Round: Elims

Judge Andy Christensen

Aff Team: Moriah - Moriah vs Neg Team: Jess - Danny

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Extensive Oral RFP provided

1st Aff: Extensive Oral RFP provided

Feedback: **Extensive Oral RFP provided**

2nd Aff: Extensive Oral RFP provided

Feedback: **Extensive Oral RFP provided**

1st Neg: Extensive Oral RFP provided

Feedback: **Extensive Oral RFP provided**

2nd Neg: Extensive Oral RFP provided

Feedback: **Extensive Oral RFP provided**

Round: Elims

Judge Scott Thomson

Aff Team: Stacy --- Seattle U vs Neg Team: Zach and Sean --- University of Montana

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The affirmative's case is not super clear - yes there are abuses and terrible schools but how these are fixed by the affirmative is not clear. There are some downsides to charging less - like losing some of the jobs that exist at the physical schools. The affirmative's harms could be offset by increased aid - this was never really responded to by the affirmative.

1st Aff: Stacy

Feedback: **Good delivery - good critique of the system. Organization could be a bit better - use main points more clearly (ie contentions).**

2nd Aff: Stacy

Feedback: **Be careful about calling your opponents arguments "illogical". Nice metaphors. I am not sure your solution deals with the harm -- the picture you paint is pretty severe and it is not clear how lower tuition solves. Cite more research and cite it more specifically. I think you concentrate too much on the shady operators - regular colleges and universities offer lots of online classes.**

Your definitions in the first speech included the range of colleges and universities.

There was a tension between your definitions and your focus on the exploitative for profit places is problematic.

Be careful with comments like - "they've never watched a commercial".

1st Neg: Zach

Feedback: **Good arguments - especially the fixed costs and need to pay the staff. Make more arguments - reviewed too much.**

Be careful with open ended questions in cross ex.

Needed a bigger range of arguments from the start. You end up repeating too much.

2nd Neg: Sean

Feedback: **Good start - nice job clearing up the breadth of the resolution.**

Learn about issues. What were the burdens on the affirmative? How have they failed to meet these burdens? Is there any harm in the current system? Would the affirmative solve for these harms? Are there any disadvantages to the affirmatives proposal?

Most if not all of your arguments fit into the context of one of the above questions.

Round: Elims

Judge Emily Mikkelsen

Aff Team: CalPolyHumboldt CiCi McGehee vs Neg Team: College Mainland Matthew Coleman

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: First, this was an awesome debate! You both made a lot of well-framed arguments that had a lot of impact on society largely. I vote for the negative on the argument that factory farm fisheries should not be banned because they are critical to adequate food supply globally. Cici, your arguments about long-term problems was really compelling, but I needed more context to situate it in impact weighing against the immediate impacts of the negative.

1ˢᵗ Aff: Cici

Feedback: **Great use of a common media reference to introduce the context of this resolution! I think you may have run out of time for your last subpoint, but that is a minor concern depending on how it is developed in the round.**

2ⁿᵈ Aff: Cici

Feedback: **You do a great job talking about the issue of water rights later in the round. I think this is a really important impact in the round, especially considering long-term outcomes. While I value the importance of local and personal experience, it would strengthen your argument further to cite experts to support your argument. I think you have an awesome case for the affirmative debate, but it's hard to give the arguments full value without knowing sources that help to contextualize your argument. Your logic and personal knowledge make this a really close round, and I think adding a few sources to help measure probability, magnitude, and timeframe of impacts are the last thing you need for the debate. Great job!**

1st Neg: Matthew

Feedback: **You do a great job presenting your disadvantages and discussing impacts for people both in the U.S. and internationally. To improve, make sure to address the affirmative case more directly in your first speech. I think your framing argument works well and protects arguments you want to make.**

2nd Neg: Matthew

Feedback: **You did a great job framing both the round, your responsibility within the debate, and the importance of your impacts. I think the sources you bring in are important, especially when you frame them effectively into the round. It may be helpful to address the long-term advantages the affirmative discusses a little more directly in contrast with your arguments, but you did a great job overall. Best of luck in finals!**

Round: Elims

Judge Julie Badgley

Aff Team: TylerTyler vs Neg Team: ThomsonThomson

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The aff team were more clear in giving me the positive effects of a no fly zone and were successful in saying the neg counterplan was not a zero death plan.

1ˢᵗ Aff: Joseph Tyler

Feedback: **Great structure. You handled cross really well. Great job going down the flow in final speech. I'm not sure the conflict in Libya ever really ended.**

2ⁿᵈ Aff: Alyson Tyler

Feedback: **Great job not getting distracted by arguments that, though inflammatory were not part of the main debate round. I might just accept that a no fly zone requires some level of US boots on the ground.**

1ˢᵗ Neg: Carlos Thomson

Feedback: **I liked your focus on the friendly fire. You had good evidence in your first speech. Tell me why the US cannot do the plan by themselves.**

2ⁿᵈ Neg: Carlos Thomson

Feedback: **I liked your point about Putin's allies being dangerous. Again, I liked the civilian combatants point. You could have made your voters and impacts a bit more clear like you did in the first debate I saw you in.**

Round: Elims

Judge Sarah Partlow Lefevre

Aff Team: Owensboro CTC Daniel David vs Neg Team: Seattle Edward Strok

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The affirmative won that a no fly zone would not escalate war and would prevent Russian incursion into Europe

1st Aff: Owensboro CTC Daniel David

Feedback: **Good case - clear plan. You could use evidence even better than you do.**

2nd Aff: Owensboro CTC Daniel David

Feedback: **Great rebuttal. Good job carrying through the reasons your arguments against escalation were good and the idea that no action would actually lead to worse outcomes.**

1st Neg: Seattle Edward Strok

Feedback: **Cite sources more specifically and engage sources, give reasons your arguments are true - don't assume we all have the same world view and opinions and experience**

2nd Neg: Seattle Edward Strok

Feedback: **be polite to the judge after the debate - not confrontational**

Aff Team: Joseph and Alyson -- Idaho State vs Neg Team: Isabella and Blake - Belmont Abbey

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Better to abolish - affirmative gets to take the benefits of cohabitation - big blow to the negative.

1st Aff: Joseph

Feedback: **Well done - clear, comprehensive. Light on solvency - relies heavily on reverse causality - always a danger.**

2nd Aff: Alyson

Feedback: **Very good - might lean too much on people living together being good. There is a danger this could be viewed as marriage. Lots of the "harms" would also occur in this context. Common law is a legal contract.**

Very good final speech.

1st Neg: Isabella

Feedback: **Clear, organized. Organize around issues instead of topics. Use time more efficiently. Be sure to say - common law marriage is marriage.**

2nd Neg: Blake

Feedback: **Very good to point out the lack of solvency and good research. Go way further to point out the lack of solvency - did they offer any proof their plan would solve?**

Use all of your time in the last speech - you were done at 3!

Round: Elims

Judge Brad Phelps

Aff Team: Idaho State AlysonTylerJosephTyle vs Neg Team: BelmontAbbey Blake TraylorIsabellaBarrett

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The NEG made a good point that getting rid of the legal institution of marriage would not get rid of the problems which are caused by societal norms.

1st Aff: Joseph

Feedback: **Great job on a difficult side of a topic. I think you should have spent some time explaining why the harms were unique to marriage and would go away if it were gotten rid of.**

2nd Aff: Alyston

Feedback: **Great job on a difficult side of a topic. I think you should have spent some time explaining why the harms were unique to marriage and would go away if it were gotten rid of.**

1st Neg: Isabella

Feedback: **Great job and great point about legal definition not the cause of the problems. I would have liked to see more talk about how the harms brought up by AFF were not unique to marriage.**

2nd Neg: Blake

Feedback: **Great job and great point about legal definition not the cause of the problems. I would have liked to see more talk about how the harms brought up by AFF were not unique to marriage.**

Round: Elims

Judge Emily Mikkelsen

Aff Team: Owensboro CTC Daniel David vs Neg Team: UofMontana Sean Kunau/Zach Craig

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Congratulations to making it to the final round! I vote affirmative on the argument that either the President will be chronically involved in impeachment trials or they may shy away from pardoning to avoid political controversy. I think the negative did a good job with their argument about efficiency of the Presidential pardon remaining in tact with an oversight mechanism, but I don't have a measurable answer to the difference in time between the case. Great debate, everyone!

1ˢᵗ Aff: Daniel

Feedback: **You have great organization and are efficient in your case construction. I thought you also did a good job with refutation, although I think it would have been helpful to include a little more development for the efficiency argument to provide an effective comparison between the two plans. I would also recommend framing your alternative a bit more in the 1AC. You make sure to remind the judges before each speech that your opponents agree that you're resolutional with your advocacy. It's probably arguable either way; if that's your argument, I would probably explain it as giving the Supreme Court pardoning power with the President advising but not actually issuing the pardon.**

2ⁿᵈ Aff: Daniel David

Feedback: **Great line-by-line responses! Be careful about repetition in your last speech.**

1ˢᵗ Neg: Sean Kunau

Feedback: **I think you did a great job offering both the benefits of the policy, as well as a possible alternative. The biggest area for improvement I would suggest is to challenge the framing. I think you need to determine if the affirmative is trying to reform or replace. If the first, that's probably not resolutional.**

2nd Neg: Zach Craig

Feedback: **You do well on the line-by-line arguments and clarifying your plan. I think the revision of the analogy generally works fairly well throughout the debate. To improve, it might be helpful to try to in some way measure or extrapolate how substantial timing differences would be between your proposed policies.**

Round: Elims

Judge Adriana Amanti

Aff Team: Idaho State Tyler-Tyler vs Neg Team: Belmont Abbey Traylor-Barrett

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Very close round, but Aff ended up ultimately winning on cohabitation and capitalism. The economic benefits of marriage still existed in the affirmative world due to common law and cohabitated couples filing taxes jointly, and harms of the institution would be significantly lessened. Neg brought up great points of many heteronormative norms being culturally influenced, but on a cost-benefit analysis, Aff outweighed.

1st Aff: Alyson Tyler

Feedback: **You are so easy to follow and did a great job road mapping. My one suggestion would be to flesh out the argument of the gender binary in the court of law; I understood able-bodied individuals having power over disabled individuals, though there are heavy gender imbalances in the court system that would've made great impacts.**

2nd Aff: Joseph Tyler

Feedback: **Great tone, very captivating persona. My one suggestion would be to clarify your constructive a bit more. I got a little lost at the beginning on the structure of your case and it made it hard to follow until the 2AC.**

1st Neg: Isabella Barrett

Feedback: **Great speaking style! I could tell you guys were taken aback by the cohabitation argument, there could've been a stronger response to that (e.g. other legal benefits offered solely to married couples that you mentioned in constructive) but still good job overall!**

2nd Neg: Blake Traylor

Feedback: **Great summarization at the end of the round. My one suggestion would be to be careful of dropping arguments like capitalism, turning that onto your side would've helped make some ground.**

Round: Elims

Judge Tucker Wilson

Aff Team: Belmont BlakeTraylor IsabellaBarrett vs Neg Team: Ithaca SkylerCepek

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: NEG case relies on the destruction point and the mutual exclusivity of the counter plan, both of which are sufficiently addressed by the AFF. NEG also does not really address points brought up by AFF at all (and even agrees that it's an unequal experience), so they flow through, meaning NEG didn't have refutation to fall back on.

1ˢᵗ Aff: Blake Traylor

Feedback: **Like your co-competitors, really nice job keeping clash in the round apparent and crystal clear - I appreciate that as a judge! For constructive feedback: like we discussed, make sure you're giving what the REAL meaning of your arguments are - focus in on the impactful parts, i.e. the point about WHY other than cost people choose online school in the status quo is a stronger counter argument than simply saying that online and residential school currently coexists.**

2ⁿᵈ Aff: Isabella Barrett

Feedback: **Like your co-competitors, really nice job keeping clash in the round apparent and crystal clear - I appreciate that as a judge! For improvement: make sure you're giving your arguments the proper depth. In particular, your point about how people don't ALWAYS make decisions with their wallets needed more extrapolation. Sure, they don't, but why is that important here? Why is it reasonable to think otherwise?**

1ˢᵗ Neg: Skyler Cepek

Feedback: **Like your co-competitors, really nice job keeping clash in the round apparent and crystal clear - I appreciate that as a judge! In the future, like we discussed, make sure that you're REALLY confident that your case in un-perm-able if you're going to focus your time as NEG on negative contentions with little to no time spent on refuting AFF arguments. Without that security, you will not have refutation to fall back on like the NEG side of a debate usually can.**

2nd Neg: SAME

Feedback: **SAME**

Round: Elims

Judge Tucker Wilson

Aff Team: CSU San Marcos DannyBennet JessUgalde vs Neg Team: CollegeMainland MatthewColeman

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The NEG successfully points out that the AFF never draws a clear enough line, and a clear enough inherency, between the historical origins of/abuses within the institution of marriage and the institution as it stands today. NEG counter arguments successfully show that marriage can clearly still exist without all the bad things brought forth by the AFF, so (coupled with the other NEG points about marriage benefits that got waved aside as less important by the AFF), so the AFF did not prove that the institution itself should not be valued and only really showed that it needs to be improved.

1ˢᵗ Aff: Daniel Bennett

Feedback: **Excellent job utilizing your passion and eloquence in this round. You are an engaging, clear speaker who's clearly very interested in and good at this activity! That said, I have a similar comment for you as I had your first round, and that is to be mindful of how you conduct Cross-X. There were times throughout your questioning that you were being a bit too presumptuous about what the NEG may personally believe instead of what their case might imply (which is an important distinction), and where you spoke for quite a while without getting to a question.**

2ⁿᵈ Aff: Jessica Ugalde

Feedback: **You are a very clear speaker, and in particular you did an excellent job of explaining the mechanics of a Value round in your first constructive while explaining that you are not banning marriage. For constructive feedback: the last part of your constructive (when you started weighing rape vs. economic benefit, etc.) would have been very persuasive if your case had done more to connect those bad things to the existence of**

marriage as an institution. Since your case didn't do much to explain why we cannot value marriage and still see it become less harmful, that closing lacked the bite it could have had.

1st Neg: Matthew Coleman

Feedback: **Nice job getting to the real clash of the debate, and upholding your burden of negating the resolution with your points about how marriage can be valued as an institution while still lacking the harmful effects brought forth by the AFF. That said, your arguments could have been a lot clearer and more effective had you made sure to argue within the Value language put forward by the AFF. Your arguments WERE within that intersectional feminist lens because your benefits could be extended to women of all kinds, and you argued against how widespread the harms to women are - just make that clear by saying it plainly!**

2nd Neg: SAME

Feedback: **SAME**

Round: Round 1

Judge michael starzynski

Aff Team: idaho state aj vs Neg Team: san jose cc dg (maverick)

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: presumption... minimal rebuttal on case, no rejoinder off case

1ˢᵗ Aff: Joseph Tyler

Feedback: **Joseph**

+

great organization of speech

lovely structure of argument

some decent preemption too

-

be sure to link your plan text

offer consistent source citations

include more warrants/examples

(you were very gracious with the new debater <3)

2ⁿᵈ Aff: Alyson Tyler

Feedback: **Alyson (last tournament! =D)**

+

great line by line in off case

your argumentation is solid

effective rejoinders on case

-

don't forget top of case

point out drops/mishandles

be sure to extend framework

(you were very gracious with the new debater <3)

1st Neg: Dominic Garcia (maverick)

Feedback: **Dominic**

+

good organization of speech

i like the research and ideas

great answers in cx, put in speech

-

no need to apologize, you're good

work a bit on structure of argument

and never forget you can do this

(take a breath and think positively =D)

2nd Neg: Dominic Garcia (maverick)

Feedback: **Dominic Garcia (maverick)**

+

decent clash in off case

good analysis up there

you clearly are very bright

-

be sure to speak the full time

choose clash and don't drop args

trust practice, embrace process

(you did so well! hang in there =D)

Judge Scott Thomson

Aff Team: Affirmative BelmontAbbey BlakeTraylorIsabellaBarrett vs Neg Team: Negative CollegeMainland MatthewColemanMatthewColeman

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The affirmative wins based on the effectiveness aspect. Infections are increasing and protections (precautions) are decreasing. The negative allowed the affirmative to have too low a burden of proof.

1st Aff: Blake

Feedback: **Clear, articulate, organized. More reference to evidence.**

Good cross examination.

2nd Aff: Isabella

Feedback: **Very nice job. Good strong defense - nice job with "as a whole" - you should have emphasized "effectively" more, point out the lack of response to this position. More time on the "personal responsibility" contention would have been useful/strategic.**

Good cross examination.

1st Neg: Matt

Feedback: **Good job - excellent speaker (everyone here is very articulate). Well organized and good well developed arguments. I think the attack ought to have been a little broader. The effectively aspect needed t o be better dealt with.**

Be more specific regarding your research. You personal examples were excellent.

2nd Neg: Matt

Feedback: **Again – the effectiveness aspect needs to be more specifically addressed. Great vividness. More detailed citation of your sources needed. I think you need to deal with concepts like ISSUES and BURDEN OF PROOF more. You are stuck on individual arguments and don't explain their function in the debate.**

Round: Round 1

Judge Andy Christensen

Aff Team: Mike vs Neg Team: Stacy

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The affirmative case is established on three main points: the strongest of which is "assault is assault," but the aff case omits a weighing mechanism, and it is also short on cited evidence. For the "FIRST EVER ROUND" you did poke some great big holes in your opponent's case, but I think the neg wins here chiefly based on a> thoroughly refuting the aff, and 2> continuing to develop the case in every speech succeeding the opening.

1st Aff: Mike

Feedback: **Welcome to the club! Excellent first round!! Remember those weighing mechanisms are a hallmark to further success.**

2nd Aff: Mike

Feedback: **Thank you for being so kind to the opponent in their first-ever round. That's got class!! Your work is very solid and becomes thoroughly built out and escalated as you make additional speeches.**

1st Neg: Stacy

Feedback: **Thank you for being so kind to the opponent in their first-ever round. That's got class!! Your work is very solid and becomes thoroughly built out and escalated as you make additional speeches.**

2nd Neg: Stacy

Feedback: **Above**

Round: Round 1

Judge Emily Mikkelsen

Aff Team: CSU San Marcos GabriellaHakopianGabriellaHakopian vs Neg Team: CalPolyHumboldt CiciMcGeheeCiciMcGehee

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: This round comes down to two questions. First, do sanctions work? Second, are boots on the ground net beneficial? The affirmative focuses heavily on the first question and provides extensive examples from history that sanctions often fail, and they provide a 40% effectiveness estimate. The affirmative is a bit ahead on this argument; there is some negative leverage on the estimated current effects on the present multilateral Russian sanctions and the lack of Russia's ability to diversify their economy in a way to avoid the sanctions- but this argument is largely left in the constructive speeches. While I grant the affirmative that the status quo is likely insufficient, I am not sure that there is a lot of offense for the proposed plan. The negative answers the second question better, arguing that increasing the longevity and severity of the current war does not improve the status quo. The affirmative mitigates the probability of nuclear war to some extent, but the likelihood of escalating the conflict is the winning argument in the debate.

1ˢᵗ Aff: Gabriella Hakopian

Feedback: **Great job organizing your case. Both your taglines and your contention content are very clear throughout your affirmative case. You also do really well in answering context-specific questions in CX.**

Be careful about framing your side into harder ground; the U.S. can increase military involvement without boots on the ground by providing additional weapons, intelligence, and/or implementing a no-fly zone. It's completely fine if that's your argument preference; it's just not the only option if your primary goal is to argue against sanctions. If you do opt to defend boots on the ground, make sure to spend some time explaining why that action would be net beneficial/ desirable. You have a great context of

history that you exemplify throughout your speeches, and I think that you can use that to build even more strength for your argument.

2nd Aff: Gabriella Hakopian

Feedback: **You have a lot of historical context internationally that you bring into the round, and that is really important! I appreciated your consideration of not only the current context, but also American foreign policy and societal values that drive them.**

It may strengthen your argument to more directly answer the negative refutation that these specific sanctions work/ are working and to spend more time on the counter-contentions/ disadvantages. A lot of your argumentation focuses on sanctions not working and being problematic, but your advocacy is about boots on the ground military action. It would help to address the legitimization arguments as it relates to the potential escalation and projected longevity of the war in Ukraine.

You do a great job in your second CX especially asking about the insufficiency of the status quo as it relates to humanitarian responsibility in Ukraine. The only drawback here is probably that I need to know from your affirmative why the plan solves those problems.

Overall, great job!

1st Neg: Cici McGehee

Feedback: **Great job focusing your first CX on the proposed plan and subsequent outcomes. You also have a lot of direct and effective clash in refuting the affirmative case. To improve further, it might be helpful to add sources that support your arguments and add to context of probability and magnitude.**

2nd Neg: Cici McGehee

Feedback: **You do a great job considering the different forms of escalation that can occur, ranging from conventional warfare, cyber warfare, and the potential for nuclear strikes. This type of argument gives you the ability to**

look at both higher probability arguments (conventional warfare is already occurring in Ukraine) and the largest magnitude. Ideally, it would be helpful to include a bit more analysis on the probability of nuclear war.

To improve, it may be worthwhile to consider if sanctions are mutually exclusive with the affirmative plan. Do sanctions go away just because we put boots on the ground? It's not brought up, so not considered in my decision, but it could be an interesting approach. You talk about mutually-assured destruction based on symmetry; it might strengthen your case to spend a little more time establishing the link between U.S. boots on the ground in Ukraine to nuclear war. You get to this in your refutation and clarify it well! In your 1NC, it might be helpful to spend a little more time extending your refutations to the affirmative.

Overall, great job!

Round: Round 1

Judge Adriana Amanti

Aff Team: Seattle U EdwardStrokEdwardStrok vs Neg Team: Owensboro CTC DanielDavidDanielDavid

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Neg provided solvency, impacts, and quantifiable voters. Russia has threatened nuclear war with US involvement in the crisis and has the capability to launch cyber warfare and attack Western infrastructure. Neg also demonstrated previous instances of US foreign intervention and how that failed.

1st Aff: Edward Strok

Feedback: **You explain things great! I had no issue following your arguments and you had a great tone. I would suggest spending more time in your speeches developing arguments from baseline contention into real-world impacts -- what realistically would happen if the US did help out Ukraine? Overall, solid argumentation :)**

2nd Aff: NA

Feedback: **NA**

1st Neg: Daniel David

Feedback: **Great argumentation. I really liked your rebuttals and the empirics you provided. I think there were some areas of the debate that you could've clashed on that were brushed over, like foreign intervention and Aff's oppressive Russian government argument**

2nd Neg: NA

Feedback: **NA**

Round: Round 1

Judge Julie Badgley

Aff Team: CollegeMainland WilliamGomezWilliamGomez vs Neg Team: Ithaca CarlosThomsonCarlosThomson

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The neg impacted out the round better and told me why the bad impacts should be considered more heavily.

1ˢᵗ Aff: William Gomez

Feedback: **Good structure. You refuted well in your third speech. Try to remember to give a definition. Try to get into your first speech a bit quicker.**

2ⁿᵈ Aff: William Gomez

Feedback: **I really liked your emphasis on the genocide, just try to tell me why this is important. Try to not let the opponent discount Ukrainian genocide. Keep these speeches a bit more structured.**

1ˢᵗ Neg: Carlos Thomson

Feedback: **I liked your question about the advancement of bad tech. You had strong refutations. Try to use a bit more evidence in your first speech.**

2ⁿᵈ Neg: CarlosThomson

Feedback: **I thought your question about what Russia will do with the nukes was strong for your side. Good point about militarizing civilians. Try to put the AL Qaeda example before the last speech so I can count it.**

Round: Round 1

Judge Sarah Partlow Lefevre

Aff Team: CollegeMainland MoriahAragonMoriahAragon vs Neg Team: Negative UofMontana SeanKunauZachCraig

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The negative counter plan solves the problems by subsidizing public transportation. The negative also successfully wins the topicality argument about the subsidy needing to modify purchase.

1ˢᵗ Aff: Moriah Aragon

Feedback: **Good case. Very clear delivery. You are good at explaining arguments. Make sure you define all important words in the topic. Your 1AR was really good with nice embedded clash.**

2ⁿᵈ Aff: Moriah Aragon

Feedback: **You have all the right arguments in the debate. They are just presented at the wrong times. Do not change your plan, instead explain why your plan meets their definition.**

1ˢᵗ Neg: Zach Craig

Feedback: **Very clear and well thought out case. Great topicality argument - make sure you explain how it impacts the debate more thoroughly. The CP needs a plan text and solvency - otherwise it is too vague. If you don't want to run it as a CP, you can argue that a shift to public transit is coming now and will solve. This gives you many of the benefits of the CP without having to defend against the permutation of do both the subsidy and the cp.**

2nd Neg: Sean Kunau

Feedback: **Both of you are very good speakers and have wonderful, reasoned explanations. Please make sure you split the block between the 2NC and 1NR. Great argument about oil prices remaining high to recoup the cost of lost customers. Voters are fine but could be more developed. Also, I would like to see some two worlds analysis in the last negative rebuttal.**

Aff Team: CSU San Marcos DannyBennett JessUgalde vs Neg Team: Ithaca SkylerCepekSkylerCepek:

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: AFF team successfully argued that a number of factors, at the very least, meant that there was a DECENT chance of the Democrats taking the House and Senate. Since the resolution was not strictly predictive, they upheld their burden sufficiently. NEG reasons for possible Democrat disadvantage (Biden's approval, Dem policy failure, etc.) were strongly refuted by the AFF point that liberals won't just give up and/or change sides because individual politicians are failing at their goals.

1st Aff: Daniel Bennett

Feedback: **Nice job recognizing potential implications of NEG statements that could benefit your case. Be mindful of how you conduct yourself in CX (avoid confrontational tone, slyly implying things with your answers, etc.) and let the questions speak for themselves.**

2nd Aff: Jessica Ugalde

Feedback: **Very nice job connecting arguments together and recognizing areas of clash. I would recommend making sure you are being clear about where you are on the flow, as sometimes during your constructive I lost track of what points you were currently addressing.**

1st Neg: Skyler Cepek

Feedback: **Nice job recognizing when a squabble over definitions is useful and when it's not - you handled the point about the use of the specific term "decent shot" well. For improvement, make sure you're giving the REAL**

reasons your arguments work, and don't fall back on things like the Appeal to Tradition when defending points like your Historical Precedent point.

2nd Neg: SAME

Feedback: **SAME**

Round: Round 2

Judge michael starzynski

Aff Team: Cal Poly Humboldt CiCi McGegee vs Neg Team: San Jose CC Mike Gates

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: presumption... no rebuttal on case, no rejoinder off case.

1st Aff: Cal Poly Humboldt CiCi McGegee

Feedback: **Cici**

+

solid organization of speech

decent structure of argument

dig your specific warrants/examples

-

be sure to offer a complete framework

offer a few important source citations

and argue through your sub-points

2nd Aff: Cal Poly Humboldt CiCi McGegee

Feedback: **Cici (you're being so gracious! <3)**

+

solid line by line refutation off case

good extensions of case arguments

super love your analysis and weighing

-

feel free to bring up cx into your speech

be sure to point out dropped arguments

and carry framework across the flow

1st Neg: San Jose CC Mike Gates

Feedback: **Mike (wow, your second debate! =D)**

+

great research and observations

the argumentation part will come

you are bright, don't doubt the skills

-

don't apologize, you're doing great

offer case rebuttal along with off case

and be sure use all your speaking time

2nd Neg: San Jose CC Mike Gates

Feedback: **Mike**

+

i like your reasoning, keep that going

good extensions of off case arguments

you're very bright and debate suits you

-

be sure to offer rebuttal on case

and be sure to offer rejoinder off case

don't doubt yourself, you got skills =D

Round: Round 2

Judge Scott Thomson

Aff Team: UofMontana SeanKunauZachCraig vs Neg Team: CollegeMainland WilliamGomezWilliamGomez

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The benefit of reigning in inflation seems to outweigh the downside. The affirmative demonstrates that inflation leads to harms such as hurting the poor and increasing the severity of recession.

The negative makes the affirmative's job way too easy by not demanding the affirmative advocate a means to achieve the decrease in inflation.

Both sides need to rely on outside research more and need to be more specific in citing it.

1st Aff: Sean

Feedback: **Clear - well organized - fairly well developed. I think you ought to have advocated a plan.**

Good cross examination question - ask him about the evidence he has for this claim.

2nd Aff: Zach

Feedback: **Good answers to the negative - articulate and well organized. Develop the harms of inflation more - you move too quickly to recession.**

Good final rebuttal - the new points were dealt with fine although they were not that threatening to your position.

1st Neg: William

Feedback: **Be careful with such open ended questions in the cross examination. You give them a chance to advance their case.**

Your arguments were very good. I liked the "inflation is good" point. Use all of your time and attack the affirmative case in more ways.

Be careful about arguing in cross examination - don't use the phrase "I believe" in cross ex.

2nd Neg: William

Feedback: **Your hesitation regarding the affirmative not having a plan is important - you need to develop this more - it is a super argument. As it stood - you merely wonder about the implications. You should argue that the affirmative is obligated to have a plan.**

Frame this speech around how the affirmative has failed to meet a burden of proof.

Round: Round 2

Judge Andy Christensen, Idaho State

Aff Team: David Daniel vs Neg Team: Gabriella Hakopian

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Neg leaves their C1, C2, C3 and several of the voters from the Aff untouched, resulting in very light clash for this debate.

1st Aff: David

Feedback: **I definitely approve of the case the Aff prefers; bur I would appreciate the aff delivering at a rate that is more friendly to the flow in their 1ac.**

2nd Aff: David

Feedback: **Polite but firm indication of what the N speaker dropped and averted from answering. 7 voters isn't a record, but a great way to secure a ballot.**

1st Neg: Gabriella

Feedback: **A great opposing case but does little in the 1NC to refute much of the 1AC. Delivered with enthusiasm and certainty.**

2nd Neg: Gabriella

Feedback: **Persuasiveness is a core skill here and you absolutely deliver!! Be sure to touch every point by the opposition even if you really have to pick up the pace to get to them all.**

Round: Round 2

Judge Sarah Partlow Lefevre

Aff Team: Affirmative Ithaca CarlosThomsonCarlosThomson vs Neg Team: Negative CSU San Marcos DannyBennett JessUgalde

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The negative wins the CP to engage and protest maltreatment. They win the argument that sports diplomacy solves better than withdrawing from the competition. They also win that shunning won't create positive change. The affirmative could have won the debate with a carefully constructed rebuttal that really elucidated the reasons the aff plan could solve better. Many of the claims in the last two rebuttals were very surface level and didn't provide the reasons the claims were true. Some reasons were developed earlier in the debate. But they were not highlighted in rebuttals.

1ˢᵗ Aff: CarlosThomson

Feedback: **Good case. Be careful with your wording. Highlight the causes of the problems - the government is ugly and evil not the Qatari people. Make sire your statements are precise in this regard. Otherwise, I thought the case was good.**

2ⁿᵈ Aff: CarlosThomson

Feedback: **You extend arguments you need but don't go into the comparative depth needed to win them in this debate. You need to narrow the focus in the final speech and discuss what can win the debate in greater depth.**

1ˢᵗ Neg: Danny Bennett

Feedback: **Good job - make sure you give both speeches you are supposed to give**

2nd Neg: Jess Ugalde

Feedback: **Good strategy and evidence in the debate. You have too many arguments. Fewer, more developed arguments is the way to go --especially in rebuttals.**

Round: Round 2

Judge Julie Badgley

Aff Team: CollegeMainland MatthewColemanMatthewColeman vs Neg Team: Seattle U EdwardStrokEdwardStrok

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The aff and neg both agreed that the government needs to provide some form of economic security. The aff was successful in arguing that many people lack the community ties to find a friend or family member to watch the kids, so a government center was the only way to meet the guarantee.

1st Aff: Matthew Coleman

Feedback: **You had a good safety contention and rebuild. Strong refutations in your second speech. Don't agree knowing people is the best background check if you are arguing family can also hurt kids.**

2nd Aff: Matthew Coleman

Feedback: **I really liked your harm can happen anywhere refutation to the Quebec evidence. Good job highlighting the government duty. Try giving me voters at the end of your speech.**

1st Neg: Ed Strok

Feedback: **I liked your anxiety evidence. Good job pointing out the topic was federally run centers. I'm not sure I would necessarily know if my neighbor was a pedophile. Be careful saying very complex social problems have a very specific cause.**

2nd Neg: Ed Strok

Feedback: **You went down the flow well to address all points. I liked your point about the low salary. Try to give me your personal experience earlier so I can count it.**

Round: Round 2

Judge Adriana Amanti

Aff Team: Ithaca Skyler Cepek vs Neg Team: BelmontAbbey Traylor-Barrett

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Neg wins off of the argument that purchasing power is meaningless if you don't have money or a reliable income in the first place. Inflation is gradual whereas unemployment is an immediate cutoff to income and benefits. Neg showed impacts of an increase in unemployment such as mental health issues, recession, generational poverty, business failure, etc.

1st Aff: Skyler Cepek

Feedback: **Good job at holding your ground in cross-examination and in constructive. You extended your points beautifully and didn't drop any arguments. Empirics would've helped support your case even better!**

2nd Aff: NA

Feedback: **NA**

1st Neg: Isabella Barrett

Feedback: **Great job at cross-examination. You did good at making sure you got solid answers from your opponent. Be careful on wording choices during speeches, in the 1NR you argued that unemployment should be prioritized then said there should be a balanced approach, which happened a few times in round.**

2nd Neg: Blake Traylor

Feedback: **Love the road mapping and crystallization in the 2NR. You made it really easy to follow along. The apple analogy in the rebuttal was a little confusing to follow.**

Round: Round 2

Judge Tucker Wilson

Aff Team: SanJoseCC DominicGarcia vs Neg Team: CollegeMainland MoriahAragon

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: While the AFF provides a solid value/moral imperative for the round, the NEG brings forth arguments about more effective alternative actions that go largely unaddressed. Because of this, the majority of the NEG case flows through to the end of the round - the AFF spent much of their time expanding on the moral reasoning of the AFF case, which was not something the NEG was against.

1ˢᵗ Aff: Dominic Garcia

Feedback: **Great job recognizing the potential for a debate to really be about a bigger picture argument. However, remember to actually contend with the points your opponent brings up - your moral argument doesn't do much if it's not actually the point of contention.**

2ⁿᵈ Aff: SAME

Feedback: **SAME**

1ˢᵗ Neg: Moriah Aragon

Feedback: **Nice work recognizing the relative lack of clash from your opponent and using that as opportunity to strengthen your case. That said, try to use that time more effectively, going into more depth about what your arguments are really SAYING and why specifically they still hold up ("My opponent has not addressed X, and this is important because..."**

2nd Neg: SAME

Feedback: **SAME**

Round: Round 3

Judge michael starzynski

Aff Team: College Mainland WG vs Neg Team: CSU San Marcos GH

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: presumption... no off case rebuttal, not enough case rejoinder.

1st Aff: William Gomez

Feedback: **William**

+

decent organization of speech

solid source citations included

i like your logic and reasoning

-

don't apologize, you're doing great

be sure each claim has grounds

and specific warrants/examples

2nd Aff: William Gomez

Feedback: **William**

+

impressive uniqueness arg on racism

good extensions of case arguments

your weighing and calculus is solid

-

be sure to offer a rebuttal of off case

and to offer rejoinder back on case

and not just in cx, put it in speeches

1st Neg: Gabriella Hakopian

Feedback: **Gabriella**

+

solid claims and grounds off case

your reasoning and logic are sound

also super enjoyed your advocacy

-

full source citations on statistics please

be sure to include warrants/examples

be sure to offer more case rebuttal

2nd Neg: Gabriella Hakopian

Feedback: **Gabriella**

+

solid work identifying key clash

decent case argument extensions

good start off case, really go line by line

-

not sure what you mean by race of protestors/organizers

be sure we are crystal clear with our attention getters

add framework to the debate to help guide the way

Round: Round 3

Judge Sarah PArtlow Lefevre

Aff Team: Affirmative Ithaca SkylerCepek vs Neg Team: SanJoseCC DominicGarciaDominicGarcia

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Aff wins better treatment for workers in a variety of ways and national and international modeling

1ˢᵗ Aff: SkylerCepek

Feedback: **Good case - nice modeling advantage. Explanations are clear and make sense**

2ⁿᵈ Aff: SkylerCepek

Feedback: **Good rebuttal - good job highlighting the reasons your side should win**

1ˢᵗ Neg: SanJoseCC DominicGarciaDominicGarcia

Feedback: **Strong first speech. Try to be more concrete in examples of harms done by unions.**

2ⁿᵈ Neg: SanJoseCC DominicGarciaDominicGarcia

Feedback: **Good job sticking in the debate. I'm sorry you weren't feeling well and hope you feel better.**

Round: Round 3

Judge Brad Phelps

Aff Team: SanJoseCC MikeGatesMikeGates vs Neg Team: Seattle U EdwardStrokEdwardStrok

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The AFF gave up most of their time and as a result did not provide much supporting evidence for their arguments and the NEG had a strong and structured argument that was convincing.

1st Aff: MIke

Feedback: **Great job keeping going and participating in every time slot even though voluntarily gave up a lot of time. Make sure to come prepared with supporting arguments for your main arguments to flesh it out and strengthen your case. Also, make sure to explain why your solution is better than the alternatives.**

2nd Aff: N/A

Feedback: **N/A**

1st Neg: Edward

Feedback: **Great job using the cross-X to pull out more info room AFF that wasn't given during their constructives giving more room for a good debate and allowing a good back and forth despite circumstances. It would have been good to have more examples of where solutions other than unions were able to achieve the improvements for workers.**

2nd Neg: N/A

Feedback: **N/A**

Round: Round 3

Judge Scott Thomson

Aff Team: Affirmative Idaho State AlysonTylerJosephTyler vs Neg Team: Negative CSU San Marcos DannyBennettJessUgalde

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The negatives counterplan can be done t the same time as the affirmative. The link to inflation from the affirmative stimulus was not very good meaning little risk of a disadvantage.

1st Aff: Joseph

Feedback: **Clear, articulate. Seems reasonable. A bit of apprehension rellated to the specificity of your plan.**

2nd Aff: Alyson

Feedback:

Nice job. Clear and comprehensive. Super god with answers to stimulus caused inflation.

You solve some of the consequences of inflation. Be careful and use language precisely.

Be confident with "do both".

1st Neg: Jessica

Feedback: **Good ideas - good enthusiasm. A bit more structure would be nice and more time spent on how the affirmative would increase inflation.**

Deal with issues more - be more comprehensive/strategic.

2nd Neg: Daniel

Feedback: **Need to better respond to "why not do both". Great enthusiasm - good pitch for the counterplan.**

Round: Round 3

Judge Emily Mikkelsen

Aff Team: CollegeMainland MoriahAragonMoriahAragon vs Neg Team: Ithaca CarlosThomsonCarlosThomson

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: There are two questions I need to answer for my decision. The first is how this affects inflation for the entire population. I think the negative is slightly ahead on this argumentation because they can directly link the quarters following stimulus checks being issued to an acute, temporary rise in inflation. That being said, I need a little more context from the negative to explain 1) how much this will hurt those above the FPL eligibility line (So, why does the 0.3% or 0.2% overall effect matter in light of other inflationary measures?) and 2) why corporate greed would continue in light of another installment of checks. I think you have answers to this question, but it's not quite tied together to help weigh impacts. Overall, I grant that some minimal level of inflation increases likely happen after the checks based on the numbers given in the negative case. The second question is ethics because it's really the framing of the round. The affirmative argues that this helps families who are most in need of financial assistance to check back corporate greed and is an ethical responsibility. I find this argument compelling, especially because the alternatives listed by the negative seem to be targeted in a way that worsens the inequality that the affirmative argues needs to be addressed. I think the negative can win this round by spending a little more time discussing the importance of social spending and/or disproportionate effects on those close to the cutoff. Both debaters did a great job!

1ˢᵗ Aff: Moriah Aragon

Feedback: **Great organization and use of expert sources to support your case! I think there might have been a miscommunication between the $1200 noted in the topic and $12,000 stated in your case. The direction of your argument shouldn't change based on this number, but the magnitude of both the advantages and disadvantages will.**

2nd Aff: Moriah Aragon

Feedback: **You do an awesome job focusing on your framing/ parameterization to refine your argument and answer refutation on your case! To improve further, it would be helpful to spend time refuting the negative's contentions directly as well. You have a broad answer, and your framing mitigates it to some extent, but spending more time on it may help you further develop your offense. Great job framing the ethical obligation argument!**

1st Neg: Carlos Thomson

Feedback: **You did a great job integrating research into your case and mentioning alternative methods of assistance for households who may be struggling financially. It might be helpful to note tax incentives or other investments that are more specific to the everyday needs of the population that the affirmative parameterizes the plan to (below the FPL).**

2nd Neg: Carlos Thomson

Feedback: **You have a good consideration for the households who just miss the means-tested cutoff. Be careful with your rhetoric; while this was likely a product of extemporaneous speaking, try to not use the phrase "poor people" as a categorical description.**

Round: Round 3

Judge Adriana Amanti

Aff Team: Seattle U Stacy Wood-Burgess vs Neg Team: College Mainland Matthew Coleman

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Affirmative's benefits outweighed the cons the negation provided for a national service. Life skills, better employment opportunities, pathways into government and political activism, and boost in infrastructure ultimately won over self-determination, ext. circumstances and people self-volunteering. The affirmative laid out a plan for action and provided empirics. In the aff world, people are more prepared for careers and other challenges.

1st Aff: Stacy Wood-Burgess

Feedback: **Great organization in the constructive and extending your arguments. Your points were easy to follow and were backed up by sound evidence. In the future, establishing definitions and fleshing out gray areas of your case could help clear up any confusion in the debate round.**

2nd Aff: NA

Feedback: **NA**

1st Neg: Matthew Coleman

Feedback: **Again, GREAT philosophical arguments! You are very compelling to listen to and I would suggest LD debate if you haven't tried that already. Your self-determination point was very alluring and almost won me over. In the future, providing empirics for real-world negative impacts/consequences that would happen in the world of the affirmative (e.g. national service was mandatory) can be a good counter to the affirmative's contentions.**

2nd Neg: NA

Feedback: **NA**

Round: Round 3

Judge Andy Christensen

Aff Team: Zach-Sean vs Neg Team: Isabella-Blake

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The ballot is given to the negative more more robust impact work in the concluding two speeches. The neg presents a clear line between recusal and suspicion of Ginny Thomas; the Neg clearly states the ultimate face that the impeachment of Clarence Thomas would be for something his wife may or may not have shared with him.

1ˢᵗ Aff: Great opening -- solid job. I would like a 1AR to tell me what the impacts are going to tell me -- so foreshadow that if possible. Solid citations.

Feedback: **More on "what constitutes a legal conflict of interest" would have really bolstered that point.**

2ⁿᵈ Aff: Sean

Feedback: **"Impeachment is only a tool." You're onto something here! Impact that out -- play it through completely. Work to declaratively, and persuasively.**

1ˢᵗ Neg: Isabella

Feedback: **A great presentational style, but remember the basics: clear signposting, solid source citations, and keep it concise in the case. You get rolling and we lose a bit of what makes flowing easy and beneficial. If you have a framework issue (in thit case definition) that's the first item to be attacked in 1NC.**

2ⁿᵈ Neg: Blake

Feedback: **Nice work looking at this topic from what seemed to be a big-picture perspective.**

Judge Tucker Wilson

Aff Team: OwensboroCTC DanielDavid vs Neg Team: CalPolyHumboldt CiciMcGehee

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The AFF wins primarily because the point about plan flexibility successfully refutes, or at least reduces the impact of, the NEG's crux argument that the plan would be unconstitutional forced labor. This flexibility also helped reduce the impact of the NEG's public outcry argument. The NEG's counterplan of incentivizing voluntary service could have clinched the win, but it was unaddressed by both sides after it was briefly mentioned in the first NEG constructive.

1st Aff: Daniel David

Feedback: **Your complement is that you did a fantastic job in basically every aspect. Well-delivered, on-topic, kept track of all the arguments, effective reasoning. The point of improvement is what we discussed about making sure you're taking the most effective refutation route. Rather than pressing your opponent on a source or more direct causal link between mask mandates and January 6th, deal with the argument for what it's trying to say - in this debate it would've been both simpler and more**

2nd Aff: SAME

Feedback: **SAME**

1st Neg: Cici McGehee

Feedback: **Your complement, like your opponent, is that you did a fantastic job in basically every aspect. Well-delivered, on-topic, kept track of all the arguments, effective reasoning. My point of constructive feedback is what**

we discussed about keeping track of your implications. Again, you don't want to be disingenuous in a debate, but be mindful of what you say and what it means for your reasoning. Your point about school options did a lot to undermine some of your key points!

2nd Neg: SAME

Feedback: **SAME**