} ~~but~~ ~~good~~
as the speaker spoke

± made good arguments on inflation / market


Guy, Clayton

~~THIELE, CHRIS~~

Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020

NPF

FLIP: 7 Piraino - Bisson v. 1 Vaidyanathan - Yuan

Novice Public Forum			Chris Thiele (*49)		
Octo-Finals			Room 826		Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Bisson	28	1st	Vaidyanathan	27
2nd	Piraino	28	2nd	Yuan	27
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Arcadia High School School / Affiliation / Occupation		
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (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.	

Pro - 1st speaker - good statistics on social effects of women - pay gap # in poverty
 nice with # women who benefit, Economic study
 good #s rebuttal speech good job on India fraud
 Debt answer - good speech

Con - good research, good debt, cost #s
 cost of welfare & programs today - good information
 Rebuttal speech framework strong/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
 impact 165 million women given money, single people out of poverty
 with 12,000 (equal to poverty) Fraud 27.80B 240w pay gap. Pro flowed
 more convincing versus con - kept on cost not sustainable + 47.70 of poverty
 2 min points. Pros refer GDP jobs - stopped debt concern - we are in
 debt & have been - no true debt stored program. Very close -
 good work

NPF

FLIP: 22 Curtis - Flores v. 5 Griffin - Jagdish

Novice Public Forum		Thomas Ateshim (*38) X44 Farzana Yasmin			
Octo-Finals		Room 828	Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Jagdish	28	1st	Curtis	28
2nd	Griffin	29	2nd	Flores	28
The winner of this debate was			_____ Judge's Signature _____ 44 School / Affiliation / Occupation		
(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.	


Pro
 1st/2nd
 Very clear voice. Nice speed. Good topic in FF.

Con
 very clear voice. Nice speed. You could ask to see the automation card against your second contention.

Pro won debate with their impact on entrepreneurship of 1.1 m jobs were not defended. Con did not defend the 25% under poverty not getting welfare point.
 Overall the debate was great!

NPF

FLIP: 1 Chakker - Chung v. 22 Bora - Burns

Novice Public Forum			Kiet Nguyen (*4)		
Octo-Finals			Room 824		Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	CHAKKERA	25	1st	BORA	26
2nd	CHUNG	26	2nd	BURNS	27
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? _____			4 School / Affiliation / Occupation		

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.	

- 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 has a slightly better attack and delivery.

