## Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter-Finals</th>
<th>Kyle Henden (*1)</th>
<th>Sat 02/08/20 01:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Minhyun</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ramkumar</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Joshy</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Nguyen</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

The pro team successfully set at their case for why a universal basic income should be established. They provided several arguments and supporting evidence why the UBI would benefit citizens in the United States. During the crossfire and final crossfire, they were able to refute the reasons why the con team set forth rising how expensive the UBI is.

The con team of Joshy and Nguyen asked helpful questions during the crossfire question periods.

It was a well done debate. I appreciated how respectfully the debaters were through the debate.
**Pro** - Good content, desire nature to work, brand recognition, customer awareness, increase productivity. Grow GDP. Debated case - good understanding of many ways VAT, reduced payment, recession will not occur. Medical should have stood at time in summary and final focus.

**Con** - Inflation, VAT, medical care issues. Strong content, by your definition. Debated case - cost push is not this case it is demand push.


Good job.
# NPF

**FLIP: 35 Lazna - Changho v. 7 Piraino - Bisson**

### Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter-Finals</th>
<th>Room 826</th>
<th>Sat 02/08/20 01:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Lazna</td>
<td>Bisson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Changho</td>
<td>Piraino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was: **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Depek Chehra
- **Change**
- **NO**
- **28 Points**

---

## Order/Time Limits of Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker 1</th>
<th>4 min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossfire (3 &amp; 4)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1 Summary</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2 Summary</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Crossfire</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3 Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4 Final Focus</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*3 minutes of Prep Time per side*

The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

**Lazna**

- **Automation**
- **UBI** to help allocate paycheck.

**WF** may not help all but does help the needy.

Correctly. 78% paycheck may not be all poor not the sort resp. to provide welfare + them.

**Chair**

When would UBI & com join? If not

**WF** pays? Raise taxes? only came from WF pays? Raise taxes? only came

**EF** 530B cost of UBI does not make sense too low. 300 mill xena x 412K kill 7 3 T.

---

**Choes**

Good point. Undercut. Crossfire should have stayed.

Point on job created by automation to counter. 117.

---

**Piraino**

- Good pts on UBI & spent on people who don't need it.

- Takes away from needy people. 73 mill Loss in 45 mill.

---

**RED Pro had very solid convincing argument. Cons could not support the bill.**
NPF
FLIP: 9 Mensinger - Webb v. 22 Bora - Burns

Novice Public Forum

Chris Thiele (*'49)

Quarter-Finals

Speaker

1st
Webb
30
2nd
Mensinger
30

Points (20-30)

Speaker

1st
Burns
30
2nd
Bora
30

Points (20-30)

The winner of this debate was

Pro (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AF

X gentrification
✓ domestic abuse
Let small population

we have traps

4. Gentrification - no proof

1. Why are other
70% not covered?

2. How does UBI
 prevent undercoverage

3. Domestic abuse

1/3 (30,000) > $2400

3. UBI can cover 1st because can be received in person

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.
1. Welfare leads to poverty trap
   Minimum wage jobs do not reach
   less coverage, UBI
   Loan debt, Fall fees, (will)
   3.5/hour tip, complete termination

2. Domestic abuse 73.8% of stay
   for economic reasons. We do escape to income

3. UBI causes market, J
   gentrification

4. Not economical viable, $4,000
   federal budget 400x more expensive
   an increase in taxes

5. People who need it, $40,000 vs. $400
   rapidly growing

6. Not EXPENSIVE, taxes
   Wouldn't necessarily raise
   $38, $18 = 1/2
   coverage
   $38 to break even
   23% of poor receive welfare

   fall in rent.

7. Giving more money to those in need

8. Elderly in welfare
   $6,000
   UBI doesn't work