

Hao Haoqun


BILLINGS, NICK

Amadeo Mckenna

Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020

VPF

FLIP: 5 Chopra - Cheema v. 35 Han - Mckenna

Varsity Public Forum			Nick Billings		
Semi-Finals			015		Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	Cheema	27	1st	Han	26
2nd	Chopra	28	2nd	Mckenna	26
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature <u>1</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? _____					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

* Although both sides did a good job debating the issue, the pro side has made better arguments with more solid evidence to support their claims, thus more convincing to vote for UBI should replace welfare.

* A couple of areas that the con side could improve: i.e. providing more evidence to support the claim (i.e. increasing income will decrease welfare, how? where is the stats?) regarding GDP & Debt issues, what's the direct linkage of them to the issue of not being able to afford UBI?

* During crossfire, the pro side was more quick & ready to counter the con side with logical arguments.

* Overall, great job, both teams!

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: 5 Chopra - Cheema v. 35 Han - Mckenna

Varsity Public Forum			Eden Gustin (*42)		
Semi-Finals			015	Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM	
Speaker	Pro	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Cheema</u>	<u>29</u>	1st	<u>Han</u>	<u>28</u>
2nd	<u>Chopra</u>	<u>28</u>	2nd	<u>McKenna</u>	<u>27</u>
The winner of this debate was			Eden Gustin		
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pro <input type="radio"/> Con (Circle Winner)			_____ Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? _____			Desert Vista HS School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Great Summary that organized the round and did the work for the judge.
- Good job handling the GDP and debt debate (federal debt doesn't matter)
- dropped impact of food and most of welfare base
- Automation best argument
- In future watch out for inflation arguments.

- Federal debt argument is not buyable. Plus weigh their GDP card vs yours and they win. Plus automates cancels debt.
- * Use more emphasis on how the Medicaid program is the backbone of USA healthcare *
- Need to respond to magnitude.
- Dropped TANF + EITC
- Need to be more blunt in rebuttal to cover more arguments
- I would find another organization system for the last 2 speeches.

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.	

FD: Magnitude + Scope (3K vs 12K) (all receive benefits)

+ Automation (education can be given in both worlds UBI gives money for those not retrained to get education)

VPF

FLIP: 5 Chopra - Cheema v. 35 Han - Mckenna

Varsity Public Forum			Victor Cervantes (*50)		
Semi-Finals			015	Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM	
Speaker	Pro Aff	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Con Neg	Points (20-30)
1st	<u>Cheema</u>	<u>27</u>	1st	<u>Han</u>	<u>28</u>
2nd	<u>Chopra</u>	<u>26</u>	2nd	<u>Mckenna</u>	<u>29</u>
The winner of this debate was					
Pro Con (Circle Winner)			<i>C. Gallup</i> Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? _____			<i>carlsbad high school.</i> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

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.	

AF:
 jumps \$1000/mo.
 status quo.
 - feeding Amer/hungry
 → foodstamp doesn't work.
 ↑ 50%
 - food insecure - unhealthy

NEG:
 u
 - highest:
 - UBI 3.8tr. 1/5 economic.
 100% tax revenue.
 - tax/household
 - mld hit
 - top 1% → ↑ 67%
 - medicare downfall.
 fed 4% - 6%/yr.
 20% rec & assist.
 - SNAP - 42m.
 - 783/1100

2 poverty trap:
 - loss 95¢ for every \$1
 welfare-trap - removes incentive.
 UBI - is a floor vs ceiling
 increase employment
 ↑ → Uganda, Nigeria.

poor
 • tax credit: keep out of poverty.

automatic apocalypse.
 2 kill
 73 million -
 UBI → access to education
 ① learn new skills
 financial → education
 ② encourage entrepreneurship
 small 6% new jobs.

Q: EITZ:
 ① feed the hungry SNAP is growing → food insecure
 ② work: still work - incentive
 ③ GDP - debt ↑ GDP ↓ ratio
 no way to pay for
 jobs: more jobs - growth, → UBI
 relearn, not cool
 Africa, non logical

timing-help/urgency:
 → work goes to higher paying job bc inherently
 know tax - 95%
 pay for it
 2 debt ↑ → economy find
 7 automated + high skill:
 cope:
 fam: 3/4
 benefit \$2k vs \$12k/yr.

2017 ↓ enrollment fell:
 ① 43/54% reskilled jobs → 46%.
 debt ↓ GDP: ratio - out of alignment.
 63% / 103%: economy.

→ ~~root~~
root issue - funding UBI -
- more than 1/2

SNAP - \$2K vs \$1K
70M - take away medicated

poverty 1.3M

increase SNAP → vs no time. increase ↑

poverty trap: \$25.5/
still employ.

Net increase ↑ net positive -

Scope
→ weight - 1/4 prove
UBI everybody

magn: \$3/yr vs. 12 yrs

SNAP:
Medicaid: decline, diff requirement.

automation: boom: ^{future}

debt - pay w/ taxes
GDP ↓ ← automation.

education: UBI - education
73M -

2.5 trillion / how to pay for it.
debt ↑ GDP ↓
take away welfare:

Reason:
Both sides researched well +
chose evidence sources well. Both
sides demonstrated a strong
understanding of causal impact of
various evidents from both perspectives
which led to insightful cross-fires.

However, I don't feel that aff
proved that the solvency of their
position. The assertions of their
automation seemed to be a panacea
of future profits that would ensure feasibility.
I feel that Neg-proved + had a
more solid case that the impacts of the
program would be debt - a hot the
status quo was effective.