**VPF**

**FLIP: 29 Vicente - Lenzmeier v. 35 Lakhotia - Patel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Joseph Natali (*'18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Patel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Lakhotia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Vicente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Lenzmeier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro wins, as they were able to maintain the integrity of all their contentions while rebutting or invalidating all of Neg's. Pro was able to negate Neg's first contention due to a lack of cards/evidence. Pro refused Neg's second contention by showing how UBI would only increase consumption. Pro's main points in favor were proof that a UBI increases GDP through income across the board while also expanding benefits to more people overall.

---

**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.
Targeted welfare more efficient - UBI taxes more money from poor - less programs that help MTWP 44,000 per year $32k taken from poor to rich

Cutting crucial programs - more expensive
MTWP = 20% of UBI costs - no more social programs - SNAP, Medicaid, go away to fund UBI
Primary healthcare costs more than UBI - No HI - no Medicaid

Chillingly on medicare.
$1200 for privatized ins
Electronic stigma has reduced to non-existent
Stigma doesn't deter the hardcore poor

It deficit spending occurs harm is caused
It isn't MTWP deficit spending

Inflation will occur because increase in money
People are in favor of helping the poor non-stigma
UBI is too broad.

It needs great enough stigma doesn't matter - People want to help the poor

Everything becomes more expensive by increase in money fully
$540 billion not covered by tax increase

UBI stigma isn't real

UBI will cause whole economy to grow

AFL - Tax your questions

MTWP - 79 welfare programs
2:07

UBI - Fixed income stipend: $1000

Welfare stigma - psychic cost of being on MTWP
Prevents people from applying aid recipients fear retaliation 1/4 people don't sign up for SNAP. Who can

Stimulates the economy 13%
1. Increase in GDP 2.5% trillion dollars - increase overall consumption
No inflation because we already have the money
Quantity over quality

Only 1/3 receive stuff 60% everyone else 40%
30% seniors 60% everyone else

UBI is cheaper Heritage 9k per year for individual

Welfare isn't sufficient but it income goes to benefits we cut Supplement income who incoming only need $3961 additionally - within welfare

Medicaid is extremely limited - doesn't include health (compared to no insurance - UBI does not cause inflation because not "new money"

UBI helps poor

UBI is more money helps poor overall

Redistributed

Medicaid isn't expensive enough

$1 increase = 3% reduction in argument for

GDP increase as a result of UBI outweigh deficit concerns
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Pro</td>
<td>PEJAVAK</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>1st Con</td>
<td>RAHMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Pro</td>
<td>MUKHERJEE</td>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>2nd Con</td>
<td>KYER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

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

(Circle Winner)

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Con**
- Inflation argument was facile.
- Good understudy of UBI.
- Investment thesis needs more work.
- Welfare argument was well done.
- How much does it cost more?

**Pro**
- Elimination of poverty [good argument].
- Investment argument could have been better.
- UBI support — Entreprenuership?
- Labor union — minimum wage — decline in income.
- Great on argument on both ways.
- Great responses to questions.
- UBI, Payin get money as well.
URF - Trade for wealth
- Consumer goods
- Higher interest
- Consumer debt rise.

Well, some programs were more beneficial than others.

Rhode's Ahmuni
**VPF**

**FLIP: 51 Parker - Swanton v. 50 Biltis - Synan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Erin Guiney (*'34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td>018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Pro</td>
<td>Synan 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Pro</td>
<td>Biltis 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Con</td>
<td>Swanton 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Con</td>
<td>Parker 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**PRO**

- don't read cards in cross, it gives them time to prep against
- make sure you preflow before getting to the round
- work on organization and cross strategy
- use your full speech time!
- you have to counter the 4 trillion tax revenue
- Con card with a card of your own - you tell me the math is flawed, but provide no replacement card
- you aren't backing up your attacks with cards so I can't really flow any impacts through - you especially need cards about conditional welfare and why the welfare cliff is worse than VB!

**CON**

- great 4 trillion card
- beautiful organization
- don't drop their c3! at least spend 2 lines on it in the rebuttal
- really strong debating from both of you!

RFD - Con had cards to back up their argumentation and their organization fully addressed all of the flow
1) Welfare ineffective
   - TANF (fin. ass to fams)
     - reach ↓ (23% had access)
     - 62k → 1.1 million pov
   - CBP: 10s of mill 1 out of pov under welfare

2) Growth effect (welfare cliff)
   - ↑ wages (an ↓ benefits; stimulated earnings)
   - children affected most (incl. kids)
   -↑ working hours due to welfare programs

3) UBI combat automation
   - Musk said UBI be automation, + cure of poverty
   - basic robotics ↑ (eff, performance)
   - leads to unemployment
   - ↑ in low wage jobs, middle income jobs, ↑ wage gap

- UBI would cost trillions/year
  - UBI at $15k/year, only 1% of UBI
  - 2x fed tax revenue
  - 2 million adults; coverage gap w/ medical
  - hurts� vn. pops that welfare protects
  - medicaid/care, ss, kid stuff, disability

- UBI benefits 17% under UBI
- 17% ↓ poverty under UBI
- 65% of old pov comp to 16%
- Kids out of pov due to welfare
- Overall MTW helps way more than us
  (8 mil vs. ?)
  ↓ out of pov
  (+ 8.5 mil still impoverished)

kv: resisting + preventing poverty
**VF**

**FLIP: 9 Moreno - Urbina v. 29 Ryu - Shembekar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Charlene Johnson (*44)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Round 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro (1)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con (2)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Urbina</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Ryu</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Moreno</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shembekar</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:

All speakers polite, prepared, professional & congenial.

Argument about wage slavery/welfare trap makes sense but was not linked to meaningful impact. "Living paycheck to paycheck" may be ok if they have Medicaid, Snap, etc. Most people live paycheck to paycheck at some point even people with a reasonable amount of $.

Con partially refuted the "welfare trap" argument however it did not address workers who turn down undesirable jobs due to welfare, but only a raise or promo.

Con made the case that UBI could only be funded from deficit spending, which could hurt the economy. Pro did not address their argument that UBI redistributes $ upwards.

Con won solidly.
### VPF

**Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020**

**FLIP: 34 Prozillo - Marks v. 38 Saravanah - Sekandari**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Nicholas Russell (*50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro 1st</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Prozillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Marks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score:**
- Pro: 26.5
- Con: 27

**Points (20-30):**
- Pro: 26.5
- Con: 27

**The winner of this debate was:**

**Pro**

(Is circle Winner)

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

"Pre-like your second contention - I would make some obligation/justice/deontology arguments. Neg - your Medicare & Foodstamps arguments are well articulated - nicely done.

Cross - Prozillo - be more assertive - ask more questions, control the cross. Sekandari is able to use almost 2 minutes asking questions. Thus.

Marks - nice clear ans to the GJ case

Saravanah - your ans to their case are stronger than your own case defense. offense wins debates. offense, offense, offense.

Cross - Marks - great job in cross. Saravanah - be more assertive. Control the Question.

Prozillo - that vi of M study evidence is great to your case first - offense

Sekandari - that 44% avg is a winner - great framing

Grand Cross - nice energy. Good exchange."

**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.*
**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Is this a low point win? **Yes**

---

**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:

- Wealth tax is nonunique
- Need for poverty
- CARO → 2025
- NBI ≠ solvency for poverty
- Any parent in NY
  - $32000 > $1200
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Carlos Ramos Medina</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Valentina DuPond</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:

**Pro:**
- Extension from the views of poverty, tax, welfare, employment, and mental health to state their opinions clearly and logically.
- Asked very specific questions.

**Con:**
- Good evidence and a lot of research to support their view. Very detailed and statistical.

Both teams are doing a good job!
<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>DUNCAN</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>DAY</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>MERCHANT</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>SUD</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **DUNCAN**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **UBI Better Plan:**
  - **Safety Net:** People earn self-sufficient, create opportunities for new jobs.
  - **Deterrence to Prevent Poverty:**
  - **Greater Efficiency:** UBI will provide the proper incentives to help people get out of poverty.

- **Disadvantages:**
  - **Lack of Planning:**
  - **Status Quo is Successful:**
  - **Current System:**

- **Other Points:**
  - **Current Economic System:**
  - **Other Important Points:**

**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

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

**FLIP: 9 Loughney - Roman v. 22 Amanti - Read**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>022</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Loughney</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</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:**

- **Constructive:**
  - Same to you, excellent case + delivery

- **Rebuttal:**
  - Really effective blocks
  - Nice job going down case

**Tough choice, lots of clash (which I appreciate).**

**FPD:** Ultimately, I'm going to go with **Pro.** If we go under utilitarianism- WBI gives assistance to those who still face food insecurity under SNAP - those who don't qualify for the programs. Additionally, even though seniors would miss out on Medicaid, if average healthcare is $40/ma, more people would be helped.
### Round 3 Forum - Varsity Public Forum

<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>Talamantez</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>Hasan</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Neuner</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Pattipati</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**
- **Con**
  - 
  - Rental assistance, basic income safety net program.
  - Automatic stabilization against UVI.
  - Good data science.
  - Nice presentation.
  - 10/10
  - 10/10
  - 10/10
  - 10/10

**Pro**
- 
  - UVI vs. vulture in LA is not enough.
  - Welfare may stop.
  - UVI is good data science.
  - Nice presentation.
  - 12/10
  - 12/10
  - 12/10

**Question:**
- Welfare Program
- Question: Good

**Answer:**
- Good
- UVI economic growth
- Savings, spent, consumer economy
- 12.5
- 12.5
- 12.5
- 12.5

**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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Arnav Bawa (*5)</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Lourdes 1st</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Con Hutch Milliken 1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Lauraine Eugenio 2nd</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Con Sedona Korzay 2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro didn't prove if UBI works as plans propose to implement in the US. Neg (barely) flowed through the offence shaming ppl would lose necessary resources. Only offense in found that made it to the end.
**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 616</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Stabilito</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Verma</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Chow</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Parau</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Pro's rebuttal missed con's point by a big margin.  
The arguments on Alaska, welfare trap and small business all got blocked by con.

Con's link chain was really clean.  UBI will get much less benefit for the poor and won't provide food and medical care, thus all impacts in con would materialize.
### VPF

**FLIP: 35 Amini - Javadpoor v. 39 Ros - Singh**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>015A</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Singh</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Amini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ros</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The winner of this debate was**

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

(Is Circle Winner) **No**

**Judge's Signature**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

"That was a beautiful clash between "hand waving cost" and "hand waving poverty". The US has infinite money and poverty will always exist. Lol...

All of you were great speakers. Singh - good explanation of issues, you are calm and convey ideas well. Ros - you have a wealth of knowledge, you spoke a little fast and..."  

In the end, Neg was able to refute most/all of AFFs contentions. Awesome job, guys!"
Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro: Our team's contentions flowed through. We countered wealth inequality, contesting on how entitlements are used and suggesting more choice in the programs. Disparities in unemployment rates differ between programs. Pro did not respond well to facts that were stated around wealth disparity, arguing that it would incentivize people to work. The Team was well prepared and had good synergy between speakers. They provided well-articulated data supporting their contentions.

Con: Our contentions flowed through as well. We countered by revising wealth inequality and discussing the impact of unemployment rates. Pro did not respond well to our facts presented around wealth disparity, arguing that it would incentivize people to work. In summary, Pro spoke well.
### VPF

**FLIP: 35 Han - Mckenna v. 5 Shih - Shukla**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Peter Beeson (*'28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Shukla 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shih 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Youjin Han 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shannon Mckenna 247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Pro** made strong points:
1. Eliminate Deep Poverty
2. May help abused women leave abusive relationships
3. Welfare benefit loss as recipient increases income is avoided by **UB**

**Con** made strong points:
1. Too expensive - never effectively rebutted by exploding GDP argument.
2. Immediate loss of vital benefit programs who replace adequate alternative
3. Welfare, when assisted by outreach, can work.

---

**School / Affiliation / Occupation:**

**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:

All spoke too fast...but they had a ton of material to cover.

**Pro** made strong points:
1. Eliminate Deep Poverty
2. May help abused women to leave abusive relationships
3. Welfare benefit loss as recipient increases income is avoided by **UB**

But one point that was difficult to understand: entrepreneurship development in rust belt.

---

**Con** made strong points:
1. Too expensive - never effectively rebutted by exploding GDP argument.
2. Immediate loss of vital benefit programs who replace adequate alternative
3. Welfare, when assisted by outreach, can work.

But no good answer to deep poverty that exists despite existing welfare.
## VPF

**FLIP: 35 Nimbkar - Rivera v. 5 Desai - Sarwar**

**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Chris-Thiele (449)</th>
<th>Glen Wilk (829)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Desai</td>
<td>Rivera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sarwar</td>
<td>Nimbkar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Room 615**

- **Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM**

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

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

(Circle Winner)

**Judge's Signature:**

**Basis Scottsdale**

**School / Affiliation / Occupation:**

---

**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:**

- Pro: News test: $12K UBI vs. poverty
  - 9.8 million people are kept out of poverty
  - $12K UBI cannot be used for large projects from other programs
  - GDP stays low and will be impacted by debt from UBI
  - Poverty will ultimately be lower from UBI

- Con: UBI will enable people to take risks and entrepreneurship
  - Will improve GDP

**Cross 1: Con: Why is effect tax rate up to 60%? Pro did not answer well.**

Pro: welfare gives 2x more than UBI for household. Pro uses it $12K? Yung Plan

**Decision:** Both teams well prepared and spoke very clearly, much appreciated!

- Con made good initial points and showed good aggressive attacks
  - Including challenge on Yung VAT
- Pro did well to challenge marginal tax rate and how it's deceiving when coming from very low rate
- Pro made good points that welfare kicks in after poverty, so limited benefit to prevent poverty
- Pro did good job challenging what specifically leads to debt
- Very close round, but overall Pro did best job in maintaining position and pointing out that Con did not bring up points in Uganda case, automation

Con: Can be less aggressive and fewer wins on addressing points is
Con 1: * Assume Yang plan → VAT not likely & would have to replace all our taxes to work & infeasible → would now
  * marginal tax rate → pro did not clearly define → will not help people climeh out of poverty → still take how 70% remain poor for long time
  * Uganda example → only small subset of people funded by Google → not relevant
  * automation good / we net gain in jobs

Pro 2: * VAT → con did not give detailed explanation → not valid? = wrong
  * UBI safety net → get educ for jobs
  * net cost UBI low no → even if UBI is expensive, growth outpaced debt
  * > 25% of poverty get no help → welfare insufficient → hasn’t worked in any years
  * welfare only helps in after poverty → reactive
  * UBI will reduce recession → automation accelerates during recession.

Cross 1: Why VAT bad? Con: Would have to tear down existing tax structure → VAT only on corporations → why bad? con: over time, VAT impact?
  * Con: how does growth outpace debt (continue)? Not past 8 years
  * pro: how much does debt slow growth? con: worse over time
  * Con: were examples? UBI in foreign countries?

Con 1 Summary
  * VAT not just corporation, does impact individual → conclusion not
  * UBI not on growth → has cutoff on income → limit back
  * welfare does work → does not just kick in at poverty
  * drop poverty trap → not extreme, keep 70% income but marginal tax rate
  * welfare kept better than UBI

Pro 1 Summary
  * net cost UBI < 3% GDP → not a problem → UBI only solution, to 25% in poverty
  * welfare does only kick in poverty (2?) → cost still very high

Cross 2: God
  * Pro: what jobs created by automation? Can no answer
  * Only non-jobless & high skilled → need other
  * UBI $12K not enough for college → drop
  * con did not bring up Uganda in summary = Pro

Final Cross: Pro horses on VAT & change all taxes? (Final Pro)
  * welfare only affords in poverty
  * Ugandan study late said it is very income
  * UBI prolongs recession so worse automation
  * 25% poverty no help → not Rebecca
  * put automation aside in 10-20 can’t fill uses
  * not riding horses, just abstract
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Vitor Cervantes (PF)</th>
<th>Luisa Samuel (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 617</td>
<td>Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Tanya Edquist</td>
<td>Kang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Larkin Gallup</td>
<td>Enwiller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Is this a low point win? **___**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**PRO**

Overall good knowledge, strategy to make your position more robust and to the society. Need more nuanced or stats however the points were valid.

**CON**

Good knowledge, Team work and Cards need to work on Rebuttal.
**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 611</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Hockin</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Obrecht</td>
<td>27</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 (1st/2nd): 3 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crossfire (3rd/4th): 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min
- Grand Crossfire (8th): 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:**

**Great job by both sides.**

**It was fun to watch.**

**It was nice to see that the Alaska sample is not a sample of other welfare support because other welfare supports were not taken funny.**

**And while $1,000 sounds like a lot on the surface, consider reality.**

**Wages without any other welfare supplement is a number that's thrown around, making it an impossible amount to live on.**
comments & reason for decision:

1. Made a good argument about the impact & cost of UBI, also tried in Canada & Finland with mixed results.
2. Sustained argument on inflation raising and reducing poverty.
3. Clarify what meant tested benefits elderly, would lose, social security, Medicare.
4. Should have quantified the split within receiving welfare, benefits vs. women undergoing domestic abuse.
5. Made a good argument about the single mother receiving more in welfare than UBI.

Red: I found the CON argument more cohesive, coherent & skillfully argued.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Luisa Samuel (*1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Chaurasia</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moran</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Dinnen</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sastriwan</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Y

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

The Pro did not answer the question that Con posed about how the govt can afford the $1000 UBI w/o taking away the welfare. Con therefore wins.

Pro 1: speaker did an amazing job!

Con 1: Smooth and confident speaker

Con 2: Maybe can slow down, need the right cueard can be more effective.

---

**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: 42 Bakshi - Kelly v. 22 Reese - Simon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Christine Nobby (24)</th>
<th>Bronson, Little 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td>Room 610</td>
<td>Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Reese</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Adv:** Work on sign posting and clean transitions.

**Neg:** Framework debate is useless, stop wasting time on it. Brought up children in the end which pick you up.

---

**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.
### Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Brendan Little (*'26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>KALIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>DAMIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>CORTIZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>PETRI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Damir:** do a more systematic rebuttal.
- **Perri:** effective rebuttal.

**Core claim of Pro:** Sando/mtw bad b/c could be racist. Res. →

↑ fairness to rich vs poor and minorities b/c rich & white get more.

**Con:** Case turn on Pro: possibility of racism in sense of necessity of racism Res. / Sando →

maybe, govt might favor whites. In Res. →

whites & wealthy get same as poor minorities (didn't happen).

**F-D:** Pro → UB↑ hands to poor,

won't cover needs of 70 mil in medicaid & 30 mil in school lunch, for instance. Poverty going down in Sando. Res. → ↑ hands w/ our benefits.
## VPF

**FLIP: 29 Wahal - Younger v. 5 Chopra - Cheema**

### Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Cheema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Wahal</td>
<td>Chopra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **Yes**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Volume and quality of analysis low in rebuttal
- Case only really defends middle class

**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.

---

**RED**

- Benefits from Con case accessed more in need
- Pro doesn't tell me why to favor middle class
- Rebuttal was clearer at covering all aspects
- Weighing needs analysis

**BOTH**

- Terminal impact

**Con**

- Don't drop recession

Did not weigh on:

- Education
- Recession
- Overheating
- Fall back
## Varsity Public Forum - Round 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Lancaster</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>Zhao</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Zhao: more eye contact. Prepare points a little better next time.

Easter: Good explanation. Good job.

King: Good point, good preparation.

Lancaster: Good presentation. Good job.

---

**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**

**FLIP: 51 McHugh - Claus v. 9 Bianes - Marquezsilva**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3 Forum</th>
<th>Miranda Vega (*35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Eleanor McHugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ava Claus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Samantha Bianes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Anahi Marquez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner) No

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

I wouldn't use the terms (2ad) because some judges went blank. What it means is what that means is it would also add a impacts section to your case as well.

Very well organized, your legal responses but in the next time I would reduce it in line with statistics. Also, good weighing.

Great job in extending in the summary. One thing I would recommend doing is voters to help you stay on topic are engaged to help you allocate your speech a bit more.

Great job summarizing the round and extending the round.

**Pro**

1. The subpoints under a contention usually signify that there are no multiplicants, but I got a little tripped up when time wasn't an impacts section that quantifies them.
2. You were very well organized, but your kind of went out of tone to respond to their welfare future point. I would also weigh impacts in this speech.
3. Be careful putting burden on the aff that aren't their burden. You kept asking for cases that would predict the future, but obviously they won't have those.
4. Your extended set which is good, but you didn't weigh your impacts at the end.

**Con**

1. You extended set which is good, but you didn't weigh your impacts at the end and would recommend you do that. Also, remember very voters because your summary was a tool disorganized.
2. I think you should have focused a little more on weighing impacts, but other than that your final focus was very good.

**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>Round 3</th>
<th>010</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Dohr, Nick</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Andreas Archuleta</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Ethan Long</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Rohan Boa</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

Is this a low point win? **Yes**

Comments & Reason for Decision: **Spk 2**

- Please more eye contact
- Good eye contact, speaks loudly & clear
- Good action, pressure
- New Varsity student
- Better, more confidence

Evidence based: X1,X2,X3

**Spk 1**

- C1 Creates poverty
- C2: Debt
- C3: Confident, Speaker
- Evidence based: X1,X2

**Spk 3** (Confident)

- Speaks loud & clear
- Well researched, speaks with authority
- Persuasive debate

Evidence based: ref. X1,X2,X3

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 1 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 2 Final Focus: 2 min

3 minutes of Prep Time per side

Notes:

- Well explained argument in 2nd half
- Good clash between teams
- Both teams struggled a bit in respective even 2 very different arguments
- Equally matched
- Great team work

**Excellent!**
TREVITHICK, MIKE
Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020

VPF
FLIP: 42 Burns - Sudhakar v. 49 Herrig - Schoenborn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Mike Trevithick (*30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro (2-4)</td>
<td>Burns 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Burns</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Sudhakar</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con** (code 49)

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **W**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Two interesting and well-supported cases
- Schoenborn - a little less loud and aggressive please. It's distracting and creates tension.
- Some of the warrants cited in the Pro summary aren't clear - be sure to make each evidence cite clear to strengthen your presentation.
- Lack of direct engagement (clash) with Pro argumentation in Con summary speech is a notable weakness.

RFD! This was single hardest round I've judged this season! Excellent round!

Entire and Fumble Con for three reasons:

1. Pro essentially admits the higher cost of UBI w/ arguments on progressive taxation
2. Con also successfully argues that resolution is about replacing welfare - which means those benefits (and examples from other countries w/ supplement vs. flat) go away.
3. Pro just doesn't put much emphasis on the other than choice since Con effectively argues inequality exists without welfare
<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>Damon Meyer</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Rohan Nair</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Darrio Montefalcon</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ayslin Exum</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Is this a low point win? _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1st speaker in pro Team was very knowledgeable and very confident producing his points. Most of the debate pro Team was dominate but in the last few minutes speaker 2nd in con Team came really strong almost went low for team. Pro and Con Team did great con Team were stronger points in the end of the debate but overall pro team did better.
PRO

A) Ask -
1) + pt about automation will in fact bring in $ for VBI
2) + welfare + VBI analogous
3) "mowing" at 1st effective but became +80 repetitive & great command of

B) Anvi
1) Good pt - 1st contention, effective in
2) Impact about eradication poverty
3) Terms such as "financial fairness" effective

CON

A) Max
1) Excellent rebuttal point
2) Principal = higher consumption = means = effective optic
3) Signal presentation - hand gestures, eye contact,
4) Emphasis of instance: GDP vs. govt.

B) Pro now is attackable, comparable to other states.
1) Good pts - What is the rank? Example of job
2) Good pt about Finland & then cited evidence
### VPF

**FLIP: 50 Hays - Justice v. 22 Nguyen - Sismondo**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 614</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Nguyen</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Sismondo</strong></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:**

**Pro**

1st/2nd -> Very good speed & clear speaking
Please clearly explain the 95$/1$ benefits.

**Con**

1st/2nd -> Very good speed & clear speaking.

**Con:**

I was not convinced about the 165 cents. It was not clear if this study was relevant to us. Pro did not counter the reaction stabilizer clearly.

**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: 36 Ahmed - Hollmann v. 1 Balian - Jandhyala**

#### Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Rosario Velazquez (*4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hollman 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Nishat Ahmed 26</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 Comments:**

You both had strong points and had great information. I felt every round you answered questions from your components. Facts were key! Great job! Good luck!

**Pro Comments:**

You both did great and I really enjoyed hearing your perspective on the topic. You had valid points, but I felt you could be a little stronger when arguing your evidence. Example - Gender equality! I felt you were going somewhere with it but you didn’t have enough facts to support your evidence. Great job! Good luck!

It was a pleasure judging you!

### 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.
I think the neg rebuttal should focus more on warranting & actually drawing out the link chain. I got a lot of general 1st answer & 2nd mentions, like “That takes X from the poor & gives it to the rich” without an actual explanation. The neg summary is also a problem, because it doesn’t actually respond to the nuance of a lot of AFE args. Like, OK, 54 mil is a big number, but you need to get into the link chain & warranting, & actually compare a UBS world vs the quo. The neg summary doesn’t seem to really discuss what would happen to that 54 mil in an AFE world, & I needed a comparison. Like, a lot of neg args are really just non-responsive, & the aff does a better job across the board with extending link chains, specifically drawing comparisons, & extending warranting. I don’t give the neg a concession arg to the neg because you don’t properly extend the link chain & the 54 mil doesn’t function as offense in your summary. You don’t tell me what happens to those ppl in a UBS world. The neg just... doesn’t respond to a lot of the AFE responses to the neg case. It just gives me broad args that aren’t specific enough. On that & freedom of choice & poverty trap...
YASMIN, FARZANA

FLIP: 22 Pike - Planchon v. 41 Groman - Warrier

Varsity Public Forum

Round 3

Room 620

Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM

Speaker
1st
Raghav Warrier
2nd
Julia Grommen

Points
28
28

Farzana Yasmin (*44)

Speaker
1st
Noelle P
2nd
Taylor Pike

Points
21
26

The winner of this debate was

Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Bringing up cultural references was smart.
- Nice enunciation.
- Cent answer why debt is negative.
- 1:13 prep.
- Taylor: good points on businesses + entrepreneurship.
- Nice hand gestures/posture.
- Eye contact/confident.
- Good work delinking.
- Facts - Social Security, UBI.
- Julia: discarded evidence.

With money there is innovation for small businesses.

Decrease need for medicare.

More money in the long term.

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.
Team con: Ultimately, I feel like you couldn’t fully back your arguments—especially when they were challenged by the pro team. Still good arguments + presentation.

Team pro: I felt like you really believed in what you were presenting—you could back all of your facts up + knew exactly how to challenge the other team. Good work.
# VPF

**FLIP: 4 Zhong - Aragam v. 41 Reason - Esposito**

### Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Leslie Edquist ('22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Aragam</strong> 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Zhong</strong> 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Reason</strong> 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Esposito</strong> 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:**

Reason for the decision:

The con team of Reason and Esposito won this debate because they made the best case against the use and impact of implementation of universal basic income in the United States. Their examples and evidence effectively showed that the universal basic income would both be expensive and not helpful. During both the regular and Grand Crossfire, the team of Reason and Esposito gave strong evidence based relatively against both contention 2 of the pro team Aragam and Zhong's case.

Regarding the pro team of Aragam and Zhong, during this round, they introduced some interesting ideas, such as why universal basic income might have social benefits in US society, but it was very respectful debate.

It was a pleasure to listen to these young adults debate.
### Round 3

<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>Shaker</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Czapek</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Panda</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ugarte</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?

---

**Panda & Shaker:** Strong, aggressive arguments and counter, well-argued constructive and final focus. Great stuff on policy trap.

**Czapek & Ugarte:** Effective, clear arguments calling for welfare modifications not abandoning effects on Medicare for the elderly. Czapek was sharp during crossfire.

---

**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.*