



LD ROUND 1

Online Ballot Comments

Round 1

[Return to Schematic](#)

[Return to Round Results](#)

Nicholas Shields vs Immanuel Fadairo



Liu, Vincent

RFD

The 1AR really messes up by forgetting to extend case which means its basically impossible to win. The negative wins that people who get a UBI could use it for bad things such as drugs and alcohol, the response that the aff gives seems to have no warrant by simply saying that that is not the case. UBI being too expensive is also really damning and is another place I can easily vote as the Greenstein 17 evidence was just straight up conceded.

Comments for Nicholas Shields

You ask way too many questions in your speeches. Sometimes rhetorical questions can be good, but when you ask questions, it just makes it seem like you are not confident about your arguments.

Diego Arcos vs Phillippe Tamayo



Fung, Elaine

RFD

Although the NIT counterplan was not defined very well it best achieved the framework and had most benefits at the end of the round.

Saumil Patel vs Lucas Walker



Orvananos, Alejo

RFD

the aff didn't do a good job of covering the neg case and the neg had better arguments

Eric Washbourne vs Seungbin Ahn



Shi, Hannah

RFD

2nr made good extensions. I think the strongest argument you made was that UBI will slash key programs from the poor and welfare solves, but I think the 2ar answered it sufficiently by saying that 40 million people are impoverished now which means that a) welfare can't be working and b) there's only a risk that UBI solves it

Thomas Hatfield vs Nathan Seelig



Dixon, Zion

RFD

Thomas wins framework, and individual arguments. both sides need to weigh.

Vincent Jumalon vs Prinze Tamayo



Georges, Joseph

RFD

Aff wins stronger link to poverty and increased revenue which decreases poverty regardless of the negs C3 talking about inequality since it would increase income anyways.

Comments for Vincent Jumalon

Good organized 1AR, good speaking voice. I feel like when you go all in for poverty in the 1AR, you should respond to his 3rd contention more directly. Otherwise, good job.

Comments for Prinze Tamayo

prinze, you're really smart, you just need to be much louder and clearer in front of judges. voice is key to persuasion and thats key to winning. your 2NR args against the aff had some new arguments that you should've brought up befor.e

Valentino Vigil vs Noah Allen



Dixon, Zion

RFD

Noah wins framework, and after that all his impacts prove to be better for framework. Good presentation both sides, I buy the argument that ugw better maximizes well being than ubi

Quentin Hnery vs Lance Alonte



Liu, Vincent

RFD

This round is extremely difficult to decide. None of you guys have any warrants and you guys never reference the reasons in your cards. Ultimately I vote aff. I feel like the ballot story for the affirmative case is much more clear. I don't really know what I'm voting for if I vote negative. Sure, we have a ELR, you never explain what it actually does and its a question of who has the better justification for a UBI or an ELR. The Alaska and Ontario examples I feel are enough to make it so that I prefer a UBI. The neg only puts defense against a UBI and the argument that a UBI is better to combat automation was never responded to. FW was never an issue so I just resort to util since both Frameworks seem pretty consequentialist and utilitarian. The aff explains why a UBI is better than an ELR when it comes to helping people with jobs, so I vote aff.

Comments for Lance Alonte

You need to time your opponent's time, Quentin went over time every speech and this will become a problem in your future rounds.

Elizabeth Cerda vs Charlize Lopez



Stuckert, James

RFD

Vote neg on the economic depression argument and the elimination of welfare argument. The neg answers the idea that the UBI will get more and more expensive too late in the 2ar and concedes the welfare argument in the 2ar. If welfare effectively addresses poverty then the other arguments about how ubi is needed to help people don't matter because welfare already does it.

Comments for Elizabeth Cerda

Work on some of your CX answers. Don't just say "you're right," but ask what their point is.

Michael Stuckert vs Javier Cisneros



Raschke, Cameron

RFD

I vote off of Alaska emprics are good for the economy. New responses to Alaska emprics in the 2N means I can't evaluate it. UGW not practical because of conceded brink 17 card that says 90% of poor people can't work even if they had a job.

Mariano Vigil vs Jatin Presse



Shi, Hannah

RFD

1ar did not make extensions of key offense, ie aff did not extend your contentions and simply just responded to neg answers on your case which isn't enough. without offense in the debate round you will lose; offense wins debates. You're 1ac was really good though, you had a great pace and was loud and clear. It was also really smart of you to say that lives are more important to save than the economy, but you need to explicitly say why neg doesn't save lives too.

2nr made a good job flagging the aff concessions. Take it one step further by impacting out why those extensions matter. Good job defending and arguing why UGW is better. Good voters at the end.

Zubair Ali vs Sofia Galewski



Orvananos, Alejo

RFD

LOOK AT THE JUDGE DURING CX

Anish Buddolla vs James Goodman



Stephan, Michael

RFD

The round was close but it came down to the affirmative weighing the probability of effectiveness of a UBI versus UGW. There are personal feedback critiques, but one shared problem between the two debaters is the fact that you can only make arguments against the opponents case itself in the 1AR (if aff) and NC (if neg). Also, in future rounds, remember to always extend your evidence by stating where it is located in your case, say the author name/date, and say what it says and why that is important in the round (impact it out). Otherwise, good debate!

Comments for Anish Buddolla

Good job on weighing. One thing you could work on is responding to your opponents arguments he made against your case in the NC. You were pretty lucky he dropped them in the NR.

Comments for James Goodman

Avoid speaking in a monotone voice. Use some prep time before the NC to generate good arguments against the AC. In future rounds, ALWAYS FLOW. It helps you keep track of your arguments and your opponents.

Christina Korman vs Brandon Elwood



Georges, Joseph

RFD

really close - welfare and UGW dont solve so I default UBI

Comments for Christina Korman

gj - respond in the 1NC

Comments for Brandon Elwood

respond to eweighing - gj

[Join the National Speech & Debate Association](#)
[Contact](#)

[About](#)

[Help](#)