

Round: Round 1

Judge Julie Badgley

Aff Team: SU StrokStrok vs Neg Team: CSU BennettHakopian

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The aff was convincing that the death penalty carries significant harms going forward and that we should not continue with a practice just because we have done it that way in the past.

1st Aff: Eduard Strok

Feedback: **Good structure. You were very skilled in CX with both questions and answers. I liked that you point out that tradition is not a good reason to continue doing something. Try to get into your first speech a bit faster.**

2nd Aff: Eduard Strok

Feedback: **I liked that you pointed that the decline in the death penalty means that we don't need it and can abolish it. Good job pointing out that the constitutionality is not what we are voting on. Make sure not to cut off opponents too suddenly in CX.**

1st Neg: Danny Bennett

Feedback: **You had very good structure. You used vocal variations very effectively. I was not sure that pointing out that the death penalty is in decline supported your side.**

2nd Neg: Gabriella Hakopian

Feedback: **You used pathos arguments very well. I thought you had good pivots in CX. Try not to say European countries are less democratic than the US (I don't think this is true and sounds ethnocentric.) I also do not think Washington has reinstated the death penalty.**

Round: Round 1

Judge Chantelle Gossner

Aff Team: Bushnell Wurst-Wurst vs Neg Team: ISU Reynolds-Reynolds

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The neg successfully argues that a no-fly zone has unique, substantive harms such as increasing the likelihood of escalation, and that a no-fly zone does not have clear benefits since Russia is not using their air superiority against Ukraine in the status quo. Aff has good argumentation about why we have a moral obligation to support Ukraine, but doesn't have clear impacts on how a no-fly zone would materially improve Ukraine's situation.

1st Aff: Wurst

Feedback: Good historical references and interpretation of meaning, need more current expert opinions/predictions on outcomes to compete on impacts, great organization in constructive but needs some work on line-by-line/tagging in later speeches - try going straight down the flow and see how that works for you. I would like more details on the judgement frame - give us some more interpretation and burdens. I'm hesitant to buy your analysis that the no-fly zone would be implemented after the situation changes, especially when it doesn't come up in your initial framing/constructive. If you're going to make a major argument like this about interpretation of the resolution, make sure it comes in early. Great confidence, smoothness, and speaking skills.

2nd Aff: Wurst

Feedback: N/A - maverick

1st Neg: Reynolds

Feedback: **Really great cx questions that build upon one another! You mention that you "have a problem " with aff's framing of US as unilateral or multilateral, but then tell us you're not going to argue about it because your argumentation applies to both - I wouldn't recommend bringing up a "beef" with the framing/defs unless you are going to make a substantive argument against them. Good work on voters.**

2nd Neg: Reynolds

Feedback: **N/A - maverick**

Round: Round 1

Judge William Andersen

Aff Team: SGSU Cyril Goud-Chan vs Neg Team: ISU Garrett-Saunders

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The NEG won the solvency argument with their arguments supporting the idea that a no fly zone would increase the risk of escalation (and therefore increased damage to civilian life and infrastructure).

1st Aff: Nicholas Chan

Feedback: **You were very well organized and presented a very solid case. Your vocal delivery was also excellent. You seemed to get very flustered during cross-ex... it is oaky to say "I don't know" if you don't know. For example, your opponent asked you if any of the countries in your WW2 example had nuclear arsenals... if you don't know the answer, simply say that you don't know. None of us are expected to know everything. :) Thank you for a very good debate!**

2nd Aff: Cyril Goud

Feedback: **Your argument in the 2NC (escalation would not happen) was very well supported (desertions, breakdown of equipment and 'wars cost cash' and the Russian economy is in shambles) was outstanding. As a suggestion: Your rebuttal should focus upon 'voting issues'. New arguments should all be presented in the constructive (except for 1AR being allowed to refute arguments that are first introduced in 2NC), so that you can use the 3 minute 2AR speech to explain how your side won the debate. Thank you for a very good debate!**

1st Neg: Bryant Saunders

Feedback: Overall, you did an outstanding job! Your argumentation was well organized and you had very good delivery. My main suggestion: When your partner is being cross examined, avoid talking to her. Not only can it interrupt her own thoughts and throw her off, but it also communicates to the judge and your opponents (and partner) that you really do not trust your partner to be able to come up with the responses and arguments. Thank you for a very good debate!

2nd Neg: Camryn Garrett

Feedback: Your cross examination of the 1st AFF was excellent. You poked holes in the AFF case and set your partner up for the 1NC... exactly what an effective 1st NEG C-X should do. Your rebuttal was also outstanding. You focused upon the voting issues and left the 2AR in a challenging position of arguing against your side and defending the AFF claim on the ballot. The major area for improvement: Your constructive should extend and build on the Neg case (rather than just summarize the points your partner already built), and you need to respond/refute the 2AC's argument on escalation. Thank you for a very good debate!

Round: Round 1

Judge Kristin Taylor

Aff Team: USU GarrettMulholland vs Neg Team: ISU TylerTyler

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Neg better addresses and carries through the arguments that the affirmative's case does not win their own argument for utilitarianism because their own examples do not cover a majority of citizens, and if it doesn't cover the majority of citizens then they can't win on citizen happiness either which where the affirmative's frameworks.

1st Aff: Ethan Garrett

Feedback: **Great job of setting up the groundwork. When going through your roadmap in the rebuttal it could have been helpful to say that you're going to cover the specific items that should be voted on and that anything that gets dropped isn't as important as the things you will talk about.**

2nd Aff: Richard Mulholland

Feedback: **I think you did a great job of addressing the negative arguments by saying that there is too much National Security overreach, but I think you maybe needed to hit not that there aren't examples of balance, but rather that things like the internment camps wouldn't have happened if civil liberties had been considered for even a moment beforehand?**

1st Neg: Joseph Tyler

Feedback: **Great job of covering that even an answer of equal civil rights and national security would win, you carried that through your whole case. Some of the negative arguments leaned a little heavy on the side of Nat.**

Security heavily over Civil Liberties, and if the affirmative had caught that they might have been able to flip the idea of balance, so watch out for that.

2nd Neg: Alyson Tyler

Feedback: I really appreciated you road mapping that you would only cover part of the argument. I also appreciated you emphasizing the argument that their examples did not impact a majority of citizens. Some of the negative arguments leaned a little heavy on the side of Nat. Security heavily over Civil Liberties, and if the affirmative had caught that they might have been able to flip the idea of balance, so watch out for that.

Round: Round 2

Judge Julie Badgley

Aff Team: USU GarrettSaunders vs Neg Team: CSU EncisoTalebloo

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The aff was convincing that crypto had significant harms like climate issues and volatility that are too risky to allow to continue. The neg side could not offer benefits to outweigh these harms.

1st Aff: Bryant Saunders

Feedback: **You had very clear structure. I liked your CX answer on volatility. Good job focusing on what security really means. If you are going to have a plan, consider getting to it a bit sooner.**

2nd Aff: Camryn Garrett

Feedback: **You went down the flow well to address all arguments. You had a good point to refute the underbanked argument that businesses won't accept volatile crypto. I am not sure bringing back crypto after regulations was a necessary part of your argument.**

1st Neg: Maya Enciso

Feedback: **I thought your point about crypto helping the underbanked was a strong one for your side. Make sure that the questions you ask in CX are likely to help your side.**

2nd Neg: Melika Talebloo

Feedback: **You had very good structure. I could follow your case well. Try to give a bit more detail and evidence for all of your contentions.**

Round: Round 2

Judge Johnathan Venable

Aff Team: USU Christensen/Hernandez vs Neg Team: SJSU TaTerrell

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Today's debate was a great back and forth debate. There were three main contentions argued in today's debate. Climate Crisis, Scams, and Volatility. I felt that the Neg was able to refute all three of these contentions effectively and efficiently and therefore, I flowed all three contentions to the Neg today. Great job and keep up the great work!

1st Aff: CLARISSA H.

Feedback: **Great job in today's debate. You did a great job in your 1AC speech. You laid out three strong contentions, however, it was defending those contentions that I felt was the weak link for the Aff team in this debate. The Neg was able to refute each of the 3 contentions and I didn't feel the Aff was able to bounce back with further information to defend those contentions. Great job all the way around!**

2nd Aff: SOPHIE

Feedback: **Great job in today's debate. You did a great job in your 2AC speech. You laid out three strong contentions, however, it was defending those contentions that I felt were the weak link for the Aff team in this debate. The Neg was able to refute each of the 3 contentions and I didn't feel the Aff was able to bounce back with further information to defend those contentions. Great job all the way around!**

1st Neg: Carter TA

Feedback: **Great job in today's debate. You did a great job in your 1NC speech. You and your partner did a great job in tag-teaming the contentions presented by your opponent and, as a result, you were able to refute all of them and win the debate. Great job!**

2nd Neg: Ryan

Feedback: **Great job in today's debate. You did a great job in your 2NC speech. You and your partner did a great job in tag-teaming the contentions presented by your opponent and, as a result, you were able to refute all of them and win the debate. Great job!**

Round: Round 2

Judge Kaleb Webb

Aff Team: Tyler-Tyler vs Neg Team: Goud-Chan

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Aff showed harms that fell within established U.S. legal framework, particularly misinformation causing deaths and danger during natural disasters such as Hurricane Ida. Neg left a large amount of the Aff constructives unaddressed, particularly the Harm of natural disaster misinformation, parts of the plan like banning targeted content / making Social Media companies legally liable for misinformation, and the Solvency of allowing individuals to sue Social Media companies. Neg had some good arguments against hate speech and medical mistrust being clear and present danger, but their attacks on Aff solvency were solved by U.S. covering the costs of increased moderation / coding teams.

1st Aff: Joseph Tyler

Feedback: **Great job getting the 1AC out within the 4 minute time, you didn't have too many subpoints in that first speech so it was easy to follow. You did a really good job keeping track of your partner's arguments and directly referencing them in your own rebuttals. Your analysis of hate speech / medical misinfo could have been a bit stronger, you largely warded off Neg arguments but there was room for doubt.**

2nd Aff: Alyson Tyler

Feedback: **Really great job covering four neg contentions and reestablishing the 1AC in five minutes. You spoke quickly but your outline was very clear, which made it easy to follow. You followed your partner's debate really well and directly referenced it in your own rebuttals. Your point about the Citizens United double bind left me with some questions, if a company didn't include rules against hate speech or misinfo, how would that work within this? Neg didn't attack that point though, so it stood throughout the round.**

1st Neg: Cyril Goud

Feedback: **You had a strong 1NC off-case with four contentions, and you did a good job defending those contentions throughout the round. The biggest issue was that you never directly addressed Aff's 1AC arguments - you referenced them at times within your own points, such as bringing up hate speech when talking about Freedom of Speech, but you needed a section of your case dedicated to attacking the Aff case line-by-line. Because that didn't happen, a few key arguments from the Aff were dropped.**

2nd Neg: Nicholas Chan

Feedback: **You did a good job defending the Neg case throughout the round, and you expanded on your partner's points well. You had a couple of long pauses in your speeches that blunted the impact of your arguments.**

Round: Round 2

Judge William Andersen

Aff Team: ISU ReynoldsReynolds vs Neg Team: USU GarrettMulholland

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: While both teams did an outstanding job, the RFD is as follows: The AFF established the criteria of cost-benefit analysis on BOTH the US and Iran. While both teams did a good job of discussing the cost VS benefits to the US, the AFF presented very strong arguments on the benefits to Iran (education, transportation, reducing poverty) of easing the sanctions.

1st Aff: Jordan Reynolds

Feedback: **You laid out a very strong case and were very organized. You also did a good job in the 1AR summarizing the arguments to that point and setting up your 2AR. The suggestion I would give is to slow down a bit... there were times when you were speaking faster than necessary. Thank you for the excellent debate! :)**

2nd Aff: Jordan Reynolds

Feedback: **You did a very good job with point by point refutation. Suggestions: This speech was a bit harder to follow at times (it was not as organized as your 1AC). Also, when you make a point that seems counter-intuitive, you may want to take a moment and explain why it is true. You mentioned that easing sanctions (which would lower cost of oil) would reduce demand for oil through 'supply and demand'. The Law of Demand states that a lower cost would increase, not decrease, quantity demanded. You should take a moment and explain the reasoning why it would not work that way--especially because this argument went against a key NEG argument (keeping sanctions can help green energy).**

1st Neg: Ethan Garrett

Feedback: You did a very good job of responding to Aff case impacts and laying out a very well organized and reasoned NEG case. You also did a good job of challenging benefits to US (domestic production + Green energy = US doesn't need Iranian oil). Suggestion: You made a bold argument at the top of 1NC that the AFF plan is just the status quo. You should have presented support for that claim. Thank you for the excellent debate! :)

2nd Neg: Richard Mulholland

Feedback: Excellent responses to AFF refutation of 1NC. Your vocal delivery was also very good...:) You did a good job of focusing on voting issues in your rebuttal. Suggestion: The hole in the NEG attack against AFF case is the benefits to Iran claimed by the AFF. When you are 2NEG, you want to use your constructive (as last opportunity to present new NEG args) to attack any part of AFF case that is still standing. In this case, that would have been the AFF claim that lifting sanctions would benefit Iran.... or build up more costs to US to lifting sanctions. Thank you for the excellent debate! :)

Round: Round 2

Judge Kristin Taylor

Aff Team: ISU HelmVaughn vs Neg Team: SU StrokStrok

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The affirmative had good evidence showing that there is an example (Germany) who changed their social media laws and that it helped solve the harms presented by the affirmative. The negative presented compelling ideas about how democracy could be threatened by regulating through the government, but had no evidence to refute the affirmative's solvency.

1st Aff: Ashley Helm

Feedback: **I appreciated the way you pulled your arguments through to the AR and addressed the the democracy issue from the Neg. I believe it would have served your case better to pull the Germany evidence to refute the argument that corporations will just shut down rather than deal with lawsuits.**

2nd Aff: Abbey Vaughn

Feedback: **Very solid summation. I appreciated that you brought the evidence about Germany back showing how they successfully pulled off the Affirmative plan and democracy didn't crumble. As I mentioned, a more direct attack on the idea that the government could become corrupt and turn into a state like Russia would have put the affirmative case in a more secure position.**

1st Neg: Eduard Strok

Feedback: **I believe your strongest arguments from the beginning were that hateful comments could still be used (people will find a way around the system) and that political polarization will impede the plan's ability to succeed. Evidence would have been your friend in this case. You needed**

evidence either to refute any one of their points or to make your points stronger.

2nd Neg: Eduard Strok

Feedback: Your final rebuttal was your strongest speech. You really hit the idea that if the national government decides what's true and what's not, and they can make it illegal for opposing views to be heard it's a slippery slope to becoming a state like Russia or China, the negative just had a stronger position by showing evidence that Germany has already done this plan and that did not happen to them. You could have tried to argue that Germany is maybe less politically polarized than the U.S.

Round: Round 3

Judge Kaleb Webb

Aff Team: Helm-Vaughn vs Neg Team: Wurst-Wurst

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: AFF highlighted in the 2AC that the entire first constructive had been dropped by the NEG, and this continued to be true until NEG brought up one AFF argument about emotional benefits of cheaper housing in the 1NR and left the others unaddressed for the entirety of the round. This left NEG on the defensive for most of the debate, as AFF's case stood intact while they attacked the NEG off-case throughout the round. AFF showed that housing makes up a majority of cost-of-living, which dulled the impact of NEG's first contention about urban areas being unaffordable.

1st Aff: Ashley Helm

Feedback: **Great job holding your opponent to the definitions of the round, especially with urban areas including more than just the main part of the city. The point in your 1AR about urban areas being within 100 miles of the city was a new argument, which I would advise against in the future. However, your point that it doesn't have to be in NYC/LA/Seattle, and it doesn't have to be downtown still stood.**

2nd Aff: Abbey Vaughn

Feedback: **You had really good, fleshed-out rebuttals. Good job highlighting NEG's dropping of the entire AFF constructive, but dedicate some brief time to reaffirming those arguments a bit so they're still fresh and present throughout the round.**

1st Neg: Anthony Wurst

Feedback: **Good job filling the 2NC / 1NR back to back 7 minute speech by yourself, it can be hard to talk for that long but you filled all the time. You**

didn't directly address a single argument from AFF's first constructive until your 1NR, which significantly harmed the impact of your arguments. Dedicate some time in your first constructive speech toward directly addressing your opponent's case. If you're unsure of definitions because you didn't hear them, ask during your cross-examination time.

2nd Neg: N/A

Feedback: N/A

Round: Round 3

Judge Julie Badgley

Aff Team: USU ChristensenHernandez vs Neg Team: ISU ReynoldsReynolds

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The neg had stronger impacts on their side including the degradation of soil, human rights abuses, and worsening of the housing crisis.

1st Aff: Clarissa Hernandez

Feedback: **I liked that you highlighted that climate change and the resolution will effect even people without houses like the homeless. Make sure you coordinate the plan with your partner a bit better.**

2nd Aff: Sophie Christensen

Feedback: **You had very good structure and evidence in your case. You summarized the round well. Watch your time in the first speech to leave more time for your second and third contentions.**

1st Neg: Jordan Reynolds

Feedback: **Excellent structure. I liked the human rights focus. Try to leave just a bit more time to refute in the first speech.**

2nd Neg: Jordan Reynolds

Feedback: **You weighed the round very well. You had very good voters. I liked that you went back to your strong evidence. I was just a bit unsure on how this negative returns on solar energy works.**

Round: Round 3

Judge Andy Christensen

Aff Team: Ethan & Richard vs Neg Team: Maya & Melika

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The affirmative carries the round based on well-built framework with is specific and beneficial. The definition of "top 1/3" really assists the "one of the best" argument. The range of arguments in proving the case (commercial success, music/song lyric analysis, and the issue of the diversity issue) are all solid. The neg doesn't attack thoroughly the LGBTQ issue raised in !A.

1st Aff: Ethan

Feedback: **I think you laid out an excellent case here with generous definitions and realistic parameters in which to both make your argument and include all kinds of refutation from the opposition. Please work on speaking more declaratively -- you occasionally sound as if you are less certain than you are.**

2nd Aff: Richard

Feedback: **You readily work within your partners parameters and properly extend the additional point (music). Nice, clear, clean voters. Great research backs your capstone points late in the round.**

1st Neg: Maya

Feedback: **Your case is interesting although it needs just a little more structure by way of signposting. For improvement, I hope you'll think about what nonverbals say about the neg team while the aff team is still presenting; there is a little fun in an eye roll, but it could be hurtful.**

2nd Neg: Melika

Feedback: **Your work has great organization but a little more depth (sub points, research, citations) would be deadly strong in defeating the opposition. You're a good presenter. Great attitude.**