

Round 0

Judge Sam Hendricks ballot code 10

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Neg presented a wider variety of unique arguments.

Aff Debater: Omar

Feedback: Great set up of the round! Good luck!

Neg Debater: Corinna

Feedback: Great speaker! Good luck!

Round 0

Judge Hans Khoe ballot code 11

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: More contentions and asked the biggest question of all - "Who is the Muffin Man?"

Aff Debater: Jazzy

Feedback: With these fun debates, it's easy to mess around, but you made this donuts vs muffins debate very professional! One improvement is that you should please look up who the muffin man is (though you may have heard before haha).

Neg Debater: Kohl

Feedback: With these fun debates, it's easy to mess around, but you made this donuts vs muffins debate very professional! You asked the important questions during round and that won you the round haha. One improvement is that you can save time by not providing a roadmap during spar debates and by just label your contentions clearly. 5 seconds is a lot in a 1 min round and you want to use all of it.

Round 1

Judge Denise Vaughan ballot code 13

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: I buy the argument that the resolution must increase use of nuclear. This burden is not met. Affirmative must address the main points of the negative in the middle speech.

Aff Debater: Jonathan

Feedback: The case is solid. You have a broad number of topics that can be defended individually. I do recommend a clear criteria in terms of expansion in this case. I liked the use of space argument for nuclear power plants but I didn't understand the impact. Do go ahead and connect that argument for us. That middle 3 minute speech is tricky. Focus on your key points first. Then refute to keep the discussion on your terms. Good use of the first source.

Neg Debater: Corinna

Feedback: I really like the argument about where to put waste. I find that compelling, particularly for marginalized communities. Do use sources for that when you can. Do add sources when you can.

Round 1

Judge Sam Hendricks ballot code 10

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The Neg did not bring up evidence to prove US nuclear facilities aren't operating at capacity, so I bought the negation's argument that we would have to deplete funds for other renewable energy sources in order to build more plants, leading to increased waste and increased risk of childhood cancer.

Aff Debater: Luke

Feedback: Great inflection, tone, and pacing. Great use of statistics and net benefits throughout your speeches. Please use up all your time! Your case would have been helped if you set up harms in the status quo first, to prove the solvency that an expansion of nuclear power could bring.

Neg Debater: Joseph

Feedback: Fantastic speaker! Good use of roadmapping and CX. Make sure to use your second speech to focus on the net benefits we see with the Neg, rather than how many contentions the Aff dropped.

Round 1

Judge Tucker Wilson ballot code 11

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The NEG offered solid arguments as to the risk of nuclear expansion being both large in potential negative effects and not worth it in the face of potential expansion of other green energy. In addition, the specific addressing of the waste management point left the reasonable assumption that waste management is both currently not adequately addressed and unlikely to be addressed better in the future.

Aff Debater: Jazzy

Feedback: Very good work on the level of specificity in your initial case, as we discussed. For improvement, pay special attention to clarifying the connections between your counterarguments and the specific claims of your opponent. Make those connections clear as day even if it seems obvious in your head what argument(s) you are addressing!

Neg Debater: Doan

Feedback: Solid job presenting your initial case with preemptive defenses against counterarguments built in (the size of the risk point, the "national toilet" point to address why waste legislation doesn't get passed). Work on concision and clarity, as sometimes your organizational language (contentions, etc.) bled over into your actual argumentation and as a result began to lose clarity.

Round 1

Judge Jennifer Stephens ballot code 14

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: A great round that was neck and neck until the end. Reason for judgement came down to Neg having the stronger contentions. I appreciated the Aff's voting issues but really didn't see how they showed why they won the debate.

Aff Debater: Omar

Feedback: Top notch speaker! You did a fantastic job starting the round with definitions and explanations of the resolution and affirmative case. You also do a great job incorporating the rules of debate within your argumentation, ie, telling me what arguments were dropped. As I said in my verbal feedback, I think proliferation of nuclear weapons was a weaker direction in this debate. If your last speech would have highlighted your more pertinent arguments I think it would have made a difference here.

Neg Debater: Paige

Feedback: You also provided an organized debate. I appreciated how you not only stated your neg contentions but verbalized how they went against specific arguments made by the aff. Some neg contentions were easily counter-argued by the aff (coal fire plants do pollute and endanger surrounding areas more than nuke power) and I think you really should have emphasized more the problematic aspects of waster storage. I voted neg because you pointed out early this contradiction with nuclear proliferation and showed how this was outside the parameters of this debate.

Round 1

Judge Andy Christensen ballot code 12

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: This was a really solid round. I awarded the win to the negative for a few reasons: first, the aff didn't establish either framework or definitions, and then eventually dropped the neg's privacy argument, so these were easy ways to determine the round.

The aff laid out a solid case and did so with fair research although more (and better quality research) would have been beneficial as mentioned in RFD. The neg provided framework AND definitions that were needed and then delivered on them well. The negative also did a good job throughout and could have provided some impact work.

Both speakers were excellent and I look forward to seeing them in later rounds.

Aff Debater: UW BOTHELL KOHL

Feedback: The aff is a good speaker and has a nice rate of delivery and solid arguments. Don't forget to doublecheck your flow to make sure you nabbed all the args of the neg, so nothing gets dropped.

Neg Debater: WESTMONT EBUN

Feedback: Great speaker -- well organized and easy to flow. You should be sure to remember that in the pursuit of the win and that you want to make sure to use the most persuasive possible language to identify appealing impacts.

Round 2

Judge Denise Vaughan ballot code 25

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Aff does not meet burden to solve. Breakups have not worked in the past. Could be bad in current environment ecomically.

Aff Debater: Eburn

Feedback: Clear first speech. I would like a reason why breaking them up is a good idea. I think the problem coming before the impacts would be a clearer set up. That middle speech is really short. It's only 3 minutes. You spend 23 seconds on a preview. Maybe skip the preview on the center speech. Good to collapse to the mixed economy.

Neg Debater: Jazzy

Feedback: Great use of sources. Good use of AT and T. The argument that the behavior is the problem not the size is persuasive. Great point by point. I like the voters.

Round 2

Judge Sam Hendricks ballot code 22

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The Neg proved that breaking up media conglomerates would increase news sources' biases in order to engage with consumers. This was proven to be much more harmful to the value of consumerism than a lack of focus on local news.

Aff Debater: James

Feedback: Great set up for this round and use of roadmaps. Good use of statistics, CX, and perm. Make sure to always tag contentions later in the round and to emphasize impact of every statement.

Neg Debater: Omar

Feedback: Great organization and speaking style! I was worried for you with the Aff's perm but you handled proving mutual exclusivity expertly. Make sure to use the value as a thread throughout your speeches to maximize impact.

Round 2

Judge Tucker Wilson ballot code 23

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Biggest reason was the NEG's counterplan of subsidizing the smaller companies went almost entirely unaddressed by the AFF, so it flowed through to the end based on the NEG's argumentation. The NEG also argued that there are always alternatives to news conglomerates specifically, and since the AFF did not specifically provide any argumentation as to why those alternatives might not be feasible, this point also flowed to the NEG.

Aff Debater: Paige

Feedback: Very solid and clear organization, easy to follow and effective initial case construction! Things to work on: make sure your statements in CX lead to an answerable question for your opponent, and remember to establish a guiding Value for "should" resolutions if you aren't going to go for a Policy round.

Neg Debater: Kohl

Feedback: Good work impacting, and not just stating, your NEG contentions, giving clear connections to the AFF case. Things to work on: try to make more deliberate use of your CX time in order to establish your own arguments and not just clarify your opponent's points. Also, work on the jumping from argument to argument during your rebuttal time to help aid clarity!

Round 2

Judge Andy Christensen ballot code 24

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: The aff framed the case as a policy round and was unable to deliver the burden of net benefit backed in research.

Aff Debater: Doan

Feedback: You have a really nice rate and cadence in presentation, but I would like you to slow a little at main points and state them clearly and succinctly. Give me tags I can hold on to. Additionally, I'm the judge who mentioned "lots of feels, not enough reals." Research is king.

Neg Debater: Luke

Feedback: I like that you didn't get sucked into the emotional appeal of the aff arguments. In the case of this resolution, going for the middle ground and illustrating choice and option as preferable to socialism was excellent. Be sure to do a stronger job in cross-application and refutation -- there was over 2 minutes of time remaining in each speech unused ... use it.

Round 2

Judge Jennifer Stephens ballot code 26

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: An incredible round. As much as I agreed with the aff contentions and the concluding premise that large conglomerates are bad, aff didn't show what mechanism could make this better. Neg explained the mechanism of the status quo, within a free market, is regulation. Aff could have explained how current regulation may be made better or more effective, and therefore more beneficial.

Aff Debater: Joseph

Feedback: A model 1AC. You truly are a fine speaker who understands the structure and organization of debate. I think defining a debate as a fact round is more effective as a counterargument. Usually you avoid fact rounds because it leaves little ground for debate. You don't want to put yourself in a position where you have to show the resolution is always true, especially when the neg happens to represent the status quo.

Neg Debater: Jonathan

Feedback: You did well to see the big picture here. I'm glad you didn't just run down the flow with counterarguments but rather took time in the beginning to explain the status quo as symptomatic of the market we chose to have. You also showed how regulation is the mechanism we have in place to remedy the harms outlined by the aff. Do add voting issues as a way of clearly stating to me why you won the debate.

Round 3

Judge Stella Chang ballot code 33

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Aff - eco, housing, climate. good comeback with how important each contention presented, savings from transportation cost (\$9k) is greater than the Covid relief bill.

Neg - prioritize in other areas, i.e. crisis with lead poisoning of water, cut down emission, Covid unemployment, key racial advocacy, etc...

Both - excellent x-exam and rebut, organized, each presented their views clear and thorough explanation,

Aff Debater: Kohl Bothell

Feedback: Excellent presentation, defined well and informative, covered all areas.

Neg Debater: James

Feedback: Excellent presentation, great rebuttal, thorough and great perspective from small towns.

Round 3

Judge Hans Khoe ballot code 32

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Flow wise there was no clash on the AFF case. Important because NEG disregarded jumping off point and marginal groups argument which were fundamental to this round.

Aff Debater: Corinna

Feedback: Great job! Love the top of case and also just the structure of your arguments in general. Clean turns and good clash. Remember to remind the judge to flow across anything your opponent misses, but I really appreciated your voter issue type of reminder at the end.

Neg Debater: Luke

Feedback: You have a great speaking voice. Lots of confidence and poise. Need to work a little more on generating clash because you could have either cross applied arguments or full out refuted them with the extra time you had. Good job spinning your opponents points when trying to discredit your case though!

Round 3

Judge Stella Chang ballot code 33

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Aff - eco, housing, climate. good comeback with how important each contention presented, savings from transportation cost (\$9k) is greater than the Covid relief bill.

Neg - prioritize in other areas, i.e. crisis with lead poisoning of water, cut down emission, Covid unemployment, key racial advocacy, etc...

Both - excellent x-exam and rebut, organized, each presented their views clear and thorough explanation,

Aff Debater: Kohl Bothell

Feedback: Excellent presentation, defined well and informative, covered all areas.

Neg Debater: James

Feedback: Excellent presentation, great rebuttal, thorough and great perspective from small towns.

Round 3

Judge Tucker Wilson ballot code 36

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: Many arguments of specific benefits had competing evidence that were congruent in scope and wound up essentially dropping. Key arguments that flowed through for the AFF included the addressing of the problem of inflation as either nonexistent or insignificant, as well as the argumentation about the harm to small businesses that would be seen with the massive increase in the size of the federal job market.

Aff Debater: Omar

Feedback: Very good, clear speaker, easy to follow and understand even with your case having many specifics and proper nouns to have to throw around. Things to work on: clarity in counter argumentation. Make sure to keep a solid handle on where you are in the flow, as sometimes your counters jumped around from point to point.

Neg Debater: Joseph

Feedback: Effective and efficient speaker, even with a decently high talking speed and a wealth of arguments of counter arguments. Walked the line between info-dumping and clarity quite well. Things to work on: clarifying the connections between your refutations and the AFF case. I sometimes lost track of which AFF points you were addressing because the rebuttals sometimes weren't specific enough for me to intuitively make those connections myself.

Round 3

Judge Sam Hendricks ballot code 35

Won the Debate: Neg

Reason for Decision: Aff had lots of good evidence UBI was great, though not better than FEG. FEG came with more benefits to quality of life, including improvements to climate health, healthcare access, and public infrastructure the UBI could not provide.

Aff Debater: Jonathan

Feedback: Great speaker! Good tone, inflection, and pacing. Your time management skills are great. You could have won if you came with clearer definitions to weigh the round closer to your favor. Make sure to come prepared with harms presented by the other option when debating a "greater than" resolution.

Neg Debater: Jazzy

Feedback: Awesome, awesome use of impact and sticking to your arguments the other may have dropped. Good job using the value as a thread in your arguments. Your argument to make this a policy round was unnecessary, as "greater than" resolutions don't require an actor or a plan.

Elims

Judge Sam Hendricks ballot code 0

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The Neg did a great job proving past Iranian nuclear deals have been flawed and failed in multiple ways. However, the Aff proved that existing without an agreement at all was much worse.

Aff Debater: UW Bothell Kohl

Feedback: Great speaker! Good job catching at the very end the exact argument I had been waiting for the the two-world comparison. Your rebuttals are what won this round! This round needed a weighing mechanism or criterion of some kind to better flesh out your case. Please tag your contentions with a simple phrase to ease flow and make sure you include impacts with your claims.

Neg Debater: Westmont Paige

Feedback: Great speaker! You really shine in CX and I could tell what you were getting at as you asked your questions. Your contentions about the flaws in the previous Iranian deal were winning the round up to the very end! Make sure to tag all of your contentions, and pare down long quotations to save time. We want to hear your analysis and applications of the material instead.

Elims

Judge Sam Hendricks ballot code 111

Won the Debate: Aff

Reason for Decision: The Neg brought up a compelling counterplan, but was not able to prove that it would solve for all of the same issues the Aff plan did. The Aff plan reduced mass incarceration, provided government-funded rehabilitation programs, and reduced drug overdose deaths.

Aff Debater: Idaho St Jazzy

Feedback: Great plan and great pacing. You really planned for everything! Awesome job at identifying and holding on to the most powerful arguments of the round. Try to spend less time on your setup for the round as Aff. You spent over a minute trying to prove that this is a policy round. Aff can just decide what type of round and what the weighing mechanism should be, so you don't have to waste time convincing us.

Neg Debater: Westmont Eburn

Feedback: Absolutely phenomenal counterplan. Great job proving mutual exclusivity and presenting a compelling case. Awesome CX and answers, you didn't lose any ground. Spend less time fiddling with definitions that are essentially an insignificant part of the debate. We want to hear what you think about the resolution.