LD ROUND 3

Online Ballot Comments

Mariano Vigil vs James Goodman

Dixon, Zion

RFD

Aff has no offense, and neg extended better. Neg does a good job at turning his framework.

Javier Cisneros vs Elizabeth Cerda

Stephan, Michael

RFD

Javier won by extending necessary warrants that proved UBI was effective. Elizabeth was much more persuasive but did not give implications of her extended warrants that tied back into her framework of maximizing wellbeing. Both debaters need to take up all their speech time in future debates by attacking their opponent's case more thoroughly and remembering to defend their own case.

Comments for Javier Cisneros

Dont make concessions in crossfire that help your opponent, e.g. agreeing that UBI feeds peoples addictions.

Flow the round to know what to say to your opponent.

Comments for Elizabeth Cerda

face the judge in crossfire.

know your case to properly answer questions in cx. It makes you look more dominant in the round.

dont agree with your opponent in crossfire, like when he said that your UGW had no evidence, dont agree with him.

Christina Korman vs Audren Rendon

Herrera, Joshua

RFD

Aff won ubi is more likley to help people

Diego Arcos vs Nathan Seelig

Georges, Joseph

RFD

the only weighing made in the first rebuttal was the aff's in the 1AR for making it the most happy and the price args didnt apply because he says it isnt 10k or 5k - not specified. neg made magnitude and scope args, but only in the 2NR so i cant vote on them

Comments for Diego Arcos

smart arguments - dont let him scare u in CX - you can always get out of tough questions

Comments for Nathan Seelig

chill in cx - at times you ask good questions but you come off kind of mean. be careful for the future

no clear warrant extension for ur first neg contention - its necessary for the future so take it into account

Zubair Ali vs Michael Stuckert

Georges, Joseph

RFD

neg is better for individualism and aff only has defensive args against it

Comments for Zubair Ali

good speaking voice in the ac

too many offensive questions in CX - you're making arguments - save it till the 1AR.

particularly in cx, you're acting kind of mean - i know you're trying to be strategic in answering/asking questions, but when you let him say half a word and say, "excuse me" - it comes off kind of rude. be careful of that in the future

1ar had good arguments - just disorganized because you didn't get to extend anything in the aff offense

Comments for Michael Stuckert

good loud voice - work on organization - the 2NR went back and forth between the aff and neg flow

good arguments - high quality and well explained

extend warrants a little more - you say he conceded framework for example but then you just should extend one reason why your framework is good from the aff just in case.

Noah Allen vs Anish Buddolla

Herrera, Joshua

RFD

The neg wont that ubi is not feasible

Jatin Presse vs Phillippe Tamayo

HErrera, David

RFD

they are winning the second contention on poverty - ubi solves poverty

Eric Washbourne vs Charlize Lopez

Orvananos, Alejo

RFD

the affirmative wins that UBI will further productivity. the aff refutes the neg well the neg does not contest the ac strongly

Seungbin Ahn vs Hunter Tran

Raschke, Cameron

RFD

I vote aff. It's a question between whether a UBI or a UGW is better for automation/poverty. Let's start w alaska - I get a few arguments that the aff wins: 1. UBI incentivizes work & stimulates econ 2. people do other things w a UBI like take care of relatives 3. people do other side jobs, helping the econ. The neg's main arg in the 2n is about UBI being too expensive, but 1. no warrant as to why it is too expensive 2. no impact as to what the expense of a UBI means 3. Greenstein card is a hypothetical starting point for a UBI, aff says that a UBI could still be a good idea, even at a lower price. Lastly, UGW: it's a question of empirics, as the aff wins that we should not look to random hypotheticals. At that point, refer back to why aff wins alaska empirics, and I vote there.

Quentin Hnery vs Thomas Hatfield

Stephan, Michael

RFD

thomas extended more arguments. quentin did not respond to thomas' attacks on his case and dropped the majority of his responses to the negative case.

Comments for Quentin Hnery

Flow what your opponent says during the speech.

Comments for Thomas Hatfield

Dont listen to music during the round.

Brandon Elwood vs Saumil Patel

Liu, Vincent

RFD

Forfeit

Vincent Jumalon vs Immanuel Fadairo

Stuckert, James

RFD

Aff co-opts the neg's weighing that solving poverty is the most important thing due to time frame. Aff also shows that status quo welfare is making poverty worse and there is a risk UBI will make it better. So I think UBI is the better solution to poverty.

LPW because the aff is probably losing most other arguments on the flow.

Prinze Tamayo vs Lucas Walker

Fung, Elaine

RFD

no real offense coming from Aff - even if UBI is cheaper than assumed, there wasn't a clear point for how it was beneficial to society (compared to squo)

Also would've liked to see weighing between impacts and cards and links back to framework

Valentino Vigil vs Lance Alonte

Liu, Vincent

RFD

The spending argument that Lance makes was never responded to which means I don't see how a UBI could possibly be implemented in the first place.

Sofia Galewski vs Nicholas Shields

Crist, Jerry

RFD

In the end, I vote for the person with the clearest voter claims. When Sofia tells me UBI will reduce extreme poverty, she is repeating a theme she used thoughout the debate. I just don't get that same strong story from Nicholas. You keep telling me about cost, but you don't tell me why I should care more for cost then the human lives UBI can in theory make better.

Comments for Sofia Galewski

Good sign posting!

When you defend your case, be clearer and more specific

Bring up drop in 1AR so you can bring it up in 2 AR

decide what you want to go for early in the round and keep going for it. You get in trouble when try to go for or argue every possible thing in the round. Usually that means going for 2 or 3 specific issues you can win!

Comments for Nicholas Shields

good cx !!

You can't bring up new arguments in the 2AR, your last speech

decide what you want to go for early in the round and keep going for it. You get in trouble when try to go for or argue every possible thing in the round. Usually that means going for 2 or 3 specific issues you can win!