**Varsity Public Forum**

**FLIP: 5 Pejavar - Mukherjee v. 9 Meyer - Montefalcon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Elizabeth Parker (*'51)</th>
<th>Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Room 818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Damon Montefalcon</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Peyman Barrie Meyer</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Speaker     | Con                     |
| 1st         | Pejavar                 |
| 2nd         | Mukherjee               |

**The winner of this debate was**

- **Pro**
- **Con**

(Circle Winner)

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- I would cut out one of the subpoints in 1st rebuttal to get more impacts.
- Need more contextualization of money.
- Prohibition subpoint is touchy specially when you talk about stigma just about it.
- Good fluency

**Housing argument - Blackwell card is super important - credit drop**

More focus on kids not getting UBL checks

Good framework

Link into VBL argument to turn

Speakers have extended

The A. Needman

Extension of the reason against UBL (end of article in rebuttal)

Slow down in rebuttal to be fluent

**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.

**Automation is a wash - needs stronger impacts**

$19,000 loss of benefits played into overview and helped weigh round

Child poverty win the round - link into prostitution plus kids don't receive money

UBL was interesting but no insurance the money goes to the individual

Welfare trap is fine but you need to prove UBL lifts out of poverty.
### VPF

**FLIP: 5 Desai - Sarwar v. 50 Hays - Justice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Room 810</th>
<th>Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Point</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Anika Desai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sazma Sarwar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>William Hays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carl Justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 made several points well:**
1. UBI provides safety net rather than ceiling
2. The loss of welfare benefits keep people trapped in welfare
3. UBI saves jobs by automating stores, facilitating higher education, and encouraging entrepreneurship - people may be willing to take risks
4. Welfare on average ($2,000) provides less than UBI ($12,000) despite examples of high benefits (N.Y. single man W/B)
5. Welfare doesn't work everyone - UBI does.

But... point about UBI kicking in before recipients are in poverty aren't persuasive -

Con supported their main contention (poverty of people) well.
1. Distribution of income upwards. This point not effectively rebutted by Pro
2. Means tested programs expand automatically in bad times - UBI doesn't
3. Undermines housing assistance

But was less effective in supporting arguments (1) that automation is a slow process we have time to accommodate with jobs, since welfare; and (2) stigma of welfare driving people up and out of welfare. Interesting argument but not persuaded.

Face of speakers shore at adset will exception.
<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>Shukla</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Nair</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shih</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Exum</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was: Pro

Is this a low point win? NO

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Con 1: Domestic Abuse
- Reduce by 2/3 possibly

Con 2: Economic Growth
- Only 23% receive help (quo)
- Enteuntivises Work
- More small businesses

Neg Constructured

Status quo can focus on who needs the most
- Reduce child poverty
  - Public housing and housing ventures only under quo
  - Medicare helps lift many out of poverty
  - UBI will be less helpful than the status quo
  - UBI cuts GDP by 9.3%
Neg Reb

1:09
- Drop domestic abuse (reason for dropping doesn't work)
- Kenya example isn't valid
- Welfare is helping people
- Prioritize the majority

Aff Summary
- Prioritize deep poverty (lives)
- Neg needs to prove UBI will negatively impact
- Money used in Medicare is wasted
- Housing vouchers are detrimental to rent prices

Neg Summary
- Medicare is worth 20,000 per year x
- Rent will go up regardless
- Poverty is currently decreasing
- Priorities majority (quality of life)

Aff FF
- Deep Poverty (lives)
- UBI puts people above the poverty line

Neg FF
- Quality of Life + Economics
- Vouchers provide housing
- Medicare $26,000 per year x

Total
2:00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Varsity Public Forum | Octo-Finals | 1st | 2nd | Pro
| 1st | Speaker | 20-30 | Pro | The winner of the debate was Pro
| Room 816 | Speaker | 20-30 | Pro | The winner of the debate was Pro
| Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020 | Speaker | 20-30 | Pro | The winner of the debate was Pro

The debate was held on Saturday, October 20, 2020, in Room 816. The judges were Mr. Chheda and Mr. Chopra.

The Pro team argued that the new workplace policies are necessary to ensure the safety of employees. The Con team argued that the current policies are sufficient and do not need to be changed.

The Pro team won the debate with a score of 20 to 30 points.

The judges' signature: [signature]

Affiliation: [Affiliation]

Time Limits of Speeches:
- Speaker 1: 3 min
- Speaker 2: 3 min
- Speaker 3: 3 min
- Speaker 4: 3 min

*The first question is asked of the top speaker by the chairperson.*

3 minutes of Prep Time per side.
# VPF

**FLIP: 27 Moss - Moss v. 9 Neuner - Talamantez**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Room 813</th>
<th>Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octo-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Talamantez</td>
<td>28 (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Neuner</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>V. Moss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>M. Moss</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Work on speaking
- Chill in Cross

**RFD:**

- Won of false ability as well as domestic violence while continuing to bring up stuff with 135

---

**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.
<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>Pranav Iyer</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Edgquist, Tanya</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sigsworth, Max</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Gallup, Larkin</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(circle winner)

**Con**

Is this a low point win? No

**Tough decision. All did well, very well. Con appeared to be slightly more prepared, could defend their case a bit more, and was stronger in pointing out areas where their opponents lacked. They stuck to fact throughout versus Pro impied a bit here and there during Crossfire. Recommendation to all is to have PDFs of cards available and know where to find them (although explanation was given as to why it couldn't be quickly pulled).**

**Great job!**
### VPF

**FLIP: 42 Khan - Wong v. 41 Groman - Warrier**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Suresh Aragam (*4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octo-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 817</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warrier</strong></td>
<td>Wong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Groman</strong></td>
<td>Khan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 |

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- PRO:
  - Wins on poverty decrease 13.5% - 7%
  - Small businesses (unrelated by CON)
  - Income redistribution (rich will still pay taxes -> money will go into hands of impoverished peoples still)
  - Employment will help get out of welfare trap
  - Household income increases

- CON:
  - Could have pushed point on marginalized people, i.e. how will targeted programs for kids that are specific be cut off by UBI, good point, if pushed better chance
  - Weird point mentioned in rebuttal about rich get richer, poor get poorer -> moves away from democracy topic did not really matter in context of this debate
  - Good arguments but was not articulated well, C2 was kinda dropped as C1 became more of end point.
VPF

Varsity Public Forum

FLIP: 9 Loughney - Roman v. 35 Han - Mckenna

Octo-Finals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Abby Roman</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yoojin Han</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Cameron Loughney</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shannon Mckenna</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro  Con

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFP:
- unemployment trap → goes to Con, kaiser card
- cost → go to Pro (includes taxes)
- total benefit → Con, replacement of means tested reduces total # to poor, especially if including taxes
- keeping people out of poverty: Pro didn’t prove w/ Alaska card since the poor likely still received means tested, Con didn’t explain how it would lift people out of poverty in long term
- jobs lost to automation require worker support unemployed short term: Con not losing, going through change but not loss

Very good speakers on both sides.

Very well argued, attention to points from opposing sides.