

cf
① Money unconditionally

= incentive
unemployment +
\$300/monthly

⑤ - living wage

- Minimum wage
→ true cost living

\$300/monthly
not enough
to change another
trap in povt

Rely on
employees
duty

welfare +
jobs

• di

• solve for
income ≠

• supplement
cash for

\$300/mo

can't buy
job or edu.

\$ Trapping
ppl in povt.

Bridge

living wage ↓
povt.

↳

Mutually exclusive
than UBI, bc
everyone
above povt line

conditional
on working
\$300 = ineffective

- companies

\$12,000 not
enough -
company control
(wage)

NEG

① UBI ↑ Biopower
allows govt to
be controlling

discriminating
bc not
working

citizens
UBI = unnecessary to
govt

UBI = TERRORISM

↳ bc \$ sending
back \$\$\$

\$ living wage
\$300/mo =
not jobs,
not for basic
income

• Not supposed
to help,
will be
supplemental

\$

Bridge gaps

Spurs
anti-
Americanism

! Terrorism

317 **Leah Clark-Villeneuve -
Marlborough**

Open LD Round 5 - 1:00 FLIGHT: B

Room: E3 307

2018 SCJFL SoCal Champs

Round Start: Now

Ballot Due: Soon After Now

Affirmative: Flintridge Preparatory School - La
Canada, CA LW

Negative: Magnet Learning Academy AN

Name	Points (100-70)	Name	Points (100-70)
Leila Wu	98	Avery Ngo	99

**Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe
won the debate.**

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

No Speaker Point Ties

Very close debate. Voted NEG bc of
dropped "DA" on inflation + market crash.
More RFD in panel.

318

Khamani Griffin - Flintridge Prep

Open LD Round 5 - 1:00 FLIGHT: A

Room: E3 407

2018 SCJFL SoCal Champs

Round Start: Now

Ballot Due: Soon After Now

Affirmative: Magnet Learning Academy EL

Negative: Marlborough School ER

Name	Points (100-70)	Name	Points (100-70)
✓ Euna Lee	100	Eva Rodriguez	96

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe
won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

Khamani Griffin
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Flintridge Prep
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

No Speaker Point Ties

+ AFF Flw

+ Collapse to Risk Calc of Women at Top of the Pyramid
Bottom of the Pyramid
X

Measuring QOL has the potential to get before
in a world w/ VBI

AFF ballot.

Further Feedback was given.

320 **Santiago Lopez - ELAC**

Open LD Round 5 - 1:00 FLIGHT: A

Room: E3 408

Alec Baillon - IPed

2018 SCJFL SoCal Champs

Round Start: Now

Ballot Due: Soon After Now

Affirmative: Walter Reed Middle School LQ

Negative: Marlborough School HH

Name	Points (100-70)
1 Lydia Qin	2 99

Name	Points (100-70)
1 Helena Hudlin	1 100

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? 70

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

No Speaker Point Ties

Poverty & Inequality

- wasted money matters bc instead of 100% of the money going to the poor under current programs, it's only 94% of the money.
- Trade off: even if US is better, it's outweighed later.
- Entrepreneurship: P. risk taker starts
- Debt & Bargaining
 - ↳ turn an econ. but money starts

Exploitation

- not really talked ab, & gov. attempts to manage

Cost

- new related → outreach

Trade off care

deficit: concealed

debt: concealed

↳ trade off new related

everything as massive magnitude & prob = 10

Imm.

↳ new related:

- global pos. as imm
- imm = innovation
- public backlash → ppl may be angry but not all of America, also no pres. is anti-

FW
 ought - duty
 UBI is all to do
 v. justice
 v. rule util

① Economy

12-56 Morris GDP growth
 Roosevelt
 Federal deficit → auto.
 Brown / velocity of money is 7
 1% wage / 200% GDP → tax cut

- ① CIA Toms / unhard
- ② CIA C4, better
- ③ Ex neg CP

We can afford now thru
 debt refinancing.
 Govt will be lost
 jobs.

Out debt scenario
 is already out of
 hand.

Ex 12.5% card
 Ex velocity of \$

② Poverty

highes / working hard → ↓ in net
 worth
 Freeman / UBI policy → elimination
 of poverty traps.

NIT doesn't meet the
 poverty line to solve
 non-ug
 hults poverty.

Doesn't solve for
 entrenched pov.

Non-ug, NIT solves pov. taxes decent
 rize

③ AI

Savovskij / robots kill employment
 wage wealth
 Minkzie / automated by L&SO
 and depressed wages
 Leinz / basic minimum → non
 automated jobs.

doesn't replace the
 workplace.

8 year growth is
 not enough.

Funding thru ultra
 welfare that is
 actually happeni

because of interest
 → more gov. reliance.

ppl want this but it
 hasn't happened yet.

④

Negative income tax
 Allen / pretty big IRS incomes and
 the govt would fund.

No v/cr, pref abls for.

CA C2, lose 24k from
 welfare trap.

Ex C1

cutting welfare problems →

taxes

② Receipts
 1 trn by 2020, L&P less expans.
 Greenstein / UBI needs to ind meet
 poverty line / w/o work.

① harming impoverished as long as taxes aren't more per.
 full income, there will
 be benefits.
 financed thru cuts and
 budget refinancing →
 1:1.28 growth.

UBI is ~~not~~ effective

Interton / replaces all types of
 gov assist.

①

UA Pinkerton / with near
 alone.

⑤ Right to Work

Mann / incentive to work will
 decline the incentive to
 work.
 Austin / 80% play video games and
 opioid addiction

Ex Mann / decre work
 incentive,
 needs gov neg at-

Black / automatic ~~cut~~ stabilize-3.

Ex Harvard / MIT studies.
 CA rebuttals, humans and then
 econ stability needs to be

Ex C4
 fights against emp.
 prefer neg here, Ex
 no empirics here

316 Kate Totz - Flintridge Prep

Open LD Round 5 - 1:00 FLIGHT: A

Room: E3 308

2018 SCJFL SoCal Champs

Round Start: Now**Ballot Due: Soon After Now****Affirmative:** Magnet Learning Academy KK**Negative:** Marlborough School SM

Name	Points (100-70)	Name	Points (100-70)
A Krishna Khawani	1 100	N Sadie May	2 97

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.Low Point Win? ~~X~~ YES

 JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

 Flintridge Prep
 JUDGE'S AFFILIATION
No Speaker Point Ties

on debt, I look to neg, I just really need
 the 12.56% card connected in the aff
 and inward.

on poverty, I like to the aff to work
 on AI, it becomes a much. negat

on NET, I look towards the sure effects
 on incentive to work, I need a lot more
 cash, but I loosely negate

FWT 240

2:20

ought duty

make available

UBI - prominent bill

V: Quality of life

C: rule util, moral constraints

Ex QoL, rule util

① Empowering women
Hamer / lack of options is why women don't leave.

Sandrine / Poverty is linked to prostitution

Edward / UBI works

① Too expensive to be feasible, not enough to fund UBI → harms not bare fits

② Cutting welfare progr. means ① harms women on mean-s-tested w

CA Roosevelt 2% wealth tax solves.

Not feasible means cutting programs that help women now

Guardian / for all US < 50 SS would be super high

Poverty down to 0, leads to all other things. Fin.

② Poverty

Sandrine / UBI gives resources reduces poverty trap

Davis / poverty → ↑ chance of gun violence.

① Grassinger / base of support → more time w/ kids.

① Doesn't decrease inequality, UBI only boosts wealth, doesn't close the gap between CA & women here.

NIT doesn't alleviate poverty, all into the middle class

CA Guardian here Ex doesn't ↓ ineq. Ex doesn't ↓ ineq. the poverty of it just makes wealthier. Perm.

③ Marginalized groups

Boston / racially inequitable New Deal → bad.

→ poverty trap of basis of society

can / decisions to take welfare → UBI solves for.



④ Neg Tax income

Allen / IRS filing → payments from the USFG

⑤ Benefits

BSO / deficit 2019 plus now can't afford a UBI

Thomas / still to distribute against to accept.

① Raise to poverty line who help

② Includes those not currently working.

Interton / means slashing other funding

PERM - all who still there before the UBI still get

① Too expensive, no public support, 2% tax wouldn't work, cutting welfare needed.

Fiat - can assume it happens

wouldn't harm the econ

Linderquist / gross cost is not effective, net cost is 2.5% US GDP. 1% of common, less than current.

Bushet / 20,000 stipend possible.

No public support → wouldn't work.

Fiat - works assume wealth tax works.

⑤ Incentive to work

Nancy / UBI → incentive to work choosing to work less hurts

Justin / 2010-2015, x% of women haven't worked → huge prediction of women

① NIT 98 / US caused the incentive to work to drop

cloud / Emp ↓, people worked 17% more, PERM solves.

can Perm - do both

⑥ Stability Directly - Progressive Tax

Albert / mitigate who political

① Macro - Roosevelt / Expands econ hasn't been tested in middle class drives poor line

Ex ① NIT alone ↓ incent

319 Kate Tetz - Flintridge Prep

Open LD Round 5 - 1:00 FLIGHT: B

Room: E3 308

2018 SCJFL SoCal Champs

Round Start: Now**Ballot Due: Soon After Now****Affirmative:** Magnet Learning Academy EJ**Negative:** Marlborough School LL

Name	Points (100-70)
A Erin Jeon	1 100

Name	Points (100-70)
N Lucy Loprete	2 93

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

No Speaker Point Ties

Make sure to extend everything with a warrant as to why it matters in the bigger picture. Very good time management and adaptability in this round.

This is not pretty but after you say PERM-tell me what order the plans go in. (do both, toughen CP, do CP then aff... etc.)

On empowering women: I buy that if you win feasibility, you win this pt.

On poverty: I buy that neither program alleviates poverty, just lessens the effects so it's a wash.

On marginalized groups: I affirm but need more impacts flown through.

Make sure to address the judge during cross, not the opponent.

No new evidence in the 2N, make sure to

On the CP: I buy the perm and need more done on it to overcome.

On net bens: perm takes out

on incentive to work: I flow aff on the perm

on stagnation, perm solves.

315 ~~ELAC JUDGE ONE~~ - ELAC

Open LD Round 5 - 1:00 FLIGHT: A

Room: E3 307

Kiana Saucedo - ELAC

2018 SCJFL SoCal Champs

Round Start: Now

Ballot Due: Soon After Now

Affirmative: Magnet Learning Academy DJ

Negative: Marlborough School KC

Name

Points
(100-70)

Name

Points
(100-70)

Diya Jain

95

Katie Cruz

90

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

No Speaker Point Ties

- strong points!
- contentions are very very STRONG!
- strong comebacks during 1st ~~rebuttal~~ rebuttal
- *UBI
 - everyone is treated the same
- no need for 'speed'
- everything was great.

- ~~good~~ good questions in your ~~rebuttal~~ crossblock strong
- also had very strong contentions!
- strong arguments during crossblock
- *NIT
 - ~~too~~ specific to suncoast ready!
- no need for speed
- check everything was great!

[illegible]

321

Tam Lambert - Head
Abraham Rincon - ELAC

Open LD Round 5 - 1:00 FLIGHT: A

Room: E3 411

2018 SCJFL SoCal Champs

Round Start: Now**Ballot Due: Soon After Now****Affirmative:** Marlborough School JS**Negative:** Flintridge Preparatory School - La Canada, CA EG

Name	Points (100-70)
<i>watch for time.</i> Jocelyn Shek	<i>2</i> 89

Name	Points (100-70)
Eliza Gunter	<i>1</i> 92

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.Low Point Win? NO

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

No Speaker Point Ties

Eliza, interesting tactics - going after protons in CX #1. Will you pick it up later on?
Both of you - improve eye contact in CX; it's like you forgot I'm there.
Both co-constructives are HEAVY on IMPACTS but light on links.
Eliza, ~~is~~ is not a singular NATION. Eliza, you should have a spike against M.A.D. they Europe
One moment in CX where Jocelyn asked Qs that contradicted her own thesis (implying giving everyone \$ was bad).
Eliza = HIGH impact, super-low probability - in order to kick out of a later if necessary, I need more case turning work and a little less mitigation as a go-to response. And the 'men' thing should be in a full shell if you're really going to make it a voter.
Jocelyn cold DROPS all of Eliza's responses on C2, but does a nice job dealing with Neg - but if you're conceding FW, let me know why that's fine.
FW - I default to consequentialism.
Gender - not a voting issue.
Neg 1 - I buy a remote risk of nuclear power - with that was turned (less nuclear power because UBI is a STABILIZER). more impact flows through.
UBI,
Aff 2 - all of Neg's turns are conceded. Harsh women, prevents some from leaving
Aff 1 - UBI offers some chance of entrepreneurial capital. Poverty is a war.