

**The ballots are in order based on  
Round 1, 2, 3, elims**

**Many judges did not complete  
comments unfortunately.**

## **Round: Round 1**

Judge Okwudili Onyekwelu

**Aff Team: CSU San Marcos Hakopian Hakopian vs Neg Team: Owensboro RushTaylor**

**Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** Neg team adequately rebutted the contentions brought up by affirmative team and affirmative did not contend with any of the points brought up by the neg against the affirmatives plan.

**1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Hakopian (28.3)**

Feedback: **Spoke with good control/speed and clarity, I liked her intro and hook. Work on developing a clear plan from the beginning or policy, gives the debate more to discuss.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: NA**

Feedback: **NA**

**1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Rush (28.9)**

Feedback: **Had great contentions and understanding of what was required in the round. When you know you're winning no need to "rub it in".**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Talyor (27.9)**

Feedback: **Had good presence towards the end as you got more comfortable. Slow down you know what you need to say, take your time**

## **Round: Round 1**

Judge Brad Phelps

**Aff Team: Texas Southern JohnsonSheppard vs Neg Team: Idaho St TylerTyler**

### **Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** The NEG successfully argued that the AFF not arguing the round as a policy did not give them room to debate and the AFF did not give enough reason that regulations would solve the problems they laid out. The NEG successfully argued solutions other than regulations that could address the problems laid out by the AFF.

### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Merrit Johnson**

Feedback: **Great job! Make sure if not going to use a traditional framing of the topic as the AFF that you have a strong argument for it and leave enough ground for the NEG to fairly argue.**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Brittney**

Feedback: **Great job! Make sure if not going to use a traditional framing of the topic as the AFF that you have a strong argument for it and leave enough ground for the NEG to fairly argue.**

### **1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Alyson**

Feedback: **Excellent job - very clear arguments and consistent throughout. No suggestions for improvement.**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Joseph**

Feedback: **Great job! You made a really great opening arguments and were consistently strong throughout. No suggestions for improvement.**

## **Round: Round 1**

Judge Liam Donnelly

**Aff Team: Texas Southern EkezieHair-Jones vs Neg Team: Owensboro DanielDaniel**

### **Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** First, the framework: The negative wins that this is a fact round because the topic asks whether something will or won't happen. The affirmative's response is that the topic entails a prediction, not a fact - but the negative makes clear that something can be factual prediction.

Deciding this, I turn to the arguments about the factual questions. First, the affirmative wins that there will be gerrymandering in the 2022 elections. The negative's response is merely that democrats have power, so they'll be able to gerrymander, but the affirmative cites specific instances of republicans doing illicit gerrymandering acts even now, during the democrat's power.

Second, the negative wins that Biden is popular now -- the claim that the negative's approval ratings evidence is superior to the aff's is unanswered, and the negative wins that a 53% approval rating indicates popularity (the affirmative's responses are inconsistent between the 1ar and 2ar).

Third, the negative also wins that Virginia will be a wake-up call for democrats - they will recognize they need to kick into gear and do a lot more to win the house.

There is nothing resembling "impact comparison" here - if the affirmative had said "the effects of gerrymandering are greater than the effect of the dems kicking into gear," easy round. Ditto to the negative saying "the dems kicking into gear kill any impact gerrymandering might have."

Because there's no impact comparison, and I think gerrymandering and the virginia wake-up call both plausibly indicate whether the repubs or dems will win, I view the approval ratings argument as a tie-breaker indicating a slightly greater chance of Ds winning, and vote negative.

**1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Deionna Hair-Jones**

Feedback: **I think you do a nice job of making and structuring arguments and using evidence.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Gloria Ekezie**

Feedback: **You make a lot of strong arguments and utilize evidence in a strong way. Make sure to keep track of and accurately describe each individual contention in the constructives.**

**1<sup>st</sup> Neg: David Daniel**

Feedback: **Good job explaining your arguments and coming up with strong responses to the aff's contentions. Work on splitting the block, impact comparisons, and making voting issues beyond "we won our arguments, they didn't clash," etc. Make sure to extend your contentions specifically one-by-one in the final speech.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: David Daniel**

Feedback: **above**

## **Round: Round 1**

Judge Johnathan Venable

**Aff Team: UW Bothell MuiangaSearle vs Neg Team: Negative Texas Southern ConleyThompson:**

### **Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** As we discussed in our feedback, this round was awarded to the Neg for the simple reason that the Aff did not offer any argument(s) that supported the topic or that swayed me one way or the other. Historical precedence did not offer anything that would convince the listener any certain thing would/would not happen in the 2022 elections. Coalition of interest argument was defined/explained as to what it is, but was not linked back to how this would/would not affect the outcome of the 2022 elections.

### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Quinn Searle**

Feedback: **Great job with speed of delivery and great job explaining/defining the main points of debate. However, I would've liked to have seen you really present a couple of STRONG/SPECIFIC arguments as to why Dems would lose the house in 2022 and then defend those arguments throughout.**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Celeuca Muianga**

Feedback: **Great job putting together what all you did as you did. I got the feeling you were a little confused on your partner's original constructive/arguments, hence making it difficult to use the majority of your allotted time (you only used 2 min of your 5 min for your constructive).**

### **1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Jervani Thompson**

Feedback: **I know it was difficult for you due to your audio challenges, however, know that none of the tech issues had any effect on your speaker**

**points, the decision, etc. Good job pivoting, adjusting, and working strategically with your partner to overcome those audio issues. I would encourage you to focus on forming/attacking good, strong, arguments vs. offering so many philosophical/technical arguments/defenses, etc. Keep it simple.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Shamus Conley**

**Feedback: Great job jumping in and finishing for your partner when he lost audio. As I told your partner, I would encourage you to focus on forming/attacking good, strong, arguments vs. offering so many philosophical/technical arguments/defenses, etc. Keep it simple.**

## **Round: Round 1**

Judge Julie Badgley

**Aff Team: San Jose St GonzalezGonzalez vs Neg Team: Texas Southern  
DaviesJarrett**

**Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** The neg won mainly on framework, specifically criteria. Once aff does not give me a criteria, I go with neg criteria. The criteria ended up being autonomy, the neg was the only team with an autonomy argument, which was not refuted.

**1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Virjillio Gonzalez**

Feedback: **I liked that you continued to work through the debate. Your points were logical, and with a different criteria could have won. Try to give some citations for the evidence you give. If you are confused by fancy debate words, just rely on logic. Look for holes in the definitions they gave me.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Same**

Feedback: **Same**

**1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Tarriana Jarrett**

Feedback: **Good job settling on a criteria that was favorable to your side. The round was mainly won of framework. I would not remind the aff to define in CX, once he forgets, that is your advantage. I am also not sure you are using the word perm correctly, it is a test of competitiveness (usually used by the aff to test a counterplan). I am not sure you can regulate something you want to get rid of. I think you had a counterplan.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Debra Davies**



Feedback: **I really liked that you focused on the framework and criteria, because I really thought it was the strong part of your case. It is good to remind the judge why you are winning on this metric. Your voter speech was very strong as well. I would just have some questions about achieving inclusivity. I thought this was a weak part of the case. Do we have to include hateful or criminal content? Under your definitions we might. Try to be aware that this could come up against you in a different debate.**

## **Round: Round 1**

Judge Yves Martin

**Aff Team: TSU - Rollins-White vs Neg Team: U Portland - Sunderland-Sunderland**

### **Won the Debate: Aff**

**Reason for Decision:** Debate was a toss-up, but ultimately shaded to the affirmative. Impact was proven, but significance of impact was left out. For example, current mandates cause us socially, politically, and economically - but to what extent? We have a divided country, but what exactly does this mean? Negative brought this up, but didn't make it their central point and didn't hammer it home. I might have gone negative, but only if they could have proven their case. Unfortunately, evidence was lacking. I think the affirmative team had plan meet need problems (re. the concept of autonomy), but negative brought this up in rebuttals. Tough round to judge. Please think about our discussion after the round.

### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Brynn White**

Feedback: **Great organization, nice cross-examination. I would spend less time on definitions, unless they are tactically beneficially. I didn't see the tactical advantage in this round.**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Deja Rollins**

Feedback: **Good organization. I would have liked to have you seen you provide the impact (socially, politically, and economically - see above), versus essentially repeating the points. Again, why should I care? How does it affect me?**

### **1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Gavin Sunderland**

Feedback: **You're just going to get better. It's a decided advantage to not have a partner. We discussed a lot of things - but evidence, inherency, plan meet need - are all things to concentrate on. Also, I'd love to see you use**

**your cross-ex to destroy the affirmative's evidence. Set yourself up for your next speech. Finally - their case, then yours - this allows you to finish strong.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Gavin Sunderland**

Feedback: **See above.**

## Round: Round 2

Judge Jack Bradley

**Aff Team: Affirmative Texas Southern DaviesJarrett: vs Neg Team:  
Negative CSU San Marcos HakopianHakopian:**

### **Won the Debate: Aff**

**Reason for Decision:** The negative did not have a Value/Criterion, or any other weigh to frame/evaluate the debate, so I default to the Affirmative's Value/Criterion of Utility. That framework lacked a criterion to uphold the Value of Utility, but they implicitly argued that this criterion was Inclusivity.

With that framing in mind, the most important argument of this debate came down to whether or not the Negatives benefits of privatization of space could exist in the Affirmative world. The Affirmative argued this quite well throughout the debate, with little response from the Negative. The negative is probably winning that there are significant benefits/advantages to privatizing space exploration, that billionaire dollars have always been in space (and likely always will be). The problem is that the affirmative is winning on the inclusivity debate that the current model only benefits the 1%.

I think the negative would have won this debate if they could have proved that any additional restrictions would limit the advantages of privatized space. I think that a good parallel to prove this point is that the billionaire tax in the US failed because republicans believed that a new round of restrictions, taxes in this case, would lead to billionaires, like these space folks from this debate, to do business elsewhere. Alas, this discussion point didn't happen, so I vote Affirmative.

### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Davis**

Feedback: **I don't think you need that many definitions in such a short debate. Adding some framework or a resolutionary analysis would be strategic.**

**I think a Value/Criterion of Inclusivity rather than Utility would have been a stronger argument. I think your argumentation about inclusivity and the problems with the 1% in space exploration were great. Perhaps inclusivity is the criterion that upholds the value of Utility.**

**I don't understand your plan. You specified some important topics for sure, but what is the plan text? What is the affirmative proposing? Obviously restricting private space exploration, but what specifically?**

**Silence is not a virtue of affirmation by any means. That is not a universally held belief in Debate.**

**I think your rebuttal was fantastic. Awesome, well communicated voters.**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Jarrett**

**Feedback: You can't just start rattling off sources near the end of the speech, you have to cite them where you are specifically using them.**

**I think arguing that Neg's arguments flow Affirmative is a fantastic idea in this debate. The problem that I have with this, is there isn't much in the way of explanation on how the mechanism of the Affirmative plan accomplishes this. Hopefully I hear more about that later on in this debate.**

**The final rebuttal speech in this debate was fantastic. Great extension of your partner's rebuttal, well executed and summarized, and helped make my decision easier.**

### **1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Hakopian**

**Feedback: There was definitely a lot of substantive information to go off of in the Aff's first speech. You're right, lots of definitions, but that wasn't the entirety of that speech. I think that conceding that the burden of the Affirmative is to frame the debate is a mistake. I would read a competing framework or resolution analysis on the neg side that would help your side of this debate immensely. Especially when your opponents are arguing that all of your points flow to their side.**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Hakopian**

**Feedback: I enjoyed your opening of this speech highlighting some relevant stories of citizens benefiting from space privatization.**

**The 2nd neg constructive substantially lacked clash against the Affirmative's most important argument against your case. They are arguing that in the world of the Affirmative, the negatives**

**impacts/benefits exist in the Affirmative world, but better. It would be a world with more inclusivity in the affirmative world. Without a response to that in the 2nd neg constructive or the 1NR, that is a significant concern.**

**I think you highlight some fantastic reasons in favor of privatization, but you fail to explain why those don't happen in the Affirmative world.**

## **Round: Round 2**

Judge Liam Donnelly

**Aff Team: Texas Southern ConleyThompson vs Neg Team: San Jose St GonzalezGonzalez**

### **Won the Debate: Aff**

**Reason for Decision:** The affirmative wins that private space exploration creates pollution (not really answered) and that it furthers elitism through a profit motive (although there should be a greater impact to this, the negative's only response is a warrantless claim that companies would want to bring more non-rich people to space). The negative's central argument is that research sharing can reduce the harms of pollution, particularly through the creation of reusable technologies, but this argument only shows that the negative effects of space exploration are less bad than the affirmative thinks, not that they are necessarily good. Beyond that, the negative fails to impact any of the "competition creates innovation" arguments - no explanation as to what specific innovation with which specific effects might result from private space competition. So, the aff wins some offense, the neg doesn't have an impact to theirs.

### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Jervani Thompson**

Feedback: **You do a good job of structuring your 1AC. Remember to apply arguments you've already made where relevant - eg, apply your definition of space exploration (limited to tourism) to their arguments about furthering research.**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Shamus Conley**

Feedback: **You do a good job of identifying points of clash with the other team and explaining, in the 2AR, why you win them. Work on structure - make it clear which contention you're on, which argument you're responding to.**

**1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Virgilio Gonzalez**

Feedback: **Your arguments are smart responses to the other side's claims, but remember fundamentals (like responding, where appropriate, to definitions) and to have your own offense. Work on structure (make it clear what you're responding to, what your contentions are, etc), and on having impacts for your specific arguments.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Virgilio Gonzalez**

Feedback: **above**



## **Round: Round 2**

Judge Barnaba

**Aff Team: David Daniel (Maverick) vs Neg Team: Barker-Helm**

**Won the Debate: Aff**

**Reason for Decision:** Aff was the only team to debate the actual resolution & to give voters.

**1<sup>st</sup> Aff: David Daniel**

Feedback: **Great speaking voice, just watch your language, "trying to PUNK us" can be seen as offensive.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Maverick refer to above.**

Feedback: **Maverick refer to above.**

**1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Barker**

Feedback: **Good adaptability, but remember the case should be about whether they should or shouldn't defend, not about whether they will or won't go to nuclear war.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Helm**

Feedback: **Good clarity in argumentation, however never contradict what your patterned has already established.**

## **Round: Round 2**

Judge Julie Badgley

**Aff Team: Owensboro RushTaylor vs Neg Team: Texas Southern RollinsWhite**

### **Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** I voted neg on several counts. First, I buy their argument that the resolution is US not NATO focused, and implies a defensive US position. I think their harms were worse on balance in that a war between two super powers has greater harms than the US showing strength and sending a message to Xi. The economy, location and message, did not outweigh the supply and possible nuclear war harms. The aff also did seem to change actors between US and NATO throughout the round. Additionally, the aff did seem to claim that we were getting really close to war, and that we are prepared to go to war (in CX) but then your case also said with US defense there would not be war. This seems contradictory.

### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Heaven Taylor**

Feedback: **You had a clear structure to your case. I liked that you tried to go back to the aff definitions at the end. Try giving me more reasons for your contentions. This may require fewer contentions to be clear. Why do we need to show US power? Why is this useful?**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Caleb Rush**

Feedback: **I liked that you pointed out the points that you thought the opponents dropped. Make it clear between you and your partner who the actor is US or NATO. I think the cyber argument was dangerous to bring up in CX. Are we willing to go to war over a hack?**

### **1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Brynn White**

Feedback: **Great CX. I loved how you nailed down that a military attack would make war more likely. This helps me weigh your harms in the net**

**ben criteria. I would have loved to hear the world alignment argument brought back up, as I thought it was very interesting and could be very convincing.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Deja Rollins**

**Feedback: You had great highlighting of the resolution and what was actually implied by it. Mainly a defensive US, not NATO position. I also liked the focus on the NATO discrepancy. I would have liked to hear about the cyber point that came up in CX. I know you had to pick what you attacked due to time, but that one could have been strong.**

## **Round: Round 2**

Judge Julie Badgley

**Aff Team: U Portland SunderlandSunderland vs Neg Team: Texas Southern  
WallaceWilliams**

### **Won the Debate: Aff**

**Reason for Decision:** I was not given a solid reason to not favor aff criteria so framework presumption is aff. I thought the aff plan help solve for climate change better, even if I accept neg harms. I also thought that the neg was unconvincing in their framework argument. I have never seen required that we provide a very specific budget on the aff or their plan is bad. Try to spend more time on the actual substance of the debate. Debate is fiat, we assume the plan will pass and be put into action.

### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Gavin Sunderland**

Feedback: **Good job sticking to your case and the climate change criteria. You handled the framework challenge well. Great job challenging the interest group sources. Try to tell me a bit more about the harms of other energy sources. It is hard for me to compare when I know nothing about them.**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Same**

Feedback: **Same**

### **1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Mikayla Wallace**

Feedback: **I really liked your point about geo energy not being useful in the areas where we need it most. I thought this was your most convincing point and would have liked to heard more about it later in the round. Try telling me who the harms of geo hurt most with your groundwater contention. I am familiar with less specific plans in IPDA.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Alexander Williams**

Feedback: **You argued a clear case. You laid out the framework challenge well, I just did not buy it. The point of a US gov source versus an interest group source was not strong. I will believe the government is less bias than an interest group. Your team's harms point on earthquakes and groundwater were stronger.**

## **Round: Round 2**

Judge Bob Glenn

**Aff Team: Tyler/Tyler vs Neg Team: Williams/Wallace**

### **Won the Debate: Aff**

**Reason for Decision:** Aff has a pretty decent case structure with 3 contentions promoting the Public Management of Space. However, had the Negative noted some contradictions and limited impacts (e.g. Contention III could be argued to be completely non-unique to space) that would have been a solid approach.

As it is, Negative argues that this is a policy resolution (and I don't disagree) but as a tabula rasa judge and with the elements of IPDA guidelines trumpeted by the AFF on several occasions. Aff has a lot of leeway to interpret the resolution anyway they want. However, 2AC argument regarding no agent of action in the topic (e.g. USFG) is a winner in that regard for AFF.

On another level, Neg you had all kinds of good arguments about private space benefits and that we have never seen so much activity because of private companies. Also, I thought you'd argue savings to tax payers and a replication of effort by having private companies lead the way. Failure is expensive so let the multi-billionaires eat those costs where necessary.

Neg you also allowed them to get away with the technology and innovation benefit which really only seemed to involve shooting a 90 year old William Shatner into the exo-sphere.

Neg was right to clash with case and produce several arguments about problems with public programs, but also tout the many benefits of a three headed approach (Bezos, Branson, and Musk) competing to get to MARS first.

I was very disappointed in a round this long that noone talked about colonization and getting to MARS first. You all had plenty of time to address this and just never mentioned it once.

**1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Mr. Tyler**

Feedback: **Excellent organization. You go a bit fast, but not as fast as the 2AC. Good questions and answers to questions. You are very good at analysis. and you presented information at a balanced pace.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Ms. Tyler**

Feedback: **You are going way too fast for no reason. Slow down and provide quality over quantity in terms of analysis and impacts in the constructive and the rebuttal. Good job citing Neg contradictions and the topic framework. You are a very good speaker-SLOW DOWN!!**

**1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Mr. Williams**

Feedback: **Work on organization You are a wonderful speaker and I liked listening to you. Be sure to not the big picture. You had the right side of the topic and you need to stress all the benefits of private space exploration instead of getting mired only in AC case arguments.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Mr. Wallace**

Feedback: **You need to work on delivery and especially posture while on camera. Try to pick a comfortable sitting position and stay oriented toward the camera. Your rebuttal was disorganized and really hard to follow. I liked your passion and your answers in cross exam.**

**You have a lot of potential individually and as a team!!**

## **Round: Round 3**

Judge Johnathan Venable

**Aff Team: Texas Southern Johnson Sheppard: vs Neg Team: UW Bothell  
Muianga Searle:**

### **Won the Debate: Aff**

**Reason for Decision:** Aff was awarded this round because their one, main/only argument was presented and defended from start to finish, however, I really would have liked to have seen/heard more arguments to support the topic. Not many (1-3 at most) as it's about quality, not quantity in IPDA....

### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Merritt Johnson**

Feedback: **Great job with delivery of speech (speed/clarity, etc). I would encourage you to form about 2-3 STRONG arguments to support your topic and defend those arguments profusely from start to finish of debate. IPDA is about the arguments, not all of the other (plans, policy, etc), therefore, it's imperative that the Aff. clearly present what those arguments are and then defend them profusely throughout.**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Brittney Sheppard**

Feedback: **Not to sound like a broken record, I would encourage you to also take note of the feedback given to your partner. Great job overall though!**

### **1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Quinn Searle**

Feedback: **Quinn, I was impressed in both debates I judged you in as far as your abilities with speech/debate in general. I can tell that you have great potential, would encourage you to not doubt yourself so much and be confident in your abilities.**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Celeuca Muianga**



Feedback: **Great job Celeuca. Great job coming up with some counter arguments and presenting those in the debate (i.e. More classes detrimental to people of color, etc). I want to also encourage you to be confident in your talents and abilities and remain positive throughout the debate as those types of things definitely show through to the other debaters/judges via what we say, how we say it, body language, and so forth.**

## **Round: Round 3**

Judge Jack Bradley

**Aff Team: San Jose St GonzalezGonzalez: vs Neg Team: Texas Southern Hall and Hall**

### **Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** This was a tough topic! I would have struck this one first because it is so difficult to frame a debate like this. I think that both debaters could have done for more energy and engagement with the topic. Introducing humor, fun facts, and other perhaps non-traditional debate jargon and techniques is often helpful in a topic that is so out there. Making claims like, "Elton John is one of the greatest artists of all time!" Or "Abba's Dancing Queen is the best song ever released!" is a great In general, there was a real lack of clash in this debate due to how the "goal posts" of the debate were changing fairly often due to the topic. Are we talking about Abba's legacy, Elton John's innovation, or just these two albums that have barely been out? This debate goes through all of those topics and even more, and I think that we need to work that out quickly.

Sales (The Aff's main point) vs the awareness it provides to Elton's collaborators, it's success already, etc. is what the debate came down to. Affirmative did not provide a way to evaluate this debate, and this is their burden. I agree with the neg here, which means that I am going to go with the Neg here. Lockdown Sessions is revolutionary in the sense of the collaborative nature that Elton provided these new artists. I don't think it is relevant if the Neg has listened to the album or not.

### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Gonzalez**

Feedback: **I think you make some good points comparing the two albums, but as the affirmative you have to have some way to evaluate the date. Which album sold more? Which one has more recognition? Better reviews? This constructive really lacked organization or structure, which can make it hard to evaluate. There's also plenty of classic artists in Elton's album.**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Gonzalez**

Feedback: **Solid rebuttal, but I just needed more clash and framing here.**

**1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Hall**

Feedback: **What a phenomenal opening question in the cross examination! Good points in your open constructive, but I think it needed more structure and organization. I understand that is difficult with a topic like this, but how should this debate be evaluated? Your opponent didn't answer that question, and you didn't either unfortunately.**

**I think the Lockdown Sessions helping out other artists on the record is a fantastic argument. I really like that a lot. It was a mistake to not listen to one or two of these songs before the debate started.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Hall**

Feedback: **I really enjoyed that you had voters here.**

## **Round: Round 3**

Judge Brad Phelps

**Aff Team: CSU San Marcos HakopianHakopian vs Neg Team: Texas Southern EkezieHair-Jones**

### **Won the Debate: Aff**

**Reason for Decision:** The AFF had great grasp and explanation of a complicated subject matter and their arguments for it. AFF made a strong argument for a wealth tax. The NEGs counter arguments were not very structured and did not clash strongly with AFF.

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Gabriella Hakopian**

Feedback: **Great job! Try to work on going a little slower and add more structure/sign posting.**

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Gabriella Hakopian**

Feedback: **Great job! Try to work on going a little slower and add more structure/sign posting.**

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Deionna Hair-Jones**

Feedback: **Great job! Try to work on adding structure to own arguments and calling out specific arguments of opponents - organizing your argument for your side and against your opponent so it easy to see where you clash.**

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Gloria Ekezie**

Feedback: **Great job! Try to work on adding structure to own arguments and calling out specific arguments of opponents - organizing your argument for your side and against your opponent so it easy to see where you clash.**

## **Round: Round 3**

Judge Liam Donnelly

**Aff Team: Idaho St Tyler Tyler vs Neg Team: Texas Southern Rollins White**

### **Won the Debate: Aff**

**Reason for Decision:** I vote aff on the permutation. First, the neg's responses to the permutations are inconsistent - the block makes a theory argument, the 2nr says that the perm is inconsistent with making solvency attacks against the perm - so there's not really a consistently extended response. Second, the aff wins that geothermal energy is more efficient in a number of respects - the neg's response is just to point out that the aff was unable to give the exact costs in CX, but I don't think that's necessary to demonstrate one mode of power is more efficient than another. Third, the neg doesn't win the argument that geothermal energy requires going to the earth's core - it's unclear what the impact is, and the aff has consistently and correctly responded that the most common forms of geothermal energy don't require drilling to the core, just taking heat from the earth itself - so there's not really a reason present why geothermal energy is bad.

### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Joseph Tyler**

Feedback: **Your 1AR does a good job of getting to the core issues in the debate and identifying your best arguments on them. I think you could do a better job of including reference to your opponents' arguments - for example, on the efficiency argument, going beyond restating the 2ac and also arguing why their claims of greater efficiency in particular are wrong.**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Alyson Tyler**

Feedback: **Both the 2AR and 2AC do a nice job of clashing, responding, and framing the debate in a strong way. The 2AR should have spent some time extending the biodiversity argument on the counterplan.**

### **1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Brynn White**

Feedback: **Your explanations of arguments are well-done, but your voters should attempt to focus on the major issues of clash in the debate and not rely on a lack of criterion etc that are not really in dispute i the debate.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Deja Rollins**

Feedback: **Your explanations of arguments are very good, but try to include references to your opponents' arguments, as well. Make sure to have consistency in how you're responding to arguments (eg, the perm) and to impact claims, particularly in the 2nr.**

## **Round: Round 3**

Judge Bob Glenn

**Aff Team: Jervani Thompson/Shamus Conley TSU vs Neg Team: Idaho State Colter Barker/ Ashley Helm**

### **Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** This was a pretty close round. I think it is important to remember though that roads are funded via the gas tax. Also, you can lower the tax but will Big Oil respond by lowering prices or increasing production to lower prices in the long run. I am missing the transfer of funds from muni tax and tariff taxes to bulk up the road fund as well.

Neg argues that you will lose jobs related to road construction. Aff claims roads last 20 years without work (no evidence to back this up).

Neg runs a huge block on green energy. I toss most of this into who cares pile because a 5 month period is not derail plans that are targeted for years in the future. Aff argues we will have an increased quality of life for poor and working families, but again no insurance that gas prices will be lowered even if taxes are artificially decreased due to government action. No guarantee that Neg args about bus service paid for with Fed gas taxes benefit the poor as do other government programs funded through the tax.

Narrowly a decision emerges in rebuttals (good job 2NR) for the Neg due to gas taxes fund roads and roads have to be repaired consistently.

### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Mr. Thompson**

Feedback: **Good case organization. Solid rebuttal effort. You almost pulled it out. In fact you and Shamus should switch positions so you do 2AR.**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Mr. Conley**

Feedback: **You asked good questions in cross exam. I think you came very close to finding the gaps in Neg arguments about eco harms, but your**

**rebuttal was rough and disorganized. The constructive was solid, but work on being more on point with voting issues and stressing structure in 2AR.**

**1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Mr. Barker**

**Feedback: I loved your calm demeanor throughout the round. You come across as intelligent and were very organized. Good job with case attacks. I like the eco args, but the five month resolutional framing was a no for me regarding the impacts. Good rebuttal and nice handling of cross exam.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Ms. Helm**

**Feedback: I liked your real world personalization (Wyoming dirt roads, Dad's a truck driver) and how you weaved it into your analysis and clash with the Aff case. You did not speak at a ridiculous delivery speed and your 2NR won the round for your team. Nice job!!**



## **Round: Semis**

Judge Sondera Malry

**Aff Team: Gabriella Hakopian vs Neg Team: Caleb Rush & Heaven Taylor**

**Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** Defund ve Reform Policy

**1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Gabriella Hakopian**

Feedback: **Strong dialogue, examples and discussions. Great refutation by the Negative**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: N/A**

Feedback: **Great examples of Police dissensions and distresses.**

**1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Caleb Rush**

Feedback: **Presentation with resources was well delivered and discussed throughout the debate.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Heaven Taylor**

Feedback: **Great refutation, delivery and feedback. Counter arguments was stronger.**

## **Round: Semis**

Judge Julie Badgley

**Aff Team: Owensboro DanielDaniel vs Neg Team: Texas Southern  
RollinsWhite**

### **Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** The aff knifed themselves on saying that defunding the police was just moving money around the police department. I was prepared to agree with aff definitions and clash until then.

### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: David Daniel**

Feedback: **Good job sticking to your guns on the definition of reform and the logic of why reform does not meet the advantages of defund. Do not say that the money is just moving to different parts of the police department.**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Same**

Feedback: **Same**

### **1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Brynn White**

Feedback: **Great explanation of how the two concepts reinforced each other. Nice job standing your ground in CX.**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Deja Rollins**

Feedback: **Good job getting your opponent to admit in CX that they were just moving the money around the police department then bringing it back up in your final speech. This allowed me to vote for your side. I thought the definitions of reform were different.**

## **Round: Semis**

Judge Jewel Smith

**Aff Team: Gabriella Hakopian vs Neg Team: Heaven Taylor and Caleb Rush**

### **Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** Negative effective in establishing value criteria of Quality of Public Service and Duty to Protect the Citizens. While Affirmative based their contentions around Defunding and Elimination of Police, but not supporting evidence and viable solution presented as to how community groups could fill the job of protecting citizens. The Negative was successful in proposing Reformation and Stronger Accountability- The Topic Debated- Defunding Police or Reforming Police

### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Gabriella Hakopian**

Feedback: **Complement- Good battery of initial questions to 1st Neg. Improvement- Provide compelling support that your solution is better alternative and as 1st AFF, you can define the terms and the type of case you are running**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: None**

Feedback: **None**

### **1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Heaven Taylor**

Feedback: **Complement- You were consistent in reiterating your team value criteria Improvement- Be more specific in answering the Q&A**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Caleb Rush**

Feedback: **Complement- Strong arguments and counter Q&A to AFF. and great answers to your Q&A Improvement- Could have brought out more**

**examples of reformations that are already providing transformations in police -**

## **Round: Semis**

Judge Bob Glenn

**Aff Team: TSU Daviess/ Jarrett vs Neg Team: IDAHO State Tyler/Tyler**

### **Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** I voted for Negative because they had a larger volume of arguments indicating that the resolution was an equivalency, that P Reform was just as important as Defunding the Police (as defined by the AFF). The arguments about crime rates going up seemed awfully late to go Neg with. But, the arguments about police culture and qualified immunity were solid and indicated that policy has to be changed to move us to promote social progress.

Neither team picks up on the year and Obama interp on case. The 88 law and Obama promotes (when he was in office 20 years late). Aff starts out strong in the round, but does not respond well to the Neg's claim that crime will increase besides saying that stopping police abuse promotes social progress. I think it is important to note that Qualified Immunity is a debate unto itself. But, that defunding the police won't solve for that issue because policies need to be changed through reform.

I think that the Neg spreads Aff out of the room and by the time we get to the last 2 rebuttals they can just cherry pick which arguments Aff couldn't get too and underscore why those justify a Negative vote and that is exactly what happened here.

I believe all 4 of you have tremendous skill and potential. Aff needs to work on more line by line coverage and to learn to group arguments and point out that the Neg is speaking at an incomprehensible rate for no reason but to initiate a spread.

### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Ms. Daviess**

**Feedback: Good case structure. You were organized and cited solid evidence. You need to clarify the 88 law with Obama since he came around 20 years later (if you mean't 2008 then that needs to be clarified. Nice job in cross exam**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Ms. Jarrett**

Feedback: **Excellent rebuttal and solid answers in cross exam. I would suggest you try to follow the line by line case structure for your 1AC and the Neg Case more closely. Use cross application to save time, especially when Neg throws everything but the kitchen sink at you in terms of argumentation.**

**1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Mr. Tyler**

Feedback: **You were very well organized. Ask solid questions in cross exam. I liked how you connected your arguments to their value and argued in rebuttals that the two elements were of equal importance. Solid analysis in rebuttal regarding voting issues.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Ms. Tyler**

Feedback: **Again, you two are spreading the Aff out of the room. While that may be the style in this area it does impede the primary value of the debate. Fortunately you are very well organized and you do a good job of stressing key voting issues in rebuttal. Try to slow down a bit, cut out an argument or three and go for quality over quantity. Nice job in cross exam.**

## **Round: Finals**

Judge Julie Badgley

**Aff Team: Texas Southerland RollinsWhite vs Neg Team: TylerTyler**

**Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** The neg successfully refuted the aff case while convincing me with the stronger historical and factual structural advantages Joe Biden has.

**1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Brynn White**

Feedback: **I thought your last speech summarized the round really well and touched on all arguments. I thought the transitional ticket was your team's strongest argument and it seemed dropped for most of the middle of the debate.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Deja Rollins**

Feedback: **I liked that you highlighted that he needed to run to win and he was unlikely to run. Good logic. PLEASE DO NOT FORFIT CX!**

**1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Joseph Tyler**

Feedback: **I liked that you pointed out if everything is related per the criteria, then everything had to be related even Biden's opponent. This was a really strong argument on your side. Try to tell me what structural advantages make an incumbent win more likely (voter rolls, name ID, press coverage.)**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Alyson Tyler**

Feedback: **I liked your point about presidents getting the best healthcare and that FDR had polio, convincing on your side. You also reinforced your**

**own case in very clear terms. I think someone who did not follow politics would have been able to follow even your Republican disarray argument.**



**Round:**

Judge

**Aff Team: vs Neg Team:**

**Won the Debate:**

**Reason for Decision:**

**1<sup>st</sup> Aff:**

Feedback:

**2<sup>nd</sup> Aff:**

Feedback:

**1<sup>st</sup> Neg:**

Feedback:

**2<sup>nd</sup> Neg:**

Feedback: