

Judge Soczynski (Con 11 Notes)

General RFD:

Good Job Y'all. I know with the tech issues and lunch and the updates, it's a weird round. That being said, I wanted to give you some reasons for my rankings.

I really appreciate people who give authorships / sponsorship speeches, especially when no one wants to do them. It shows you're willing to be a leader and quick on your feet. Ultimately, I'm looking for flexible debaters who can do all types of speeches well. Sen Noll and Sen Maheshwari both did this, and if I thought they were neck and neck with another debater, I did place them above the other debater for leadership.

Second, keep yourself engaged. Make sure you ask questions, keep making speeches and try not to check out of round. I keep track of that stuff. Third, if you P.O. at any point in the session and do a decent job. Doesn't have to be perfect, but kept the chamber under control. I also helps elevate your rank.

Fourth: Uniqueness of arguments / extending and rebutting arguments vs. Rehash. I understand a lot of you pre-write or pre-bullet your speeches, great, but make sure you are changing it as the round changes. Don't use the same quote or intro three other people have used.

Lastly, memorability, performance: If you read your speech and it sounds like you're just reading it to read it, I won't remember you. It's important that at least you sound and look like you care. Lack of emotion and in voice and facial expressions, hand movements make you forgettable.

That being said you all did well and I look forward to seeing more from you all!

Session 1: Venezuela

Maheshwari:

- Wage gap
 - 289% - relative way
 - Gender pay gap - make sure that you cite the year.
- Harms people
 - 2016 - implemented - 255% inflation.

- Where did this information come from? Make sure to cite your sources and the year.
- Great Job with questioning
- I know that you weren't planning on giving this speech, but you'll want to work on your delivery being a bit more fluid and confident. But Doing the first speech when no one wants to, does show leadership, so that helps!
- 2:30

Champ:

- Speech was good. You addressed the basic things on the bill that should have been covered and also doing some pre-emption on the aff.
- Good job with questioning. Don't have too much to add at the moment.

Thakore:

- You're talking way too fast, this isn't a spreading event :)
- This is a first affirmative - I'm surprised you didn't volunteer to do this speech first, you had the opportunity since nobody wanted to do the first aff

Whittet:

- Your speech is good, but your performance is a bit flat.
- It feels a bit like a constructive speech, which is fine for an early round speech, but you want to bring in some of the points that have been brought up already
- Confidence is key!!!! Try to work on some fluency, one thing you can do is practice in front of a mirror and it will help with being able to see what you're doing and the body language that you're projecting.
- You can also record yourself and play it back and critique yourself.

Barchuck:

- You did a good job adding some more to the oil info, but again, would hope to see more rebuttal in this speech at this point in the round.
- You did a decent job with questioning - I would like to see that same confidence in your speech

Morphew:

- You did a good job with attacking the evidence of your competitors
- Overall, this was a good speech!

Lin:

- Good speech - remember to give power behind your speech so it's interesting and feels some urgency. Also make sure to adjust your camera. We can't see below your nose.
- You did a great job in questioning - would like to see that confidence in speech

Noll:

- This was this a decent speech, but I did see more rehash than I would like to at this point of the round. You did have some rebuttal in there, but it should be the majority htat.
- I think you really shined during questioning

Nadella:

- Crystallization speech, great!
- Sanctions don't work - thank god, someone is saying it, this has been the biggest thing that needed to be said.
- Made humanitarian process worse -
- Your points are great, your organization and fluency need a bit of work. I know that it's hard because you are making these on the fly, so it's not like you can practice it. But you can practice this by giving yourself a prompt and try and speak on it clearly for 1 min and increase the time as it goes on. It helps with getting used to talking on the fly.

Wei:

- Sanctions won't work - using real life examples - I love this. This is a great - I would add the language "to expound on sen Nadella statements" that way we know that you're using and extending current
- No worries, it still happens, people forget introductions.
- For the question about saddam hussein - you did give an example of haiti, pivot to that. Even if it is slightly different, those other examples still stand.

2: Military Bases:

Noll:

- Thanks for going first and giving a sponsorship speech. I love that. It shows good leadership to me, especially since I know most people want to give rebuttal speeches.
- Deterrence - can have adverse effects - this is a great article.
- I think that you were a bit shakier in questioning but honestly since you're going first, it's hard.

Nadella:

- I like that you already start with some rebuttal right away. Again, fluency is something you're going to have to work on, but that's way easier to fix than bad arguments.
- Great job with questions

Champ:

- Imperialism, liability all good arguments
- Great performance of your speech
- I also like how you keep your answers short and to the point

Ryan:

- I'm glad you got a speech in!
- Good job in questioning, sometimes it's okay to own up when you mess it. It's okay :)
- Keep working on it! Making speeches on the fly are hard!

Round 2: Bill 1- Mars

Whittet:

- NASA - already has this
- I like the rhetoric - papercut
- I think I would have liked the intro to be more concise. I think instead of saying I'm going to tell you why the neg has no ground, focus on what this bill is solving and why we should pass it, and you can include some pre-emptive arguments.
- Your points felt organized, it was just the beginning few sentences that were shaky.

Thakore:

- Again, very fast, I know you're trying to get through a lot, but we also can only take in so much and it doesn't allow you to emphasize as much the important things.
- Arguments seemed good, this was a nice constructive speech for points, again remember, less can be more.

Morphew:

- Both worlds mars exploration is going to happen, that's a great argument
- Good presentation - good volume, emphasis, etc.
- Good to bring up some questioning already in some rebuttal
- Good use of rhetoric.
- Don't have a lot to say on this one, I thought this was well done!
- I like your answer about the phone - those visual types of examples are exceedingly

Muneeb:

- I think that you are making super valid arguments, but can you find evidence to back this up, or if you know where the water is coming from etc, make sure to cite your sources
- You have a great urgency in your voice, and I feel like you actually care about this and not just arguing because you have to.

Champ:

- I did like your speech, however, I was hoping you'd have a bit more rebuttal in this one. You have a few here, but you do have 4 different speakers to pick from
- You do add this more later one. Well done.
- You somehow defy time and you get so much in but really well in 3 mins. Well done

Winnick:

- Crushing dreams, that was funny. I liked it
- Long history imperialism - this was brought up before - make sure you added in new things.
- Good adding in some rebuttal here on the aff side and the vagueness of the bill.

Barchuck:

- JFK - isn't this the third time this has been used in this round? You have to be adaptable, if you see that others are using that same one, even if you have it written in, you'll want to change your opening. Like "I won't bore you with the JFK quote again, but he's right"
- The other thing is, when you're aff. You want to link your arguments to other ones, so you either are extending their arguments and giving them more nuance, OR you're going to be refuting or saying they're missing a big point. OR that all sides are or both sides are missing a point or that you want to deviate from the other representatives.

Lin:

- I like your first line, it's hilarious
- I think that all your points are valid. I would have loved you to bring in more of the other arguments to skewer them :)
- I like your fire! You did well with this speech!

Maheshwari:

- I think you brought up a really good point here, that we can use this money for something
- Fluency is something we're going to have to work on. It's really hard to do, especially when you're used to not talking necessarily in full sentences and more informally.

2nd Bill: Ransomware:

Noll: Aff

- I like when people do first aff's when no one else will, that shows leadership in the round.
- I'm glad you spend time defining it, that's important
- I'm glad you showed the impacts of what they are.
- I thought for having little notice, you did a good job in questioning.

Whittet: Neg

- Good job painting the picture of what the issue is and makes it feel more real
- You did a good job covering multitude different issue
- Questioning was a little hard since you had some connectivity issues.

Muneeb: Aff

- Good to add some rebuttal already
- I think that when you're doing rebuttal here, you can tell you're a bit off script and you lose your mojo, work on keeping the same energy and confidence when you go off script.

Champ: Neg

- You did a great job showing harms and impacts
- Your fluency was very good.
- How do we do this? It's simple - great use of rhetoric
- You also have been participating well in round - good questions, very respectful.
- Good job!

Morphew: Aff

- Good use of logic and also good use of relevant data
- You've done a good job all round keeping active in questioning. You also have been doing some good questions in there and I appreciated it.

Winnick: Neg

- You did a good job with paying attention to the other arguments and rebutting them. This was your best speech today.
- Totally picked. I have shown, not showed. Just grammar thing, not a big thing, just pointing it out.

- Nice conclusion at the end.

Lin - Neg:

- Good job, again would love to see you have a bit more confidence when you're doing your speech

Bill 3: Infant mortality

Aff: Maheshwari

- You do really well in questioning, but you can tell that you're a bit unfamiliar with the speeches, we'll have to work on doing speeches on the fly with rebuttal

Neg: Thakore

- Same comments from before
- You struggle a little bit with questioning, keep your answers short

Speaker	Rank	RFD
Sarpamale	2	You did an excellent job for a first time PO, I know rising to the position of the chair is scary for the first time. Just remember what Sun Tzu tells us about how " <i>in the midst of chaos, there is opportunity</i> ". Work with your coach to improve even more.
Stoltz	3	Brilliant speech, excellent argumentation. I am impressed that you took side arguments and responded to other debators in a EXTREAMLY limited prep round.
Lin		
Gnomeland	1	Simply lovely. You were the best speaker in the round. The Constitutionality argument was a gamble but it payed off well. But be prepared because when you take risks you could get caught up in questioning, and the other debators kind of put you on the ropes
Ali	8	Good work on the speech, it was actually the highlight of my day strangely
Ovall	6	Great speech and excellent work on responding to the other representitives questions
Fraher		
Thakore	7	Good speaking ability and questioning. Only problem was you speed up at points making it a little harder to hear <i>exactly</i> what you were saying on both questioning and speaking
Talatam	5	Wonderful speech and responce on questioning. My only critique is to try and slow down sometimes as over the computer it can be a little hard to tell. (tell Ross I say hi!)
Kuntla	4	Thank you for doing the first speech and kickstarting debate. I know it can be intimidating to do that but you did an excellent job on both the speaking and questioning

Chamber Comments

Ok so I know the topic of the round is a joke and not meant to be taken *too* seriously. But I am overall impressed that you all managed to keep decorum. I also am impressed that you all took the topic to the files and started doing actual prep for the round. Great work and I hope you all have an excellent rest of the season. Under this block is my email. I HIGHLY recommend personally emailing me and I will try and give any and all personalized feedback. You all missed the oportunity for a DIO joke though so neither here nor there

john.novack@und.edu

"Get your facts first, and then you can distort them as much as you please." — **Mark Twain.**

Student Name	Score	Comments
		Good sources for your data. Not sure what your argument was for it being xenophobic to not pass but otherwise great job and great arguments
Rep Cook	5	otherwise
Rep Yearous	4	Great argument for our civil rights on a difficult topic!
Rep Johnson		asked one question
Rep Barnbridge		did not speak
Sen Holding Eagle	4	Good uses of evidence, good arguments. Started a little later.
Rep Ousman	3	Good job, I must have missed the evidence but otherwise pretty good speech
Rep Krejci	6	Wow, great arguments on survival of the fittest, and sources. Nice source of Dungeons and Dragons, great arguments and confidence! Way
Sen Bigelow	6	to stress the urgency of taking action on the bill!
Rep Chen	6	Good job keeping with time and making sure people are not going over
Rep Zhang	6	Good use of evidence, great job addressing other arguments in your speech
Ramberg	4	Good arguments made, great job answering questions

Student Name	Score
Rep Cook	5
Rep Yearous	4
Rep Johnson	
Rep Barnbridge	
Sen Holding Eagle	4
Rep Ousman	3
Rep Krejci	6
Sen Bigelow	6
Rep Chen	6
Rep Zhang	6
Ramberg	4

Comments

Good sources for your data. Not sure what your argument was for it being xenophobic to not pass but otherwise great job and great arguments otherwise

Great argument for our civil rights on a difficult topic!

asked one question

did not speak

Good uses of evidence, good arguments. Started a little later.

Good job, I must have missed the evidence but otherwise pretty good speech

Wow, great arguments on survival of the fittest, and sources.

Nice source of Dungeons and Dragons, great arguments and confidence! Way to stress the urgency of taking action on the bill!

Good job keeping with time and making sure people are not going over

Good use of evidence, great job addressing other arguments in your speech

Good arguments made, great job answering questions

East Ridge Debate Congress Consolation Round Room 1 Ranking & Speaker Notes:

Student Name	Rank	Speech 1	Speech 2	Comments
Singh	1	PO		Well done. Thank you for your strong leadership
Briggs	2	6		Great round leadership and on point questions and speech
Willis	3	6		Hard hitting questions and felt like you were the best prepared for this round. I just wish you spoke more. When you did speak, it was impactful.
Denniston	4	5	4	Really great round. A little more prep would've served you well.
Maheshwari	5	5		Great questions and round leadership.
Muneeb	6	6		Intriguing ideas. Lost momentum and leadership after your speech.
Liu	7	5		Super great energy. Would love more research.
Johnson	8	5		Great improvement from round 1 to now. More participation will serve you well.
Irion	9	5		I found your perspective strong. You were the first to bring up the current blood shortages in a speech. I'd love to hear more from you in the future.
Aikins	9	--		Congrats on making it to consolation. Hope you participate next time you make it 😊
Ayeni	9	--		Congrats on making it to consolation. Hope you participate next time you make it 😊

Speaker Notes:

PO Rep Singh—6

Really great leadership. Calm, authoritative, and kind. Very well done.

Rep Denniston Blood Sponsorship—5

Arguments: Avoid Major Crisis (Immortal)—Common Good for Americans—Distribution/Storage Systems in Place

Speaking: Great eye contact, well spoken

Sources: 1

2:09

Rep Maheshwari Blood Neg—5

Arguments: Health of Citizens—Negotiating with Terrorists—Violate Human Rights—Alternatives

Speaking: Strong, well spoken

Organization: Strong

Sources: 0

2:19

Rep Muneeb Blood Pro—6

Misquitos analogy is intriguing

Arguments: Protect Citizens Life/Death—They are too strong to resist

Speaking: Great use of inflections and nonverbals to support your arguments

Sources: 2 (Twilight, 14th)

2:29

Rep Irion Neg—5

Arg: Shortages for humans in need of blood (great point)

Speaking: You seem a bit nervous but have strong delivery. Be confident in your knowledge

Sources: 0

General: Great job answering difficult questions

1:37

No Aff

Rep Liu Blood Neg—5

Argument: Bill Needs Changes—Look at Alternatives Instead of Adopting and Improve Vampire-Human Relations—Humans Need Blood too (Shortage Sources?)

Organization: Speech could use a little more structure

Speaking: Great energy! This is a fun topic, thanks for bringing energy to it. Great eye contact and non verbal.

Sources: 0

Questions: Use specific culture and lore to back your statements

3:10

Rep Briggs—Convert some of those great questions into speeches

Rep Denniston Blood Aff—4

Argument: How do we know traditional lore is correct?

Thanks for keeping the debate going to make sure everyone has a chance to speak, would love to have some more research included as well.

1:13

Rep Briggs Blood Neg—6

Arguments: Do not negotiate with terrorists—Focus on finding missing people—Focus on our people and blood shortages (THANK YOU for citing blood shortage stats and not just saying it)

Organization: Good

Speaking: Strong well spoken, good passion and energy

Sources: 1

Questions: Great answers to questions

2:56

No Aff

Rep Johnson Blood Neg—5

Argument: Should Declare Martial Law to War with Vampires National Quarantine—How to Kill (Cite Sources share what lore you know. It sounds like you really know a lot about Vampires so support your expertise.

Speaking: Really Strong

Sources: 0

1:25

No Aff

Rep Willis Blood Neg—6

Arguments: Blood Diseases/Internal Bleeding in Humans—France Precedence (fantastic point)

Speaking: Strong, well spoken

Sources: 2 (Best use of authority and research so far)

2:23

Voting—Did not pass

Participant	Enbackorr	Hussein	Long	Powell	Ress	Lemaster
Aff/Neg	Aff	Neg	Neg	Aff	N/A	Neg
Comments	> Made a good point about the fact that alternative is vampires ravaging humanity	> Critiqued the bill convincingly > Noted that vampires can consume blood from other animals than humans	> Made cogent argument that many people cannot donate blood safely > Pointed out that the demand ed amount of blood by the vampires can still be met if we exempt at risk populations	> Used data Somewhat incoherent	Made a hilarious proposal that involves Congress receiving powers from the vampire overlord and sending objectors to blood farms. All, but one person voted for this proposal	> Pointed out that many people cannot donate blood > Argued that we could just kill the vampire overlord
Rank	5	3	2	6	1	4

Student Name	Rank	Judge Comments - Jonathan Lemaster	Speech 1 Score	Speech 2 Score	Speech 3 Score
Chen (PO)	3	<p>Initial starting session: Very good. Maintaining timing and questions: Great job. Final vote: Good job on making sure everyone voted.</p> <p>RFD: Very good job for doing PO your first time. Work on smoothing out voting process, but like that you accurately got everyone's vote.</p>	5		
Cook	2	<p>Speech 1 - 2:42 Sponsor speech: Good introduction with definition of human. Interesting argument that vampires are citizens, flesh out logic to support claim and be prepared for rebuttal questions. Good delivery.</p> <p>RFD: Very good sponsor speech and great job with questioning.</p>	5		
Ousman	9	<p>Speech 1 - 2:16 Negation speech: Multiple negation claims. Work on developing logic to support claims. Good delivery.</p> <p>RFD: Speech logic was a little all over the place. Suggest structuring the argument to make it easier for the listener to follow.</p>	4		
Bigelouw	1	<p>Speech 1 - 2nd Affirmation: Great sources cited of D&D to known vampires weaknesses. New argument introduced by diluting blood. Great delivery.</p> <p>RFD: Good speech and very good rebuttal questions.</p>	6		
Holding Eagle	4	<p>Speech 1 - 3:10 2nd Negation: Good citing sources of Red Cross for how often to given. New argument introduced, unable to produce enough blood. Good job citing CDC statics.</p> <p>RFD:</p>	5		

Krejci	6	<p>Speech 1 - 2:06 3rd Affirmation: Good reference to details of the bill. Interesting argument on do unto others. Anticipate questions to a claim to just submit to our overlords. Delivery was aggressive, suggestion slowing the pace down.</p> <p>RFD: Well structured argument, work on on pace of delivery.</p>	5		
Yearous	7	<p>Speech 1 - 1:31 3rd Negation: New argument that vampires that are terrorist and US doesn't negotiate with terrorist. Suggest adding support for claim. Good delivery.</p> <p>RFD: New argument and bold claims, need to support claim and be ready for passionate rebuttals to claim. Good job with questioning other speeches.</p>	4		
Zhang	8	<p>Speech 1 - 3:09 4th Affirmation: Good citing source for Red Cross. Pace of speech was very fast, suggest slowing down to present argument clear.</p> <p>RFD: Well formed arguments and sources, the speech was so fast it was hard to listen to and process. Good job with questioning other speeches.</p>	4		
Ramberg	5	<p>Speech 1 - 2:13 5th Affirmation: Very good 3 point argument. Suggest with additional time to add sources to support argument. Good delivery.</p> <p>RFD: Argument very well structured and logical. Had time to support argument and suggest adding some sources.</p>	5		
Johnson	10	RFD: No speech given, but good follow up questions.			
Branidge	11	RFD: N o speech given and no questions asked.			

Student Name	Rank	Judge Comments (Your Name Here)	Speech 1 Score	Speech 2 Score	Speech 3 Score
Rep Enbackom	4	You are saying a lot of very funny things in very serious ways. I would either recommend having fun with the speech, or taking it seriously that way it's not a fight between what you are saying and what you mean.	5		
Rep Long	3	I think you could have spoken a bit stronger/louder.	5		
Rep. Hussein	2	You had a lot of fun with this speech! Good work. You also held your ground well in questioning	6		
Rep. Powell	5	You are tripping over your words a lot in this speech. Work on fluency overall!	5		
Rep. Speltz	6	Great start to your speech. Try to utilize the full time of your speech. Your speech only took up about half of the speech time.	5		
Rep. Lemaster	7	You could have utilized the time of your speech a bit more. This was a very short speech!	4		
Rep Ress	1	Love the power to your voice. Thank you for POing.	6		

Judge Soczynski (Final Round)

RFD:

Congrats - you made it! Long day. You all did such a good job. I'm glad you had fun with it. A couple of things that weighed heavily in my decision.

1. Weighing - the biggest argument here is weighing which side will save more lives, one person I think did the best job with this was Rep. Amarrah. This is one of the biggest things in debate, to be able to weigh the opponent's argument against your own and tell your judges why you win, or why they should vote for this bill.
2. Creative arguments - love seeing them and people having fun.
3. P.O. - Tumu did a great job, and PO's usually land in my top 5

Just an observation in general:

There was a brief allusion to this but the people turning into vampires are people you know. And I think the cure was a good argument, and I would have liked to see the Aff weigh more into, killing all vampires and taking large military presence could kill your friends, family members, etc. Again, getting into those weighing mechanisms. Nothing says that once they became a vampire they became a totally different person.

I think the Neg needed to prove that your world saves more lives & more effectively than passing today's legislation and then using military or other resources at a later date. I didn't see much of that happening. Something to think about when you have a lot of alts and unknowns in a bill. Not saying neg speakers did a bad job, just something, especially later in round would be a good thing to address. There will be other more serious (think nat cir) tournaments in your life that will come up and this is something you'll have to deal with again!

Williams: Aff

- I like that you had fun, I also like that you offer some alts that we can give them
- You have both for defensive or offensive arguments
- I think you have to be a bit careful, some people were worried if it was for or against.

Kori: Neg

- You did a great job here, you have some creative and some real sources in here
- I think that you did a great job here laying out all the harms that could happen here.
- I think in questioning - try not to repeat yourself
- Are nuclear weapons going to be able to destroy them? Did I miss this in your evidence
- I think the argument that they may test it - is a good one.
- Mikesell is right here, they are people who are dying and becoming vampires

Sun: Aff

- 4-8 weeks to replace - 3 months - reasonable and within that time
- Passifying - are they though? What promises do we have? Although I think this is a good point

- COVID vampires - cure - this would be my thought too, these are people we know :)
- You could be stronger in questioning, be confident with your answer!
- Also when asking questions, you'll want to ask them faster :)

Singh: Neg

- Other alternatives for vampires
- I think that you need to say why you are risking the lives of people in hospitals
- I think that adding some rebuttal in this point would help.
- I feel like this was a bit of rehash of rep kori's point

Frohlig: Aff

- Everything at risk - can you make this a more powerful statement? Disaster, worst case senario, worse than Kirsten Stewart in any movie ever? Try and make this more of an active argument that will catch people's attention and be more powerful. This is one of the best arguments you have on the AFF
- We don't know what's going to work.
- Way to hold your own there and in both worlds people may die. You'll want to reiterate that and say either way people die, this is the one with less casualties, double down and don't let others push you around! You got this!

Chandra: Neg

- Patient autonomy - I do like that you have a variety of sources
- Issues - anyone over age of 18 - 1 pint - 37% can donate blood that's a great statistic
- Covid-19 can't be eligible. Do the vampires care about that?
- Fighting back - strongest military
- I think here, you also need to do the weighing and impacting of lives.

Amarrah: Aff

- How stuff works - few weaknesses
- You go into multiple other things that we can do on top of passing this bill
- Period blood - this was so unique! I didn't even think about that
- I like that you do some weighing and impacting of lives (this is the biggest point of this debate)
- I also like that you brought it back to your constituents and why it's the best
- Good job with questioning!

Ballsrud: Neg

- 6.8 million donors - this was really cool evidence!
- You'll want to work on fluency, how you can do this is by giving yourself some prompts to talk about for two mins and try not to mess up and keep things conversational. This will help you with impromptu speaking and it makes life so much easier.
- Congress is a combo of really good research and points and being able to present them in a confident and make it easy to understand.
- Otherwise, I thought this was well structured, your points were well reasoned and I liked your conclusion!

Rauchbauer: Aff

- Lol I love that anti-twilight - which gets to your greater point that we don't know anything about it, but it was humours

- I think that alliances are a great argument and something people haven't brought up yet
- good job.

Knusel: Neg

- I'm glad you gave a speech! It's important to keep trying
- We can make a vaccine, if that's the case, why not approve the bill in status quo? You'll want to address this
- Again, super happy that you are giving a speech and trying a crystal speech, the biggest thing you'll want to remember, you want to weigh and say why the neg is winning and why we should vote against this bill.

Mikesell: Neg

- If you're the last speaker, what you'll want to do is make a crystallization speech and weigh why your side is winning. You'll want to include more rebuttal.
- I think what she was doing was weighing - some lives over many - not sure if this is the strongest argument
- That being said, I'm glad you got a speech in! And that you dressed up. I love halloween! Daybreakers - lol, good reference!

Tumu:

- You did great! It's a tough with so many people and we had an active chamber.
- You had only a few mess ups with questions, mostly with recency, which I can sort of understand because the way you track questions is really confusing. It's hard to tell the recency and precedence. I started keeping track on my own paper.
- You needed a few seconds to get your bearings - totally fine! It's all part of the process. I know at the end you seemed flustered but you did great! Keep doing it and keep practicing.

Name	Rank	Comments (Ben Ross)	points
Krejci	1	Very interesting take on this bill, and a well structured speech. Taking this to the logical extreme is a good way to shift the discursive window.	6
Bigelow	2	Great job crystalizing the risks of a Vampire war and affirming the bill with a sneaky trick. The questions on keeping the plot covert (and if it works on these types of vampries) are fair, but your D&D research ceratinly came in handy. We had multiple competing theories of affirmation going on, so it kept things interesting	6
Chen	3	Great job being prepared with placards, keeping the conversation moving, and setting a serious tone for a fairly silly topic. Nice job trying to find some clash (since the majority is clearly eager to submit to our vampire overlords.)	6
Zhang	4	I like the pointed questions in cross-x, though I would recommend allowing the rep to finish answering the question. Your speech did an excellent job articulating the true risks of negation, and teasing out an alternate interpretation of an "escort" was very clever	5
Ramberg	5	Well structured speech, and a good job articulating the risks. Nice job with the careful reading of the bill and the updates	6
Holding Eagle	6	Excellent, focused questions on cross-x. I like the quick research on current blood donations. There was a clear link between your negative interpretation of the risks to vampires from our lousy human blood and Rep Bigelow's eager willingness to poison vampires through affirmation. The aff conceded your point! I was hoping to see you extend that toward the end of the round	6
Yearous	7	I like that you assumed the defiant mantle of the Vampire resistance! Conceding "even if we all die" in your speech put you at a fairly immediate disadvantage. As you conceded in cross-x, there have been no overt threats. No need to necesasrily gift them to the opposition. This bill had fairly lopsided representation, so I appreciated you introducing a clear theory of negation	5
Cook	8	Thanks for getting things started! I had some trouble following your equating of humans and animals in the opening part of your speech, as I'm not sure how that helped affirm the bill. Excellent participation throughout the debate, and good pointed questions on cross-x	5
Ousman	9	I like your point on vulnerable people without means to pay a fine. This point went mostly conceded throughout the debate. In terms of style, your speech contained a lot of open questions. I would recommend structuring your speech with declarative sentences and outlinging your points ahead of time. This also applies to cross-x answers	4
Barnidge	9	No speech	
Johnson	9	No speech / questions	