

17

SHADOW DEBATE BALLOT

SATURDAY FEB 23rd 2019

~~Potomac HG vs. Accolce ED~~

PRO *Con*

POS	team: <u>Potomac HG</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
1	Speaker: <u>Michael</u>	27	4
2	Speaker: <u>Garrett</u>	28	3

CON *pro*

POS	team: <u>Accolce ED</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
1	Speaker: <u>Allyse</u>	28	2
2	Speaker: <u>Kenneth</u>	28.5	1

The better debating was done by the AFF from Accolce ED
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Andrew King

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted ~~off~~ the Yemen argument for pro. At the end, the only extended response was that a) Hawks kill me and b) Saudi loses. The ev about Hawks killing me didn't exist, and Saudi losing is the arg- when Saudi loses, they seek peace talks with Hawks. There were also no extension of responses on El Kheshoggi or CS HMA. By neg, on con's flow, there was no extension of case in summary- what was I supposed to vote off-? I am forced to presume aff.

SHADOW DEBATE BALLOT

POTOMAC HIG
CON (2nd)

SATURDAY FEB 23rd 2019

Accokeek ED
(PRO 1st)

PRO

POS	team:	POINTS:	RANKS
1	Speaker: Michael	25	2 nd
2	Speaker: Kenneth	27	1 st

CON

POS	team:	POINTS:	RANKS
1	Speaker: ALLYSE	26	3
2	Speaker: Kenneth	28	1

The better debating was done by the PRO from Accokeek ED
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

PRO: well researched, good prep work
Kenneth is a dynamic, ^{natural} speaker
& performed well.
Just need to summarize the opponents' results in final focus and speak to how their own pts are better.

CON: lot of good prep work,
Need to speak more about why PRO's pts are weak & and the need stronger results

SHADOW DEBATE BALLOT

SATURDAY FEB 23rd 2019

Saturday

~~PRO~~

CON 2nd

POS	team:	POINTS:	RANKS
	POTOMAC HG		
	Speaker: Michael	28.5	1
	Speaker: Garrett	28	2

~~CON~~

PRO 1st

POS	team:	POINTS:	RANKS
	ALCOKE ED		
	Speaker: Allyse	27	4
	Speaker: Kenneth	27.5	3

54

↓
27.5

The better debating was done by the CON from POTOMAC HG
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Asfija Marwan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~CON appropriately~~

CON was able to reason effectively & back up their arguments with respect to the framework that the act that was in the US's best interest should win.

~~to be clearly outlined~~

SHADOW DEBATE BALLOT

Potomac HG
Mike
Janet

SATURDAY FEB 23rd 2019

Accokeek ED
Allyse
Keneth

PRO

POS	team: <u>Accokeek ED</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: _____	28	28 4
	Speaker: _____	28	28 3

CON

POS	team: <u>Potomac HG</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: _____	29	29 1.
	Speaker: _____	29	29 2.

The better debating was done by the con from Potomac HG
AFF OF NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Keneth

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I am more persuaded by the con team's contentions and refutes. they address every contention brought up by the pro team.

Pro team performs well in crossfires and asks great questions. However they have not refuted most of ~~the~~ con team's cards.

NYS WITH GM
UNI PRO AK
17

SHADOW DEBATE BALLOT

SATURDAY FEB 23rd 2019

CON

PRO → Potomac HB

PRO


CON

POS	team:	POINTS:	RANKS
2	Speaker: Michael		
4	Speaker: Garret		

POS	team:	POINTS:	RANKS
1	Speaker: Alyse		
3	Speaker: Kenneth		

The better debating was done by the NEG from POTOMAC
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD

- I am voting off of ⁴ ~~5~~ mini debates
 - Yemen on the CON vs. Yemen on the PRO
 - Lives vs. Terror
 - Civilian Deaths vs. Isolated Deaths
 - Alternate seller solvency vs. No solvency
 - ~~Iranian presence vs. Saudi not re~~
- CON won three of these debates because I got some solvency,

PRO -

- Don't drop Iran; it's integral to their case, also don't state you just want to pause arms sales you harm your uniqueness.

SHADOW DEBATE BALLOT

SATURDAY FEB 23rd 2019

PRO

POS	team: <u>Acoke ED</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: <u>Alyse</u>		27
	Speaker: <u>Kenneth</u>		27.5

CON

POS	team: <u>potomac HG</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: <u>Michael</u>	28	
	Speaker: <u>Garret</u>	29	

The better debating was done by the Yea from potomac HG
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted on the defensive alliance towards terrorism 2 months because solving for terrorism in our selves was only voting issue. I don't buy the "teaching a lesson" argument because the refueling answer was unconvincing. In the end I thought con had enough

13

SHADOW DEBATE BALLOT

SATURDAY FEB 23rd 2019

PRO

POS	team: <u>Potomac RW</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
1	Speaker: <u>Pippa</u>		
3	Speaker: <u>Natalie</u>		

CON

POS	team: <u>Potomac RW</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
2	Speaker: <u>Shelby</u>		
4	Speaker: <u>David</u>		

The better debating was done by the AFF from Potomac RW
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: X

Signed: M. Shuckman

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

13

SHADOW DEBATE BALLOT

SATURDAY FEB 23rd 2019

PRO

POS	team: <u>Potomac RW</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
1	Speaker: <u>Pippa</u>		
3	Speaker: <u>Natalie</u>		

CON

POS	team: <u>Potomac ^{BW} RW</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
2	Speaker: <u>Shelby</u>		
4	Speaker: <u>Daide</u>		

The better debating was done by the Nea from Potomac BW
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Maryam albrasi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

SHADOW DEBATE BALLOT

13

SATURDAY FEB 23rd 2019

PRO

POS	team:	POINTS:	RANKS
	<u>Pro PW</u>		
	Speaker: _____	<u>30</u>	
	Speaker: _____	<u>30</u>	

CON

POS	team:	POINTS:	RANKS
	<u>Con BW</u>		
	Speaker: _____	<u>30</u>	
	Speaker: _____	<u>30</u>	

The better debating was done by the Con from Potomac
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Chris

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

SHADOW DEBATE BALLOT

14

SATURDAY FEB 23rd 2019

3-0
Accus Keel
JB

PRO


POS	team: <u>Potomac</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
2	Speaker: <u>Meredith</u>	27	4
1	Speaker: <u>Anna Ash</u>	28	2

CON

POS	team: <u>Accoke</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
2	Speaker: <u>Jessie Anliyah</u>	28	2
1	Speaker: <u>Reborah Eldon</u>	28.5	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from Accoke
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

• Contours
US enabling
Saudi war
crimes, ~~harm~~
~~Year~~, and
the removal
of an
harm to Yemen,
and takes
lives

They are not
able to
~~extend~~ extend
any of
these points
through the
final focus,
choosing
to rebut. They
are able to
rebut ^{most} end of
Neg's claims

NEG

• Neg counters that
the arms make the
US to maintain
good relations
to bring for
aid (economy),
keeps quarter,
safe, and
the weapons
can be
sold
from
US 17.

They extend
and counter
all of
the AFF's
arguments.
Their argument
is very
good, as
well as
the
arguments.

14

SHADOW DEBATE BALLOT

SATURDAY FEB 23rd 2019

PRO

POS	team: <u>Potomac</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
1	Speaker: <u>A. Nozziz</u>	27.5 27.5	3
2	Speaker: <u>M. Vonneman</u>	28 28	2

CON

POS	team: <u>A. Cooke</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
2	Speaker: <u>A. Jones</u>	28 28	2
1	Speaker: <u>E. Burkantynus</u>	28.5 28.5	1

The better debating was done by the Neg from A. Cooke
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Mh [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Vote neg. oral RFD.

Neg

- Case: pretty good, but the ending was a bit awkward. Maybe have a conclusive statement. Additionally, you could clarify a bit about how exactly Qatar relates to the resolution.
- Rebuttal seemed a little disjointed, not a lot of distinction between the different arguments you made. Additionally, you read a lot of pre-prepared things about Khaziygo, which the pro case does not mention.
- Summary didn't really answer their defense on your case. Organization was fine, though. Collapse more! You can't go for everything effectively. Pick your strongest arguments and explain why they are the place I vote.
- Final focus needs to collapse's see above. Additionally, you have to explain how your impacts happen - how do arms sales cause oil spikes? How is Qatar and Yemen hurt?

Aff

- Case was 2:15! You can do more work on why the air force would be "granted" or how other countries could fill in the gap.
- I thought this rebuttal was pretty good, but you did drop their Qatar argument. Additionally, you say "this contention is defeated" without explaining how your argument defeats it.
- Rebuttal had lots of good defense but summary does not extend most of it. Summary also needs to explain the direct effects of ending arms sales outside just "they save lives." You need to use all your speech time.
- The final focus really does not explain any of the voting issues. What do I vote on? What arguments are there?

SHADOW DEBATE Abigail Serrano BALLOT

14

SATURDAY FEB 23rd 2019

PRO

Potoma

POS	team: <u>Potomac VA</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
1	Speaker: <u>Ava M</u>	27	4
2	Speaker: <u>Meredith V</u>	27	3

CON

POS	team: <u>Accoke BS</u>	POINTS:	RANKS	Points
2	Speaker: <u>Alleyah Jones</u>		1	28
1	Speaker: <u>Elda Berhanejesus</u>		2	27.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from Accoke BS
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Elda FW: stability of US
 - talk to judge in CX
 - Good response to CX question about hurting Yemen by hurting both
 - Keep connection to judge
 - I) oil retaliation
 - II) Alliance may be broken
 - III) Keep khater safe

Ava FW: Lives benefited and saved
 - Slow down in opening, you had extra time
 - Judge in CX
 - Keep a connection with your judge - talk in CX
 I) War crime
 II) Yemenise are dying
 III) Saves lives

Alleyah
 + Beginning of Rebuttal you were organized but fell through later on
 + ask for sources during prep + argue fw
 I) → Arms wrong are given to the hands save Yemen lives
 II) We will win
 III) → save lives
 Con wins under pros fw standing 3rd contention

Mimi
 + Dropped 3rd contention in rebuttal
 + try to keep CX questions short
 + continue answering the question you are asked not skip to 2 previous one
 I) source says oil won't be a weapon
 II) Haven't been butt
 III) ...
 of saving lives w/ their still

15

SHADOW DEBATE BALLOT

SATURDAY FEB 23rd 2019

3-0
Nysmith
DM

PRO

POS	team: <u>UniPROJD</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: <u>Ryleigh Jahmani</u>	<u>28</u>	
	Speaker: <u>Caleb Dodson</u>	<u>28</u>	

CON

POS	team: <u>Nysmith DM</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: <u>Dilan Memetov</u>	<u>28</u>	
	Speaker: _____		

The better debating was done by the Neg from Nysmith DM
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Jana Alvas

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The round became messy as it went on because neither side responded to the rebuttals. It was difficult to evaluate each argument because they were dropped then extended. I ended up voting on lives because both sides agreed that was most important. The clearest debate was on Yemen lives versus Qatar lives. Yemen lives was not extended as cleanly as Qatar lives during summary. I don't feel super comfortable voting there, but I evaluated the round based on whose link was stronger, which was con. It was hard to evaluate whose argument was important because there were no statistics, so I evaluated based on whose link was stronger.

Ryleigh

- great confidence
- ask more questions in crossfire, don't just answer
- use your summary to respond to the opponent's rebuttal
- go over your arguments more clearly

Caleb

- good structure, try to fill all your time with more responses

Dilan

- try to fill all your time
- good structure to rebuttal
- use summary to respond to the opponent's rebuttal
- good control of crossfire

SHADOW DEBATE BALLOT

15

SATURDAY FEB 23rd 2019

PRO 2nd

CON 1st

POS	team: <u>University</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
1st	Speaker: <u>Nyleigh Jameson</u>	25	3rd
2nd	Speaker: <u>Caleb Dotson</u>	26	2nd

POS	team: <u>MSmith</u>	POINTS:	RANKS
1st	Speaker: <u>Dilan Mehmetgul</u>	27	
	Speaker: _____		1st

The better debating was done by the Con from Dilan
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Nyleigh don't read your contention again.
You did not hit the point
Caleb speak clearly and louder.

Dilan no new arguments in ~~summary~~ ^{Crossfire}.
You did a great job of refuting your
point and flipping. Know your
case.

Con did not give specific details and did
not know how to answer questions.
They did not know what they were
doing in grand crossfire. Stop the arguing.

SHADOW DEBATE BALLOT

15

SATURDAY FEB 23rd 2019

PRO University Pros JD


CON Nysmith M

POS	team:	POINTS:	RANKS
1	Speaker: Ryleigh	26.5	3
2	Speaker: Caleb D.	27.9	2

POS	team:	POINTS:	RANKS
1 & 2	Speaker: Dylan M.	28	1
	Speaker:		

The better debating was done by the Neg from Dylan M.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

CON

Dylan - Beautiful speaking style. Good eye contact - Don't drop any points, stay consistent. Good job flipping points from other side. Use all of your time!
You introduced economy a bit late. Also use all of your time. All your speeches were easy to flow because you have great organization.

PRO

Ryleigh - Answer questions in a more direct way. Know the case - Study it. Use eye contact to follow judges and opponents. Great time use.

Caleb - Really strong speaker - Good points - run in parallel with partner thought. Really attack and understand questions asked by opponents. Great time use. Good job at weighing points!