

## **Round: Round 1**

Judge Beth Cole

### **Aff Team: SU Aryana-Matthew vs Neg Team: DSUW Evan-Sydney**

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

**Reason for Decision:** The neg's impact and consistent argument on lives was the best supported in the round. The aff economic impact was not as clearly argued/quantified. I thought the neg argument on offsets for pilot training was persuasive. The national security issue was a wash/no impact in the round. Great job by both teams!

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Aryana Matsumoto**

Feedback: **You are a persuasive speaker! Try to give your case more structure with contentions and easily quantified impacts. You also did well in cross ex. In your 2nd speech you had good arguments but try to eliminate hesitant pauses.**

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Matthew Cessna**

Feedback: **You are a persuasive speaker! You brought up good arguments in your first speech. Try to signpost (letting judge/opponent know what you are addressing where in the round) more. Your 2nd speech was very well organized; a few times you said the neg did not argue something they argued so try to say why the aff outweighs/defeats their argument in those cases.**

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Sydney Sabourin**

Feedback: **You a persuasive speaker! Your case was well structured and had good impacts on safety. Your second speech also covered good points; try to eliminate hesitant pauses as much as possible.**

## **2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Evan Maudlin**

**Feedback: You are a great speaker! I liked how you pointed out points your opponent didn't address. Try to signpost more (letting judge/opponent know what you are addressing where in the round). You had a lot of good arguments in your 1st speech; some of them could have used more content/fleshing out; this comes with time and experience. You did a great job emphasizing the importance of lives as an impact in your 2nd speech. I would have brought up how the aff didn't counter your argument on pilots getting paid for some aspects of their training (copiloting); that would effectively take out any aff arguments against that point.**

## **Round: Round 1**

Judge Mitchell Levy

**Aff Team: Seattle U Sam Jamaale-Sam Jamaale vs Neg Team: DSUW Thomas Monahan-Katie Merill**

**Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** Neg persuaded me on the definitions debate because we're talking about populist \*messaging\* not populist \*platforms\*. With this, negs impacts of erosion of trust outweighs affs impacts on access to political discourse.

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

Feedback: **As far as framework, the only thing given was definition of "populism". This caused some issues later on in the round because it's not clear how I should weigh the round. Are we talking about benefits to the democratic party, benefits to the country, benefits to the middle-class, etc? Setting up the round is part of the aff's duties in the round, and it makes later speeches much easier to follow.**

**Your case felt very disconnected from the resolution, and the neg picked up on this.**

**Please make sure to signpost your case, during crossex you mentioned that you have two contentions, but the delineation between them was not clear during your speech. Along with this, providing 2-3 word taglines for each contention helps me keep track of arguments in the round (since you and your opponent can refer to the lines of argumentation by tagline)**

**You went over on prep before your 2AC**

**Don't say you're "restating" your contentions; you should ideally be responding to your opponents arguments without just saying the same thing again. (You didn't do this, and did actually respond to your opponents rebuttals, but I would avoid using this language).**

**I'm not sure what the "98% of people aren't upper-class" stat is doing for your case, since you're focusing on using social media to reach people, this**

**stat would need to go along some stat about what percentage of low-middle income people use social media.**

**Try and respond to arguments in the order they were made in the last speech, this makes taking notes on what you're saying a lot easier**

**I don't see what you're getting at on this "populism is an ideology, so populist messaging is a platform" point. Could populist messaging not be spread via fliers, etc?**

**Basically all of neg's case has been unaddressed at the end of the 1AR, so I have to weigh all those points against you at the end of the round.**

**You went >30s over at the end of the 2AR. This might've just been a misunderstanding/-communication though.**

**=== TLDR ===**

**Overall I really like your speaking style, and I thought you got a lot of good/interesting arguments on the flow. I felt like you managed your crossex especially well, I appreciate that you didn't let your opponent filibuster out crossex. The biggest point of improvement would be establishing what's important in the round (e.g., are we talking about benefits to the democratic party, or benefits to people with low SES?), and then make sure that every argument you make is explicitly linked to that thing.**

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

**Feedback: N/A, see above**

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

**Feedback: Please make sure to signpost all of your arguments, the first few points you made during 1NC I couldn't tell if you were starting one of your own contentions or responding to an aff contention.**

**Since the aff didn't set a value/weighing mechanism, you should do so in order to have something to link your case to. For example, you mention that populism erodes trust in capitalism, but I'm not convinced that maintaining trust in capitalism is actually beneficial (or vice versa, that**

**eroding trust in capitalism is harmful). Every argument on my flow should be linked to benefits/harms to \*something\*.**

**During crossex, I liked where you were going on those topicality questions.**

**Overall I like your style, and you were able to cover a lot of ground in a 5minute 1NC without having to go too fast or drop points.**

**Your 1NR felt a little bit all over. There were lots of good ideas here, but I wasn't sure where on my flow I should put them.**

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

**Feedback: It's weird, but during crossex you should be facing the judge, not your opponent (at least, this is the norm in NW IPDA in-person tournaments).**

**By the start of the 2NC, much of your case has gone unaddressed. When you revisit those points, you should explicitly mention that they were not addressed, and then instead of simply repeating the points you made, spending some extra time on impacts here (why are the points you made important? why do they help you win the round?) would be really helpful.**

**I think you made the topicality argument really well at the start of your speech. Keeping this argument at the forefront as you make your way through the aff's case is great.**

**Great job comparing impacts during the 2NR, these are the most important part of the round.**

**Don't say you're "restating" your contentions; you should ideally be responding to your opponents arguments without just saying the same thing again. (You didn't do this, and did actually respond to your opponents rebuttals, but I would avoid using this language).**

## **Round: Round 2**

Judge Lyd Haindfield

### **Aff Team: Seattle U - Pepper Berry-Trinity Doyle vs Neg Team: DSUW Kaitlyn Cox-Linda Corona**

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

**Reason for Decision:** Neg showed that the divide into different states would exacerbate the current inequality which outweighs other impacts as this is a values round. I thought the most convincing aff argument was that California requested new states 220 times and that we should listen to the citizens, however I am more persuaded by both the argument of every state dividing into more states if allowed, and that the main proponent of the divide the last 3 times is a billionaire. I think that if the aff spent more time on the economic argument explaining how the systems would function if they were in separate states, then the peoples' choice argument would be stronger. Alternatively, collapsing to a different argument and using impact calc to own the economic impact.

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Trinity Doyle**

Feedback: **really loved the case, liked the argument organization and information. I think that there could be more on how there are cultural differences because of the natural environment. I thought your arguments in the 1AR were good, but I feel that there was not enough of the neg arguments responded to. Still I liked the introduction of LA with the homelessness and wealth disparity**

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Pepper Berry**

Feedback: **I really loved how clean your answers were in the 2AC. I thought that you made it very easy to follow. I would spend less time on your case - especially when the neg didn't make it to your side yet, and go to the neg flow faster.**

**I also thought the 2AR was good, and I liked your reiteration on the peoples voice with the 220 time's states. I think that the collapse could be**

**cleaner though - extend fewer things but go big in the impacts, the impact calc and how your argument wins over the neg**

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

**Feedback: I liked the neg case, i thought the org was very clean, and thought the arguments were creative. I think that you need a impact for the state precedent bad arg. I liked the extension of this argument in the 1NR, but i think you should spend more time on the wealth disparity arguments.**

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

**Feedback: I thought your ability to go over the aff case, was very good, you had a very good distribution of arguments here. When you are talking about a different part of the flow - let me know here you are, and on what argument your are talking about. I thought the cultural argument was smart, as is the framing argument at the top about worsening. Great job.**

## **Round: Round 2**

Judge Beth Cole

### **Aff Team: SU Danny-Dylan vs Neg Team: DSUW Tate-Shruthi**

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

**Reason for Decision:** I thought the aff contentions on better land usage and greater efficiency were the better supported contentions in the round by the end, especially the the evidence used. The neg argued they supported climate change and renewables and while the arguments were good, I felt the aff had better evidence used to refute these points more consistently throughout the round. A really close round.

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Danny Herre 28.7**

Feedback: **Good case but try to use more sources; called the points contentions. Your 2nd speech, you made good points but try to cover more ground and mention impacts more at this point. You are a good speaker!**

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Dylan Berman**

Feedback: **You use a lot of good evidence in your first speech; watch for hesitant pauses. Your 2nd speech was very good at covering key points in the round.**

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Tate Parker**

Feedback: **You are a good speaker and have a well structured case; be sure to mention sources (2-3 per contention) in your case. Your 2nd speech, you summarize well but I think refuting some of your opponent's points would be more advantageous at this point in the debate.**



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

**Feedback: You are a great speaker! You do a great job briefly restating your opponent's argument before presenting yours; makes things easier to follow. In your 2nd speech I could have used a little more organization in what you were going to cover but you did a good job establishing voting issues.**

## **Round: Round 2**

Judge Mitchell Levy

### **Aff Team: DSUW Griffin Hehmeyer-Griffin Hehmeyer vs Neg Team: Seattle U Sam Jamaale-Sam Jamaale**

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

**Reason for Decision:** Neg's C1 is largely not relevant to whether or not we should increase investment in nuclear power, especially in light of evidence presented during the 1AC. I buy that existing waste is hard to deal with, but if new power plants aren't producing much (if any) new waste, I don't see where the harms from the aff plan come from. Likewise on C2, without some analysis for opportunity costs that come from spending this money on nuclear power, it's hard to say why the existence of better options means that the aff plan wouldn't have benefits.

Much of aff's case goes dropped, so I have to flow through the impacts of all of those points. This, along with the limited impacts from the neg's case, leads me to vote aff.

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Griffin Hehmeyer**

Feedback: **Don't spread**

**I'm not sure how this works in TIPDA, but it's probably not a good idea to call a drop in the 2AC because neg could address the argument in the 2NC.**

**Thorough case with lots of solid evidence**

**You impact out \*much\* further than your solvency actually gives you.**

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Griffin Hehmeyer**

Feedback: **N/A, see above**

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Sam Jamaale**

**Feedback: This was a really hard round, and I think you handled it exceptionally well.**

**Your case made it sound like we only use nuclear power for weapons development in the status quo, however this is not the case. Not sure if I was just misunderstanding what your case was getting at here.**

**You spent a lot of time in the 1NC talking about the harms created by nuclear waste. Given that your opponent had explicit evidence that modern nuclear reactors produce very little waste, it's really important that you address this point (even if it's something like "small amount of waste times lots of reactors -- after we scale up due to increased investment from aff's plan -- equals lots of waste"), having something on the flow prevents aff from taking out your entire contention all at once.**

**On contention two, it's really important that you make it clear why this prevents the aff's plan from being net beneficial to US/global citizens. The fact that better alternatives exist doesn't, by itself, do this. Instead, noting that any money spent on nuclear power cannot be spent on renewables is one possible argument here, though note that this isn't necessarily the strongest argument (as the US has lots of money, it'd be very difficult that the US would spend on nuclear power to the point where it couldn't afford to spend on anything else).**

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

**Feedback: N/A See above**

## **Round: Round 3**

Judge Lyd Haindfield

### **Aff Team: Seattle U Sam Jamaale-Sam Jamaale vs Neg Team: DSUW Tate Parker-Shruthi Chandrasekaran**

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

**Reason for Decision:** Great job everyone this was a really close debate. I end up voting for the negative, that in order to save the most us lives we need to not ban the majority of guns. I believe that the argument of the black market having the shifted purchases of the guns was convincing, and that citizens need to then be able to protect themselves against criminals. I thought the aff arguments about how dangerous guns are was very convincing, but I did not have enough of it in the last speech to vote on.

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Sam Jamaale**

Feedback: **I really liked your aff case. i thought your definitions and parameters' were really strategic. U think you could have spent less time on contention 1. Also in CX try to ask questions, not just making points. Questions asking one after the other can be really pressure inducing for your opponent, that you can then use in your speeches.**

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Sam Jamaale**

Feedback: **I liked the arguments you had regarding the opponents argument of the 2nd amendment about how much guns have developed i think the examples you had about the different type of weapons were very good. Try to get more responses in, including the argument about minority reactionary politics**

**need more extensions on your case.**

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Tate Parker**

Feedback: **good 1nc - liked the points and the examples you gave. Try to find more ev to back up your points (or let me know where you are getting these statistics). Try to block split with your partner. I liked the argument that you made about how the aff had not responded t the point about reactionary politics - i thought that was really important, to take it one step further explain the impacts from it.**

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

Feedback: **I really liked the questions that you had around criminals owning guns.**

**I liked the arguments that you made in the 2nc. I thought they were all very well formatted. I think it would be helpful to split the block with your partner. So that you are not covering the same thing in both speeches. Instead, in the 2nc you can choose to EITHER respond to the Aff case OR go over your case/arguments. I also think that You should have a more robust response for the criminal tracking argument the 2AC made.**

**I think the 2 nr was good, you had a great set up and organization. I think you should collapse the debate- not extending it all, but instead choosing a few points to extend. here i think you could have won with your minority reactionary politics arg .**

**impact calc**

## **Round: Round 3**

Judge Beth Cole

### **Aff Team: Seattle U Pepper-Trinity vs Neg Team: DSUW Thomas-Katie**

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

**Reason for Decision:** I thought the aff defeated the neg on the power dynamics argument, showing how the neg skews the dynamic, the issue about what weapons are actually used in mass shootings, and that mental health checks discriminate against those with autism and promotes ableism. In the end, I thought the aff plan solved better than the neg counterplan.

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Trinity Doyle**

Feedback: **Your case is well structured with good evidence. In your 2nd speech, you do a good job; could have used more signposting. In this speech when saying the neg didn't dispute your 1% reduction stat, I would have put more emphasis on it (saying this proves that gun violence will go down etc.)**

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Pepper Berry**

Feedback: **Both of your speeches are really good! I thought you had great coverage in your first speech and presented innovative arguments. Your 2nd speech was also good. I would not have included additional argumentation on the Australia point other than to summarize it; also it would have been good to mention more about how lives would be saved via the aff.**

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Thomas Monahan**

Feedback: **You are a good speaker and have a well constructed case. I would have preferred going more point by point on the aff but your**

**arguments were still solid. In cross ex be sure to make sure the judge knows the term you are asking about (swatting). Your 2nd speech you had good arguments but I was unsure where to apply them.**

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

**Feedback: You have a clear explanatory speaking style. Watch for hesitant pauses in speaking. It is probably better strategy to spend more time on refutation vs. restating arguments as much. In your 2nd speech I could easily follow your arguments; organization is always a big deal for me so that is great! When you say you outweigh try to give some reasons why you outweigh your opponent too.**

## **Round: Elims**

Judge Lyd Haindfield

**Aff Team: DSUW Tate Parker-Shruthi Chandrasekaran vs  
Neg Team: Seattle U Danny Herre-Dylan Berman**

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

**Reason for Decision:** Given the burden of the aff to prove whether the ban is necessary's for the green transition, i find that it is not. The negs alternative of waiting for the market to catch up so we can have a for sure answer that the infrastructure that can handle the transition is necessary. the strongest argument that the affirmative made was that they can implement these changes during this time before the ban, however the neg argument that this isn't a guarantee overall convinces me to not implement the ban.

I also believe that waiting for the market to catch up can resolve the impact of affordability of the cars - which seems to be conceded on both sides.

### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Tate Parker**

Feedback: \* **liked aff. good support of evidence**

\* **liked the Norway arg for definitions**

**I thought your use of facts and data were really strong, and think you did an effective responses in you 1 ar. I think that there was more needed with the power gird argument.**

**really great use of your speech and time.**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Shruthi Chandrasekaran**

Feedback: \* **great ability to respond to as many args as you did**

\* **liked your reasoning for prefer your definitions**

\* **liked your arg about ev having net fewer emissions**



**\* confused about your argument about how older fossil fuel cars will be cheaper for low income people.**

**\* The argument about the purchasing of old cars makes more sense in your questioning period**

### **1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Dylan Berman**

Feedback: **\* good cx question's.**

**\* good reasons**

**\* add impacts for the case**

**\* energy grid - clever arg**

**\* remember to add the sources of your stats in the case**

**\* i really liked the extensions that you made from your partners stats, and how you added some of your own.**

**\* the definition debate doesn't seem super relevant to me bc there are no arguments about those vehicles outside of the definition debate**

**\* liked the arg about the price of cars, and the supply and demand arg.**

**\* block split**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Danny Herre**

Feedback: **\* good cx question's, good pushing of certain question's**

**\* i REALLY liked your argument about the horses v cars transportations**

**\* Sign post more - let me know where you are on the flow**

**\* block split + delegate between you and your partner.**

**\* try to include a reason to prefer your definitions**

**\* going into the 2nr i think your strongest points were that the grid cannot sustain the banning of vehicles. You brought this up when mentioning how bidens plan wouldn't be enough, but i would have liked to see this impact calc**

## **Round: Elims**

Judge Beth Cole

### **Aff Team: DSUW Thomas-Katie vs Neg Team: SU Pepper-Trinity**

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

**Reason for Decision:** I thought the neg's argumentation on the debate being a question of something either will or will not happen as a revival being an improvement/being used vs. the value of it. I thought the neg showed that crypto is significant and. The aff had some great arguments on trust and the system being flawed but in the end I thought the neg reasoning was the most strongly presented in the round. Really close debate.

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Thomas Monahan**

Feedback: **Good case! and good 2nd speech. Could have used more signposting overall.**

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Katie Merill**

Feedback: **I thought you brought up important points in your speech; would have liked to see more weighing in the 2nd speech.**

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Trinity Doyle**

Feedback: **You have a good neg case and arguments; really important to attack the aff in your speech though. As they didn't call you out on it, it wasn't an issue but others teams might then claim their case would be unrefuted, etc. so be careful to do that in future rounds.**

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Pepper Berry**

Feedback: **Great speeches and providing good real world examples. Would have liked more summarization/weighing in 2nd speech.**

## **Round: Elims**

Judge Jennifer Stephens

### **Aff Team: DSUW Thomas and Katie vs Neg Team: Seattle U Pepper Trinity**

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

**Reason for Decision:** Congrats to both teams for making it to semis! I would have liked to see more line by line argumentation from both teams. Starting with the INC I didn't see direct arguments made against the affirmative case. 2AC should have been more specific in their line by line debating as well. The affirmative arguments were better held throughout the round, especially with mention of the enviromental concerns and recent news about FTX. I also agreed with the aff definitions and the presumption that they could define the round.

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

Feedback: **You did well explaining why your definition didn't need a source. Agreed, the definition is simply what the aff defines the terms to be. Also regarding definitions, you started your last speech saying the debate has come down to definition. I really don't think it did. Assert your burden to define the terms and show why your arguments win.**

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

Feedback: **Great argument about confidence in currency being important, not just the amount of crypto that exists. Work on sign posting and arguing line by line.**

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

Feedback: **You had a great cx -- strong questions and answers spoken with confidence. Well done! Be sure to spend more time counterarguing against**

**the app contentions or at least cross applying your arguments as you present your case.**

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

**Feedback: You do a good job narrowing in on the strongest arguments in your last speech. I did think it was ok the aff didn't have a source for their definition. Also, I'd push back not by saying it's not believable but that there is a better way to understand the word revival.**

## **Round: Elims**

Judge Ronna Liggett

### **Aff Team: SU Aryana -Matthew vs Neg Team: DSUW-Griffin**

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

**Reason for Decision:** Both teams presented a complete case with well developed and evidenced claims - basically stating that affirmative case and negative case agreed on goals of resolution - to deal with the environment and energy used in cars. However, the clash occurs over the best method to solve the current varied problems, like harm to the environment, and effect on the attitude of people toward electric fuel as a preferred source of energy for cars. However, as the debate progressed, the negative speaker argued the benefits and improved solvency of a more prudent counter plan which had more specificity. As the debate advanced, the negative team was more responsive in refutation to the positions of the affirmative as well as continuing to extend its own case. Additionally the negative team's arguments had more complete development as the debate progressed with clearly stated evidence and expressed impacts. The affirmative team was less effective in argument development in their refutation. Therefore I was persuaded to vote for the negative team.

#### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Aryana Matsumoto**

Feedback: **Excellent 1st Affirmative speech: It was well organized, had careful definitions, and clearly organized positions with evidence. You fulfill this speaker responsibility effectively! As an area of improvement, work on your refutation skills to develop more complete arguments as some times you provide a claim but are less thorough in development of that claim, with claim, reason, evidence and impacts.**

#### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Matthew Cessna**

Feedback: **Excellent areas of attack/refutation to your opponent's positions. You are flowing carefully and refute key issues. As an area of improvement**

**- try working on better organization of that 2nd aff speech so that first you offer refutation, and then spend important time on extending your team's contentions which will help pull the debate back to your side.**

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

**Feedback: Your questioning is outstanding because you ask pointed and useful questions which re-direct the debate to your own positions and "tuck" those into your answers. As an area of improvement, in the 2nd negative speech provide a clear thesis statement or negative philosophy to sharpen the key keys, which I think you do later in some speeches: an example - you tell me to look to the counter plans solvency and beneficial impacts.**

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

**Feedback: You listen and flow so carefully and do not drop a stitch to attack the several areas of your opponents' case. This is vital to keeping superiority in the round. I also like your case specificity which opens attacks on theirs is more a statement of hope and wishes than careful action. As an area of improvement, in your last rebuttal the organization gets a little "ragged" (you are probably tired), but be careful that closing speech is a strong closing speech as it is the last you will give.**

## **Round: Elims**

Judge lyd haindfield

**Aff Team: Seattle U Pepper Berry-Trinity Doyle vs Neg Team: DSUW Griffin Hehmeyer-Griffin Hehmeyer**

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

**Reason for Decision:** Using the framework for analyzing the arguments under which the arguments are filtered through what is best for the customer base, i vote negative. I believe that the survey the negative brought up and extended shows that either way this word is defined, users have determined apple is the better phone. I thought the arguments that the androids were more customizable and cheaper were convincing, however I believe that the negative arguments about durability and faster connection went largely uncontested, while the negative responded to the customization argument with a turn showing how the choices made it less user friendly. Overall this was a great debate!!!

### **1<sup>st</sup> Aff: Trinity Doyle**

**Feedback: like the args and reasons that you gave in the speech. I think you could add more labeling of your arguments so its clear where the separation of arguments is in the 1 ac. I liked the 1 ar, and think you made some good key repones. specifically i liked your car analogy when explaining prices. Try to sign pos more and tell me where you are on the flow.**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Aff: Pepper Berry**

**Feedback: I really liked the logic arguments that it had. I thought your arguments about phone plans being 2 year contracts, and including the price turn. I thought that was really clever! i thought the 2ar was good in the responses that it had, i extending the arguments about accessibility, however i think there were to many open ends to the arguments overall. I would also like to see more impact calc!**



### **1<sup>st</sup> Neg: Griffin Hehmeyer**

**Feedback: loved the question's of your first cx. great organization of both sides of the debate - great coverage of the ff flow. i think you could add more to the reason of why privacy contributes to the overall user support. - how critical security is to people. I liked the 1nr but i think you should be block spitting and saving the 1nr speech for the 2nr. This will maximize the responses of the neg and utilize the strategic advantage of having the block in the first place.**

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Neg: Griffin Hehmeyer**

**Feedback: I liked your examples for the cx. I liked how you grouped the app arguments all together. The speech overall, did bounce around a bit. Increase the signposting of those arguments, tell me where you are in the debate, and do your best to going straight down in the order of their responses. I thought your arguments were convincing. the layout of the durability software updates and faster processing were very convincing. I think you could collapse the debate a bit more, you seemed to jump around the page, when i think that you didn't need to to win the debate. Then you can impact calc.**

## **Round: Elims**

Judge Jennifer Stephens

### **Aff Team: Seattle U Danny and Dillon vs Neg Team: DSUW Evan and Sydney**

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

**Reason for Decision:** A truly neck and neck debate. My decision came down to which team did the best job showing why they satisfied aff's definition of better. Though the aff provided strong reasons why android phones are cheaper and more customizable, the neg showed why as a group, apple users were happier with their overall experience. Also, though I liked the aff arguments about price and sunk cost, the neg showed why environmental concerns and user safety was more important.

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

Feedback: **I really liked how you took some time to explain the resolution and state definitions/parameters of the debate. Perhaps if the definition would have included a global measure of usefulness that would have better supported your arguments.**

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

Feedback: **Great use of the sink cost fallacy! I thought that was right on! Make sure to go down the neg flow to make sure you are covering every argument.**

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

Feedback: **Your responses during cross were right on, very impressive! I'd spend more time on aff counterarguments, especially in the first NC. Go line by line so you don't forget any arguments.**

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

**Feedback: I was glad you noted dropped arguments and brought up the impact of that in your final speech. Good answers on cross as well.**