**Pro:**
- Really unique automation contention! I like it
- Put the burden of MTW alleviating poverty in your framework
- Nice rebuttal args about women's legal justice and how the UBI solves for anyone slipping through the cracks (make this a support in C1! Strengthen this!) (Instead of just a single card in the C2)
- Agree to their framework earlier, it can help your case!

**Con:**
- Nice framework + parallel contentions
- Great rebuttal organization + delivery
- Theory isn't good enough; it isn't a good arg here. UBI isn't the so-so of course, they don't have adequate non-theory ex
- Work on helping cross as equal as possible - don't monopolize the time

**RFD:** The debate was close (honestly I'm not just saying that!)
but I voted on aff ensuring 100% of people in poverty get $ from UBI (feeding into con framework) and long-term solvency based on MTW jeopardizing jobs
The US should replace welfare programs with a UBI.

**MTW:**
- Provide aid directly to low-income individuals.
- Prioritize policies that rely on MTW in states that prove UBI = better conditions for low-income populations.
- Must prioritize long-term poverty reduction.
- Solve most poverty problems.
- UBI = reduce MQ:
  - (disabled, old, young aged)
  - Welfare < UBI for low income, UBI $5
  - Higher income (hurt poor, unhelpful rich)
- UBI penalizes effort:
  - 54% more of pov & 2% more under MTW.
- Health: 32.2 million adults in 2012 participated in welfare UBI as 20 million lifted from poverty.
- Long periods of poverty mean little economic benefit.
- UBI efficient for all under 18.
- Umbrella for all prol. self

**Children = benefit**
- Sufficient escape poverty.
- Most UBI targets 1st+ physical & mental dev. of kids hurt by prison, etc.
- School lunch programs lost under MTW.
- UBI solves for ppl slipping through cracks, guarantees every poor person gets aid.
- UBI helps minorities, women (less justice).
- 60% of women's votes & 20% will add to Econ by 2025.
- Welfare targets, UBI can't + spec. needs won't be helped (since is reg. of circumstances)
- Have to use UBI $ for medicare, food, housing.
- UBI + help kids be #10 to live.

**Trump:**
- Cutting welfare in SQ + eligibility standards.
- Under welfare, much loss get benefits (only 24% under TNAF!!)

**Means tested welfare prog. w/ a UBI**

- 0.5% pov.
- pov. rate 17.1% under UBI.
- high skilled jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- MTW works: more efficiently.
- targets need not be politically reliant.
- UBI reduces MQ:
  - (disabled, old, young aged)
- Welfare < UBI for low income, UBI $5
- Higher income (hurt poor, unhelpful rich)
- UBI penalizes effort:
  - 54% more of pov & 2% more under MTW.
- Health: 32.2 million adults in 2012 participated in welfare UBI as 20 million lifted from poverty.
- Long periods of poverty mean little economic benefit.
- UBI efficient for all under 18.
- Umbrella for all prol. self

**Children = benefit**
- Sufficient escape poverty.
- Most UBI targets 1st+ physical & mental dev. of kids hurt by prison, etc.
- School lunch programs lost under MTW.
- UBI solves for ppl slipping through cracks, guarantees every poor person gets aid.
- UBI helps minorities, women (less justice).
- 60% of women's votes & 20% will add to Econ by 2025.
- Welfare targets, UBI can't + spec. needs won't be helped (since is reg. of circumstances)
- Have to use UBI $ for medicare, food, housing.
- UBI + help kids be #10 to live.

**Trump:**
- Cutting welfare in SQ + eligibility standards.
- Under welfare, much loss get benefits (only 24% under TNAF!!)

**Means tested welfare prog. w/ a UBI**

- 0.5% pov.
- pov. rate 17.1% under UBI.
- high skilled jobs
In the Pro summary, two quotes:

"Broken status quo that needs change"; absolutely supported. And telling Neg that "welfare changes are not the scope of this debate." Won this's debate for me.

Exum - you showed very deep knowledge of the subject, you speak clearly and (although fast) very easy to follow your well-constructed speeches.

Ugarte - I told you this, but Trump is a very divisive figure and you’d do better to not mention him. Say "current administration" or "recent proposed changes". The Trump contention actually weakened your argument + Pro used it against you.
**Round 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st DINNAN</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd SASTRIAWAN</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st CHEEMA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd CHOPRA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CHEEMA - EXCELLENT OPENING SPEAKING SKILLS

DINNAN - GREAT SPEAKING SKILLS, GOT YOUR POINTS OUT CLEARLY.

CHOPRA - STARTED OUT KINDA ROUGH, BUT YOU SEEMED TO REGAIN YOUR COMPOSER

SASTRIAWAN - PLEASE SLOW DOWN, YOU MAKE IT HARD TO UNDERSTAND YOU WHEN SPEAKING too fast.
**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Rich Reason</td>
<td>Pranav Iyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Vincent Esposito</td>
<td>Maszgworz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote for Sigsworth - Iyer on Aff.

The Neg concedes all three Aff defenses out of the rebuttal w/o any effective frontlines.

Aff wins the experiment argument handily, which gives a 0 risk of offense to the Aff.

B/c Neg concedes the squo is broken, risk of offense is enough for me to vote.
**Pro Comments:** They answered every question clearly. They made excellent points in their case, and were very confident when speaking. They explained clearly and as a new judge that was important to understand the lingo.

Con Comments:

You had great points but I felt they weren't as sharp and some information was repeated. Both Amber and Samuel did great and great eye contact.

Thank you to both Teams!

Good Luck!
**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<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>DESAI</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td></td>
<td>BRAUN</td>
<td>2A.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>SARWAR</td>
<td>2B.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>CARTER</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **PRO**

(Circle Winner)  

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**NEG**

1st speaker: 1. **Spiral of poverty** (GDP & lazy)
   - **Good points** - Working in factories, $8-10/hour.
   - **bad points** - Fewer children, no time for children, less income.

2nd speaker: 1. **Working in factories** (GDP & lazy)
   - **Good points** - Working in factories, $8-10/hour.
   - **bad points** - Fewer children, no time for children, less income.

**PRO**

1st speaker: 1. **UBI pays for goods, no need to work.**
   - **Good points** - UBI pays for goods, no need to work.
   - **bad points** - Fewer children, no time for children, less income.

2nd speaker: 1. **UBI pays for goods, no need to work.**
   - **Good points** - UBI pays for goods, no need to work.
   - **bad points** - Fewer children, no time for children, less income.

**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

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.*
Both sides provided good and relevant evidence. I'm siding with Con because their argument about current funding is important. Aff says they have to replace, but that's a lazy argument because you can't discount the impact on programs and spending. And a card to support this.

*Great speakers on all sides!
**VPF**

**FLIP: 9 Castruita - Eugenio v. 15 Kalies - Damir**

**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</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>Aidan Kalies</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Lourdes Castruita</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Syrah Damir</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Laurine Eugenio</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**1st Aff Constructed**

Cont 1: Specific to needs

- Avoids historical racism in aid programs

Cont 2: UBI more beneficial

- More effective at removing people from poverty
- Helps to reduce inequality

Cont 3: More flexibility and accommodation

- Allows for continued education

---

**2nd Neg Constructed**

Cont 1: Ineffective

Signpost contentions more clearly

- Could never be funded as 3.5 trillion
- Federal debt would increase
- Inflation: you need to explain exactly what causes "Economics" isn't a sufficient explanation

---

**Aff Reductive**

- Status quo is discriminatory
- Helps those slightly above poverty - Status quo doesn't
- 3.5 trillion figure not explained
- Federal debt bad
- UBI would decrease poverty
- Value equality

---

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: 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.
Prep: AFF Summary:
- Inflation only occurs when more money is spent ×
- UBI allows for flexibility of socio-economic class → Equality
- Status quo ineffective → Equality
- UBI can be funded → Economics

Prep: Neg Summary:
- Equality
- Inflation will increase ×
- UBI is too expensive - didn't address tax ↑ ×
- Federal debt increases → Economics

AFF: FF
- UBI helps improve Equality with more people
- UBI can be funded
- Flexible use

Neg FF:
- Increase National Debt
- Quality of life - key voter
### Varsity Public Forum

**FLIP: 5 Panda - Shakir vs. 9 DuPond - Ramos-Medina**

**Danielle Delgado (*36)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>016</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Shakir</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Panzer</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

** Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**CON:** Are you sure you agree with def. If no def are presented But your 1st is $1000 a month really going to & work rate

**PRO:** Impact CNT 1 to healthcare costs/welfare programs have existed for longer

**PRO:** Your "speeding" is no faster then you actually speak

**CON:** Are there recons/betas to high skills programs

**CON:** Do the other examples have other recons/betas to entrepreneurship response?

**KV in FF?**

**PRO:** They did respond to your tax increase on rich (Yang plan: your def doesn't tax rich but everyone)

I vote CON. Even tho enl. we rarely address the issue of UDI Costing trillions to billions falls to trillions. Thus solun is unable to be fully oblered on the Pro.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 610</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Calista Wilk</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Catherine Jiany</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sebastian Javesh</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Parw Amini</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- Pro
- Con

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

Hamilton High

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both sides dropped observations on how UBI will/won't be paid for.

The "incenwray go to work" was a weak Aff didn't interact w/ 26 weeks among

Ney " " " less money means no job

Voted off offense for more inequality if medicaid goes away
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker Name</th>
<th>Points (2-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro: Wong</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con: Zhao</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision**

Is this a low-point win? (√)

**Order of Time Limits**

- Grand Creature (10) 3 min
- Speaker 1: Summary 3 min
- Speaker 2: 1st Round 3 min
- Creature (Q & A) 4 min
- Speaker 2: 2nd Round 3 min
- Creature (Q & A) 4 min
- Speaker 1: Final Focus 2 min
- Speaker 2: Final Focus 2 min

*The final question is asked by either speaker.*

**Judge's Signature**

[Signature]

**FIP, 42 KHAN - WONG v. 44 ZHENG - EASTON**

**Varsity Public Forum**

**Room 615**

**Friday, 04/07/20 05:15 PM**

**Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020**
All speakers cordial, polite, professional & well prepared.

Neg should have been better prepared to address Yang’s proposal as it is the main one that is under consideration in the U.S. today.

3K vs 32k: 32k seemed to be the upper limit vs 3k the median value in reality; actual value has more impact than upper limit.

Pro wins due to impact of 13% annual economic growth, also better argument.

Con impact of plunging 900k children is also a big concern & impact, but I was convinced the current system is failing & it could happen anyway. Con has a tough job defending a system that is marginal at best.
Varsity Public Forum | Jason Crosby (*'39) | Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM
---|---|---
**Round 2** | **Room 619** |**Points (20-30)**
| Speaker | Pro | 1st | Hossain | 20 |
| | | 2nd | Pattipati | 25 |
| Speaker | Con | 1st | Patel | 30 |
| | | 2nd | Lakhotia | 30 |

The winner of this debate was

**Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Pro:** Argument of impending recession unless VRE was not convincing. Wealthy & Corps. actually taking on too burden in community w/o demo of how that would happen besides trickle down & eco statement.

**Con:** Good crossfire rounds and argument about high care/rev burden & long term effects on current welfare/medicine programs. Team was (seemed) more in control of countering pro-argument

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<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 (all)</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.
**Page Dimensions: 599.0x787.0**

**RAW TEXT END**

---

**WAKS, DANIEL**

**VAHTAN, JOSHDUB**

**FLIP, JOSEPH, 35 Han Pal - 35 Han Pal**

**Jackrabbit Jamboeree 2020**

---

**Judge's Signature**

---

**Order of Speeches**

- **Speaker 1:** 3 min
- **Speaker 2:** 3 min
- **Speaker 3:** 3 min
- **Speaker 4:** 3 min

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision**

- **Pro:** YES
- **Con:** NO

---

**Round 2**

- **Pro:**
  - **Speaker:**
  - **Points:**

- **Con:**
  - **Speaker:**
  - **Points:**

---

**FLIP, 5 Loghi - Pal - Pal**

---

**Flip, Joseph 35 Han Pal - 35 Han Pal**

---

**Points Breakdown**

- **Pro:**
  - **1st:** 10 points
  - **2nd:** 15 points
- **Con:**
  - **1st:** 10 points
  - **2nd:** 15 points

---

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

- **Pro:**
  - **Name:**
  - **Affiliation:**
  - **Occupation:**

- **Con:**
  - **Name:**
  - **Affiliation:**
  - **Occupation:**
VARSITY PUBLIC FORUM

Avel Flores (22) Glen Wilk (*29)

Room 816
Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM

Speaker

Pro

Points (20-30)

1st
Stabilito
27

2nd
Verma
27

Con

Points (20-30)

1st
Hockin
27

2nd
Obrecht
29

The winner of this debate was

Pro

(Circle Winner)

Con

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

Scott Steele
School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro 1st means federal does not have medical, so we
- industrial keep income low to guilts for benefits (could we - 38k to wake up)
- UBI removes incentive for artificial low income
- OECD - income less shrank > UBI grows wid cross
- small biz makes up 25% of sales, drive innovation
- will lose jobs & innovation

Con 1st - Good clear speaking
Targeted aid for medical + food > UBI makes targeting
less precise > 29 M poor kids get meals
- UBI not affordable + ballooning deficit
- UBI not enough to raise people above poverty
- will need to draw from other programs > mediated gulfed
- extra $15/mth noting vs loss of med. coverage

Cross #1 - Pro
- UBI less precise & not cover all 15 be specific, Con focused on setting
- pro attack points of con, not just ask for clarifying
- con what next so UBI solves poverty > pro: evades rise above poverty
- so $12k > dist is $12 gain above > not good response to gulfing

Decision: Both teams did a great job speaking clearly and logically

Con did a great job attacking pro conclusion UBI not enough to get out of poverty
Con also did well to attack claim of benefit from small businesses > pro did qualify
Con defended their points well

Pro made good points about people intentionally staying below poverty line needed
to better defend how UBI will help since many people at different levels
of poverty, yet UBI is a fixed amount, so won't get all out of poverty

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

Speaker 1
Speaker 2
Crossfire (1 & 2)
Speaker 3
Speaker 4
Crossfire (3 & 4)
Speaker 1 Summary
Speaker 2 Summary
Grand Crossfire (all)
Speaker 3 Final Focus
Speaker 4 Final Focus
3 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
Pro 2: **Attack con**: Medicare cost ↑ so people receiving less

- UBI can even poverty \( \rightarrow \) address all welfare from con

  - Cost: UBI less cost \( \rightarrow \) why?

  - attack con \( \rightarrow \) UBI not enough for \( \rightarrow \) poverty, but con acknowledged

  - Alaska \( \rightarrow \) UBI can even 40% poverty

Con 2: **Attack Pro**! means \( \rightarrow \) get UBI

- UBI won't raise above poverty \( \rightarrow \) not accounting for welfare cost

  - 1st: UBI won't raise above poverty \( \rightarrow \) not accounting for welfare cost

  - 2nd inequality worse w/ UBI

Cross 2: why is UBI needed to get out of poverty (\( \Box \)) not enough to get \( \rightarrow \) poverty

  - cons: what is innovation from small biz? pro: small biz gives more jobs \( \rightarrow \) can't quantify

  - pro: will UBI help with? UBI \( \downarrow \) income gap? (\( \Box \)) can provide card \( \uparrow \) refuted

  - Con: how does UBI save middle class? pro: want UBI will poor move up (\( \Box \)) pro said they did not state UBI will save middle class but they did

Pro 1 Summary:

- \$12k poverty line \( \rightarrow \) $16/hr \( \rightarrow \) $35/hr w/ UBI

  - UBI less precise \( \uparrow \) gap not closig \( \rightarrow \) pro did include stops, welfare

  - UBI reduces poverty \( \rightarrow \) drop complaints, con

  - Small biz: more consumer \( \uparrow \) were demand from UBI

  - Older people have income \( \rightarrow \) ? Passing on \( \rightarrow \) not relevant

Con 1 Summary:

- pro said receive less paid anyway \( \rightarrow \) con: will not have any Medicare

  - Poverty: UBI will get from \( \$16k \rightarrow \$28k \) above poverty, not-enough

  - Large deficit, can't just fund from non-tested welfare

  - Pro \( \downarrow \) child poverty \( \rightarrow \) near-welfare already does that

  - Attack Pro \( \rightarrow \) UBI causes losing overall benefits from medical exp

Cross 2: post vs. future? pro: if future shows how cost reduced \( \uparrow \)

  - Con \( \rightarrow \) UBI doesn't solve problem \( \rightarrow \) worse (\( \Box \))

  - Poverty range at people \( \rightarrow \) UBI is low enough to everyone, won't get

Cross Final:

- Pro 2: Medicaid cost ↑ by 2024 \( \rightarrow \) will not benefit people

  - Con Final

  - Chin con said UBI can take people \( \rightarrow \) poverty \( \rightarrow \) no

  - In which study UBI will end poverty

  - UBI not enough \( \rightarrow \) poverty

  - Small biz help employ.

  - may depend on welfare \( \rightarrow \) UBI help employment

  - more decided on welfare \( \rightarrow \) much needed
**VF**

FLIP: 42 Bakshi - Kelly 50 Hays - Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Clayton Guy (*'49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Bakshi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro ✅ Con (Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Pro**
- I think you misunderstand your opponent point on the recession
- Summary dropped the flow, only resisted core
- Summary changed the FW to lives?

**Con**
- Dropping labor incentive
- Didn't understand housing response in summary

**RFD**
- Con clarifies tax on rich loophole, VBF not accused
- Pro misunderstands drops recession scenario
- Pro summary loss clarity of flow
- Con world targets more in need: Quality of analysis cleaner on Con

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.
**VEGA, MIRANDA**

**VPF**

Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Miranda Vega (*'35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantej Singh</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linus Ros</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddhu Janchyala</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zane Bailon</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- Pro
- Con

(Pro is the Circuit Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- The summary jumped around a lot. I had some issues figuring out where to show strength.
- The neg summary was pretty disorganized. I felt like I lost time figuring out where to place things on my flow.
- We really need to work on warranting in the args. I think we all do a better job over in there.

Both teams should do a better job with including their extending warrants. I don't give the implementation any to the neg. I buy the fill response and the res presented a USB world at the status quo. Like, feasibility args historically don't do well in PF because it's difficult to provide a good warranting for. Also, if I don't get a good response to why USB would need an item every year? I give the res some housing impacts. But your 5 rebuttal responses aren't fully saturated? But the args' eco health args aren't properly warrant. The 60 year thing is an issue for me - and the neg needs to tell me how warrants are adapting.
Clear delivery. Seems a bit disjointed toward the end. Make sure all contentions flow together.

Some issue as last round-time allocation is an issue. Also, make sure to be very clear where you are applying certain arguments.

PF was much better than last round; however, the humanitarian flow is: 1) a bit late, and 2) not used properly, but good effort.

Try to emphasize the welfare programs that stay.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<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 (all)</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.
**V PF**

Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020

FLIP: 38 Saravanan - Sekandari v. 30 Archuleta - Dohr

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sekandari</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Saravanan</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Dohr</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Archuleta</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- Pro (Circle Winner)

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

---

**Pro team capitalized on sexual feeling that means tested welfare not effective. An alternative that provides safety net has appeal.**

**Con team could have spent more time attacking UBI that goes to wealthy - vulnerable point.**

All speakers made good eye contact with judge.

All speakers were civil and courteous.

All speakers spoke too fast.

As points indicate, the teams were very well matched. The decision was difficult.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>020</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Yniguez</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro.

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: Throughout the debate, Con failed to address crucial points brought up by Pro:
- The number of people who qualify for welfare but don't receive it
- Income caps on welfare eligibility
- Technology expansion leading to inaccurate precedent
Con also failed to provide any actual evidence that UBI would lead to rent increase - just "common sense"

Both teams need to be clearer about what exactly creates an effective "safety net."

Pro opened debate by establishing a framework where UBI does not mean entire removal of any other assistance program. This was not ever disputed by Pro.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Victor Cervantes (*50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Prozillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Is this a low point win? Yes

---

**Prozillo**: Good eye contact in CrossX - good explanations + answers.

**King**: Good job on Grand X! Finland card, (while weak) Study $700 is better than none.

**Lancaster**: Give a clear road map (not jumbled)

**Marks/Lancaster**: Work on CrossX starting with Questions (After 1st question - mostly just made points instead of further questions)

Neg would have been strengthened by bringing up that children, who do get Medicaid, wouldn’t get UBI.
### Varsity Public Forum

#### Round 2

<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 Pro</td>
<td>Synan Biltis</td>
<td>1st Con</td>
<td>Kanebakis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Pro</td>
<td>Biltis</td>
<td>2nd Con</td>
<td>Baylon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

**NO**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Pro** - Pro flow before the round, before everyone is ready to start.

Entire Pro case is based on 1/3 of workforce going away in 10 yrs - Con should not concede to this.

- Try to fill 4 minutes w/ rebuttals.

- Con (cross claim that "UB") encourages the lower classes to work is both weird and classist, as though the lazy poor folks need Uncle Sam's handout to get a job.

**RFD** - To Con - MThw → ↓ Poverty.

**UBI** → ↑ Poverty, esp., harms to aged and disabled.

Pro automation makes no sense - no reason to believe would solve anything - if 100 mill out of work, then no link to ↑ structural unemployment.

**NO OTR Please,** unless your order must be weird.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Shirley Ouyang (Pro) Martin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Adriana Amanti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ryan Read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Karanja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Goswick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The winner of this debate was
(Circle Winner)       |                             |
| Pro ( )             | Con ( )                     |
| Is this a low point win? | No                          |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1) Asking for cards between rounds is not allowed. Because Reed did this and, when not given the card as a result of its not being allowed, used the lack of seeing this card as a point in his ensuing speech - this was a bad look. Fue to ask tor it in cross but not between rounds.

2) Reed rushed a lot in speaking making it hard, at times, to fully follow the argument.

3) SNAP program—neither side conclusively proved that this was a means-tested/need program, although Con proved federal funding.

4) Entire argument devolved into accusing the other side of not being able to prove funding amounts and sources.

5) Pro did not conclusively prove Con’s contention that children wouldn’t benefit from UBI.

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.
### VPF

**FLIP:** 29 Sud - Day v. 27 Moss - Moss

#### Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>011</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Mallory Moss</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>William Moss</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Daryl Day</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sahil Sud</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Is this a low point win? 

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**PRO/Moss/Moss** - Overall good presentation. Knowledgeable, knowledgeable and rebuttal. Evidence & connection to make the case.

**CON - Day/Sud** - Need better structure. Etiquette for the debate needs to improved. From the time you enter the room. Knowledge was OK but not strong enough. Need better communication.

#### Order/Time Limits of Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Time Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<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 (all)</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>
<tr>
<td>3 minutes of Prep Time per side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
Pro 1st speaker (Simon) did a good introduction elaborated what UBI is and how beneficial it is. 2nd speaker (Reese) was very substantive in naming arguments but really couldn't alone bring on poverty reduction. Pro brought poverty reduction.

Con 1st speaker (Ryu) said there is no real data to prove UBI actually works in these countries where it is implemented as it was implemented on top of other welfare schemes. Good point (UBI alone could not bring results). Grand Cross: During grand cross 'Con' team was able to argue that UBI will be replacing welfare schemes, unlike in other countries
Final Summary/Focus

The 'Con' team was able to substantiate their claim that UBI alone cannot bring poverty alleviation.

The 'Pro' team couldn't specify which countries have actually benefited from UBI.
In round 2 of the debate between Nimbkar and Rivera v. Biana - Marquezsilva, the Pro and Con speakers were as follows:

**Pro**
- Nimbkar
- Rivera

**Con**
- Biana
- Marquezsilva

The winner of this debate was **Con**.

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:**
- **NE**

2. **Biana**
   - Good delivery and case
   - Good evidence - but...
   - You are poorly being solved in statute. How does it apply to poverty? Wouldn't UBI replace and improve?
   - Nobody will lose Medicare.

3. **Marquezsilva**
   - Work requirements and welfare, will it help or hurt? Will UBI replace Medicare? How does tax increase impact poor people?

2. **Nimbkar**
   - Good case and very good rebuttal
   - Poverty cycle
   - Econ expressions, very good evidence
   - 1 trillion for welfare over how ENS?

4. **Rivera**
   - Trump plus 700,000 people, etc.
   - Strong point. Tax will not impact poor. Very strong rebuttal. Threshold argument is strong.

**Decision**
- **NE**

VFW used too many assumptions, not backed up by evidence. Medicare reform in the House assump.

**VFP**
- FLIP: 35 Nimbkar - Rivera v. 9 Biana - Marquezsilva
- Christine Nobby ("4"
- Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM

**School/Affiliation/Occupation**
- Horner H.S.
### VPF

**FLIP: 22 Nguyen - Sismondo v. 9 Meyer - Montefalcon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Brendan Little ('26)</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sr. Meyer</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3. Montefalcon</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2. Nguyen</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1. Sismondo</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- **Pro** **Con**

(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
- 3 minutes of Prep Time per side

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**No clear conclusion**

from **arg**

_-Verbal feedback_

---

**School/Affiliation/Occupation**

Catherine Foothills 26
## VPF

**FLIP: 35 Enwiller - Kang v. 29 Estrada - Lafayette**

### Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Tatum Ball ('41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Enwiller</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The winner of this debate was Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Constructive:
- get more specific about more recipients
- how many people that excludes

Rebuttal:
Same to you

RFD: tough choice, but I'm going to go with the Pro. They showed they can help the people on welfare and those who are unreached by it; doing the most good for the most people. I think the lack showing deficit detriments was weak, and that more people getting aid outweighs less people getting more aid.

Very well debated!
Con can't quantify inflation impact, which is a normal part of economy. Con's attempt to reform welfare is on the border of a counter plan, which is not allowed in PF.

Pro's economic multiplier argument was dropped throughout the round. Automation was offense for pro, not con.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 611</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Loughney</td>
<td>30</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

3 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff: status quo = insufficient coverage (26%) - aff has no solvency

good job comparing cards - no proof of BIs work

proof via Alaska - no quantifiable waste

current system = cyclic trap - trap
1. Automation: future jobs will destroy economy, will be hard to get loans, UBI keeps income flowing in economy.

2. Welfare system broken, more $x in 50 years, does not help those in need, dependent on government help.

UBI solves: safety net, bring everyone up to poverty line, 15k residents brought up saved for college/retirement.

Neg

Cost of replacing, abolish current programs which eliminate purchasing power (millions), purchasing power of low income, cost $4trillions, close to entire federal budget, does not account for special circumstances.

2. Leaves poor vulnerable, disability, unemployment, social security, 15k health coverage vs. 1$000 w/ UBI $19,100, 45mil $53mil, 52% of elderly, 30% of children (4.5mil).

251. of low income receive welfare, insufficient coverage (SNAP), (EITC), fraud, receives too much from government, $440/month in health covered easily by UBI, will not cover children rich paying for taxes, social security staying, receive mortgage but no break for cycle.

UBI does not save for automation.

Planned system of UBI used in conjunction w/ welfare current status quo keeping millions of children out of poverty.
## Varsity Public Forum

**Flip:** McHugh - Claus v. Bora - Long

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Room 612</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>McHugh</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Claus</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Claus</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bora</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**THE UNITED STATES SHOULD REPLACE A MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAM WITH A UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME (UBI)**

**McHugh** - SP #1

- ALTIER MVC
- BASIC income people more confident
- Poverty is expensive.
- Job creation
- 7,6 million jobs
- Stimulate program
- TAUGHT VON FASCH W/ ANSWERS

**Claus**

- Good eye contact
- Current point - did not hear
- Ask question
- Need to emphasize current UBI decreases economic insecurity
- Prove its less expensive
- Less than cost of food
- Seems repetitive

**Bora**

- UBI to $1000 to every D.O.
- NOT INCLUDED FOR SOCIAL SECURITY
- ACKNOWLEDGE JUDGE
- Short eye contact
- ALASKA COLLECTIVE PROGRAM

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Time Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</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 (all)</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>

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

Judge's Signature

Bunita Vista HS | Parent | Police officer
SUMNER, BRANDON

VARIOUS PUBLIC FORUM

FLIP: 9 Moreno - Urbina v. 41 Groman - Warrier

Round 2

Speaker Pro Points (20-30) 1st Warrier 29 2nd Groman

Speaker Con Points (20-30) 1st Urbina 28 2nd Morend

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Vote pro on UBI reducing poverty long term.
- Debate was good, but I end up not buying the micro inflation arguments, and I think the aff does a good job on the welfare trap argument.

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.
NEG wins because Alt accepted their framework to fail to beat NEG on their own terms. Alt admitted that a UBI would be less money than MTWP and also admitted that their tax funding would not come only from the Ultra-Rich. NEG on the other hand was able to show that the loss of MTWPs would impact 1/3 of children who rely on these programs strongly argued that $1000 was insufficient to replace this, especially for large families.

Alt's main contention involved a misascription of data, arguing that what only 34% of recipients buy applies to the whole. Ultimately NEG proved that the implementation of a UBI would hurt current WFP recipients more than it would help them.
Social welfare policies discourage work mobility because benefits go away when income goes up. Significant $'s have been redirected to avoid income increases so as to stay on benefits — benefits that less than 25% is spent on childcare. Poverty increase 25% decrease by 80% welfare recipients poverty.

UBI increases overall economic growth on whole - Roosevelt study consumer spending is vital.

UBI increases overall economic growth on whole - Roosevelt study consumer spending is vital.

UBI provides a consumption tax on $ for companies that works for everyone, not just the rich.

UBI encourages working because benefits are lower than UBI $1000 is enough spending is more (stimuluses income increase). 4.5-4.7 more growth with UBI.

13% growth with UBI Roosevelt more jobs.

Welfare gets cut off low incomes income increase $1000 covers rent.

UBI doesn't work because too general (3.5% per year).

Targeted programs = greater social benefit.

Reds unheard of for the poor anymore.

UBI must be used for basic necessities. Welfare used to provide.

Poverty hurts UBI makes it worse because not targeted.

Children don't benefit with UBI. V3 lose benefit - hurts physical development.

Nut school lunch gone under UBI.

What's the guarantee for this funding everything. All programs are cut. Everyone is hurt.

UBI is too expensive $1.5 trillion per year more exp than all existing programs combined. 3/4 budget.

$1000 not enough to climb out — Welfare allows income to be spent elsewhere — UBI just allows less to be spent - UBI too exp does nothing.

No robust evidence on UBI.

UBI would be funded by the poor & rich hold political power - no democracy.

Taxes everyone = not just the top 1% UBI.

Pure UBI worse = BC UBI is too expensive.

No economic growth hurts lowest income. Most targeted problems are irrelevant.

Children won't benefit.

Why want UBI?

Logic: Rich won't be taxed by the hold Red's power. UBI is less money than welfare flows back up.

UBI isn't a consumption tax on $ for companies. It is for everyone.
### VPF

**FLIP: 9 Neuner - Talamantez v. 30 Cortez - Petri**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Firoz Ahmed (*4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Talamantez</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Neuner</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Cortez</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Petri</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge's Signature**

Carle Quest
Campbell High School
School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Wow - what a great debate!
Both sides well prepared and made great points and rebuttals!

Denver Team - slow down just a little -

Petri - Great questions - very sharp - maybe close to dissonative - effective though!

Neuner - you stood up well to the heat Petri was bringing -

Petri caught you up on the "SNIP" mention vs. his actual reference to school leaders