**Round: Round 1**

Judge Kaylee Tegan

# Aff Team: Ethan Andersch-Andersch vs Neg Team: Dylan Berman-Danny Herre

**Won the Debate: Aff**

**Reason for Decision:** Both teams did a great job. Ultimately, this round came down to the Weighing Mechanism in the round, which was more often than not. Throughout the round, the Aff did a great job of centering their arguments to more often than not through sources to support the arguments that new ideas are difficult to develop and that sequels are made for money, not entertainment. There was great refutation from the 1N that argues that sequels get more money and can expand on ideas, but the aff came back and argued that 1. Originals have to be good for sequels to be made, and then connected this argument back into how entertainment value suffered based on time constraints and difficulty in creating new ideas as evidence by their sources, while also providing an overwhelming amount of examples, which fits the criteria of more often than not. The Neg had some quality examples of good sequels that were overwhelmed by the quantity of bad sequels.

**1st Aff: Ethan Andersch**

Feedback: **Great organization and sign posting, but work on stronger warrants. You rely a lot on evidence but don't always connect the evidence to the claim you are making.**

**2nd Aff: Ethan Anderesch**

Feedback: **See comments above**

**1st Neg: Dylan Berman**

Feedback: **Good refutation in the first speech. Work on slowing down your speaking pace to make it easier for the judge to follow along with your organization or increase your signposting, if you don't want to slow your pace.**


**2nd Neg: Danny Herre**

Feedback: **Great answers to cross ex questions. Work on line by line refutation of opponents case.**

**Round: Round 1**

Judge JEREMY WILLIAMS

# Aff Team: U OF NEVADA vs Neg Team: U OF WASHINGTON

**Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** NEG WON BECAUSE THE FRAMEWORK OF NET BENEFITS OF ALLOWING ANIMAL TESTING ON VACCINES OUTWEIGHED

**1st Aff: SAMUEL**

Feedback: **BECAREFUL OF USINGING BIASED DATA (I.E. PETA)**

**2nd Aff: Ari Merlos**

Feedback: **WORK ON LINE BY LINE, YOUR 2AC DID FEEL LIKE YOU DID CONTRATRADIC YOURSELF WITH THE IRB CONTENTION**

**1st Neg: Tate Parker**

Feedback: **CAREFUL NOT TO MAKE STATEMENT LIKE COVID CAME FROM ANIMALS**

**2nd Neg: Helen Murphy**

Feedback: **YOU MIGHT WANT TO CONSIDER ADDING MORE ARGS IN YOUR SPEECH AND ALLOW THE 1NR TO EXTEND ARG**

**Round: Round 1**

Judge Beth Cole

# Aff Team: Aff Utah State Univ. Miranda Judson-TJ Lambert vs Neg Team: Neg Univ. of NV Jenna Atencio-Greydon geil

**Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** Great round! In the end, the easiest place to vote was the neg's C1 on societal change. The aff argued that the neg was supporting violence/riots, but the neg's counter on how debate is important and allows inclusivity more than the aff's own criteria was persuasive to me. The aff had some interesting points re: discussion and debate in the academic setting, but the neg's real world example was the more impactful way to vote in the round. EVERYONE was a great speaker and did well at cross-ex.

**1st Aff: Miranda Judson**

Feedback: **You had a good case; would like to have heard some examples of excluded groups. Your 2nd speech was good but add a little more structure to your summary and also say why your arguments are more important/impactful than the neg's.**

**2nd Aff: TJ Lambert**

Feedback: **Your 1st speech was clear and concise; probably best to spend less time on the neg C1 to gain coverage. Your 2nd speech was also good-- focus 1 or 2 very clear aff voting issues more and also give more reasons why your arguments outweigh the neg.'s.**

**1st Neg: Greydon Geil**

Feedback: **I thought both of your speeches were very good. You have a good neg case and had good argument coverage in the round. I was a little confused when you said the 2N would be offering an additional**

argument/contention and it sounded like they would also cover some of the rebuttal and that didn't happen---not a big deal and maybe I misheard, but be sure to be clear on your roadmap prior to your speech. It would also be good to hear more on your impacts--BLM especially since it was the most recent example.

**2nd Neg: Jenna Atencio**

Feedback: **Your 1st speech was good; try to provide a little more signposting so I know what you are covering where in the round. You had good coverage of arguments in this speech. Your 2nd speech was a good wrap up; work on saying why your arguments are more impactful than your opponents and adopt more of a summary style in this speech as well. Your team did a good job creating the most impactful reason for me to vote in the round!**

**Round: Round 1**

Judge Emma Murdock

# Aff Team: Aff University of Nevada Gabby Detrick-Gabby Detrick vs Neg Team: Neg University of Washington Griffin Hehmeyer-

**Won the Debate: Aff**

**Reason for Decision:** the big argument of the debate was why we should make all people pay for social security and aff showed that by making whelthy people pay it would extend the life of SS

**1ˢᵗ Aff: Gabby Detrick-Gabby Detrick**

Feedback: **thing to improve- try to upfront define. the round ie policy. in cx don't let your op go off and build their case cut them off! things you did great- great attack on evidence, great perm point! just needs to be brough up sooner to be more effective!**

**2ⁿᵈ Aff: na**

Feedback: **na**

**1ˢᵗ Neg: Griffin Hehmeyer-**

Feedback: **things to improve on- try not to speak so fast its hard to follow and flow. try to explain information a bit better, it was a complex topic and info just needed to be broken down a bit more to establish stronger connections**

**things you did great- great cx you are really string here, great last speech to wrap things up.**

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

Feedback: **na**

# Round: Round 2

Judge Hannah Branch

## Aff Team: Griffin vs Neg Team: Trinity-Pepper

**Won the Debate: Aff**

**Reason for Decision:** I vote Aff because their arguments about overall societal impact of dogs (saving lives, detecting drugs and bombs, and providing personal impacts to fitness and health) outweigh the impacts provided by the Neg. The root of my decision is the net benefits framework which the Aff discloses and the Neg does not refute. Because the benefit to society is the lens through which the debaters ask me to consider their arguments, the framework weighs heavily in the decision. The Neg's best argument is autism because it is most unique, but the argument is outweighed because the Neg doesn't do enough work on the framework or the warrant for the contention itself to demonstrate the uniqueness/magnitude of the autism impact.

### 1st Aff: Griffin

Feedback: **Excellent clash and refutation. Your round vision is clear and your weighing is consistently impactful throughout the round. An area for improvement is utilizing a respectful tone towards your opponents and their arguments. This would create a more enjoyable/educational round, and would likely add to your credibility.**

### 2nd Aff: n/a - maverick

Feedback: **n/a - maverick**

### 1st Neg: Trinity

Feedback: **You do a great job of returning to line by line and spotlighting the arguments you're ahead on. I like the organization of your case—you balance your time in the constructive well. For me, the case would have**

**been more effective if you clashed with the weighing mechanism or engaged with it in later speeches.**

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

Feedback: **I like that you ask the judge/room to consider biases in what we consider to be a "net benefit." This contention is unique and somewhat unpredictable on the Aff, which is awesome. Its impact is a thoughtful and important addition to the round. Increasing organization/signposting in your refutations could help them to be more easily weighed—don't be afraid to turn everything they say in refutation in the line by line. You hint at this with "antisocial good," but impacting that out to more people feeling safe/accepted would be helpful.**

**Round: Round 2**

Judge JEREMY WILLIAMS

# Aff Team: U of Washington Ahna Pahirdin-Ada Lu vs Neg Team: University of Nevada Gabby Detrick-Gabby Detrick:

**Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** DROPPED MARXISM AND NEOLIBERAL ARGUMENTS BY THE AFF

**1st Aff: Ada Lu**

Feedback: **KEEP YOUR TIMER AS PART OF YOUR HABIT BEFORE YOU START SPEAKING. NICE DIVERSITY IN YOUR ARGUMENTS. YOU NEED TO WORK ON GROUPING ARG IN 1AR.**

**2nd Aff: Ahna Pahirdin**

Feedback: **GOOD SPEECH BUT I THINK YOU SHOULD HAVE WENT A DIFFERENT WAY WITH THE COLONIALISM ARG**

**1st Neg: Gabby Detrick**

Feedback: **1NC -- TRY SHOWING CLASH ON THE VALUE DEBATE, THE MARXIST ARGUMENT WOULD HAVE BEEEN A LOT BETTER IN THE 1NC**

**2nd Neg: Gabby Detrick**

Feedback: **WORK ON NEG BLOCK BY RESPONDING TO THE AFF IN THE 1NR, COULD HAVE SPEND MORE TIME ON THE MARX ARGUMENT IN 2NR STRATIGICALLY. YOU DONT NEED TO REREAD THE RESOLUTION IN 1NR.**

**Round: Round 2**

Judge emma Murdock

**Aff Team: Seattle University Dylan Berman-Danny Herre vs Neg Team: Neg University of Nevada Ari Merlos-Sam Rea Ramirez:**

**Won the Debate: Aff**

**Reason for Decision:** based on line by line arg af has more that flowed through so they showed that dogs are better. especially the loyalty point

**1st Aff: Dylan**

Feedback: **things to work on- tie back to weigh mech more! things you did really well- you round out your last speech super well and cover a lot. case set up was also super strong!!**

**2nd Aff: Danny**

Feedback: **things to work on- work on your cx and asking Qs instead of making solo args. tie back to weigh mech more. things you did really well, great last speech! great job showing the lines of arg at the end!**

**1st Neg: Ari**

Feedback: **work on tying back to weigh mech and really clashing on the aff case a bit more. great job with org it was super easy to follow, great non unique arg!**

**2nd Neg: Sam**

Feedback: **work on tying back to the weigh mech more, you do it in the last speech but t needs to be more. be careful about new args in your voter**

speech non of that can be flowed. great job connecting that cats and dogs are both hunters!! easy to follow org!

!

**Round: Round 2**

Judge Kaylee Tegan

# Aff Team: Tate-Helen vs Neg Team: Robert Corbett-Corbett

**Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** The Neg won on the argument that without a clear definition of what violent depictions are, we cannot know what to restrict, therefore we cannot prove that restrictions will have positive impacts on societal welfare. The aff spent too much time being dragged into Neg ground, that there wasn't a lot of clash against their points. I do think the aff would have benefitted from running this as a policy rather than a value.

**1ˢᵗ Aff: Tate Parker**

Feedback: **Good responses to refutations. Work on better warrants for your evidence to clearly connect your evidence to your overall argument and back up your value.**

**2ⁿᵈ Aff: Helen Murphy**

Feedback: **Great answers to cross examination questions. Work on expanding your case beyond what was said in the 1AC.**

**1ˢᵗ Neg: Robert Corbett**

Feedback: **Good job tying the value back into the round and arguing that without a metric on what to restrict, we can't determine what impact it would have on societal welfare. Work on organization of refutation, and work on line by line refutation of opponents case.**

**2ⁿᵈ Neg: Robert Corbett**

Feedback: **See comments above.**

**Round: Round 3**

Judge JEREMY WILLIAMS

# Aff Team: University of Nevada Ari Merlos-Sam Rea Ramirez vs Neg Team: Seattle University Pepper Berry-Trinity Doyle

**Won the Debate: Aff**

**Reason for Decision:** NEG CP HAD NO PLAN TEXT, AFF PLAN TO BAN TT STILL SOLVES WITHIN AGREED FRAMEWORK

**1st Aff: SAM**

Feedback: **GREAT US OF A PLAN, NEED BETTER ANWSER TO VPN QUESTION**

**2nd Aff: ARI**

Feedback: **THREAT TO DEMOCRACY ARGUEMENT SEEMED TO BE MISLABLED. I THINK YOU SHOULD HAVE CALLED OUT THE NEG FOR NO PLANTEXT FOR CP. YOU SHOULD HAVE RAN A PERM ON THE CP.**

**1st Neg: PEPPER**

Feedback: **WORK ON ORGANIZING YOUR 1NC, IT FELT LIKE YOU WERE ROADMAPPING DURING YOUR SPEECH INSTEAD OF AT THE BEGINNING OF IT. IF YOU ARE GOING TO RUN A COUNTERPLAN, YOU NEED A PLAN TEXT**

**2nd Neg: TRINITY**

Feedback: **THE 2NC NEEDED TO STATE A CP TEXT IF YOU ARE TRYING TO RUN IT. GREAT ENERGY IN YOUR SPEECH.**

**Round: Round 3**

Judge Kaylee Tegan

# Aff Team: Miranda-TJ vs Neg Team: Ahna-Ada

**Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** Great job to both teams. This was a hard round to judge. Ultimately, I voted for the negation on the argument that we have very little evidence to prove that Tiktok is doing anything different/more harmful than what other companies are already doing. While there may be "concern," the neg did a good job of highlighting that American company hegemony. The aff had great responses to other regulations and constitutional violation, but they didn't have enough evidence/examples to prove that data collection has moved into harmful actions, aside from fear mongering about Chinese intention, which plays into the Negs hegemonic argument.

**1st Aff: Miranda**

Feedback: **Great refutational organization. Work on sign posting and citing your sources with all claims.**

**2nd Aff: TJ**

Feedback: **Great refutation and cross ex, but don't argue in cross ex.**

**1st Neg: Ada**

Feedback: **Good case organization, but you need stronger warrants to connect your evidence to the claims you're making.**

**2nd Neg: Ahna**

Feedback: **Good cross ex and refutation, but work on expanding your speech beyond the 1NC.**

**Round: Round 3**

Judge Hannah Branch

## Aff Team: Ethan Andersch vs Neg Team: Tate Parker - Helen Murphy

**Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** I buy the neg argument that the only way to evaluate the Aff's value framework is through policy and its impacts as each side is already engaging in that argumentation throughout the debate. With that framework in place, I vote on the neg's argument regarding preferability of their counterplan. Since Aff doesn't refute Neg's claim about increased taxation and decreased efficacy, I'm buying that CP is preferable regardless of exclusivity.

Please note - Neg went overtime in the 2NC and I didn't catch it in time to signal, so I struck the arguments I heard overtime from the flow and did not include them in RFD.

**1ˢᵗ Aff: Ethan Andersch**

Feedback: **I like your case structure and use of evidence. You do a good job at cohesive persuasion through ample examples. I think this case would have been more effective if the impacts of Dem policies had been linked to the plan more clearly—even if we're in a value world, without clear links to the res the impacts are difficult to weigh. Great job!**

**2ⁿᵈ Aff: n/a - maverick**

Feedback: **n/a - maverick**

**1ˢᵗ Neg: Tate Parker**

Feedback: **Your clash is outstanding—you are clear, efficient, and effective at weighing clearly within a somewhat convoluted framework. Staying on**

**the flow through clear signposting could further enhance your argumentation.**


**2ⁿᵈ Neg: Helen Murphy**

Feedback: **Your cross-ex and clash are very efficient and clear. Your speaks dropped a little as a result of speaking over time in 2NC, which I understand from the judging instructions to be a relevant factor for speaks at this tournament. Your extension of impacts is paired with clear additions of relevant argumentation that advances the debate and prefaces voting issues throughout. Signposting/staying in the flow would further benefit clarity. Great work!**

**Round: Elims**

Judge Hannah Branch

# Aff Team: Ahna Pahirdin-Ada Lu vs Neg Team: Ethan Andersch

**Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** Since there was a lack of clear clash with regard to impact weighing in this debate, I default to the magnitude of the impacts provided on the negation, which suggest that a variety of very harmful things can be attributed to peer pressure. These arguments include eating disorders, trans death, drug use, and conformity against individuality. While the Aff's arguments are salient, I do not feel that I can vote for them without hearing the Aff carry through their definition and explain why Neg's impacts are not topical.

**1ˢᵗ Aff: Ahna Pahirdin-Ada Lu**

Feedback: **I really like your argument about discerning peer pressure from other types of pressure. I think that was a smart way to approach framing in this round, and while I don't ultimately vote on it, I would encourage you to keep thinking about definitional framing like that: a game of dividing the world into what is topical and what isn't. I would encourage you to be careful on timing and cutting your opponent off in cross—that level of interruption isn't necessary for getting the answers you need. Great job and congrats on breaking to this round!**

**2ⁿᵈ Aff: n/a**

Feedback: **n/a**

**1ˢᵗ Neg: Ethan Andersch**

Feedback: **I appreciate the variety and depth of impacts presented in your case. Since the framework debate is highly subjective, I end up weighing**

**those impacts heavily in my decision. The credibility of impacts is enhanced by your use of evidence (although I am not specifically voting for the debater who has the most evidence). As a next step, I would work to spotlight key issues on the flow instead of hitting them all in every speech. Great job and congrats!**

**2nd Neg: n/a**

Feedback: **n/a**

**Round: Elims**

Judge Denise Vaughan

# Aff Team: University of Nevada Gabby Detrick-Gabby Detrick vs Neg Team: University of Washington Tate Parker-Helen

**Won the Debate: Neg**

**Reason for Decision:** The debate here was largely about whether a Financial transaction tax would be preferable to the CP which is a capital gains tax. I would have enjoyed a discussion about why we would do either. The resolution is The USFG should establish a financial transaction tax. I would have enjoyed a discussion of why we should implement (or not implement) this tax.

RFD: I find that the transaction tax takes money for both those who make and those who lose money. The capital gains tax is preferable because it only takes from those who make money. On balance, neg plan is preferable.

I find that there is no reason to implement the transaction tax. I would like a compelling reason in the affirmative.

Without a reason to affirm, I negate.

## 1st Aff: Gabby Dietrich

Feedback: **Good approach to financial transactions. It was a clear approach to the topic and financial topics do need a clear start. Good questions. The question about what is covered in a capital gain is excellent. Do set up the problem in the resolution which will be solved by the plan.**

## 2nd Aff: Gabby Dietrich

Feedback: **It's no big deal that you don't have a number. Don't let that argument lead you into debating a specific that will not matter. I**

understand the goal of comparing policy implications. Go ahead and use the idea of volatility versus some stability. In IPDA, the theory should be enough.

**1st Neg: Tate Parker**

Feedback: **Remember that this is IPDA. I appreciate that you have a specific number for what you raise in terms of taxes. However, that is not enough in IPDA. The plan is secondary. The idea here is to tax people on wall street. That is appealing. Focus on reducing volatility. Thats the big win. You have a great idea here and it is appealing to the audience. Stay organized and set up your case then attack affirmative case. I realize that some of this might be overlap but the organization will be the win in many rounds. Structure really helps the listener. The DA is solid and an excellent choice. It is clear and easy to support. Clear breakdown in the final speech on why to negate. The refutation is clear. Be sure to attack the inherency.**

**2nd Neg: Helen Murphy**

Feedback: **Overview is solid and short. Thats excellent. Good focus on lower and middle income right away. Good focus on keeping up financial activity which is a higher benefit. I would like to come back to the reason we would engage in this.**