

Edwist, Leslie
~~HENDEN, KYLE~~

Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020

NPF

FLIP: 28 Ramkumar - Mahey v. 4 Joshy - Nguyen

Novice Public Forum		Kyle Henden (*1)			
Quarter-Finals		Room 824	Sat 02/08/20 01:45PM		
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Mahey	27	1st	Joshy	25
2nd	Ramkumar	27	2nd	Nguyen	26
The winner of this debate was					
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro Con (Circle Winner)			[Signature] Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			Central High School School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Reason for the decision:

The pro team successfully set at their case for why a universal basic income should be established. They provided several contentions and supporting evidence why the UBI would benefit citizens in the United States.

During the crossfire and grand crossfire they were able to refute the claims that the con team set forth regarding how expensive a program 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 respectful the debaters were throughout the debate.

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: 1 Jain - Manchikalapati v. 5 Griffin - Jagdish

Novice Public Forum			Christine Nobby (*4) Clayton Guy		
Quarter-Finals			Room 827		Sat 02/08/20 01:45PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Jain	27	1st	Jagdish	28
2nd	Manchikalapati	27	2nd	Griffin	28
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Arcadia HS 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:

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 - good contentions - disincentive to work, fraud increased, discourages marriage, increase productivity grow GDP - Rebuttal case - good understand of priority money VAT, reinforced GDP growth - recession will not occur Medicaid - stumbled there stumbled at times in summary & final focus -

Con - inflation, VAT, medical main issues - Strong contention by your definition - Rebuttal - cost push is not this case it is demand pull

Good close debate - Both well prepared. Both agreed impact is most people being helped who need it. Con wins with medical. Chip helping 72 million + EITC helping 8 million & red state in cash study. Pro added 4.6 million & poverty trap 52 million both flawed economy will grow & not recession. Con better debate team slightly & did good job.


Depek Cherna (5) ~~(35)~~

~~PA...~~
~~John Scissan~~

NPF

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

Change

Novice Public Forum			Elizabeth (30) John Scissan (35)		
Quarter-Finals			Room 826	Sat 02/08/20 01:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Lazna	29	1st	Bisson	28
2nd	Changho	29	2nd	Piraino	28
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature ASPER/Chenot/Pharmacist 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:

Lazna Automation
 - UBI to help alleviate psych-2.
 WF not help all - but does help the needy
 currently. 78% psych-2 may not be all
 poor -> not the govt. resp. to provide welfare to them


Changho where would UBI & come from? if not
 from WF program? Raise taxes? only come
 by i-x. \$530B cost of UBI -> does not make
 sense -> too low. 300 mill America x \$12K/yr = 3.8T.

Bisson -> Good pts. Underbit. Crossfire should have stronger
 points on jobs created by Auto mech. to counter Aff.

Piraino Good pts on UBI & spent on people who don't need it.
 Takes away from needy people - 73 mill raw inv / 45 mill
 UF.


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.	

RFD Pro had very solid convincing argument. Con could not support the
 3.8T number. Job gains outside due to automation can be substantial



NPF

FLIP: 9 Mensinger - Webb v. 22 Bora - Burns

Novice Public Forum		Chris Thiele (*49)			
Quarter-Finals		Room 825		Sat 02/08/20 01:45PM	
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Webb	30	1st	Burns	30
2nd	Mensinger	30	2nd	Bora	30
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Hamilton Hs School / Affiliation / Occupation		
Pro <input type="radio"/> Con <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? No Yes					


Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~AAA~~
 ✓ Gentrification
 ✓ domestic abuse
 ✓ lots small population
 ~ welfare traps

meg

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.	

4. Gentrification - no proof
 1. Why are other 70% not covered?
 2. How does UBI prevent undercoverage
 $\frac{1}{3}(30000) > \$2400$

weak constructive 
 1. That salary doubled when on welfare?
 what does that mean?

3. Domestic abuse
 1. of small UBI can cover just because can be received in person?

sum / welfare traps: 23% in

not expensive, taxes & wouldn't necessarily raise \$0 → \$/8 = 1/3 ↓ coverage ∴ \$38 → breakeven 23% of poor receive fall in Rent?

giving more money to those in need

1: Welfare leads to poverty traps
min wage jobs → reach less coverage, UBI low, can't afford, equalizes \$/hour ↑ compare termination domestic abuse → 70% of stay for economic reasons & when no escape, no income
2: UBI weers market, ↓ gentrification

endomy in welfare \$45,000 UBI doesn't work

1: not economically viable, while UBI federal budget 400x more expensive an increase in taxes

2: People who need it, \$3000 vs \$400 rapidly growing