

Round: Round 1

Judge Bob Glenn

Aff Team: ISU Jonathon and Ashley vs Neg Team: Sky and Ethan (not Modragahan)

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Negative shows that we are better off leaving Amazon alone to grow and innovate and serve small businesses to enhance Quality of Life overall via net benefits. Neg argument on environment goes away due to coverage issues (too late). Aff Plan is murky as we don't know how Amazon would be sub-divided up. This was a very competitive round and all of you did a fine job.

1st Aff: Jonathon

Feedback: **Jonathon you were well organized, fluent, and did a good job presenting case. I would add a bit more of a picture as to what the post monopoly Amazon looks like.**

2nd Aff: Ashley

Feedback: **Good rebuttal. Your constructive was solid too as you noted the drop on environment was correct and I agree it can't be part of the decision in fairness to AFF. Focus on how SBs will be helped by a new Amazon with more localized services.**

1st Neg: Sky

Feedback: **Don't drop the Con. II Environment. Good rebuttal. Solid responses in cross exam**

2nd Neg: Ethan

Feedback: **Excellent job on several levels. You were organized and really covered the voting issues in rebuttals very solidly. Nice job!**

Round: Round 1

Judge Brad Phelps

Aff Team: Shayna Dennis-Danny Bennet vs Neg Team: Julia Janar Bario - Matthew Mattox

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Aff wins by making a very tight argument that there is nothing inherently bad in the meme form of communication that is not present in other forms of communication and that it is bad it is the content, not the method of communication. Neg made an argument that memes were particular more harmful than other forms of communication but the AFF successfully refuted that.

1st Aff: Shayna Dennis

Feedback: **Started off really well, I hate that you felt you needed to stop the round, hope to see you in a future round.**

2nd Aff: Danny Bennet

Feedback: **Your positive demeanor and ability to roll with the punches of suddenly having to debate by yourself was really impressive. You did a great job!**

1st Neg: Julia Jenaro Barrio

Feedback: **Excellent job! Great explanation of facts and summarizing the arguments for your side, you really solidified the case.**

2nd Neg: Matthew Mattox

Feedback: **Excellent job! Amazing job creation a step by step framework to disprove the AFFs case getting them to agree with each part of your**

argument question by question during Cross-X and then summarizing that in later speech.

Round: Round 1

Judge Jett Smith

Aff Team: SU Strok-Strok vs Neg Team: Neg Owensboro CTC David Daniel-Preston Hayden:

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The Affirmative points out that the negative world has all the same problems/disadvantages they claim the Affirmative causes. The negative doesn't present any harms of subsidizing exploring space in the last speech, while the Affirmative explains that exploring can help with medical innovation.

1st Aff: Eduard Strok

Feedback: **1) Good job not getting thrown off by their criticisms of your structure. 2) Try to ground more of your arguments in offense/benefits of your side.**

2nd Aff: Eduard Strok

Feedback: **1) Your 2AC was very easy to flow. 2) Try to structure your last speech more clearly into either being line-by-line or crystallization.**

1st Neg: David Daniel

Feedback: **1) You have great confidence! 2) Try to ground your arguments in the proper structure of off case positions. A disadvantage should have uniqueness, link, and impact**

2nd Neg: Preston Hayden

Feedback: **1) You have a great speaking voice. You are very easy to listen to. 2) Make sure to give a roadmap before your speech so its easier to follow.**

Round: Round 2

Judge Nick Grunig

Aff Team: Nevada Sky-Ethan vs Neg Team: Seattle U. Eduard

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: I was most persuaded by the influence of power over politics and neg showing the corporations were using a loophole created by bureaucratic problems. Below I am putting all of the team comments.

Aff-

Money should be one point and hurting strikes should be another but you should explain why strikes are key for democracy

A lot of your arguments aren't really directly about hurting democracy rather it is more like these are why corporations are bad or that they give lots of money. You need to do some work on how giving more money directly hurts democratic systems, it's because money gives more voting power and influence over elected officials and that unbalance destroys the democratic influence over elections

Assuming but not specifying that this is a US topic is rough and I think it limits the topics to a worse discussion personally, if you do it to provide more depth that can be good but it feels like it doesn't have enough depth.

Entire case feels predicated on citizen's united, and that corps are bad. If neg says that one law changes all your impacts on money in politics you better have a good answer to that and I don't think you do

Neg-

You spend a lot in the top of case before going for your actual arguments, it can certainly be good but we want to certainly keep the time down on non-essential parts.

Overall, pretty good points, but at times it feels like you don't show exactly how inefficiency is ruining democracy, how is that? You need to discuss it more in depth of the internal link. I think your stronger point is on how power within systems take power and ruin democracy such as Vashanko and Putin

I would also discuss more about how the system is broken beyond corporations such as people not voting out those with corporate wallets, inactive or do-nothing politicians, etc...

Still should try to go more line by line in the rebuttals, the 1nr was just a long speech, in a future scenario it will become an issue with winning arguments on the flow. You may need to figure out a flowing strategy to help combat this.

1st Aff: Ethan

Feedback: **I think you have a strong speaking style that will do you well in the future. You should be working towards efficiency in your 1st speech to cover more, this can be by taking out more non-essential words for example.**

2nd Aff: Sky

Feedback: **I think you have a nack for refutation and could do really well in a role with heavy refutation. Adding some better structure would help substantially**

1st Neg: Eduard

Feedback: **Your knowledge of foreign politics and grasp of the topic was very good, I appreciated it. Work on the organization (like line by line) to help judge's out**

2nd Neg: Eduard

Feedback: **same as above**

Round: Round 2

Judge Brad Phelps

Aff Team: Hannah Branch - Hannah Branch vs Neg Team: Ashley Helm - Jonathan Stonebeck

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The NEG made the round harder for themselves by saying that geothermal should be banned and did not make a strong enough argument that was necessary. The AFF made a strong argument of the benefits of geothermal and navigating the NEG's position and why the AFF should win.

1st Aff: Hannah Branch

Feedback: **Excellent job! Points were really clear, clashed well with NEG and navigated well an unconventional approach by the NEG to ban geothermal.**

2nd Aff: Hannah Branch

Feedback: **Excellent job! Points were really clear, clashed well with NEG and navigated well an unconventional approach by the NEG to ban geothermal.**

1st Neg: Ashley Helm

Feedback: **Creative approach to the debate argument. If going to take an extreme position need to make sure than position is defensible. Great job!**

2nd Neg: Jonathan Stonebeck

Feedback: **Creative approach to the debate argument. If going to take an extreme position need to make sure than position is defensible. Great job!**

Round: Round 2

Judge Bob Glenn

Aff Team: Matthew and Julia vs Neg Team: Ciara and Joseph

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Neg consistently clashes with case and provides some excellent analysis that Aff just does not strongly refute. At the end of the round Neg has more evidence and more disadvantages to increasing traditional police funding and arguing for shifting to de-escalation and mental health focused training to reduce racism and militarization.

1st Aff: Matthew

Feedback: **Matthew-well presented case. Please include Resolution analysis-net benefits policy round etc. Good questions in cross exam. Excellent rebuttal.**

2nd Aff: Julia

Feedback: **Ciara**

You were very well organized and clashed well with case and set up a strong Negative case. Good questions in C-X. Strong rebuttal. Call them voting issues in your rebuttal. Excellent analysis and strong rebuttal. Work to clash more with case in 1NC

1st Neg: Ciara

Feedback: **Very strongly worded and organized neg case. Great clash with Aff Case. Maybe expand on the concept of militarization for your audience if not the Aff team. Good citation of drops in rebuttal.**

2nd Neg: Joseph

Feedback: **Worked well with partner to mesh your arguments. Strong detail and depth of analysis. Nice work as a team!**

Round: Round 3

Judge Brad Phelps

Aff Team: Eduard Strok-Eduard Strok vs Neg Team: Joseph Tyler-Ciara Gaches

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The NEG argument built on the premise that daycare is bad, which while was a strong argument did not overcome the argument of the AFF of the benefits of daycare and why it should be funded.

1st Aff: Eduard Strok

Feedback: **Great job arguing the benefits. Awesome examples. Make sure to be very clear about your plan and all the specifics and that of your opponent. Excellent job overall!**

2nd Aff: Eduard Strok

Feedback: **Great job arguing the benefits. Awesome examples. Make sure to be very clear about your plan and all the specifics and that of your opponent. Excellent job overall!**

1st Neg: Joseph Tyler

Feedback: **You made a really strong case with your counter plan but make sure to be really clear on your specifics and that of your opponents plan. May should be careful declaring the topic of the round completely bad as it raises the bar to win. Excellent job overall!**

2nd Neg: Ciara Gaches

Feedback: **You made a really strong case with your counter plan but make sure to be really clear on your specifics and that of your opponents plan. May should be careful declaring the topic of the round completely bad as it raises the bar to win. Excellent job overall!**

Round: Round 3

Judge Nick Grunig

Aff Team: Cal State San Marcos John vs Neg Team: Seattle U. Julia-Matthew

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The tangible examples of the fed helping or hurting the economy, i.e. 70s measures for economic benefits in the 80s

1st Aff: John

Feedback: When you make a very specific claim that we are in a crisis but not an extreme crisis I need to be given a good reason to why we aren't in the same type of crisis or on our way to. You have a lot of good claims that have sources but I want the warrants of the evidence more present to help back your point

I think you definitely have good debate skills and are well spoken, it was easy to follow what you were saying and to flow it

2nd Aff: John

Feedback: Same as above

1st Neg: Julia

Feedback: I think you have a great knack for being very specific about how processes work that helped change the outcome of the round specifically. Keep this need to explain why things happen as it is a strength that I often see lacks in other competitors.

I want to see some sources cited in your case, it feels missing without it. Just a few sources would help and examples too. It feels more like a BP case where you can't really use evidence. The structure should follow a

more clear format, with main claims, warrant, impact. Starting with that will help the case flow easier and you can probably make more arguments as well. You kind of repeated yourself a lot on your case and had a lot of time left if you didn't just repeat it. I would spend time thinking about how you are prepping and how to write your case, Main argument is _____, sub point a is _____.

I want to see more evidence about examples of where the fed has helped in the case to help support your claims

2nd Neg: Matthew

Feedback: Look to improve the neg block to split it, you take one side or certain arguments and your partner covers the others in the neg rebuttal. the refutation you did was pretty good overall, I think your 2nd speech was better than your first, more direct clash and explanation of points.

You have really good clash with arguments from the other side and you acted like you knew what you were talking about well, which when we talked after the round was done you didn't. This is a good skill to have. The direct clash really helped seal the case for your team, talking about the 80s economy