

1nc you don't need to make extension of your case after you've read me it. Extentions happen in the rebuttal speeches.

1ar made good extensions but sometimes it became redundant and too long, as a result you wasted a lot of your speech time. Extensions should be short and precise. Just be sure you sufficiently answer neg contentions and don't concede them.

Elizabeth Cerda vs Mariano Vigil



Liu, Vincent

RFD

At the end of the day, I don't see how you can pay for a UBI. This argument was extended through both speeches, insofar as you cannot fund a UBI, you do not gain access to any of your impacts.

Comments for Elizabeth Cerda

You should not talk during other people's speeches. Try to be more familiar with LD times.

Comments for Mariano Vigil

Don't smirk during other people's speeches, it makes you seem extremely rude and disrespectful.

Hunter Tran vs Prinze Tamayo



Stephan, Michael

RFD

RFD:

Voted for Hunter because he extended important cards in his case and made sure to 1. respond to his opponents arguments to them 2. weigh and emphasize the impacts of those pieces of evidence. Prinze made new arguments in the 2AR I couldn't evaluate and did not respond to his opponent's arguments (instead just restated his evidence). It was a good debate!

Hunter:

You are really confident when you speak, keep that up.

Good job at poking holes in Prinze's argument's in Cx and being polite about it, it made you look more dominant.

Understand your evidence more, because you claimed that UBI would cost 75000 per person (6250 per month), but the Coren 18 evidence in your case claimed it was 2000 per month.

Prinze:

 $Good\ job\ for\ remembering\ that\ you\ can\ skip\ FW\ if\ your\ opponent\ has\ the\ same\ one\ as\ yours.$

Use prep time, it's there to help you during the round.

You were more clear in this round but speak up, you need to be confident while giving speeches.

Charlize Lopez vs Christina Korman



Shi, Hannah

RFD

I really like the 1ac- thank you for doing you're own research and coming up with different contentions.

1nc was really good at attacking the 1ac framework; you made several arguments that made a lot of sense and that was incredibly strategic.

1ar was really strong in extending and impacting out your contentions and attacking neg case/fw, however you did not respond to neg's attack on your own individuality fw.

2nr killed the fw debate, but your answers to her abuse/health contention are new so I didn't evaluate. The 2ar made the right choice to concede to neg fw, but didn't ever explicitly say why you link back into morality and max wellbeing. The most strategic way you can win the round is to extend ur health/abuse contention, and impacted that out -- had you done that I would've voted for you. Instead the 2ar was mostly defensive and didn't win bc didn't extend key offense and explain why that offense linked into the fw.

Phillippe Tamayo vs Brandon Elwood



Stephan, Michael

RFD

RFD:

Brandon won the round by extending his evidence throughout every speech and thoroughly attacking his opponent's case.

Phillippe:

When giving your case, stop slurring your words. I could not understand what you said and im sure Brandon felt the same way. Towards the end of the AC, you spoke clearly, but not when you were reading your actual case.

In Cx, don't put your foot on the chair while standing. I don't care, but if you have a lay judge, they probably will take it into evaluation.

Good job in Cx in trying to poke holes in your opponents cited author's.

Don't read weird frameworks like problem-solving. If you want to, provide evidence that framework is right.

Brandon

Good job on the case extensions and successfully defending your case from the aff args.

Speak louder and more confidently next time.

Nathan Seelig vs Valentino Vigil



HErrera, David

RFD

aff has more offense with contention 3 - ubi will solve obesity

Comments for Valentino Vigil

cool twin bro

Audren Rendon vs Quentin Hnery



Georges, Joseph

RFD

way too expensive, takes away welfare, UGW solves sufficiently and keeps welfare, worsens automation crisis. almost all the aff offense wasnt sufficiently extended in the 1AR for me to vote on it, so i can also vote neg on a risk of offense

Anish Buddolla vs Jatin Presse



Liu, Vincent

RFD

The weighing that the affirmative does breaks the tie between two very close sides. Scope and magnitude weighing means that I feel that even though a UBI might have some negative impacts, that ultimately is outweighed by the benefits of a UBI.

Join the National Speech & Debate Association Contact

About

Help