



4:58 1-54

5:24 465

AFF

Spkr	Barstow NP	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Ariza Nanji	29
1	Solomon Park	28

NEG

Spkr	Casady AC	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Shaheer Aamir	27
2	Jack Christ	28

Winner: Barstow NP School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? N/A

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff ~~was on~~ defended T, CP, DA was very close but won on impact calc. Neg did well on Solvency answers to the advantages, but not enough emphasis.



AFF

Spkr	Little Rock Central CM	POINTS (25 - 30)
1A	Chloe Cunningham	27.8
2A	Andrew Marecki Alida Kohlmann	27.6

NEG

Spkr	Liberal Arts and Science BJ	POINTS (25 - 30)
2N	Ayush Bhansali	27.0
1N	Aadarsh Jha	27.2

Winner: Liberal Arts and Science BJ debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? Yes

Signature: Vyas Venkataraman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Aff proved they were T but couldn't defend it. It took over the case on circumventing lawyers.
 No good answers to legitimizing the state and saying the aff stops racism is not persuasive.*

Neg don't disclose unless you have to
Aff, LA should be all 5 minutes



Handwritten notes:
 8.00
 6:53

AFF

Spkr	Edmond North CL	POINTS (25 - 30)
1A	Michael Cox	28.6
2A	Caleb Lagge	28.4

NEG

Spkr	Barstow AB	POINTS (25 - 30)
2N	Alex Archer	29.1
1N	Julia Butch	28.3

Winner: Barstow AB School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision: _____

Handwritten comments:
 CPo/w
 the aff
 of answer to the KB



NEG - ~~5:49~~ : 56
AFF - 3:07

AFF

Spkr	Tulsa Union MP	POINTS (25-30)
1	Zachary Martin	26.5
2	Gregory Pitts	26.4

NEG

Spkr	Bentonville DD	POINTS (25-30)
2	Rohin Dasari	27.2
1	Shubhu Dharmadhikari	27.0

Winner: Bentonville DD debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

IN THE 2 AC / IAC
 AFF'S ONLY ANSWER TO THE SECURITY K IS THAT AFF O/W - THERE WAS NO DENIAL OF THE LINK; NO POEM; NO ATTEMPT TO CHALLENGE IT'S FRAMEWORK / THEORETICAL APPROACH:
 WHEN THE AFF DROPS ALL OF CASE IN IAC, THE K FACILITY MUCH WINS BY DEFAULT. THE 2 D EXTENDS THAT AFF'S APPROACH CREATES BETA EDUCATION - SOMETHING AFF CHALLENGED.
 FRONTLINING THESE ARGS & MAKING BETA USE OF THE ORIGINAL IAC GUIDANCE & APPLYING IT TO ANSWER BOTH SOME OF THE CASE ARGS & SOME OF THE TERROR / T & K WOULD SOLVE TULSA UNION WEL.



AFF

Spkr	Barstow LL	POINTS (25 - 30)
3	Luke Lopatofsky	27.3
1	Shaunak Lokre	27.8

NEG

Spkr	Crossings Christian BW	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Cole Bardell	27.5
4	Thomas Ward	27

Winner: Barstow LL School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Rachel Watson

Comments & Reason for Decision:

aff - JAC should put case on top - also work on enunciation
 You should call them out on their perf cons - pretty screwed up to say embrace suffering is a racism aff
 Natives not doing fine ...

neg - ask questions in cross to help get links to DA so your discls stick better
 - probably bad to tell a person of color to embrace racism
 - signpost better in INC
 - Ridley 14 was extended 3 times ...
 - Churchill is not a link - it's a framing issue
 - they totally answered Ks on JAC

Flow the JAR - don't pick up!

RFD: Neg o de enough work on impacts / impact framing & INC was problematic.
 Perm (S) - there are no links

5:37-48:18 2:56

4:53-52 1:26



Calm down a little. Both of you are unnecessarily aggressive and it is very out of place in this low key round

"Hackers who smoke weed are better hackers."
LOLZ.

AFF		
Spkr	Crossings Christian SH	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Dalton Schumaker	28
2	Emma Hawxy	27.9

NEG		
Spkr	Barstow PF	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Robbie Putney	28.2
2	Taha Fanaswala	28.1

Winner: Barstow PF School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: Rosalia Valdez LRC

now 4

Comments & Reason for Decision:

To All: I know that you are just starting out, but please quickly correct steaming prep. I gave two verbat warnings about this, and yet it continued! Steaming prep (in this round) → neg: 1) reading ahead twice in the speech doc 2) talking during flashing & setup & tech issues (multiple times); aff: talking during flashing.

Both teams are using WAY too much prep. Nearly 5 minutes for the INC and 7:50 for the ZAC.

AFF
- you need to provide a CI on T. Reading a case card doesn't really cut it as a WM, and definitely doesn't adequately refute T.
- Extend your offense! They don't touch 90% of your aff, but the ZAC only hones in on defense args on Cyber Attacks adv.

NEG
- your case D is incredibly outdated/non-unique. 2002 evidence on "cyber attacks/threat exaggerated/unreal" is very much a nonstarter.

RFD → neg → no extension of AT. T-surr. / no CI or CS
aff concedes 100% of offense in 1AR/2AR.



AFF

Spkr	Little Rock Central CC	POINTS (25 - 30)
1A	Abbey Carlson	28.9
2A	Abbey Cunningham	29.1

NEG

Spkr	Barstow TB	POINTS (25 - 30)
1N	Haley Turner	29.0
2N	Zoe Brous	29.2

Winner: Little Rock Central CC debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? yes

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Value to Life vs. Extinction became the nexus question, and the 2AR does a lot of flushing out of this argument while the 2NR only extends it.



AFF

Spkr	Casady DW	POINTS (25 - 30)
3	Quinn Daugherty 1A	28
4	Jordan Westlake 2A	27.5

NEG

Spkr	Barstow DT	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Tyler Durwood 2N	28.5
1	Kristin Tingle 1N	29

Winner: Barstow DT School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Alexandria Fredrickson

Comments & Reason for Decision: *TO ALL: ask judge pref before the round, saves time during the round*

- 1AC: Good! Put more in it, you had 2:34 left, add an advantage, Good CX
- 1NC: Good case specificity! I like your T:interp
- 2AC: Need more on case + counter:interp on T, standards + voters, more on DA. you had 3 min left, read more
- 2NC: Good, They didn't read a counter:interp
- 1NR: Good, spend more time on circumvention, don't just shadow extend on California
- 1AR: Better cards on DA, put these in 2AC, argue no new in the 2 on the CP
- 2NR: Don't kick T!! Spend more time on DA if you're still using it as a NB, you have 1 min left, don't drop case title
- 2AR: They dropped T, you don't have to address it



AFF

Spkr	Casady RC	POINTS (25 - 30)
IAC	Humza Razaq	28
2AC	Sean Cudd	27

NEG

Spkr	Liberal Arts and Science BV	POINTS (25 - 30)
INC	Isabelle Blaha	29
2NC	Caroline Voges	29

Winner: Liberal Arts and Science BV debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Camil Gosomov

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The 2AC was only Topicality but still didn't answer the neg args
~~Heated a counterpoint~~
Overall, the aff didn't answer any of the counterplans or da enough
to win the args.



AFF

Spkr	Barstow CS	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Paul Case	24.2
2	Sam Short	29.3

NEG

Spkr	Tulsa Union AL	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Sandra Alrifai	24
2	Haley Lee	24.1

Winner: Barstow CS debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

INC - The FW on the K card... w/ your lib! EV on case.

X of INC - saying "we need a economic system to be stable" might be a cap link

JAC: Good Cover you don't focus on their ~~the~~ Turn enough

JNC - Answer all of the Aff args on the K. Use ALL speech time.

MVA: Answer the Perm!! Don't read all those new Topics

JAR: Tell me how your Perm functions. How do you do both.

JNA: Good Analysis. W/o Perm answer its hard to win K. Try going for process

JAP: Don't over focus on Neg's foreign econ. Tell me how yours is in price

RFD: AFF wins
 Perm. Neg has no offense left

8
 5:00
 5:20
 5:40
 6:15
 6:15
 6:15
 6:15



Bentonville DD (Dasari & Dharmadhikari) vs Barstow AB (Archer & Butch)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Barstow AB

Bentonville DD

AFF

NEG

Winner: Pos Bentonville DD debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Vyas Venkataraman

Other judges on panel: Matt Casas, Gene Moon. Please do not start until all judges are present.

*K is unannounced, both K's. Took a ct down. Neg told me how Aff was unethical. Incredibly slow the
format K was run.*

*rx
only option is to
context*

Quarters

Casas, Matt



Bentonville DD (Dasari & Dharmadhikari) vs Barstow AB (Archer & Butch)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Barstow Bentonville
AFF NEG

Winner: Bentonville debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Matt Casas

Other judges on panel: Gene Moon, Vyas Venkataraman. Please do not start until all judges are present.



Barstow DT (Durwood & Tingle) vs Tulsa Union AL (Alrifai & Lee)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

 :10 Tulsa Union AL Barstow DT :30
AFF NEG

Winner: Barstow DT debating on the NEG
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Callie

Other judges on panel: Dave Devevrat, Daniel Schexnayder. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Neg took out most of case & won on unanswered DA.

Aff

Solv. - illalt causes not overcome

Econ. - econ resilient

Sec. - best cont. for Aff, but fumbled evidence that cyber war not a threat

Neg

T - dropped by Neg

CP - ok.

DA - minimally & superficially answered in 2AC - but dropped & insufficiently answered until 2AR

Quarters



Barstow DT (Durwood & Tingle) vs Tulsa Union AL (Alrifai & Lee)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Tulsa	Union	AL	Barstow	DT
AFF			NEG	
Winner: Barstow DT debating on the Neg				
School/Team			Side (Aff or Neg)	
Signature: Dave Devevrat				

Other judges on panel: Callie Ham, Daniel Schexnayder. Please do not start until all judges are present.

The 2AR does no impact calculus, and while the negative has no warrants for any of the case args in the 2NR, they do give me an ethics first claim on the warming debate, which is the only comparative ! calc.

PA also turns case not particularly answered b/c aff concedes warming → instability/war which would incentivize terror in the 1st place; 2AR extended no impact to the econ advantage.

Room: US 128
Start: 11:00 AM
Novice Policy

Quarters

[Signature]
Schexnayder, Daniel
Little Rock Central



Barstow DT (Durwood & Tingle) vs Tulsa Union AL (Alrifai & Lee)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Tulsa Union AL Barstow DT
AFF NEG

Winner: Barstow DT debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Daniel Schexnayder

Other judges on panel: Dave Devevrat, Callie Ham. Please do not start until all judges are present.

NEGATIVE WINS THE DT WHICH OUTWEIGHS CASE
AND SUFFICIENT DAFANGE TO MITIGATE THE AFF'S IMPACTS

Room: US 129
Start: 11:00 AM
Novice Policy

Quarters



~~SCHENNAUER DANCE~~
Siems, Lane
Little Rock Central
Lane Siems

Liberal Arts and Science BV (Blaha & Voges) vs Barstow CS (Case & Short)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Barstow CS Liberal Arts Science BV

AFF

NEG

Winner: Liberal Arts & Science BV debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Other judges on panel: Jaryn Phillips, Hanna Roberts. Please do not start until all judges are present.

RFD = Φ perm on CPse only risk of
Net benefit O/W any ~~defense~~ defense

Lmsiems@gmail.com



Liberal Arts and Science BV (Blaha & Voges) vs Barstow CS (Case & Short)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Barstow

AFF

Liberal Arts & Science

NEG

Winner: Liberal Arts & Science debating on the Neg.
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Hanna Roberts

Other judges on panel: Jaryn Phillips, Lane Siems. Please do not start until all judges are present.

2N - great analysis on the impact level for the disad, but there was no discussion on the uniqueness, link, or internal link level.

1A2 - you need the overview. Stand still!

2NR - Love the CP, need you to tell me why your net benefits outweigh why they weigh the AFF against your CP since you @ the AFF. Really needed the DA to make this easier, but a lot to work w/ after the block. The way you're describing lower courts refusal to listen to the Supreme Court sounds a little like a sovereignty take out to the CP as well.

AFF: a great answer would have been precedent setting. The Supreme Court sets precedent for all courts in the U.S. (@ state & fed level). The D.C. District court ~~the~~ rulings do not set ~~being~~ binding authority for all courts just those in their district. While they ~~do~~ have jurisdiction over the D.E.A. because the D.E.A is within their ~~jurisdiction~~ geographical boundaries, it doesn't set a precedent for, say, Texas local authorities who engage in similar activities as the DEA.

1AR - You HAVE to leave the 2AR alone. Absolutely cannot keep interrupting his final 30 seconds - it's very obvious he doesn't want your assistance, and it undermines his speech.

voted on the CP. & perm. & answer to timeframe/real world net benefit. CP is inclusive of ~~and~~ checks against later circumvention. Solves racism faster than the AFF so it's my most ethical option.

- as an aside, the CP is just factually how court cases work. You can't just skip to the Supreme Court.

Quarters



Liberal Arts and Science BV (Blaha & Voges) vs Barstow CS (Case & Short)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Barstow ~~CS~~ CS AFF Liberal Arts and Science BV NEG

Winner: Liberal Arts & Science BV debating on the neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Other judges on panel: Hanna Roberts, Lane Siems. Please do not start until all judges are present.

the affirmative team ~~is~~ risks at least a link to the disad, even when taking into account the possible nonuniqueness of the disad.

Regardless of that though, I believe that the counterplan solves back for 100% of the use, and it ~~is~~ abide by the minimal evidence,

then it should chase to solve ~~quickly~~, this instance of racism the fastest way possible.

Since the use is on the disad, the counterplan may ~~is~~ feel the CP solves much quicker than the affirmative.



Barstow PF (Fanaswala & Putney) vs Liberal Arts and Science BV (Blaha & Voges)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Barstow PF

LAS BV

AFF

NEG

Winner: LAS BV debating on the Neg

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Will Thompson

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Gabi Glidewell, Anthony Joseph. Please do not start until all judges are present.

No offense on DA (aff says, "extend the turn" in the ZAR, but no idea what "turn" this might be - not enough info to evaluate). CP (S) 100% of DA, and the only risk of a deficit is if the CP's DC Court can't do plan. However, the plan text repeats ONE CASE, EPIC vs. DEA, and the neg. CP does the same via the DC Court, ~~the~~ which the Justia ev. proves is possible. No explanation in analytics or cards of how HRW case would be key or even how aff would solve it. Means 1% risk of DA justifies neg. ballot b/c CP (S) 100% of case. Embedded answer to perm.



Liberal Arts and Science BV (Blaha & Voges) vs Barstow PF (Fanaswala & Putney)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Barstow PF
AFF

Liberal Arts BV
NEG

Winner: Liberal Arts BV debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Other judges on panel: Will Thompson, Gabi Glidewell. Please do not start until all judges are present.

*I don't think the arguments
assumptions are as good as you
think. just think that your*

Semis



Barstow PF (Fanaswala & Putney) vs Liberal Arts and Science BV (Blaha & Voges)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Barstow PF


LAS BV

AFF

NEG

Winner: Liberal Arts & Sciences debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: _____



Other judges on panel: Will Thompson, Anthony Joseph. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Oral



Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Barstow DT (Durwood & Tingle)

Bentonville DD (Dasari & Dharmadhikari)

AFF

NEG

Winner: Bentonville DD debating on the NEG
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Derek Hilligoss

Other judges on panel: Hanna Roberts, Justin Yoon. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Aff 6:50
Aim 1
1:53

neg 6:00
Aim 2
6:40

RFD
pic (S)
use

att & justification for state
DSRB inpt terms att argues
h5a p ignore own copracency
cedes & fiat dicit a fess

1st: quit jumping around in
speech & head so rone
sar ras ext.

all = quit using "back back"

Room: US 205
Start: 3:00 PM
Novice Policy

Semis

~~_____~~
***Roberts, Hanna**



Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Barstow DT (Durwood & Tingle)

Bentonville DD (Dasari & Dharmad-
hikari)

AFF

NEG

Winner: Barstow (AFF) debating on the AFF
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Hanna Roberts

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Derek Hillgoss, Justin Yoon. Please do not start until all judges are present.

IAR - You are wasting so much time with generic IAC extensions. Put it in context of what they've said.

All agree I should vote on racism, so not worried about the DA turn who does best job explaining their political approach? AFF because feels like Nunn is the "individual speech act" arg addresses the ~~the~~ args about not externalizing ~~the~~ politics to the state.

Semis



Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Barstow DT (Durwood & Tingle)

Bentonville DD (Dasari & Dharmadhikari)

AFF

NEG

Winner: Bentonville debating on the Negative
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Hanna Yoon

Other judges on panel: Hanna Roberts, Derek Hilligoss. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Neg
aff concede state fails empirically and functionally concludes Schley.
Roleplaying? also bad.



4:58 1:54

3:24 4:65

AFF

Spkr	Barstow NP	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Ariza Nanji	29
1	Solomon Park	28

NEG

Spkr	Casady AC	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Shaheer Aamir	27
2	Jack Christ	28

Winner: Barstow NP School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? N/A
Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff ~~was on~~ defeated T, CP, DA was very close but won on impact
Calc. Neg did well on Solvency answers to the advantages,
but not enough emphasis.



AFF

Spkr	Little Rock Central CM	POINTS (25 - 30)
1A	Chloe Cunningham	27.8
2A	Andrew Marecki	27.6

Alida Kuhlmann

NEG

Spkr	Liberal Arts and Science BJ	POINTS (25 - 30)
2N	Ayush Bhansali	27.0
1N	Aadarsh Jha	27.2

Winner: Liberal Arts and Science BJ debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? Yes

Signature: Vyas Venkataraman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff proved they were T but couldn't defend it. He took over the case on documenting lawyers.
No good answers to legitimizing the state and saying the aff stops racism is not persuasive.

Neg don't disclose unless you have to
Aff, IAC should be all 5 minutes



8.00
6:53

AFF

Spkr	Edmond North CL	POINTS (25 - 30)
1A	Michael Cox	28.6
2A	Caleb Lagge	27.4

NEG

Spkr	Barstow AB	POINTS (25 - 30)
2N	Alex Archer	29.1
1N	Julia Butch	28.3

Winner: Barstow AB School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision: _____

CPo/w
The aff
of answer to the KB



NEG - ~~5:59~~ : 56
AFF - 3:07

AFF

Spkr	Tulsa Union MP	POINTS (25-30)
1	Zachary Martin	26.5
2	Gregory Pitts	26.4

NEG

Spkr	Bentonville DD	POINTS (25-30)
2	Rohin Dasari	27.2
1	Shubhu Dharmadhikari	27.0

Winner: Bentonville DD debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

IN THE 2 AC / IAC
 AFF'S ONLY ANSWER TO THE SECURITY K IS THAT AFF O/W - THERE WAS
 NO DENIAL OF THE LINK; NO POEM; NO ATTEMPT TO CHALLENGE
 IT'S FRAMEWORK / THEORETICAL APPROACH:
 WHEN THE AFF DROPS ALL OF CASE IN IAC, THE K FACILITY
 MUCH WINS BY DEFAULT. THE 2 D EXTENDS THAT AFF'S
 APPROACH CREATES BETA EDUCATION - SOMETHING
 AFF & CHALLENGER.

FRONT LINED THESE ARGS & MAKING BETA USE
 OF THE ORIGINAL IAC GUIDANCE & APPLYING
 IT TO ANSWER BOTH SOME OF THE CASE ARGS &
 SOME OF THE TERROR / T & K WOULD SOLVE
 TULSA UNION WELL.



AFF

Spkr	Barstow LL	POINTS (25 - 30)
3	Luke Lopatofsky	27.3
1	Shaunak Lokre	27.8

NEG

Spkr	Crossings Christian BW	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Cole Bardell	27.5
4	Thomas Ward	27

Winner: Barstow LL School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Rachel Watson

Comments & Reason for Decision:

aff - 2AC should put case on top - also work on enunciation
 You should cull them out on their perf cons - pretty screwed up to say embrace suffering to a racism aff
 Natives not doing fine ...

neg - ask questions in cross to help get links to DA so your discls stick better
 - probably bad to tell a person of color to embrace racism
 - signpost better in INC
 - Riley 14 was extended 3 times ...
 - Churchill is not a link - it's a framing issue
 - they totally answered Ks on 2AC

Flow the 2AR - don't pick up!

RFD: Neg o de enough work on impacts / impact framing & INC was problematic.
 Perm (S) - there are no links



Calm down a little. Both of you are unnecessarily aggressive and it is very out of place in this low key round

"Hackers who smoke weed are better hackers."
LOLZ.

AFF		
Spkr	Crossings Christian SH	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Dalton Schumaker	28
2	Emma Hawxby	27.9

NEG		
Spkr	Barstow PF	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Robbie Putney	28.2
2	Taha Fanaswala	28.1

Winner: Barstow PF School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: Rosalia Varden LRC

now 4

Comments & Reason for Decision:

To All: 1) I know that you are just starting out, but please quickly correct steaming prep. I gave two verbat warnings about this, and yet it continued! Steaming prep (in this round) → neg: 1) reading ahead twice in the speech doc 2) talking during flashing & setup & tech issues (multiple times); aff: talking during flashing.

2) Both teams are using WAY too much prep. Nearly 5 minutes for the INC and 7:50 for the ZAC.

AFF
- you need to provide a CI on T. Reading a case card doesn't really cut it as a WM, and definitely doesn't adequately refute T.
- Extend your offense! They don't touch 90% of your aff, but the ZAC only hones in on defense args on Cyber Attacks adv.

NEG
- your case D is incredibly outdated/non-unique. 2002 evidence on "cyber attacks/threat exaggerated/unreal" is very much a nonstarter.

RFD → neg → no extension of AT. T-surr. / no CI or CS
aff concedes 100% of offense in 1AR/2AR.



AFF

Spkr	Little Rock Central CC	POINTS (25 - 30)
1A	Abbey Carlson	28.9
2A	Abbey Cunningham	29.1

NEG

Spkr	Barstow TB	POINTS (25 - 30)
1N	Haley Turner	29.0
2N	Zoe Brous	29.2

Winner: Little Rock Central CC debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? yes

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Value to Life vs. Extinction became the nexus question, and the 2AR does a lot of flushing out of this argument while the 2NR only extends it.



AFF

Spkr	Casady DW	POINTS (25 - 30)
3	Quinn Daugherty 1A	28
4	Jordan Westlake 2A	27.5

NEG

Spkr	Barstow DT	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Tyler Durwood 2N	28.5
1	Kristin Tingle 1N	29

Winner: Barstow DT School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Alexandria Fredrickson

Comments & Reason for Decision: *TO ALL: ask judge pref before the round, saves time during the round*

1AC: Good! Put more in it, you had 2:34 left, add an advantage, Good CX

1NC: Good case specificity! I like your T:interp

2AC: Need more on case + counter:interp on T, standards + voters, more on DA. you had 3 min left, read more

2NC: Good. They didn't read a counter:interp

1NR: Good. Spend more time on circumvention, don't just shadow extend on California

1AR: Better cards on DA, put these in 2AC, argue no new in the 2 on the CP

2NR: Don't kick T!! Spend more time on DA if you're still using it as a NB, you have 1 min left, don't drop case title

2AR: They dropped T, you don't have to address it



AFF

Spkr	Casady RC	POINTS (25 - 30)
IAC	Humza Razaq	28
2AC	Sean Cudd	27

NEG

Spkr	Liberal Arts and Science BV	POINTS (25 - 30)
IAC	Isabelle Blaha	29
2NC	Caroline Voges	29

Winner: Liberal Arts and Science BV School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: Camil Gosomov

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The 2AC was only Topicality but still didn't answer the neg args
~~Heated a counterpoint~~
Overall, the aff didn't answer any of the counterplans or da-enough
to win the args.



AFF

Spkr	Barstow CS	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Paul Case	29.2
2	Sam Short	29.3

NEG

Spkr	Tulsa Union AL	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Sandra Alrifai	29.4
2	Haley Lee	29.1

Winner: Barstow CS School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

INC - The Fw on the K catalyst w/ your lib! EV on-case.

X of INC - saying "we need an economic system to be stable" might be a cap link

JAC: Good Cover you don't focus on their ~~the~~ Turn enough

JNC - Answer all of the Aff args on the K. Use ALL speech time.

MPA: Answer the Perm!! Don't read all these new Topics

JAR: Tell us how your Perm functions. How do you do both.

JNA: Good Analysis. Who Perm answer its hard to win K.

Top going for on-case

JAP: Don't over focus on Neg foreign contra. Tell me how yours is - crisis

RFD: AFF wins
 Perm. Neg has no offense left

8
 5:00
 5:20
 5:40

8
 6:10
 6:15
 5:40
 2:15
 :05



6:43 5:00

4:54 2:44 2:00

AFF

Spkr	Liberal Arts and Science BV	POINTS (25-30)
2A	Isabelle Blaha	29.7
1A	Caroline Voges	29.8

NEG

Spkr	Barstow NP	POINTS (25-30)
1N	Ariza Nanji	29.4
2N	Solomon Park	29.5

Winner: Liberal Arts and Sciences BV debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg)
 School/Team
 Signature: Pure Kwat
 Low point win? tell no, best twice db8 of 2016

Comments & Reason for Decision: Neg conceded perm do CP = justified b/c Agent CP's are bad and (S) deficits, so perm (S) or risk of aff (!).

Caroline: IAC: Very clear, very well paced

Ex of IM=very good
 -only recommendation is slowing down on tags and say "next" or "and" between each card if you don't want to slow down/emphasize tags
 -you are already fast enough; trying to speed up is slowing you down not more and becoming less clear

overall amazing speech, well done
 Caroline - IAR: put case on top of IAR (before CP+Elections)
 -go more in depth on args, don't just extend 2AC
 -should've extended tag lines
 -explain theory (PIC/Agent CP Bad) on the CP; smart to go external offense
 turn on DA; IAR NEEDS some external offense

Isabelle: 2AC - only go for one advantage
 very clear; well paced
 2AC - don't need so many cards on case; just extend the IAC to answer their very generic cards (4 min of 2AC on case vs 2 min of IM=case)
 -don't read TPP answers/non-uniques vs the Elections DA
 -should use your aff more, ex. internet freedom as a huge alt cause to the internal NB on the CP/reason why you (S) democracy
 which would mean no reason why CP is beneficial
 cooperation via democracy

Ariza: -don't need to be so apologetic/say "sorry" so much; you're already a very nice person perceptually
 -no need to be so nervous, db8 is fun
 -need to make theory args vs "perm do CP"
 -conceded Agent CP/PIC's bad

Solomon: -don't just ask them to help explain advantages in CX bc gives them extra speech time, basically

More comments:

Solomon: 2NC: ~~very~~ very great on combo of speed w/ clarity
 2NC: don't need so many warning impact cards
 2NA severance bad = too late

General:

LASA - novice disclosure on wiki = appreciated by me; got you a minimal boost in speaks
 Everyone - you all gave roadmaps; that makes you part of a top tier level of novice db8
 -both sides need more aff-specific + turns on DAs

★ Aff could've made CP db8 a lot easier by saying no NB to CP b/c then (S) democracy perceptually too which = LI NB i. LI. co



AFF		
Spkr	Crossings Christian BW	POINTS (25 - 30)
ZA	Cole Bardell	28
IA	Thomas Ward	28

NEG		
Spkr	Edmond North CL	POINTS (25 - 30)
ZN	Michael Cox	29
IN	Caleb Lagge	28

Winner: EDMOND NORTH CL debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
 School/Team

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CASE T PRES POWERS AGGRO TERROR RFD

Q ANSWER TO ANALYTICS
 RE: NSA & COLLECT META DATA

TO RESP. TO OPS SUPP. TDN

PRIVATE vs. COLLECT DATA, WITH S GOV. POLICY THE SAME? NOISE?

IF DOES IT ADDRESS NEG ARG THAT PRIVACY IS NOT MOST IMPORTANT RIGHT. & HARMS MUST BE WEIGHED.

AFF DEC IS REASONABLE W/ CARD.

REASONABLENESS IS SUPERIOR STANDARD.

NEG'S ARG THAT AFF MUST ELIMINATE ALL SURV. IS TOO limiting

(AFF)

2AR DROP

NEG

NEG

NEG WINS BOTH DISADS. EVEN W/ WEAKISH IMPACTS, I'VE NO MOTIVATION TO VOTE AFF.

CASE GOES TO NEG AS WELL. FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

(1) AFF & RESPOND TO ANALYTICS THAT NSA & LONGER COLLECTS META DATA & LOSES EURO SAFETY IMPACTS

(2) AMERICAN PUBLIC ALLOW WHOLESALE DATA COLLECTION FROM CORPS. IF THE GOV. FORGETS IT TOO, AND USE IT TO KEEP US SAFE, RIGHT ON.

(3) AFF UNDERUTILIZES THE IDEA THAT SURV. DESTROYS DEVICES & QUALITY OF LIFE

(NEG)



AFF

Spkr	Bentonville DD	POINTS (25 - 30)
33	Rohin Dasari IA	28.7
1	Shubhu Dharmadhikari 2A	29.3

NEG

Spkr	Barstow LL	POINTS (25 - 30)
4	Luke Lopatofsky IN	28.5
32	Shaunak Lokre 2N	29

Winner: Bentonville DD School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Alexandria Fredrickson

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- 1AC: You're reading faster than you can & it makes you stutter. if you go slower & don't stutter you will end up being faster
- 1NC: Good! read more on case- you had 1:09 left, use it, Be sure you understand all of your tags
- 2AC: You don't hold more cards on case, extend it & move on ← but it worked, maybe put add-ons on the bottom
- 1NC: You don't have to tell me where the neg block is, T is a voter- say it
- 1NR: Don't go on T to extend what your partner just said. Making 2 terms does not make them on topical.
- 1AR: need more on T, extend impacts on case more
- 2NR: Use their no link on terror to prove abuse on T also tie on case args
- 2AR: Good speech

Rd 2



2:30

Collier, Linda

Barstow

NEG - ~~5:06~~
 AFF - ~~6:46~~
 2:37

AFF

Spkr	Casady AC	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Shaheer Aamir	26
1	Jack Christ	26

NEG

Spkr	Little Rock Central CC	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Abbey Carlson	25.8
1	Abbey Cunningham	26.7

Winner: Casady AC School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? X

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Abbey 2 - You need to answer the permutation. It's very easy. Your alt says reject the plan, & they want to do the plan. Either they commit Perm (simultaneously doing both) or the perm is pretty artificial - it's not a true test of which is better. BC it's a legitimate combination.

The IAR completely dropped the security K. That ~~is~~ should have been 4:30 seconds of the 2NR - an easy ballot, because they did not contest ① it comes first ② they promote bad scholarship & should be rejected ③ realism is bad, etc.

Also, the de-dev you had initiated in the block - they & answer that at all

Everyone needs to flow & realize

what's been answered & what hasn't - mistakes are being avoided & capitalized upon if you



4:35 3:55

5:15 5:30

AFF

Spkr	Liberal Arts and Science BJ	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Ayush Bhansali	29
2	Aadarsh Jha	26

NEG

Spkr	Barstow CS	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Paul Case	29
1	Sam Short	29

Winner: Barstow CS School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff of Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Gene

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Only offense against CP was perm, but Neg's answer was on-spot. They didn't attack the Net benefit on the 2AC, so I voted on the CP-net benefit combo that solves the plants advantages entirely and many more.



AFF

Spkr	Barstow TB	POINTS (25-30)
2	Haley Turner	28.8
1	Zoe Brous	28.9

NEG

Spkr	Casady RC	POINTS (25-30)
4	Humza Razaq	27.1
3	Sean Cudd	27.2

Winner: Barstow TB School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF wins TL to SD dehumanization/racism by d wov.
 - This own Neg bc the Neg didn't read any
 of the case on the case, and only 3 massive cards all count.
 - 1 massive claim AFF SD I vote AFF. (Both Proposed)

AFF
 - GOOD CR Q'S
 - You shouldn't need speaker 2L
 in this case
 - Call them out when they
 say "casady racism is justification."
 - APP ONT under speaker 2L.

NEG → NEED
CONFIDENCE
 - LEAD OFF CASE
 - OFFENSIVE IS NEEDED
 - KNOW CASE/ARGOS IN CX
 - (DISCOURSE WAS RACIST)
 @ TIMES.

AFF
 3:25
Neg
 3:20



AFF

Spkr	Tulsa Union AL	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Sandra Alrifai	29.1
1	Haley Lee	29

NEG

Spkr	Crossings Christian SH	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Dalton Schumaker	29
1	Emma Hawxby	29

Winner: Tulsa Union School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? X

Signature: Camil Gosomov

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I think that the PR and circumvention Da could have wanted
round for the neg, but ~~section for can be c~~
the aff did well answering links
The AFF made most of the best args in the last speech, but
they didn't answer the best throughout the debate
du
The K didn't matter much in this debate and wasn't explained well



AFF

Spkr	Crossings Christian KI	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Caleb King	28.5
1	Sam Iverson	28.6

NEG

Spkr	Casady DW	POINTS (25 - 30)
3	Quinn Daugherty	27.6
4	Jordan Westlake	27.5

Winner: Crossings Christian KI debating on the HEC Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision: _____



AFF

Spkr	Barstow PF	POINTS (25 - 30)
2A	Robbie Putney	29.3
1A	Taha Fanaswala	29

NEG

Spkr	Tulsa Union MP	POINTS (25 - 30)
2N	Zachary Martin	28.7
1N	Gregory Pitts	28.8

Winner: Barstow PF School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: Ew Burd

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Case was dropped throughout the debate — and there probably isn't a link to the DA.



AFF

Spkr	Barstow DT	POINTS (25 - 30)
209	Tyler Durwood 1A	28.9
1	Kristin Tingle 2A	29.5

NEG

Spkr	Crossings Christian KI	POINTS (25 - 30)
4	Caleb King 2N	27
3	Sam Iverson 1N	27.1

Winner: Barstow DT debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no
School/Team

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The aff: ~~negative~~ wins The perm on the cap bc ~~only~~ there is a stronger link ~~of a~~ risk of the link turn than link on the D.A. Racism outweighs so I vote aff



AFF

Spkr	Little Rock Central CC	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Abbey Carlson	28.1
2	Abbey Cunningham	28.2

NEG

Spkr	Barstow AB	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Alex Archer	28.5
1	Julia Butch	28.0

Winner: Barstow AB School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

IAC: race census

INC: UN HRC Review CP, Elections Clinton Good DA, case, part of link send to the "cosmopolitanism K"

ZNC: CP, case

INR: election DA

ZNR: CP

CP 100% of aff

- "say no" new in ZNR

- no perm, solving deficit, therapy

No aff offense on the internal net benefit



AFF

Spkr	Liberal Arts and Science BV	POINTS (25-30)
2	Isabelle Blaha	28.7
1	Caroline Voges	29

NEG

Spkr	Barstow TB	POINTS (25-30)
1	Haley Turner	28.5
2	Zoe Brous	28.6

Winner: Liberal Arts debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No.

Signature: Kenton Hutcherson

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: I look at T first. The Neg does not really answer the argument that corporations are people. So I think the Aff is topical. On the Elections DA, the Neg drops the argument that Hillary will lose the general election, so the DA is non-unique. And the Aff wins the Econ advantage.

IAC- Very clear.

INC- Put your off-case arguments before you go on case.

ZNC- You need to specifically answer the ZAC's arguments, instead of just extending your own arguments.

IAR- You need to spend more time on the Elections DA. You got to it with only 30 seconds left. That is not enough time.

ZNR- Don't go for T unless that is the only thing you go for in the ZNR.

ZAR- You should focus on only a few arguments on T and the DA- you had a lot of ground to cover and you need to make sure you win your best arguments.



LHO

AFF		POINTS (25-30)
Spkr	Barstow PF	
2	Robbie Putney	28.5
1	Taha Fanaswala	28.6

3:19 2:37

NEG		POINTS (25-30)
Spkr	Bentonville DD	
2	Rohin Dasari	28.3
1	Shubhu Dharmadhikari	28.4

Winner: Bentonville DD School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win?

Signature: Daniel Carlson

Comments & Reason for Decision:

IAC c/x - it's best to use all c/x time since it is functionally prep time for your partner
 INC prep should almost never be needed, especially 9:30 → of prep

INC - Kappeler turns on case double turn invisible Committee

ZAC - case on top
 No reason to read 3-4 long cards (2:15ish of ZAC) for 2 minutes on a drop-down case flow. Some of them answer the WoD d/a, but unnecessary

ZNC - too many flaws
 WoD d/a + elections aren't extended fully (No IIL, Impact, back of coverage on line by (the) responsiveness on line by line

IAR - Good contentation on line by line, but arguments are 3 parts
 1) claim(s)
 2) warrants(s)
 3) Impact(s) } Work on depth and development

Extend ZAC args fully -
 1) claim
 2) citation
 3) warrant(s)

INR - Aff ≠ representation ptx or movement
 All blocks, no responsiveness on line by line

RFD -
 (K) link of representation ptx is not the off... only question of debate is whether off gets access to first to weigh vs. to the (K)
 There's no unique offense and no established alt.
 Perm on is 5 seconds on both teams.
 Minor risk of Neg offense, first turns

Email Chams are only faster if there aren't constant mistakes -
 Check at beginning of round next time



AFF

Spkr	Tulsa Union MP	POINTS (25 - 30)
1A	Zachary Martin	28.3
7A	Gregory Pitts	28.4

NEG

Spkr	Casady DW	POINTS (25 - 30)
2N	Quinn Daugherty	28.5
1N	Jordan Westlake	28.6

Winner: Casady DW debating on the Negative Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature:

Comments & Reason for Decision:




AFF

Spkr	Crossings Christian BW	POINTS (25 - 30)
2A	Cole Bardell	28.7
1A	Thomas Ward	28.3

NEG

Spkr	Tulsa Union AL	POINTS (25 - 30)
1N	Sandra Alrifai	28.6
2N	Haley Lee	28.5

Winner: Tulsa AL debating on the neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: I vote neg. Very close debate. I gave the debaters extensive comments after the round. Coaches can email me if they have other questions!!

Great debate everyone!

remember to
FLOW

Rd 3



AFF

Spkr	Casady AC	POINTS (25 - 30)
ZA	Shaheer Aamir	27.6
1A	Jack Christ	27.5

NEG

Spkr	Barstow CS	POINTS (25 - 30)
2N	Paul Case	28.5
1N	Sam Short	28.8

Winner: Barstow CS debating on the Negative Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No
School/Team

Signature: Justin Yoon

Comments & Reason for Decision:

counterplan was conceded and solves the entire aff, net benefit of UP credibility.



AFF

Spkr	Barstow NP	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Ariza Nanji	29
1	Solomon Park	29.5

NEG

Spkr	Liberal Arts and Science BJ	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Ayush Bhansali	30
1	Aadarsh Jha	29

Winner: Liberal Arts and Science BJ debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? OK

Signature: Camil Gosomov

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Neg could have won much easier if they went for the CP and Da but they conceded it. The Neg won that the perm doesn't make sense.



AFF

Spkr	Barstow LL	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Luke Lopatofsky	28.4
1	Shaunak Lokre	28.6

NEG

Spkr	Edmond North CL	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Michael Cox	28.5
1	Caleb Lagge	28.4

Winner: BARSTOW debating on the AFF Low point win? _____
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)
Signature: Matt Casas

Comments & Reason for Decision:

2AR spent minute on T when 2NR spent 10 seconds which is unnecessary





AFF

Spkr	Little Rock Central CK	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Chloe Cunningham	28.8
2	Alida Kaufmann	28.9

NEG

Spkr	Casady RC	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Humza Razaq	27.2
1	Sean Cudd	27.1

Winner: Little Rock Central debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- 1NC - Need more than generic solvency takeouts.
- 2AC - Start w/ overview, try or die for aff, etc. There wasn't much to answer, in this instance you did not need to use all speech time.
- 2NC - Need some link to how removing racial questions from census causes nuclear terror
- 1AR - Blanket extensions on case aren't really needed, just extend the impacts
- 2NR - I would try to avoid comparisons of racial inequality.
- 2AR - Organizing the 2AR would be beneficial, overview, conceded impacts, here's some line by line, done.

RFD

Aff gets conceded case,
 Risk of defense is minimal.

Room: US 207
Start: 8:00 AM
Novice Policy

Rd 5

Joseph, Anthony



AFF

Spkr	Barstow TB	POINTS (25 - 30)
2A	Haley Turner	28.8
1A	Zoe Brous	28.7


NEG

Spkr	Crossings Christian BW	POINTS (25 - 30)
1N	Cole Bardell	28.4
2N	Thomas Ward	28.3

Winner: Barstow TB debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:





AFF

Spkr	Liberal Arts and Science BJ	POINTS (25 - 30)
4	Ayush Bhansali <i>LA</i>	28.5
3	Aadarsh Jha <i>LA</i>	28.6

NEG

Spkr	Barstow PF	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Robbie Putney <i>LN</i>	28.7
1	Taha Fanaswala <i>LN</i>	29.3

Winner: Barstow PF debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no
School/Team

Signature: *gnp*

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~Politics~~ turns case.

Aff never proves there is no risk
of circumvention, so my ballot
goes neg.



AFF		
Spkr	Barstow CS	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Paul Case	28.5
2	Sam Short	29.1

NEG		
Spkr	Bentonville DD	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Rohin Dasari	29
1	Shubhu Dharmadhikari	28.8

Winner: Bentonville DD School/Team debating on the neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
 Signature: Rosie Valdez LRCH

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff → The 2AC is very strong and puts a lot of diverse coverage out there. You obviously have very good (and impressive) instincts; you two need to be communicating a lot more during IAR prep. The IAR is largely unresponsive. In order for me to flow what you prompt, you partner has to say it.

Neg → WHY IS THIS your 2NR CHOICE ??? The INK was HEAT on both Ks, and then you go for neither. You two demonstrate a much better understanding of microptx and role playing than you do how to close the door with a ptx dA. Cmon!

This round started so strong and really fizzled in all speeches after the block. IAR drops Case, doesn't extend Solvency or offense, and undercovers PTX. The 2AR is good on impact calc but is unfortunately too late.

NEG → PTX



AFF

Spkr	Casady DW	POINTS (25 - 30)
1A	Quinn Daugherty	28.3
2A	Jordan Westlake	27.8

NEG

Spkr	Barstow LL	POINTS (25 - 30)
1N	Luke Lopatofsky	27.4
2N	Shaunak Lokre	28.0

Winner: Casady DW School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Vyas Venkataraman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Timed frame on CA went to aff so the won Impact case. Simple as that.

Aff: put case first, always

1AC has to be 8 minutes!! must 6) Neg: better links on DA, really generic here, maybe delat DA as it's ITP

Neg: better CX question

Aff answered CX decently



AFF 7:05 3:30

Spkr	Barstow AB	POINTS (25 - 30)
1A	Alex Archer	28
2A	Julia Butch	28.5

NEG ~~7:00~~ 6:45

Spkr	Tulsa Union AL	POINTS (25 - 30)
1N	Sandra Alrifai	27
2N	Haley Lee	27.5

Winner: Barstow AB debating on the AFF Low point win? No
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Hanna Roberts

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- 1A - Clearer during text of the card. Try not to lower your voice, because at some points you sound like you're whispering.
 - 2A - The extra cards you're reading aren't really responsive, until you get to the util answers at the VERY end of the speech. You don't need all these extra advantage cards, we need answers to why utilitarianism is bad or how your AFF accesses util ~~is~~ better than the Cap K.
 - 2N - Your order should just be "The Cap K" you don't have to tell me exactly what parts of the K (that's called sign posting) until you get there in the speech. You need more specific answers to the perm. Put together a block with all your theoretical reasons why the perm is bad and a few cards on the issue. Right now it's disorganized. ~~the~~ The perm block is in INR.
 - 1N - You shouldn't need to take several minutes of prep for the INR. "Why didn't we split the block "WHY" & "WHY" & "WHY?"
 - 1A - You gotta stop the mumble-spreading.
 - 2NR - Not nearly enough work on the perm. Also, I feel like I'm getting a fly-over view of this speech. Instead of telling me "we read 4 cards on that" tell me what those cards said and how it answers their arguments. Why are their cards about Cap being good incorrect? It's not just their author or the date, you need to find what the logic is flawed. Furthermore, you need to tell me WHY the alt solves, not just that it does.
- I think the AFF is giving better explanations on the following points: the alt can't solve because no blue print; capitalism is inevitable, some things can't be explained by capitalism. Why the perm is functional. I think you have all the tools to win this debate, Union, but your analysis is too shallow. I think the 2NR lack of depth can be ~~explained~~ explained by NO prep.



AFF

Spkr	Casady AC	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Shaheer Aamir 2A	28.3
2	Jack Christ 1A	28.5

NEG

Spkr	Little Rock Central CK	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Chloe Cunningham 2N	28.6
3	Alida Kaufmann 1N	28.4

Winner: Little Rock Central CK debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
 School/Team

Signature: Alexandria Fredrickson

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1AC: Good, if surveillance is bad, why is "Congressional oversight" good, check date on "1 year life" card on California, actually 3 mos.

1NC: Good, 2N should be flowing, ~~never mind~~ read one more off

2AC: "their ev is from 2014", read counter standards / voters on T, Good cap answer!
 ↳ thank you!

2NC: Address their alt solvency / solve / extend or explain your alt, you had (2:05) left, use it

1NR: Don't address K, put alt of K in the 2NC, More on T, the alt is 100x more topical than aff

1AR: more on T - put the responses in 2AC more on K extend your answers from before

2NR: "impact value" tell the story of the K + how it relates to the aff

2AR: Put case above K, standards & voters on T, impact value, tell the story of the aff, you had (2:34) left, use it



Forfeit

AFF

Spkr		POINTS (25 - 30)
	Casady RC	
	Humza Razaq	
	Sean Cudd	

NEG

Spkr		POINTS (25 - 30)
	Crossings Christian SH	
	Dalton Schumaker	
	Emma Hawxby	

Winner: Crossings Christian SH debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: A Chase

Comments & Reason for Decision:



AFF

Spkr	Barstow NP	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Ariza Nanji	28.5
1	Solomon Park	28.6

NEG

Spkr	Little Rock Central CC	POINTS (25 - 30)
2n	Abbey Carlson	28
1n	Abbey Cunningham	28.1

Winner: Barstow debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Jacob Smith

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~negative does~~
 negative does
 for too much in
 2NR - without
 impacting stuff

aff
 - IAC needs to
 be clearer
 - don't spend
 2 minutes
 on impact
 calculus
 - do
 more LBL

neg
 - both parties need
 to answer question
 - more applicable
 net strat
 - ~~2NR~~ 2NR answer
 your own CX
 - 1NR should do line
 by line
 - 2NR needs to make
 a choice - only go for
 one thing





AFF

Spkr	Liberal Arts and Science BV	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Isabelle Blaha	27.9
1	Caroline Voges	27.8

NEG

Spkr	Barstow DT	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Tyler Durwood	28.2
2	Kristin Tingle	28.3

Winner: Barstow DT School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
Signature: Kiersten Strachan

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative had no 2AC offense versus the politics disad.
Democracy / freedom doesn't outweigh global warming.

11



AFF

Spkr	Crossings Christian KI	POINTS (25 - 30)
1A	Caleb King	27.5
2A	Sam Iverson	27.4

NEG

Spkr	Edmond North CL	POINTS (25 - 30)
2N	Michael Cox	28.1
1N	Caleb Lagge	28.3

Winner: Crossings Christian KI debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? Yes
School/Team

Signature: Dan Mullasseril

Comments & Reason for Decision:

On case: privacy and democracy impacts were extended and negative did not give adequate answers.

only other arg neg had was a DA that was not extended well + no impact calc

All neg said was prez power weakening leads to terrorism which was no where before.



AFF

Spkr	Barstow DT	POINTS (25 - 30)
1A	Tyler Durwood	28.9
2A	Kristin Tingle	28.8

NEG

Spkr	Little Rock Central CM	POINTS (25 - 30)
2N	Chloe Cunningham	28.3
1N	Andrew Marecki - Aliya Kautman	27.4

Winner: Barstow DT debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
 School/Team

Signature: Dennis Savill Crossings Christian School

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1A - Good job. Well read.

1N - Need to practice reading skill for capk, you are tripping on many words.

Neg. - Good technical debate on cap & T but you don't answer their 5 cap card answers, especially their alt solvency takeout.

2AR - No need to reread condo Bad again.

RFD: Vote Aff on cap turns, case.

Capk - solvency on Aff dropped throughout round.

Aff case - conceded in 2NR. Racism-fighting most important granted by Neg.

T - 2AR goes for we meet, should have kept up your counter - interp also.



AFF

Spkr	Tulsa Union AL	POINTS (25 - 30)
2A	Sandra Alrifai	28
1A 2A	Haley Lee	29

NEG

Spkr	Barstow LL	POINTS (25 - 30)
1N	Luke Lopatofsky	28.4
2N	Shaunak Lokre	28.1

Winner: Tulsa Union AL debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? OK

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:



AFF

Spkr	Bentonville DD	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Rohin Dasari	26
2	Shubhu Dharmadhikari	28

NEG

Spkr	Barstow DT	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Tyler Durwood	27
1	Kristin Tingle	28

Winner: Barstow DT School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO
Signature:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF concedes internals on TPP. No access to deterrence analysis in ZAR. Hard to reach WA internals as IAR conceded other intl threats outweigh & innovation checks back.
Bit sloppy rebuttals... Both teams cleaner line-by-line & strategically pick args sooner to go far in rebuttals.



AFF

Spkr	Crossings Christian KI	POINTS (25 - 30)
1A	Caleb King	29
2A	Sam Iverson	29

NEG

Spkr	Barstow PF	POINTS (25 - 30)
1N	Robbie Putney	29
2N	Taha Fanaswala	30

Winner: Barstow PF School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CASE | φ ANSWER TO:
 (1) PRIVACY IS DEAD ALREADY
 (2) BULK COLLECTION IS BETTER THAN TARGETED COLLECTION
 (3) RESILIENCE OF ECONOMY
 (4) STRONG ECON φ STOP WAR

* BE PROFESSIONAL AT ALL TIMES. IF YOU ARE GETTING LONG MEANDERING ANSWERS, YOURS QUESTIONS NEED TO BE BETTER.

CP | DROP
 φ RFD

*

SCINTA DISAD | * WEAK DISAD
 WEAKER RESPONSES BY AFF

* NEG EVIDENCE SUPERIOR
 * AFF DROPS MOST OF NEG FLOW.

RFD



AFF

Spkr	Crossings Christian SH	POINTS (25 - 30)
DA	Dalton Schumaker	26.7
EA	Emma Hawxby	26.4

NEG

Spkr	Barstow NP	POINTS (25 - 30)
AN	Ariza Nanji	27.5
EN	Solomon Park	28.0

Winner: Neg Barstow NP debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No
School/Team

Signature: Vyas Venkataraman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Was flowing a bit on CP for the FBI will come to arg, but this was dropped. Neg was a P. → clear a P.
 this includes liberty arguments, guess they.

Neg: use all your speech time
 Aff: don't hear



3:20
 6:50

AFF		
Spkr	Barstow CS	POINTS (25 - 30)
3	Paul Case 1A	27
2	Sam Short 2A	29

NEG		
Spkr	Little Rock Central CK	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Chloe Cunningham 2N	30
4	Alida Kaufmann 1N	26.1

6:00
 4:30

Winner: Little Rock Central CK debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: Callie Jen

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG wins on K

K solves only Aff advantage of racism with poverty net benefit.

1AC | Lots of "mark that card" & all of the cards essentially said "WOD is racist." Re-cut case so you can fit all of case in 1AC. Work on clarity.

1NC | Calm down & breathe! Slow down if you need to.

2AG | Speed is clear. Good articulation of analytics

2NC | Thorough K analysis of cap. Good split of blocks





AFF

Spkr	Edmond North CL	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Michael Cox IA	28.4
4	Caleb Lagge 2A	27.8

NEG

Spkr	Little Rock Central CC	POINTS (25 - 30)
3	Abbey Carlson 2N	28.2
1	Abbey Cunningham 1N	29

Winner: Little Rock Central CC debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
 School/Team

Signature: Alexandria Fredrickson

Comments & Reason for Decision:

IAC: Good

INC: Need a link card on the k

2AC: be nicer in cx - point out that they have no link on k

2NC: Good, still need link on k

1NR: Good, more line-by-line, specifically on case

1AR: Wait to start until everyone is ready, don't just shadow extend case, issue with framing muslims

2NR: Say T's voter, don't bounce around so much, impact value
 & thank you, but tell me why

2AR: Impact value, extend case, say T is not voter



lol
 7:52 4:20 4:00

4:39 2:10

AFF

Spkr	Liberal Arts and Science BJ	POINTS (25-30)
1A	Ayush Bhansali	28.9
2A	Aadarsh Jha	29.0

NEG

Spkr	Tulsa Union MP	POINTS (25-30)
2N	Zachary Martin	28.3
1N	Gregory Pitts	28.8

Winner: Liberal Arts and Sciences BJ debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: Dave Devevrat

Comments & Reason for Decision:

IAC: very clear, good pace, nice tag emphasis
 -both LASA teams I've judged today try to go faster at the end of the IAC which slows them down- maintain the starting phase

Aff

RFD: IAR is all defense made me think the neg could win, but 2NA did not exploit this/ explain well enough- 2AR is not responsive to the rest but wins on case o/w b/c the neg doesn't do impact calculus.

Neg

Ayush: -I am very happy that you tried to do line by line.

IAR- please put the flaws in some order via roadmap or at least sign post

-you clearly need more than 20 seconds of IAR prep, and there's nothing wrong w/ that- USE PREP

talk to Yao Yao

Zachary:

-use your whole 2NC time; you had 2:38 left
 -need to extend 1NC not just read more cards b/c you forgot

-don't read new cards in the 2NR; there's no point in this scenario

-You NEED OFFENSE IN THE IAR- all you have is case o/w...

Aadarsh:

-don't need new 2AC case cards if they concede case, b/c you need more time on CP- only got there w/ 30 seconds left

-please stop making me switch between 3 dif flaws every 30 seconds; they didn't extend the terror DA in the 2NC/1NR or 2NR- why answer it in the 2AR
 -great job trying line-by-line though :)

Gregory:

1NC- gotta read a link to the ~~2NR~~ DA's in the 1NC; it'll help

-you should flow- never give up

-good job not backing down in CX of the 2NC and saying FIRST was part of the NSA

-don't take prep for 1NR; prep during 2NC
 -sorry about your laptop; I appreciate you not giving up!



AFF

Spkr	Barstow AB	POINTS (25 - 30)
1A	Alex Archer	27.9
2A	Julia Butch	27.8

NEG

Spkr	Liberal Arts and Science BV	POINTS (25 - 30)
1N	Isabelle Blaha	28.3
2N	Caroline Voges	28.5

Winner: Liberal Arts BV debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team
Signature: [Signature] Crossings Christian

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: Neg on conceded court ptx.
Aff dropped court ptx in 1AR. Neg's 4 offense just overwhelmed 1AR.



3:34 ✓

3:30 3:07

AFF

Spkr	Casady RC	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Humza Razaq	28
2	Sean Cudd	28

NEG

Spkr	Crossings Christian BW	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Cole Bardell	29
2	Thomas Ward	28

Winner: Crossings Christian BW debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

No answers to K in 2AC. K is a voter. Nuff said



AFF

Spkr	Barstow TB	POINTS (25 - 30)
2	Haley Turner	28
1	Zoe Brous	28

NEG

Spkr	Casady AC	POINTS (25 - 30)
1	Shaheer Aamir	29
2	Jack Christ	28

Winner: Casady AC debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? Yes⁰¹²

Signature: Camil Gosomov

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I think that the Neg did a good job in the CP and Da
They would only have to win a one percent risk.
They can't permit the CP and do both
Aff didn't explain why racism > extinction

Quarters



4:40 3:40 2:22

5:51 5:27

Bentonville DD (Dasari & Dharmadhikari) vs Barstow AB (Archer & Butch)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Barstow AB

Bentonville DD

AFF

NEG

Winner: Bentonville DD debating on the Neg

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Gene

Other judges on panel: Matt Casas, Vyas Venkataraman. Please do not start until all judges are present.

There weren't enough arguments against the Fiat, and I agree with the Neg's interpretation of rule playing = imagining things I voted on the Fiat argument