

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Advika Baditela Advika Baditela

Round 1

Neg

vs Melvin Ma

Judge Adrian Sendejas

Advika Baditela

Pts 28.5

COMMENTS

Mag - not that its happening now, but isntead the amt of ppl/stuff it effects more warrants
- "because" "they say X, but that is wrong because Y"

RFD

rfd - aff - risk of nuclear war is rapidly increasing, miscalc is possible, accidents in the
past - all mean risk of nuclear esclation is likely to happen and kill us sooner than CC

Round 2

Aff

vs Sophia Zhou

Judge Toby Whisenhunt

Advika Baditela

Pts 29

COMMENTS

Good AC and solid command of the speech. Good job in CX both answering and asking questions. Clearly you have a firm grasp of the content and structure of the arguments. 1AR - focus on the arguments you have made and the negative made instead of reading new case cards / arguments that are new in the rebuttal. Almost 1:10 of your 4:00 speech was that and then you extended Contention 3 again later in the 1AR. You need to address the negative contentions and specific arguments against the case like human expansion bac and microbes for example. You do a good job extending and using author names and arguments, but you must pick adn choose. You have to address teh negative case and not just extend yours.

RFD

This was a good debate, but the affirmative failed to address the negative case. Too much time was spent extending the affirmative and even reading new arguments. Focus down on what you need to win the debate instead of trying to extend it al. It is hard on the affirmative to cover all the negative. That being said all the answers to colonization bad only came up in 2AR so they are too late.

Round 3	Neg		vs Emily Zhang
Judge Cortez Proal	WIN	Advika Baditela	Pts 27

COMMENTS

work on your clarity when you both have the same criterion you dont need to do anything on fw. slow down during cx your case need an extinction impact. all the aff needs to do is win that future gens ow and they win under util always put case first no new arg in the 1nr dont waste time

RFD

I vote neg. The aff conceded the negs solvency take outs and dropped case.

Round 4	Aff		vs Clara Lee
Judge Solomon Watson	WIN	Advika Baditela	Pts 29

RFD

Good debate, voted aff. I think it really does come down to this card read in the 2ac about how we can do both space col and conservationism. This is an, essentially, no link or no trade off argument. Saying that there is no forced choice between space col and climate change. This means that even if the economic conditions for selfsufficient colonies isn't possible in the short term — they can be mutually reienforcing of earths position. I do think Clara did good to lock in more on the structual violence impact calq argument s given this but there is another no link argument Advika has made analyitcally which is that this debate is about the ethics of space col not the ethics of a specfic space col proposal. So I don't need to be held accountable to the squo forms of space col that would cuase inequality and structual vioelnce. I think you just, again, need some on point clash to keep yourself in it and you'll be fine.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Andy Yue Andy Yue

Round 1

Neg

vs Dittu Tandon

Judge Cortez Proal

WIN

Andy Yue

Pts 28

COMMENTS

Try not to ask questions in cx that directly state the argument you're trying to make. Try and lead them there. work on clarity. You're a good speakers but some times you get a little garbled. extensions = Claim + warrant + impact make sure your impacts align with your fw Good job recognizing you were winning in that last speech and ending early once you got done what you needed to do. Baller move. Don't get led down rabbit holes in CX. She had you arguing about resource wars when that wasn't even a real issue in the round.

RFD

The aff concedes the offense on fw and the solvency take outs. Means neg wins.

Round 2

Aff

vs Jason Chen

Judge Jacob Skinner

Andy Yue

Pts 27.8

COMMENTS

I would not try to argue that we shouldn't use speculative arguments when your case is built upon a scenario that hasn't happened yet. You should have argued that a high chance (and used your evidence to support this) should be calculated. When the negative said that futurism is speculative, you had to respond, since you told me to reject speculation.

RFD

The round turned into discussions of what impacts we are obligated to solve. There was a debate about which impact is speculative and which way can solve for extinction. Ultimately, the lack of affirmative response on futurism being speculative made me vote for the negative. You both need evidence and warrants for your arguments. This round largely turned into a claim and then the other person saying "that's speculative." This makes it difficult to determine what to support and what I should evaluate. Under this, I feel that the affirmative did not meet the burden to show that the impacts of extinction outweigh the reality of structural violence.

Round 3	Neg		vs Lynetta Jin
Judge Adrian Sendejas	WIN	Andy Yue	Pts 29.5

RFD

NEG - I dont think colonization is physically or biologically possible after the 2AR which means it is not try or die, its just die - moral recklessness AFF needs the card from the 1AR - says mars was possible Both sides need to be better on organization 2AR shouldnt be reading new cards

Round 4	Aff		vs Rachel Ke
Judge Adrian Sendejas		Andy Yue	Pts 28.5

RFD

NEG - 1) AFF does NOT stop extinction. It redistributes humanity and our issue with overconsumption to different places which recreates x risks associated with things like climate change or international tension that would cause conflict or war. 2) Neg does NOT respond to the argument that only the rich benefit from space col because they are the ones that go to space. Instead, we can distribute benefits into climate change mitigation programs or building cooperation. 3) Not even sure what requires us to get off the rock at the end of the debate. "Asteroids and disease" is not an impact explanation.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Angela Zhu Angela Zhu

Round 1 Neg vs Lynetta Jin

Judge Toby Whisenhunt

WIN

Angela Zhu

Pts 29.3

COMMENTS

Good job attacking the case and framework. The contention about space colonization will be hard does not really access your value. Its more of a case argument IMO.

RFD

The aff in the 1AR dropped a large part of the negative case / defense to colonization. Also the affirmative leaned hard into timeframe despite the case needing to push magnitude. The negative ends up ahead on time frame and the immediate impact of structural violence.

Round 2 Aff vs Ishana Gautam

Judge Emanuel Vargas

Angela Zhu

Pts 29.1

RFD

This was an EXCELLENT debate. One of my favorites. I voted negative. I was VERY close to voting for the aff on just "extinction outweighs". The reason that I ultimately dont end up doing so, is beacuse I think the aff is doing a good job at layer 1, which is telling me that extinction is very likely. If this is the case, then I think you might be winning the fw arguments, since a bunch of thier stuff on framework is pretty much just saying that extinction is unlikely. I think you're winning that it is likely, my issue with this, is that I think you're missing the crucial SECOND portion of this, which is to explain your "solvency" or your reason why you meet your burden. I.E. you need to explain to me why space col prevents extinction. I think you're doing an excellent job at this in the 1AC and in 1AC cross ex, but it doesnt make it through the entire debate. I think the neg has impacts I can point to that are probable, and not doing space col might solve. Impacts like spate eliteism, S.V on earth, all those sorts of things.

Round 3 Aff vs Cindy Wang

Judge Rafael Sanchez

WIN

Angela Zhu

Pts 28.9

RFD

by the end of the debate, the aff is winning that space col is the biggest threat Ultimaptely the biggest problem at the end ofteh ebate from the neg is that there needs to be much more offenseive reaosns for why the aff is a bad idea. The defense they are making is good, but it is insufficeint because any risk that the aff wins that their impact still have then its try or die for the aff.

RFD

Good debate, voted aff. So, I think the aff is slightly ahead on util at the end of the debate, but frankly I don't think either side is debating this question decisively. But I also kinda don't think the fwk changes the outcome. So, I think the neg has the really persuasive space exploration good, space col bag kinda of angle which I think is smart. And should solve a lot of these resource extraction arguments the aff is going for (the like extinction inev stuff is kinda in there but not really by the end of the speech. I think it was a mistake not really pushing more on the space exploration solves all these impact — you make the argument in the block that mining is not space col, but you don't do the more offensive work of explaining why it solves the aff's impacts and means even if they o/w you still vote neg on space exploration and the inequality trade off da. I think from the aff's perspective you want to say the only way to sustainably mine is to have a permanent presence, even if that doesn't require permanent human stationing. You kinda walk this direction but you need to be more specific. However, I don't think I ever got answers to the link arg from the aff that space col resources won't go back into the enviro or inequality. Finally the just like health complication and its not technically possible debate was the other place I was lingering, I think the tech advances arg is dropped so there isn't enough there for me to check out on pure defense BUT I feel like you were really light in your answers here. Read a card. cx — you gotta let your opponent ask questions — don't do clarification questions unless its absolutely necessary, don't ask open ended question is space col possible good questions Joanna don't have to say they say (insert whole argument) they are wrong for 3 reasons just say they say health complications take out solvency — 1. 2. 3.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Annie Huang Annie Huang

Round 1 Aff vs Caroline Ge

Judge Mak Kovar

WIN

Annie Huang

Pts 29.5

COMMENTS

good compelling reading of the Aff. Good job pressing for answers in cross examination, great job getting a concession. You got a little muddled on the framework comparison, but you eventually found your footing - good job. You only had 40s to attack the neg, try to condense your arguments on the aff and go for what you're winning instead of trying to cover it all. Especially good job propping up the contention 4 with the treaty response.

RFD

Very close round!!!!!! Voted Aff because it was the biggest risk for solving climate change and saving more people with resources from other planets.

Round 2 Neg vs Lily Qiu

Judge Erick Berdugo

Annie Huang

Pts 29.5

COMMENTS

Avoid yes/no questions as the answer will always be to their favor. 1NC You stated extend, I think you meant cross-apply to your opponents case because this is your first speech and the AFF has not had the opportunity to attack your case so you are extending arguments and evidence that have not been attacked. NR You are doing a good job outlining the effects of the impacts. However, you are not outlining the link to space colonization.

RFD

General comments for Both debaters 1) did an excellent job of referencing and explaining their evidence. 2) Road mapping is too specific. Don't need to tell me you are going to attack and then extend specific arguments. Just tell me where you are going to start (IE AFF OR NEG) how you intend move through the debate, it assumed you will do things like extending/cross applying and weighing. 3) General rebut outline 1) Sign post where you are on flow 2) Extend your evidence across their attack OR cross-apply your evidence when attacking their case. 3) Explain why you are right with the reasoning of your evidence. 4) Explain WHY this is important: a) why you are winning the time frame b) why you are winning the magnitude Number is the summary that provides a voter **SPEAIL NOTE:** It is obvious both debaters had the majority of there rebuttal speech written. This prevents adapting and especially prevents adapting to mistakes of your opponents. While you feel might feel more comfortable it will lock you on a path that prevents you talking advantage of your opponent's mistakes while at the same time prevent you from answering attacks you did not include in your prewritten speech. RFD: The negative does a good job of explaining the impacts but ultimately they do not respond to AFF arguments that tech research and applications will solve for the problems proposed the negative.

Round 3

Neg

vs Kathie Liu

Judge Solomon Watson

WIN

Annie Huang

Pts 29.1

RFD

Good debate, voted neg. Think that it comes down to a lack of clash from the aff. So, i think your impact calculus instics are correct however that is your primary response to the negative's positions which is problematic because Annie is making a couple of arguments on your case that coplicate your ability to access your impact calq. So first is this colonization not possible/toruture fwk turn. Then there is this space exploration v space col with trade of da as a nb. These two arguments primarily really complicated your magnitude extinction first impact caql because I think the neg establishes that you don't solve extinction and there is at least a comorable chance the neg's case does.

Round 4

Aff

vs Enoch Xu

Judge Rafael Sanchez

Annie Huang

Pts 28.5

RFD

by the end of the debate, the neg is winning that the squo is preferable over space col Ultmatley, lack of a reponse to the negs contetiosn makes it hard for the aff to generate a lot offense in teh roudn because the contentions turn a lot of the offense. Especailly the arg about how spce col takes too long to sovl for anything which makes it so that even if you o win taht we can get off the roock it would be too late before we can sovl for cc

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Bonnie Zhao Bonnie Zhao

Round 1 Neg vs Joanna Zhao

Judge Freddie Smith

Bonnie Zhao

Pts 26

COMMENTS

Great job! You're a clear speaker and you have a strong case. The area you should work on the most is your refutation because you didn't respond to much of your opponent's case. Great weighing as early as your first speech. Try to use all of your time in the rebuttal.

RFD

Great job to both debaters! This was a great round, you have both clearly worked hard these last two weeks! I voted aff on framework and flow. I bought the aff criterion of util over distributive justice because I bought the aff argument that there is nothing to guarantee than funds diverted from space colonization will go to solving current problems. neg also dropped a lot of aff's points which makes a clear ballot. Great job both!

Round 2 Aff vs Lydia Hea

Judge Rafael Sanchez

Bonnie Zhao

Pts 28.3

RFD

by the end of the debate, the neg is winnign that the space col will likley results in worse outcomes for poor pple and climate chagne Ultaimtely, the neg iswinnign taht space col would take too long to ever be able to resolves any of those problems andthe onlything that we can do is to try to provent the proxicmate cause of the ipmact

Round 3 Neg vs Summer Li

Judge Adrian Sendejas

WIN

Bonnie Zhao

Pts 29

RFD

1AR coverage issues means theres not really any offense to vote aff in this debate

Round 4

Aff

vs Caroline Ge

Judge Emanuel Vargas

Bonnie Zhao

Pts 28.7

RFD

I voted negative. The affirmative did not extend their offensive arguments. The contentions were not extended in the 1ar and 2ar. Only the negative extended their arguments. The aff is doing a brilliant job at answering the negs arguments, but absent these extensions, I can't vote for the aff. The negative is winning that we should prefer allocating our resources to the earth right now, which is why space colonization is bad.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Caroline Ge Caroline Ge

Round 1

Neg

vs Annie Huang

Judge Mak Kovar

Caroline Ge

Pts 28.5

COMMENTS

Make sure to look at the judge during cross examination. Try to lengthen your answers in cross ex - they were a bit too short, context is good to have to your position and cx is a good way to give more context.

RFD

Very close round!!!!!! Voted Aff because it was the biggest risk for solving climate change and saving more people with resources from other planets.

Round 2

Aff

vs Chloe Sun

Judge Jacob Skinner

Caroline Ge

Pts 27.3

COMMENTS

I would use your contentions to generate offense. Had you argued that by going towards long term solutions we generate immediate solutions to our problems, then you could have applied that to the other two obligations. When the negative spends the majority of their speech arguing a framework that you can conceivably win, you need to spend your speech showing why. You did a great job showing why space colonization was beneficial and necessary, but when the negative is spending their time arguing that good does not equal necessary, and that it isn't the best solution, frame any argument that you make about why something is good (a case or contention argument) and connect it to framework. The building blocks were here, but you didn't put them together well enough.

RFD

I voted for the negative on framework, specifically, Prioritization and Collective Scope. The negative spent more time on framework, while the affirmative spent more time on their contentions. As a result, I think the negative needs to prove that it meets all three burdens for Space Colonization to be a "moral obligation." They do meet the first (Necessity), but fail to meet the other 2. The aff had unresponded to impacts that the negative was unable to solve for without leaving the planet. However, they do not prove that it is what we should prioritize (as opposed to other, quicker, and more realistic solutions), and did not contest the work currently being done to save the planet.

Round 3

Aff

vs Penny Lin

Judge Erick Berdugo

Caroline Ge

Pts 29

COMMENTS

What is the purpose of asking her the definition of annihilation? CX is about being able to poke holes in your opponent's logic. Unless the definition helps you in this or provides the FW for weighing the arguments it really isn't necessary.

RFD

General comments for Both debaters 1) did an excellent job of referencing and explaining their evidence. 2) Road mapping is too specific. Don't need to tell me you are going to attack and then extend specific arguments. Just tell me where you are going to start (IE AFF OR NEG) how you intend move through the debate, it assumed you will do things like extending/cross applying and weighing. 3) General rebut outline 1) Sign post where you are on flow 2) Extend your evidence across their attack OR cross-apply your evidence when attacking their case. 3) Explain why you are right with the reasoning of your evidence. 4) Explain WHY this is important: a) why you are winning the time frame b) why you are winning the magnitude Number is the summary that provides a voter **SPEACIL NOTE:** It is obvious both debaters had the majority of there rebuttal speech written. This prevents adapting and especially prevents adapting to mistakes of your opponents. While you feel might feel more comfortable it will lock you on a path that prevents you talking advantage of your opponent's mistakes while at the same time prevent you from answering attacks you did not include in your prewritten speech. RFD: The negative did a slightly better job of explaining the link story and that unlikeliness of space colonization and that the process means we should focus on solving earth problems./

Round 4

Neg

vs Bonnie Zhao

Judge Emanuel Vargas

WIN

Caroline Ge

Pts 28.9

RFD

I voted negative. The affirmative did not extend their offensive arguments. The contentions were note extended in the 1ar and 2ar. Only the negative extended their arguments. The aff is doing a brilliant job at answering the negs arguments, but absent these extensions, I can't vote for the aff. The negative is winning that we should prefer allocating our resources to the earth right now, which is why space colonization is bad.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Chloe Sun Chloe Sun

Round 1

Aff

vs Rachel Ke

Judge Adrian Sendejas

WIN

Chloe Sun

Pts 29.5

RFD

RFD - AFF. I think the AFF is doing a better job at the end of the debate telling a clean story - that we have fundamentally put all our eggs in one basket and we are falling victim to the downsides of that. Aff has 2 args i find persuasive. 1) Reversability 2) No tradeoff Structural violence and all iterations of the neg impact require a populace to exist in order to solve or better, which makes the aff impact a pre-requisite. Neg args also assume there is a tradeoff between space col and whatever you think is good to do now - but you need to go harder on specific examples.

Round 2

Neg

vs Caroline Ge

Judge Jacob Skinner

WIN

Chloe Sun

Pts 28.5

COMMENTS

I am hesitant on the strategy you used. You put a lot into framework, while being specific about your arguments. If there was more work on how the aff met your criteria, then you could have lost. The majority of your speeches were about framework, and saying that "good doesn't mean an obligation" which allowed you to show that the aff didn't meet framework. But if the aff had stood up and said "the benefits we get now, which the neg says are good, meets the prioritization" then you have lost. Simply put, you are placing way too much on thin differences when it comes to philosophical definitions. Spend more time showing how the opponents are weak, which feeds into all of your requirements.

RFD

I voted for the negative on framework, specifically, Prioritization and Collective Scope. The negative spent more time on framework, while the affirmative spent more time on their contentions. As a result, I think the negative needs to prove that it meets all three burdens for Space Colonization to be a "moral obligation." They do meet the first (Necessity), but fail to meet the other 2. The aff had unresponded to impacts that the negative was unable to solve for without leaving the planet. However, they do not prove that it is what we should prioritize (as opposed to other, quicker, and more realistic solutions), and did not contest the work currently being done to save the planet.

Round 3	Aff		vs Emi Takeuchi
Judge Cortez Proal	WIN	Chloe Sun	Pts 30

RFD

I vote aff. The neg does not extend their arguments on case in the 1nr. This means the aff gets access to their solvency and their arguments about multiple moral justifications for the aff. While I agree with the neg that how we survive matters and that there are social consequences for surviving at any cost, the aff wins that their impacts are irreversible. While I think the neg does a good job covering most of the aff's impacts, they do not answer the argument that colonization solves the structural vulnerability that humanity exists on one planet and therefore, needs a 2nd planet to ensure its survival. At the point where the neg does not go for it's arguments on case and lets the aff win their contentions uncontested I vote aff.

Round 4	Neg		vs Lydia Hea
Judge Mak Kovar	WIN	Chloe Sun	Pts 30

COMMENTS

Good job pressing the logic of the aff case- especially the question of moral good and moral obligation also the questions about existential risk!! Great job understanding your case and keeping firm on your position (uncompromising under pressure). I enjoyed the nuance in your answers about necessity and moral imperatives when pressed. Great overview in the 2NR and pressing the burden of the Aff to prove the uniqueness of the obligation of space colonization. Remember to use all of your time in the 2NR, you could have spent more time comparing the "world of the negative to the aff" or weighing impacts - you had a about a minute and 20s left.

RFD

Great job to both debaters, very close round - both of you have a highly engaging speaking style and it was very entertaining! The round boiled down to the urgency of the obligation to colonize space. Neg presses the Aff to address the uniqueness of colonizing space, Aff's answer was not specific enough to meet the Neg's burden. Aff needed to answer it in the 1AR, related answer was given in the 2AR but it was new and about the reduction of extinction risk being the real importance so was not weighed against the burden. Neg was able to contextualize the burden and frame Aff's impacts of space colonization as unnecessary but admirable in the face of having space exploration as an option.

Quarters

Aff

vs Lydia Hea

Judge Elisabeth Kiu

COMMENTS

I think that you presented really great line-by-line clash throughout this round. I think the majority of the problem lied in the fact that I felt as though your response of "there can be multiple moral imperatives" wasn't a sufficient enough response for me, and it felt more defensive than anything.

RFD

A really great round from the both of you! I voted neg off of probability. I felt like the responses from the aff were largely defensive, and that the neg case worked under both frameworks.

Quarters

Aff

vs Lydia Hea

Judge Rafael Sanchez

WIN

RFD

by the end of the debate the aff is winning that space col is a moral imperative. Ultimately, I think a big problem at the end of the debate for the neg is that there needs to be a much more direct link between how the aff would lead to a direct tradeoff with solving for other issues. I think you do a little bit of this about how colonization would not be self sufficient, but the problem here is that it's unclear to me how the self sufficiency would trade off with any of the other solutions that you have described. Ultimately, there needs to be more of a direct link for how the aff would lead to a deprioritization of other social issues, or, why the aff would make those other social issues worse.

Quarters

Aff

vs Lydia Hea

Judge Emanuel Vargas

WIN

RFD

This was a tricky debate for me to evaluate because I think the aff is winning 1. FW a. the way they ask me to frame this round is conceded. The aff says I should not evaluate this debate on a binary but rather understand that affirming space col as a moral imperative does not mean we have to forego other moral imperatives. I think this is important because it serves as a framework mitigator, that tells me the aff doesn't just forego structural violence completely in its affirmation of existential risks. They are also winning their framework is a prerequisite. This was conceded. I don't think this is an incredible framework argument but I do think that it is dropped, and because of that I think that stopping extinction has to come first before looking toward other things. 2. Offense. I think it's important for me to affirm a way out of extinction. Closest I am to not voting for the aff is on offense. The aff doesn't extend probably their best pieces of offense, arguments that I would like to see like the quality of life/better resources arguments. This would have given you way more offensive reasons to prefer you under their framework.

Semis

Neg

vs Enoch Xu

Judge Mak Kovar

RFD

Incredibly close round, great job to both debaters!!! Aff conceded framework while neg conceded extinction is a moral imperative. Aff provides a concrete method to solve for risks of extinction and accounts for uncertainty with the back up planet argument. The uncertainty argument went unaddressed by the negative. Negative does not provide specifics on method of solvency for the risks of extinction, as the agreed framing binds the debaters to concrete action and the Aff holds the negative to this standard as well.

Semis

Neg

vs Enoch Xu

Judge Adrian Sendejas

COMMENTS

more distinct offense if your strat is based around the aff being totally great but not a moral imperative, you should give some examples outlining what a moral imperative looks like in the context of the real world and debate - "space col is not a moral imperative, but this is what an examples of what a moral imperative would be"

RFD

Prev extinction = moral imperative —> extinction coming to earth now (agreed on by both sides) —> space col = prev extinction now (plan b, contention 1, malik and sean)
—> space col = moral imp

Judge Emanuel Vargas

RFD

This was an absolutely fantastical debate and it was so fun to judge, it was my favorite one on camp so far so thank you everyone for all the hard work you put in throughout this tournament, I know camp is draining and you should be proud for making it this far. I ended up concluding affirmative. I really like the angle the negative is taking, I think it's unique and I think it really could work. I end up having 2 major issues that lead me to an aff ballot. First is that there's no evidence that the alternatives the neg has introduced would work. The reason that this is important is because if I take the 3 standards you have on what defines a moral imperative, and filter through them, I conclude space col is a moral imperative. 1. Necessity, I can only conclude space col is necessary, you have to win something else is possible to stop extinction, and while on a truth level I think you're right that these other alts solve extinction, there's no evidence that they do, only aff has evidence that space col solves. 2. prioritization, similar conclusion here. Why should I not prioritize space col if I can't be certain something else definitely solves? The last standard about collective scope doesn't really make its way into the 2nr and you end up trying to hang your hat on these 2 things. If aff solves extinction, they are moral. CX admits this and cross is binding, which puts the nail in the coffin for me. Things to change. Really good ev why space col is just always gonna be impossible, IK this is in the camp files so this should have been used. Second, probably ev why anything else solves climate change, and you win the round. It was very close, good debate.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Cindy Wang Cindy Wang

Round 1

Neg

vs Ishana Gautam

Judge Erick Berdugo

WIN

Cindy Wang

Pts 29.5

COMMENTS

NC - Excellent speaking and control of the flow - great impacting back to the FW. IE you were always evaluating within the context of the FW. NR- Excellent weighing, need better interactions between your evidence and their evidence to fulfill the reasoning.

RFD

General comments for Both debaters 1) did an excellent job of referencing and explaining their evidence. 2) Road mapping is too specific. Don't need to tell me you are going to attack and then extend specific arguments. Just tell me where you are going to start (IE AFF OR NEG) how you intend move through the debate, it assumed you will do things like extending/cross applying and weighing. 3) General rebut outline 1) Sign post where you are on flow 2) Extend your evidence across their attack OR cross-apply your evidence when attacking their case. 3) Explain why you are right with the reasoning of your evidence. 4) Explain WHY this is important: a) why you are winning the time frame b) why you are winning the magnitude Number is the summary that provides a voter **SPECIAL NOTE:** It is obvious both debaters had the majority of there rebuttal speech written. This prevents adapting and especially prevents adapting to mistakes of your opponents. While you might feel more comfortable it will lock you on a path that prevents you talking advantage of your opponent's mistakes while at the same time prevent you from answering attacks you did not include in your prewritten speech. RFD: The AFF fails to do the weighing - though they say the numbers at risk the AFF does not do the comparative weighing and risk analysis. The Neg does a better job explaining the time frame while leveraging the low probability of success of colonization.

Round 2

Aff

vs Grace Moore

Judge Adrian Sendejas

Cindy Wang

Pts 28.5

COMMENTS

Signposting in final rebuttals Numbering More impact explanations - both scenario and terminal Warrant heavier - "because"

RFD

NEG - 1) No impact scenario for AFF anywhere - i hear the words nukes and asteroids but im not sure when that happens or how 2) FW push - neg FW becomes more encompassing as it is argued because yes a sufficient standard of living focuses on welfare which at the end of the day is the only thing that can make a life worth living

Round 3	Neg	vs Angela Zhu
Judge Rafael Sanchez	Cindy Wang	Pts 28.3

RFD

by the end of the debate, the aff is winning that space col is the biggest threat Ultimaptely the biggest problem at the end ofteh ebate from the neg is that there needs to be much more offenseive reaosns for why the aff is a bad idea. The defense they are making is good, but it is insufficeint because any risk that the aff wins that their impact still have then its try or die for the aff.

Round 4	Aff	vs Ryan Arora
Judge Toby Whisenhunt	WIN	Cindy Wang
		Pts 28.9

COMMENTS

I think you are reading evidence but not quoting the author of the evidence. this does you a disservice at times. It was not all cards but some in the aff lacked cites i feel. 1AR was great, but you had time to extend your case and contentions more than just your framework. use that last 40 seconds. The speech was well written but don't be shy to go off script with an analytic here and there. Good extension and explanation of your framework / value. Good focus. Both rebuttals seemed very scripted. Work more off the flow than just a speech that covers everything.

RFD

This was a ships passing kind of debate but in the end I think the aff does a better job explaining their framework and why it comes first.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Clara Lee Clara Lee

Round 1

Neg

vs Kevin Lin

Judge Mak Kovar

Clara Lee

Pts 28

COMMENTS

Good Job! Good start using pre-prepared questions if you're unsure of what to ask! Try to have a little more passion when asking questions in cross examination and for the neg case - rhetorically this communicates urgency and makes your position seem important. Remember to signpost so the judge can keep up with your answers on the flow, it took a bit to guess where you were going so some arguments were missed. you gave the voters during the 2nr but they were a bit scattered, try to have a summary at the end so it's a bit easier to follow. Its a good tactic to number off the voters too. Good job covering the neg flow, and referencing the aff's arguments.

RFD

Aff won the framework debate so extinction mitigation was the lens I used in the round. Even under the neg framework AFF was able to solve to structural violence harms because the risk of colonization is so pressing due to the resource restraint.

Round 2

Aff

vs Joanna Zhao

Judge Adrian Sendejas

Clara Lee

Pts 29

COMMENTS

1) Signposting 2) numbering 3) take out a framework card or two in order to read the lan card - not sure you got to it in the 1AC

RFD

NEG - 1) Aliens will launch a crippling attack on any colony we try to set up, which causes xtc 2) Increase space colonization efforts causes increased tension which turns the nuclear war scenario and now means it is neg offense.

Round 3**Aff****vs Elijah Lau****Judge Solomon Watson**

Clara Lee

Pts 28.8

RFD

Good debate, I voted neg. Really liked the clash from Elijah and but thought that Clara you were doing a better job with the overview especially in the last rebutals. So, something early on that would have helped both of yall is that yall essentially have the same fwk so — first to conceded and identify that it doesn't implicate the debate gains an efficiency adv. Now to the debate. I think the neg is ahead on two major cuts 1. the tf of solvency for both resources and colonization more broadly 2. the technical limitations involved with things like radiation make the likelihood of even try or die negligible especially because I think the neg is winning we might be able to correct warming in time. Reading a card on that was smart to the same end I think if the aff read a card on we can solve in time and its technically possible I might be voting aff. can be more efficient in the they say clara and elijah, need to be reading a card on space col possible.

Round 4**Neg****vs Advika Baditela****Judge Solomon Watson**

Clara Lee

Pts 28.9

RFD

Good debate, voted aff. I think it really does come down to this card read in the 2ac about how we can do both space col and conservationism. This is an, essentially, no link or no trade off argument. Saying that there is no forced choice between space col and climate change. This means that even if the economic conditions for selfsufficient colonies isn't possible in the short term — they can be mutually reinforcing of earths position. I do think Clara did good to lock in more on the structural violence impact calq argument s given this but there is another no link argument Advika has made analytically which is that this debate is about the ethics of space col not the ethics of a specific space col proposal. So I don't need to be held accountable to the squo forms of space col that would cuase inequality and structural violence. I think you just, again, need some on point clash to keep yourself in it and you'll be fine.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Dittu Tandon Dittu Tandon

Round 1

Aff

vs Andy Yue

Judge Cortez Proal

Dittu Tandon

Pts 27

COMMENTS

Util - U - Tarian - ism Need impacts to your contentions - I think contention 3 is the impact to C1 and that you need a uq impact to c2. Work on your word economy - remember extensions are claim warrant impact.

RFD

The aff concedes the offense on fw and the solvency take outs. Means neg wins.

Round 2

Neg

vs Ryan Arora

Judge Mak Kovar

WIN

Dittu Tandon

Pts 30

COMMENTS

Great answers in CX and leveraging the bias of the Musk card. Well written case.

RFD

Remember to look at the judge in cross examination! A lot of the negative was dropped by the aff. Neg won the frame work of stewardship and sustainability. Bought it was imperative to solve for climate change now as space colonization will exacerbate classism and leave the marginalized to die while entrench the cold-war esc tensions internationally from space competitiveness.

Round 3

Aff

vs Jayden Chai

Judge Emanuel Vargas

Dittu Tandon

Pts 28.8

RFD

This was a great debate, I voted negative. I think they are outframing the aff. I agree that their framework could incorporate extinction impacts, and the aff is right ot try to hijack it in that way but I think where they're ahead is this question on what we ought to do right now, and I think the way they're explaining their framework is about how the affs treatment of people in the squo and sacrificial is something we should reject. I.E. when the aff says we need to do space col right NOW instead of divesting those resources elsewhere, those are the arguments I should farme out. I ended up voting more on the negatives of the second contention than on their first one. Some of the aff's arguments dont have HUGE impacts, and I don't get enough "try or die, we're on the brink" arguments from the aff t make me think we need to do space col NOW.

Round 4

Neg

vs Jessica Ouyang

Judge Cortez Proal

Dittu Tandon

Pts 27

RFD

I vote aff. The aff wins that their fw comes first and that space colonization is key to human flourishing.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Elijah Lau Elijah Lau

Round 1

Neg

vs Lydia Hea

Judge Ronen Bowman

Elijah Lau

Pts 28.5

COMMENTS

You are doing good on the line by line but you need to work on not using words such as "like, uhm, uh, and". You should do a speech redo where you redo a speech like this but you make sure that every time you say one filler word you restart your time and speech and you keep doing it until you are able to not use filler words for the line by line that should clean things up and make it a lot easier for you and me to follow along giving you more time to attack your opponents case. In the first speech you did a good job splitting up your time when it came to the attacking and defending but in your last speech you didn't do enough extending and debating your opponents case.

RFD

I vote aff I think that the neg is lacking behind on the actual substance of the debate and what the actual link story is on the argument about climate change and poverty I am not sure why space colonization makes climate change worse or poverty worse at most I think these are kinda non uq and think the aff is winning their impacts happen unless we colonize space and also that space tech is helping right now track and contain things like climate change and natural events and issues.

Round 2

Aff

vs Jessica Ouyang

Judge Mak Kovar

Elijah Lau

Pts 29

COMMENTS

Good confident reading of the Aff constructive. Remember to look at the judge in CX. Dont make arguments in CX when it's your turn to ask questions. The 2ar needs to be more organized, you went a few different places on the flow quickly without naming the contention number you were talking about.

RFD

Neg won framework for distributive justice. She painted the picture of the world where space colonization would bring on climate change faster and is likely to be unsuccessful. It would also lead to international competition while still running out of resources. Aff neglected to extend the resource benefits of space colonization - answer for international resource sharing lacked a bit of context for me to be comfortable voting on it.

Round 3**Neg****vs Clara Lee****Judge Solomon Watson****WIN**

Elijah Lau

Pts 28.9

RFD

Good debate, I voted neg. Really liked the clash from Elijah and but thought that Clara you were doing a better job with the overview especially in the last rebutals. So, something early on that would have helped both of yall is that yall essentially have the same fwk so — first to conceded and identify that it doesn't implicate the debate gains an efficiency adv. Now to the debate. I think the neg is ahead on two major cuts 1. the tf of solvency for both resources and colonization more broadly 2. the technical limitations involved with things like radiation make the likelihood of even try or die negligible especially because I think the neg is winning we might be able to correct warming in time. Reading a card on that was smart to the same end I think if the aff read a card on we can solve in time and its technically possible I might be voting aff. can be more efficient in the they say clara and elijah, need to be reading a card on space col possible.

Round 4**Aff****vs Jason Chen****Judge Jacob Skinner**

Elijah Lau

Pts 27.3

COMMENTS

Use warrants and evidence to back up your positions. I know there are cards that talk about how wealth will be distributed and the benefits of space colonization. Unfortunately, this round largely didn't have warrants or evidence supporting positions. I think the negative was more persuasive that money won't be distributed. My main piece of advice is about rebuttal. Use a formula that does "The other team says X, but my evidence means Y, for the round that equates to Z." In this round if you had said "The negative says that resources won't be distributed, but my evidence shows that inventions designed for space have benefited everyone, so that means space colonization benefits structural violence." This shouldn't add that much time to an argument, but will give it more weight and tell me why it means you should win. You did a really good job at the line-by-line and answering the negatives points, but you need more in the responses than "Rich people aren't stupid enough to not help." and "Some resources will be given to the poor."

RFD

I voted for the negative on the basis that they save more lives, which was the value. The negative made the argument that structural violence will kill millions, while the resources gained from space colonization will be used for weapons and not used to help with poverty. The affirmative was unable to convince me that resources will be distributed in a way that helps people.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Emi Takeuchi Emi Takeuchi

Round 1 Neg vs Jason Chen

Judge Elisabeth Kiu

WIN

Emi Takeuchi

Pts 28

COMMENTS

Great job, Emi! I think you had a really strong case here. I think you could work on adhering to the roadmaps a little more cleanly, especially in rebuttal speeches. For lay judges, especially, signpost and adhere to the roadmap you set at the beginning of your speech

RFD

I voted neg off of framework. I felt like neg case could sufficiently stand under both the aff and neg frameworks.

Round 2 Aff vs Lynetta Jin

Judge Erick Berdugo

WIN

Emi Takeuchi

Pts 29.8

COMMENTS

You need to follow the pattern I gave in the general comments because you are doing a good jobbing explaining why SV is bad but, you are assuming (claiming) your opponent is causing the SV but do not really clarify the link.

RFD

General comments for Both debaters 1) did an excellent job of referencing and explaining their evidence. 2) Road mapping is too specific. Don't need to tell me you are going to attack and then extend specific arguments. Just tell me where you are going to start (IE AFF OR NEG) how you intend move through the debate, it assumed you will do things like extending/cross applying and weighing. 3) General rebut outline 1) Sign post where you are on flow 2) Extend your evidence across their attack OR cross-apply your evidence when attacking their case. 3) Explain why you are right with the reasoning of your evidence. 4) Explain WHY this is important: a) why you are winning the time frame b) why you are winning the magnitude Number is the summary that provides a voter **SPECAIL NOTE:** It is obvious both debaters had the majority of there rebuttal speech written. This prevents adapting and especially prevents adapting to mistakes of your opponents. While you feel might feel more comfortable it will lock you on a path that prevents you talking advantage of your opponent's mistakes while at the same time prevent you from answering attacks you did not include in your prewritten speech. RFD: The AFF does a better job in weighing within the FW of the debate. IE they do a better job explaining the moral imperative as the terminal impact of the debate.

Round 3

Neg

vs Chloe Sun

Judge Cortez Proal

Emi Takeuchi

Pts 29

RFD

I vote aff. The neg does not extend their arguments on case in the 1nr. This means the aff gets access to their solvency and their arguments about multiple moral justifications for the aff. While I agree with the neg that how we survive matters and that there are social consequences for surviving at any cost, the aff wins that their impacts are irreversible. While I think the neg does a good job covering most of the aff's impacts, they do not answer the argument that colonization solves the structural vulnerability that humanity exists on one planet and therefore, needs a 2nd planet to ensure its survival. At the point where the neg does not go for it's arguments on case and lets the aff win their contentions uncontested I vote aff.

Round 4

Aff

vs Grace Moore

Judge Mak Kovar

WIN

Emi Takeuchi

Pts 29.5

COMMENTS

Great delivery for the AC, very compelling. Remember to adjust your volume level to the room you're in (was a tad loud for a small space - but still, persuasive).

RFD

Very close round, great job to both debaters! Framework was very similar apart from quality of life criterion from the aff that was mostly dropped to discuss similar values. Defaulted Aff framework because it was extended well in the rebuttals. On the flow, Aff was able to outweigh on magnitude because of the compounding effects of future generations that beat out the time horizon of climate change that was mostly unaddressed so it undercuts the risk of space colonization.

Octas

Aff

vs Lydia Hea

Judge Charlie Hale

COMMENTS

just have the timer run down from 5 minutes or however long u get - don't try to guess how much u need. 1AR needs to answer the resource competition and tradeoff argument more - it was warranted on two different parts of my flow in the 1NC and had turns case warrants like medical research and disaster preparedness.

RFD

I can't explain why space col saves us from a specific extinction scenario - the innovation driven by it has been described as renewable energy that solves climate change - a dire but manageable risk in the status quo. With no clear extinction scenario, I default to the negative's impact of resource competition and tradeoff - there is little to no defense to it - so i believe it is the most likely to potentially cause war or extinction - and it also causes the largest amounts of structural violence. This means the Colonization Competition argument is a moral imperative to stop under either criterion.

Octas

Aff

vs Lydia Hea

Judge Adrian Sendejas

COMMENTS

1AR has to be a little tighter on the line by line, 1NC is proliferating a good amount of arguments on the case page which is making it an uphill battle

RFD

1—Space col redistributes violence and the problems of humanity onto other planets - means no solvency for any x risk bc they get recreated - on top of the fact that i dont think the likely target (mars) is habitable - args for this are radiation, lack of water, and i think one or two more things. 2—Issues back home are solveable - pandemic prep, nuclear security, asteroid defense systems - means A) not necessary and B) money can instead be put into resolving ineq – aff leans into this by also saying things like CC can be managed - but not answer the alternative that the neg gives to solve it, which is space exploration 3—Space exploration solves any benefits to tech or knowledge, satellites example, not sure what the difference is between that and space col

Octas

Aff

vs Lydia Hea

Judge Jacob Skinner

COMMENTS

I think you need to show that colonization is key. You show that space is k, but I think you need to spend time showing how the goal of colonization is the requirement. Occasionally you get to the point of saying Mars is feasible, but that doesn't answer larger colonization. This was a debate about who is better at solving for futurism. You need to show that your argument is key. I would also use that to contest with the other team saying we need to solve for now and systemic inequality.

RFD

I am voting for the negative because I don't think the aff proves that we need space colonization to solve for threats or that it is viable. The aff does argue that colonization doesn't require mars, I don't think that answers colonies are dependent on earth, and that all colonies aren't viable. Therefore, Space Colonization won't ensure survival. At the same time, on the technologies debate, I don't think the aff does enough to prove colonization, not exploration is necessary. Therefore, colonization itself isn't an obligation. On the human flourishing angle, I don't think the aff responded to giving better lives to the rest of humanity.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Emily Zhang Emily Zhang

Round 1

Neg

vs Enoch Xu

Judge Toby Whisenhunt

Emily Zhang

Pts 29.2

COMMENTS

Use some prep time to come up with arguments against the 2nd and 3rd contention. You had time in your speech to cover them, but you elected not to. Just some analytics and cross applications could do the job. Having a bunch of prep time will do little good if you can't answer arguments you have dropped since they would be new. Make arguments in your speeches instead of asking rhetorical questions. Why are we .. How do we know ... Also you have time left at the end of your speeches. Slow down or add stuff.

RFD

This was a very good debate. I find myself voting on a technicality of sorts in that the negative did not directly refute the aff framing of util and prevention of extinction in comparison to prevention of structural violence. Although it was mentioned multiple times that the poor would suffer the brunt of the impacts and be effected the most, there was a lack of framework explanation and to why that should come first or be amoral priority. I understand the assumption, but it needs to be more explicit.

Round 2

Aff

vs Kevin Lin

Judge Emanuel Vargas

Emily Zhang

Pts 28.5

RFD

This was a GREAT debate. I'm going to line by line a couple of things on the flow. (orally) I voted negative. I think that spacd colonization would lead to an alien war. While I don't think this is the best argument, and the answers given in the 2ar made a lot of sense and are the right ones to make, I think that these responses are given too late in the debate and I cant evaluate them. They win a couple of ticky tacky things that give sufficient defense on the aff's case. They win that given all the talk about sanctuaries in space for the aff, extinction due to climate change would happen before we have the means to be able to enact those, since terraforming the surfaces of moons or planets would take way too long.

Round 3	Aff	vs Advika Baditela
Judge Cortez Proal	Emily Zhang	Pts 26

COMMENTS	You need to always extend case and answer the arguments your opponent makes on your case. Good cxs but phrases like "can you guarantee X?" should leave your vocab Make sure to answer the warrants of the cards not just a phrase you pick up from reading the evidence.
-----------------	---

RFD	I vote neg. The aff conceded the negs solvency take outs and dropped case.
------------	--

Round 4	Neg	vs Jessica Wang
Judge Adrian Sendejas	WIN	Emily Zhang
		Pts 29

COMMENTS	Remember to answer fw in the 1NC!
-----------------	-----------------------------------

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Enoch Xu Enoch Xu

Round 1 Aff vs Emily Zhang

Judge Toby Whisenhunt

WIN

Enoch Xu

Pts 29.4

COMMENTS

AC and presentation was solid. Great projection, but you could adjust volume based on the size of the room. Good job in CX defending and asking questions. Solid 1AR good cross applications and coverage. Some more comparative warrants about why your card is better than the negative Jackson evidence for example could push things to the next level. More explicit voters and boxing out the negative with "no new arguments" and "even if" type of analysis.

RFD

This was a very good debate. I find myself voting on a technicality of sorts in that the negative did not directly refute the aff framing of util and prevention of extinction in comparison to prevention of structural violence. Although it was mentioned multiple times that the poor would suffer the brunt of the impacts and be effected the most, there was a lack of framework explanation and to why that should come first or be amoral priority. I understand the assumption, but it needs to be more explicit.

Round 2 Neg vs Rachel Ke

Judge Cortez Proal

WIN

Enoch Xu

Pts 29

RFD

The neg proves that colonization takes too long to solve and that the squo is sufficient to avoid climate change, The aff does not respond to the neg's impact defense which means under the shared UTIL fw I vote neg because they save the greatest number of lives.

Round 3	Aff		vs Joanna Zhao
Judge Emanuel Vargas	WIN	Enoch Xu	Pts 28.8

RFD

I vote affirmative because I think that the risk that space colonization solves catastrophes is greater than the risk it will lead to a negative impact. The negative main pieces of offense seem to be predicated on low-probability impacts, without a clear story for how space colonization accelerates other types of impacts. I think they're right that the argument on rapid tech advancement is somewhat dropped, but I think the aff needs to be taking a different angle on this. You only have to defend the value statement that space colonization is justified, not that its inherently possible. I'm not sure, coming out of the 2nr, why the aff would lead to a sort of crisis between countries. Con 4 about resources is probably strongest, but you move on too quickly without impacting it out. I think the fundamental misstep for the 2nr is that they are going for far too much. This speech definitely feels very defensive without a clear mechanism for how I should evaluate each thing.

Round 4	Neg		vs Annie Huang
Judge Rafael Sanchez	WIN	Enoch Xu	Pts 29

RFD

by the end of the debate, the neg is winning that the squo is preferable over space col Ultmatley, lack of a reponse to the negs contetiosn makes it hard for the aff to generate a lot offense in teh roudn because the contentions turn a lot of the offense. Especailly the arg about how spce col takes too long to sovlr for anything which makes it so that even if you o win taht we can get off the roock it would be too late before we can sovlr for cc

Quarters	Neg		vs Jessica Ouyang
Judge Elisabeth Kiu	WIN		

RFD

I voted neg due to the "space exploration solves" argument. I felt like it sufficiently answered a lot of the aff's worries, and I felt like the claims against climate change made by the aff were not sufficient.

Quarters	Neg	vs Jessica Ouyang
Judge Rafael Sanchez	WIN	

RFD

by the end of the debate, the neg is winnign that space col casues cliamte cahgne which leads to exintction. Ultimatley, the big problem at the end of the dbate for the aff is that there needs to be more explanation for why climate chagne inev and why we are able to get off the rock in time. Ultimatley, the neg is making 2 claims that makes it hard for the aff to generate a lot of offense. first is taht the aff uniquely accelerates climate cahgen because of the process of thegetting to space, and 2 that it would take too long to get off the rock. saying climate change inev is insufficeint because even if you win that climate cahgne is ienv, you have to be winning that we are able to get off the rock before climat chagne is able to save us.

Quarters	Neg	vs Jessica Ouyang
Judge Emanuel Vargas	WIN	

RFD

At the end of this debate, both sides agree that climate change will happen now. I have to decide whether we should affirm space colonization to escape that, or forego that in favor of using our resources for now. Neither side gives me judge instruction for how I should go about evaluting these, which is my biggest tip for you both. Framework is irrelevant, both sides are saying extinction and are being utilitarian. I end up thinking the negative has a greater risk of offense. If climate change is happening now, there's only a risk space col will accelerate that and it will happen too fast for us to get out of earth. My biggest problem with the 2ar is that it never addresses the time frame question, which seems to be the main argumen the negative is going for. Time and time again the neg says in the 2NR "climate change will kill us before getting to space" the 2AR only response to this, is that that's exactly why we need to get out the rock. But that doesn't answer their internal link/warrant which is TIME FRAME, for why we can't get out of here in the first place. I end up concluding it's better to risk using the resources on Earth, than wasting them on space colonization.

Semis	Aff	vs Chloe Sun
Judge Mak Kovar	WIN	

RFD

Incredibly close round, great job to both debaters!!! Aff conceded framework while neg conceded extinction is a moral imperative. Aff provides a concrete method to solve for risks of extinction and accounts for uncertainty with the back up planet argument. The uncertainty argument went unaddressed by the negative. Negative does not provide specifics on method of solvency for the risks of extinction, as the agreed framing binds the debaters to concrete action and the Aff holds the negative to this standard as well.

Semis

Aff

vs Chloe Sun

Judge Adrian Sendejas

WIN

COMMENTS

1—call out the lack of evidence more, you can honestly make it a theme of your cross ex - circle back to things you know they dont have cards on - feasibility would have been another one in this debate 2—they say other alternatives – aff should say do both – everytime this is brought up in a round 3—more warrants from Sean and Bienkowski in the 1AR - but its a time pressured speech so i get it 4—

RFD

Prev extinction = moral imperative —> extinction coming to earth now (agreed on by both sides) —> space col = prev extinction now (plan b, contention 1, malik and sean) —> space col = moral imp

Semis

Aff

vs Chloe Sun

Judge Emanuel Vargas

WIN

RFD

This was an absolutely fantastical debate and it was so fun to judge, it was my favorite one on camp so far so thank you everyone for all the hard work you put in throughout this tournament, I know camp is draining and you should be proud for making it this far. I ended up concluding affirmative. I really like the angle the negative is taking, I think it's unique and I think it really could work. I end up having 2 major issues that lead me to an aff ballot. First is that there's no evidence that the alternatives the neg has introduced would work. The reason that this is important is because if I take the 3 standards you have on what defines a moral imperative, and filter through them, I conclude space col is a moral imperative. 1. Necessity, I can only conclude space col is necessary, you have to win something else is possible to stop extinction, and while on a truth level I think you're right that these other alts solve extinction, there's no evidence that they do, only aff has evidence that space col solves. 2. prioritization, similar conclusion here. Why should I not prioritize space col if I can't be certain something else definitely solves? The last standard about collective scope doesn't really make its way into the 2nr and you end up trying to hang your hat on these 2 things. If aff solves extinction, they are moral. CX admits this and cross is binding, which puts the nail in the coffin for me. Things to change. Really good ev why space col is just always gonna be impossible, IK this is in the camp files so this should have been used. Second, probably ev why anything else solves climate change, and you win the round. It was very close, good debate.

Finals

Neg

vs Manya Jindal

Judge Ronen Bowman

WIN

RFD

I thought that this was a very good debate and congrats to both sides for making it this far and having a great final debate. For me this came down to a couple key things and ended up narrowing down to mainly one impact. At the end of the debate the neg has come down with two main issues and points of contentions the first is climate change and the second is alien life. I do not think that this alien impact is really all there for me and at most I agree with the aff that you just prove that alien life does exist but not the war aspect. SO this come downs to the argument of climate change and who's impact is greatest in this debate and I just end up thinking that the neg is winning that the time frame issue of the climate change issue is most important and something that the aff has good responses too but I think it is a little too late breaking for me and just doesn't really answer the argument about what colonization really does to solve the idea that exploration cant already do or has already done.

Finals

Neg

vs Manya Jindal

Judge Rafael Sanchez

RFD

by the end of the debate, the aff is winnignthat space col is a moral prioirity ultimateluy, the big prblem withteh neg is taht there needs to be a much more robust explanatnation for why the aff would lead to a direct tradeoff with cc policies. ON the arg that the aff woul dled to more emissisions, the problem here is that the aff is pretty ahead on this question that the aff would lead to more scientctfic innovation which owuld result in overall cc solutiosn which ow the emissiosn that comes from rockets. This also means that even ifyou do win taht space col takes forever, that doesnt matter because teh process of scientific innov from space col doenst happen in a vacuum which means that all the existential risks that would arise in teh interim would still be mitigated in the process prioritizing space col

RFD

I think the negative is winning the time frame question. They have specific evidence that says it will take decades for climate change to kill us, and the aff evidence agrees. Even if I agree that space colonization gives us some good resources to help stop that from happening, it would take far too long, both sides agree that climate change is on the brink. I don't think the aff ever answers the negs time frame changes which matters because it determines who's impacts turn who's. Also, even if rocket omissions are short term and teh aff is a long term solution, we are so on the brink, it still exacerbates it. That's bad. I guess I kind og think that there's a reason to believe the aff doesn't trade off, but the aff hasn't done an robust enough job to point this out to me, especially cosnidering they have evidence (frank) that says thinking we can have a "plan b" is exactly what exacerbates the impacts. I think neg is best for stopping extinction, or atleast piositively affecting the time frame of extinction. ALL other riss dont matter if climate change comes first.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Grace Moore Grace Moore

Round 1 Aff vs Penny Lin

Judge Cortez Proal

WIN

Grace Moore

Pts 28

RFD

The aff wins that there are multiple existential threats to Earth. They also extend their FW in the rebuttals. Even though the aff conceded almost all of the negs solvency take outs, the neg does not extend their fw nor do they have an impact in this round. Therefore, I have to vote aff.

Round 2 Neg vs Cindy Wang

Judge Adrian Sendejas

WIN

Grace Moore

Pts 29

COMMENTS

Signposting in final rebuttals Numbering Space exploration solves a lot of these benefits Great job on knowing what the \$ goes towards (or should be going towards)

RFD

NEG - 1) No impact scenario for AFF anywhere - i hear the words nukes and asteroids but im not sure when that happens or how 2) FW push - neg FW becomes more encompassing as it is argued because yes a sufficient standard of living focuses on welfare which at the end of the day is the only thing that can make a life worth living

Round 3 Aff vs Lydia Hea

Judge Jacob Skinner

Grace Moore

Pts 28.4

COMMENTS

You spent too much time stressing the importance of colonization (as in, it's the only way to prevent extinction), while not enough time proving it's feasible. In a debate about long term v. short term solutions, then you need to show how your solution will work. There are several arguments (such as space col only helps the wealthy), that aren't responded to until late in the round. In your final speech you spend a large amount of time on impact calc and explaining how we can later bring the non wealthy (which should have been earlier), but you didn't speak enough on framing. If you are trying to win on longtermism, then during your 2ar, tie how you solve and your impacts into your impact calc.

RFD

I am voting for the negative on Framework and that we need to solve for Structural Violence. There are several arguments that Space Colonization is unlikely, and we need to focus on what is currently happening. I don't think the aff contends with these arguments. At the same time, there were many arguments and pieces of evidence that we can't feasibly colonize, which the aff doesn't have enough to.

Round 4

Neg

vs Emi Takeuchi

Judge Mak Kovar

Grace Moore

Pts 29

COMMENTS

Remember to look at the judge during cross examination, good job pressing at the logic of the aff. Remember to sign post during the 1NR (signal where you are on the flow so it's easier to follow). You jumped in to the Aff quickly without signaling you were refuting while giving the 1NR. Great job weighing impacts in the 2NR! It was a great overview of the round.

RFD

Very close round, great job to both debaters! Framework was very similar apart from quality of life criterion from the aff that was mostly dropped to discuss similar values. Defaulted Aff framework because it was extended well in the rebuttals. On the flow, Aff was able to outweigh on magnitude because of the compounding effects of future generations that beat out the time horizon of climate change that was mostly unaddressed so it undercuts the risk of space colonization.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Ishana Gautam Ishana Gautam

Round 1

Aff

vs Cindy Wang

Judge Erick Berdugo

Ishana Gautam

Pts 29.2

COMMENTS

1AC Excellent speaking and pronunciation. 1AR - Your speech we written and lacked an organic feel. IE it was written in advance versus coming out as you were assembling it from the flows. Thus, you missed engagement of the underlying time frame press of the negative. 2AR - The attacks of her CX is something you should have done in the 1AR. It is lacking weighing

RFD

General comments for Both debaters 1) did an excellent job of referencing and explaining their evidence. 2) Road mapping is too specific. Don't need to tell me you are going to attack and then extend specific arguments. Just tell me where you are going to start (IE AFF OR NEG) how you intend move through the debate, it assumed you will do things like extending/cross applying and weighing. 3) General rebut outline 1) Sign post where you are on flow 2) Extend your evidence across their attack OR cross-apply your evidence when attacking their case. 3) Explain why you are right with the reasoning of your evidence. 4) Explain WHY this is important: a) why you are winning the time frame b) why you are winning the magnitude Number is the summary that provides a voter **SPEACIL NOTE:** It is obvious both debaters had the majority of there rebuttal speech written. This prevents adapting and especially prevents adapting to mistakes of your opponents. While you feel might feel more comfortable it will lock you on a path that prevents you talking advantage of your opponent's mistakes while at the same time prevent you from answering attacks you did not include in your prewritten speech. RFD: The AFF fails to do the weighing - though they say the numbers at risk the AFF does not do the comparative weighing and risk analysis. The Neg does a better job explaining the time frame while leveraging the low probability of success of colonization.

Round 2

Neg

vs Angela Zhu

Judge Emanuel Vargas

WIN

Ishana Gautam

Pts 29.2

RFD

This was an EXCELLENT debate. One of my favorites. I voted negative. I was VERY close to voting for the aff on just "extinction outweighs". The reason that I ultimately dont end up doing so, is beacuse I think the aff is doing a good job at layer 1, which is telling me that extinction is very likely. If this is the case, then I think you might be winning the fw arguments, since a bunch of thier stuff on framework is pretty much just saying that extinction is unlikely. I think you're winning that it is likely, my issue with this, is that I think you're missing the crucial SECOND portion of this, which is to explain your "solvency" or your reason why you meet your burden. I.E. you need to explain to me why space col prevents extinction. I think you're doing an excellent job at this in the 1AC and in 1AC cross ex, but it doesnt make it through the entire debate. I think the neg has impacts I can point to that are probable, and not doing space col might solve. Impacts like spate eliteism, S.V on earth, all those sorts of things.

Round 3**Aff****vs Nila Rajkumar****Judge Mak Kovar**

Ishana Gautam

Pts 28.5

COMMENTS

Fantastic delivery of the 1AC, very compelling! Great job pressing on the logic of the neg in CX!!! 2ar was too focused on covering everything and so you missed your opportunity for voters, focus on a few key issues.

RFD

Very close round!!!! Neg sufficiently won the frame work debate, though it was close thus the moral imperative was to decrease structural violence. This was supported best by the focus on the negative to solve climate change with the resources we have and the improbability of a nuclear war that was uncontested. The aff's time frame to colonization and nuclear war was a bit muddled but the neg was able to cast doubt on whether space colonization would be a sufficient way to prioritize life if by the aff's time line, humanity would be taken out by nuclear war in 3 years whereas space colonization would be 7 year. Thus if it's muddy but nuclear was is unlikely then we can solve for structural inequalities tied to climate change first before considering "fleeing to space: Remember to look at the judge in CX!

Round 4**Neg****vs Melvin Ma****Judge Jacob Skinner**

Ishana Gautam

Pts 28.6

COMMENTS

I think you did a really good job in this debate. My main piece of advice is to be careful in CX. You also can just say no. If the other team wants you to agree with their position, you don't have to. When asked about morality, you can just say "no, morality exists independent of humanity" and this could have been a negative ballot. That said, you got very close to turning this aff. I enjoy the arguments that say leaving means earth is redundant and will increase the chance of death. The only thing missing is to argue that the aff won't solve (as in, colonization won't solve). You had lots of offense, but not enough defense. If you aren't going to go all in on winning framework, then you should spend more time trying to win on both positions, especially with as many arguments that they would cause extinction as you ran.

RFD

I voted on Framework and that the Aff save humanity from extinction Okay, in CX the Negative said that if people go extinct we can't have morality and the aff used that to force the framework debate to be about saving life. I think that the aff is winning on extinction. There is more from them arguing that leaving the earth is necessary and that there is a chance of the aff saving humanity from extinction. Largely, this comes down to argument framing. While the negative is winning that many people will die from space colonization (due to us leaving people here) and that earth will be left to get destroyed, there is not enough contestation throughout the debate that all people will die.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Jason Chen Jason Chen

Round 1

Aff

vs Emi Takeuchi

Judge Elisabeth Kiu

Jason Chen

Pts 27.5

COMMENTS

Great job, Jason. Your constructive speech was strong and logical in nature. I would continue to work on making sure that responses to your opponent's case/rebuttal are more offensive rather than defensive. While you did great in directly addressing some of what your opponent said, I felt like I needed a bit more substance and strength. I think I noticed this in particular when you responded to your opponent's C1 of unresolved injustices. I think continuing to work on flowing skills and additional practice will help with these skills, especially when you have such a great foundation!

RFD

I voted neg off of framework. I felt like neg case could sufficiently stand under both the aff and neg frameworks.

Round 2

Neg

vs Andy Yue

Judge Jacob Skinner

WIN

Jason Chen

Pts 29.2

COMMENTS

I would spend more time arguing the impacts that are currently being experienced. You have several cards saying that people are currently dying from structural violence, but you don't bring this up. If you are saying to prefer what we can see and what is happening, you should take your examples through the speeches.

RFD

The round turned into discussions of what impacts we are obligated to solve. There was a debate about which impact is speculative and which way can solve for extinction. Ultimately, the lack of affirmative response on futurism being speculative made me vote for the negative. You both need evidence and warrants for your arguments. This round largely turned into a claim and then the other person saying "that's speculative." This makes it difficult to determine what to support and what I should evaluate. Under this, I feel that the affirmative did not meet the burden to show that the impacts of extinction outweigh the reality of structural violence.

Round 3	Aff	vs Jessica Ouyang
Judge Toby Whisenhunt	Jason Chen	Pts 29

COMMENTS

AC was solid. Well read and presented. Defended well in CX. Questions in CX were good as well. AR needs to really focus in on your FW and why it excludes the aff. More even if and some defense to her case, not just the case cards she read against you. Good job on responding to case attacks.

RFD

Solid round. The AR left 40 seconds on the table at the end that could have been used to push back against the negative framework. Aff did a good job extending extinction but never really had a response to the negative framework outside of extinction framing comes first. Need some defense or push back from the affirmative here. Seeing as that was lacking and the defensive arguments the negative made I find that it is not moral imperative to colonize space.

Round 4	Neg	vs Elijah Lau
Judge Jacob Skinner	WIN Jason Chen	Pts 28

COMMENTS

I think you need more warrants and evidence to support your arguments. You did a fantastic job at turning the affs arguments, but you mainly just made claims. This round came down to who was more persuasive (in, who sounded more correct with their claim), but if the aff had warrants, then you would have lost. You had several cards about how wealth is poorly distributed, that benefits of space will only go to the rich. If you had referenced those cards to prove that it won't help stop structural violence, then it would have been far easier. This doesn't require a lot. Try this formula: "[Claim] which is supported by [card], which shows structural violence will be worsened by space colonization, so the negative is better at [Framework]." This doesn't add time, but creates a full, supported picture of the round.

RFD

I voted for the negative on the basis that they save more lives, which was the value. The negative made the argument that structural violence will kill millions, while the resources gained from space colonization will be used for weapons and not used to help with poverty. The affirmative was unable to convince me that resources will be distributed in a way that helps people.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Jayden Chai Jayden Chai

Round 1

Neg

vs Jenny Gu

Judge Ronen Bowman

WIN

Jayden Chai

Pts 28.2

COMMENTS

You did a really good line by line on the negs case in your first speech. You are doing good explaining and using analytics to answer questions in the cx but TONS of filler words which we should try and cut those out. You should slow down in last speech because you had more time left and do not want to end your speech early make sure to use all the time you have.

RFD

Yay good debate! This was a close debate and thought it was very good. I ended up voting neg I just think that at the end of the debate the fw page gets a little bit messy and the neg has more reason to prefer. As well as gives a long list of reason why they outweigh and things like radiation and destruction of bone density on each colonizer that tries to colonize space means that it is not possible. I think that just sort of begs the question on if its even possible that the aff does not really address which means I would just default to assuming its not and preventing at least the colonizers lives by voting neg.

Round 2

Aff

vs Nila Rajkumar

Judge Toby Whisenhunt

Jayden Chai

Pts 29.4

COMMENTS

Look more at the judge during CX than your opponent. And when they are asking questions they can cut you off and vice versa. Good extensions but need to address the neg more directly in terms of colonization the imperative not just extinction.

RFD

This was a close debate. Both sides did a good job extending and putting some arguments on the other case. In the end I found the negative argument that the aff is proving extinction bad but not colonization is the only hope. More emphasis on that and this could have easily gone the other way.

Round 3	Neg		vs Dittu Tandon
Judge Emanuel Vargas	WIN	Jayden Chai	Pts 28.9

RFD

This was a great debate, I voted negative. I think they are outframing the aff. I agree that their framework could incorporate extinction impacts, and the aff is right to try to hijack it in that way but I think where they're ahead is this question on what we ought to do right now, and I think the way they're explaining their framework is about how the aff's treatment of people in the squo and sacrificial is something we should reject. I.E. when the aff says we need to do space col right NOW instead of divesting those resources elsewhere, those are the arguments I should farm out. I ended up voting more on the negatives of the second contention than on their first one. Some of the aff's arguments don't have HUGE impacts, and I don't get enough "try or die, we're on the brink" arguments from the aff to make me think we need to do space col NOW.

Round 4	Aff		vs Kathie Liu
Judge Rafael Sanchez	WIN	Jayden Chai	Pts 28.5

RFD

by the end of the debate the aff is winning that space col is preferable. Ultimately, at the end of the debate, the problem with the neg is that there needs to be a much more direct response to the argument that space col would lead to trickle down effect where tech and innov is passed down which would directly help and alleviate structural violence. The neg's arguments of sv and climate change are very good, but without a response to this argument they just turn the whole contentions.

Octas	Aff		vs Kevin Lin
Judge Cortez Proal	WIN		

RFD

I vote aff. The aff wins that colon solves the structural vulnerability of all of humanity being on one planet means eventually we will go extinct. The neg has ev that could push back on this Malik, but never uses it here. The neg could have won this round had they leveraged the Malik evidence and pushed harder for the aff can't solve the most direct threat climate change and causes ALIEN WARS, but since the Malik evidence is never used to answer extinction inevitable, I view the "you solve too slow to avoid the impact of cc" as defense since the aff wins any risk that we can avoid extinction is how I should evaluate the round. That leaves me with ALIEN WARS the neg never identifies the warrant in his card, while the aff explains we have searched for advanced life a la seti and found nothing. That means I don't see ALIEN WARS as a probable scenario for ext. However, had the neg used the aff's 1% framing of ext impact means you have to give it 100% weight argument and leveraged the Malik card it would have made it harder to vote aff.

Octas

Aff

vs Kevin Lin

Judge Rafael Sanchez

WIN

RFD

by the end of the debate the aff is winning that space col is the only way to avoid extinction. Ultimately, the aff is winning that getting off the rock is the only way to eliminate existential risk because any other solution is just a band aid and doesn't eliminate the underlying conditions that it only takes one to eliminate humanity. On cc, the problem here is that there is a lack of explanation for why the aff would cause climate change and why the aff would accelerate it, and ultimately, the aff is winning that the development of space col would develop the tools to help deal with climate change. On aliens, the problem here is that there needs to be more substantive work to explain why aliens are more likely than any of the existential risk that the aff is describing and more importantly, more evidence for why offensive aliens are true.

Octas

Aff

vs Kevin Lin

Judge Solomon Watson

RFD

Good debate, very close, I voted neg. Think Kevin was smart to identify clashing over fwk was a waste since y'all essentially have the same fwk. Kevin's best argument for space colonization, in my eyes, was the argument that technological breakthroughs that emerge in the process will have terrestrial applications. And in the middle aff speech you were a little better at responding to space exploration solves but dropped the argument in your last speech. And this feels kinda intuitive to me. Especially since all the examples you list, which are good, are all examples from space exploration. I think citing some specific types of tech that can only be used for space col (clean energy, terraforming) these might be a better angle. I also thought Kevin was smart to go for it takes a really really long time to get a self-sufficient colony and the probability that a planetary extinction event would happen is essentially the same as if we would spark an alien conflict. Maybe alien stuff is a little lower, but it is an extinction scenario with somewhat comparable probability so on balance I think squo is better. Do some space exploration, don't mess with the aliens, and pray some tech comes in.

Quarters

Aff

vs Sophia Zhou

Judge Ronen Bowman

RFD

I thought that this was a good debate! I find some things to be a little unclear for me at the end of it which makes me very skeptical of voting aff. I think that the neg is winning that there is a big time frame and plan question as well as this argument that does get some air time in the 2AR but not enough to where I think it was responded to enough. The idea that space colonization and exploration are different things is almost dropped in the debate and think that the aff has some foot work on it in the end but at the same time don't respond that these colonies are only able to exist if the earth is there in the first place as well as lacking a valid response to the inequality that is created by the existence of space colonization. This makes things a little unclear for me if that space colonization actually does "trickle down" and what that would look like for the people on earth and how they get access to it. A lot of the neg's offense is coming from these sort of questions and presumption like pushes to the aff's case that make it hard to really understand how sound the aff is at the end of the day. I think we are also could be a little more clear on how we get to extinction at the end of this debate for the aff and what that looks like for the rest of the neg's offense I think the neg does a good job putting their impacts into perspective to the aff and who is actually affected.

Quarters

Aff

vs Sophia Zhou

Judge Mak Kovar

COMMENTS

Make sure to remain firm in your position in cross examination and be more polite to your opponent - you come off as slightly aggressive. It is great to be assertive but you're tipping the balance a little too much - it's better to re-calibrate to avoid the risk of an aggressive perception. Avoid making arguments in the second CX, your duty is to ask questions to move the debate forward, you will have time for arguments in the 1AR. You needed to paint a clearer picture of the imminent risk to colonize and the unique benefit of space colonization for mitigating existential risks that exploration can't solve already (was non-unique and you dropped that point). You spent too much time in the 1AR talking about the impacts of extinction and the benefits of space tech gained from exploration when you needed to reinforce the link to avoiding (extinction) and gaining more of impacts to help the earth. You dropped your argument that we could help earth avoid climate change and colonize at the time that was written in the constructive - extending this argument and providing more context as to how that could happen would have undermined her offense. The imminent threat to the Earth was brought up in the 2AR but it was too late and insufficient to answer the doubt cast by the negative. This was the same with the universal benefits argument mentioned in the constructive. You doubled down on the extinction is bad, but did not adequately secure the link.

RFD

Voted Neg. The Neg sufficiently painted space colonization as non-unique to climate change and population benefits of space exploration. The Aff was framed as taking irresponsible actions that harm majority of the human race and allow for humans to repeat the mistakes made on earth to other planets (thus, spreading around the suffering to other potential species and those left on earth).

Judge Freddie Smith**COMMENTS**

Great case, I like the defense built into it especially in C2 about how the tech benefits the underprivileged. Face the judges during cx. I don't like rude debaters, yell less and stop shouting "I'm not done yet!" at your opponent during cx. Outside of cx, you did very well! Great clarity at speed, great case, and great organization! I think you will have a very strong season.

RFD

Congrats on quarters and great job to both debaters! I can tell you've both been working hard these last two weeks. This was a very close round for me as both sides had great arguments. I ultimately voted neg because of the aff's blunder about exploration vs colonization, and the neg's callout of it. Aff- I know you called it a misflow in your last speech, but your cx questions were exploration-specific and the neg was right to call you on it. The aff point about technology derived from space is supporting marginalized communities almost won me over, but the neg's callout and better decorum pulled through. Both sides should work on impact calculus. Good job bringing up your own impacts, but tell me exactly how they stack up to the other side's impacts and outweigh them. Great close round and have a great season!

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Jenny Gu Jenny Gu

Round 1

Aff

vs Jayden Chai

Judge Ronen Bowman

Jenny Gu

Pts 28.1

COMMENTS

You did a good job in your first speech but I would just suggest trying to speed it up a little bit just so you can get more arguments in. You also have good CX questions keep that up! I would suggest doing a little bit more weighing and some more line by line on the frame work in your second speech but you are doing a very solid line by line on the contentions so keep that up.

RFD

Yay good debate! This was a close debate and thought it was very good. I ended up voting neg I just think that at the end of the debate the fw page gets a little bit messy and the neg has more reason to prefer. As well as gives a long list of reason why they outweigh and things like radiation and destruction of bone density on each colonizer that tries to colonize space means that it is not possible. I think that just sort of begs the question on if its even possible that the aff does not really address which means I would just default to assuming its not and preventing at least the colonizers lives by voting neg.

Round 2

Neg

vs Manya Jindal

Judge Rafael Sanchez

Jenny Gu

Pts 28.1

RFD

by the end of the debate the aff is winning that space col is the best method to prevent extinction I think ultimately a big problem at the end of the debate for the neg is that there needs to be more explanation for why the tradeoff between space col and solving social issues exists, especially in a world where the aff is making claims that space col would lead to innovations that would trickle down to solve those problems

Round 3

Neg

vs Ryan Arora

Judge Jacob Skinner

Jenny Gu

Pts 27.8

COMMENTS

I think you need to spend more time comparing impacts. You spend time talking about how space colonization will only benefit the wealthy and we can't get to mars. What you don't spend time on is showing me that leaving for mars will cause more undue harm to poor people. You need to show me that it is actively harmful to leave. You also need better refutation that space colonization will help poor people. You have evidence that shows wealth won't be distributed, but don't use it to respond to affs arguments (ex. space colonization will later become more accessible). You spend time telling me to help people, so compare impacts to show me that staying on earth helps more people.

RFD

I voted Aff on Util. I don't think the aff was able to prove there was a better solution other than going off planet. On Framework, I the Negative was not able to convince me that we should prefer structural violence. There wasn't enough comparison or work showing me that inequality will increase.

Round 4

Aff

vs Summer Li

Judge Cortez Proal

Jenny Gu

Pts 26

RFD

I vote neg. The neg wins that we can solve climate change without colonization. Since the aff's fw is util the neg wins that they solve the biggest existential risk in the round which means they win.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Jessica Ouyang Jessica Ouyang

Round 1

Aff

vs Manya Jindal

Judge Freddie Smith

Jessica Ouyang

Pts 25

COMMENTS

Good job! Strong case though you spent a very long time on framework (1:30). Good clarity and emphasis in constructive, easy to flow and follow. Speaker points docked for being both quiet and very condescending during both cx periods. Several neg arguments not thoroughly responded to in the 1AR, but this may have been an issue of organization. The 2AR was much stronger, it was great! Try to follow your roadmap more closely! Good job overall, I think you'll have a strong season!

RFD

Great job to both debaters! I can tell you've worked hard these last two weeks and I think you will both go far this season. I voted on the neg arguments that the aff's case is not specific to colonization and all aff benefits can be reaped via exploration as well as the neg argument that aff proves there are benefits to colonization but fails to prove a moral imperative. Both sides did great, this was close.

Round 2

Neg

vs Elijah Lau

Judge Mak Kovar

WIN

Jessica Ouyang

Pts 30

COMMENTS

great adding pressure to the aff in cross! great choice to go after the urgency of the aff's timeline. Remember to look at the judge in CX. Great job jumping back in after getting caught up on the document.

RFD

Neg won framework for distributive justice. She painted the picture of the world where space colonization would bring on climate change faster and is likely to be unsuccessful. It would also lead to international competition while still running out of resources. Aff neglected to extend the resource benefits of space colonization - answer for international resource sharing lacked a bit of context for me to be comfortable voting on it.

Round 3	Neg		vs Jason Chen
Judge Toby Whisenhunt	WIN	Jessica Ouyang	Pts 29.4

COMMENTS

NC is solid. NR could be organized a little better. You covered all the areas but you could have a better plan of action. A few more explicit voters along the way too. Don't let me opponent do this or extend this is also a big part of the NR in preventing sneaky affs from trying to get away with stuff.

RFD

Solid round. The AR left 40 seconds on the table at the end that could have been used to push back against the negative framework. Aff did a good job extending extinction but never really had a response to the negative framework outside of extinction framing comes first. Need some defense or push back from the affirmative here. Seeing as that was lacking and the defensive arguments the negative made I find that it is not moral imperative to colonize space.

Round 4	Aff		vs Dittu Tandon
Judge Cortez Proal	WIN	Jessica Ouyang	Pts 29

RFD

I vote aff. The aff wins that their fw comes first and that space colonization is key to human flourishing.

Octas	Neg		vs Lily Qiu
Judge Cortez Proal	WIN		

RFD

I vote neg. The aff does not do enough to respond to the neg's fw or solvency take outs. The neg also has two pieces of offense on case that the aff does not answer in the 1nr. The aff banks on the argument that her op conceded human survival is prior to justice. However, the neg responds to this argument in her speeches arguing that justice is a prior question to survival. Even then the turns on case are enough to mitigate aff solvency at best and turn the impacts to the neg at worst. Either way it justifies a neg ballot.

Octas	Neg	vs Lily Qiu
Judge Rafael Sanchez	WIN	

RFD

by the end of the debate the neg is winning that colonization would accelerate climate change. Ultimately, the big problem at the end of the debate from the aff is that there needs to be a much more substantive response to the rocket turn that the neg is going for. I think your current response is insufficient because even if we do launch rockets from the moon, in the interim when we are developing space colonies, it would accelerate warming too fast for us to get off the rock in time. which would kill us through climate change.

Octas	Neg	vs Lily Qiu
Judge Solomon Watson	WIN	

RFD

Good debate, voted neg. Thought Lily did a really good job in the rebuttal to do impact calculus and re-center the debate to the question of space vs. case. Think there are some technical arguments that Jessica is making that make it difficult for me to vote aff. So, I do think Jessica is ahead on framework, although I'm not sure what exactly that means either in impact calculus or the debate more broadly other than I should probably weight magnitude of inequality higher. I think Jessica did a really good job essentially winning the increase in emissions for space colonies would accelerate warming faster than a lunar base could offset those emissions (even if abstractly it's true) and that there is evidence that specifically identifies this catch 22 as decking solvency. The fact the base is also not permanent but still reliant on the earth means all the farming arguments about try to die and get off the rock don't make as much sense to me because you couldn't live on the moon alone. Jessica speak up more and don't be afraid to use the space exploration good argument more.

Quarters	Aff	vs Enoch Xu
Judge Elisabeth Kiu		

RFD

I voted neg due to the "space exploration solves" argument. I felt like it sufficiently answered a lot of the aff's worries, and I felt like the claims against climate change made by the aff were not sufficient.

Quarters

Aff

vs Enoch Xu

Judge Rafael Sanchez

RFD

by the end of the debate, the neg is winning that space colonization causes climate change which leads to extinction. Ultimately, the big problem at the end of the debate for the aff is that there needs to be more explanation for why climate change is inevitable and why we are able to get off the rock in time. Ultimately, the neg is making 2 claims that makes it hard for the aff to generate a lot of offense. First is that the aff uniquely accelerates climate change because of the process of getting to space, and 2 that it would take too long to get off the rock. Saying climate change is inevitable is insufficient because even if you win that climate change is inevitable, you have to be winning that we are able to get off the rock before climate change is able to save us.

Quarters

Aff

vs Enoch Xu

Judge Emanuel Vargas

RFD

At the end of this debate, both sides agree that climate change will happen now. I have to decide whether we should affirm space colonization to escape that, or forego that in favor of using our resources for now. Neither side gives me judge instruction for how I should go about evaluating these, which is my biggest tip for you both. Framework is irrelevant, both sides are saying extinction and are being utilitarian. I end up thinking the negative has a greater risk of offense. If climate change is happening now, there's only a risk space colonization will accelerate that and it will happen too fast for us to get out of earth. My biggest problem with the 2AR is that it never addresses the time frame question, which seems to be the main argument the negative is going for. Time and time again the neg says in the 2NR "climate change will kill us before getting to space" the 2AR only response to this, is that that's exactly why we need to get out the rock. But that doesn't answer their internal link/warrant which is TIME FRAME, for why we can't get out of here in the first place. I end up concluding it's better to risk using the resources on Earth, than wasting them on space colonization.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Jessica Wang Jessica Wang

Round 1

Neg

vs Kathie Liu

Judge Sean Newman

Jessica Wang

Pts 28

COMMENTS

Jessica, .General - Speak a bit faster and louder - Make sure to attack your opponents case in the constructive speech .Round Specific - Maintain your criterion or explain how you win under theirs - Don't leave time on the table

RFD

I vote Aff because the Neg did not contest the Aff criterion. While it doesn't help that the Neg's criterion also went uncontested, the Aff made their case workable under structural violence in some way. I think that under the utilitarian criterion the argument is very rudimentary, just saying that more people can exist if we colonize space.

Round 2

Aff

vs Melvin Ma

Judge Solomon Watson

Jessica Wang

Pts 28.6

RFD

Good debate, basically I think the neg is winning that social justice fwks best access morailty values which link turns your fwk — that means I think less about the magnitude of your impact in turns of deaths and more in terms of access to resources. This space opens up resources argument is good but I think the neg is doing a really good job contending with the inevitability framing and the tf of solvency. Which means a small risk of a structural veiolnce da o/ws. jessica — probably too long on util/fwk, stand up straight, bending down and over will contract your diaphragm which is where all of your lung capacity comes from and therefore projection ability melvin —

Round 3

Neg

vs Rachel Ke

Judge Mak Kovar

Jessica Wang

Pts 29

COMMENTS

Remember to stand and look at the judge for CX. Great at pressing of the logic of the aff case in CX. Remember to read the case first in the 1NR, your eagerness to answer the aff was appreciated but you could potentially run out of time to read your case so it's useful to start there. It would be useful to speak a little louder, we were in a loud area and it was a bit difficult to hear you at times. Your passion for the topic was evident and appreciated. Remember to sign post (tell me what contention you're talking about when you reference the aff or your case), it allows you to be more organized so it's easier to note down your speech. You did a good job of providing an overview, you need to work more on the specific details of attacking the aff. Fantastic start, keep at it!!!

RFD

A lot of the aff was dropped at the specific level, neg was able to provide descriptive overviews. Aff won the frame work. Neg did a good job of addressing urgent need but the extinction level prioritization followed the logic of the aff, it would have been interesting to hear an argument about how focusing on the means to solve structural violence would prevent extinction. Overall good debate between both competitors! Keep at it! Voted on the aff because of the moral imperative to save lives on the extinction level and that the spill over effects of space colonization would be beneficial to the solving climate change.

Round 4

Aff

vs Emily Zhang

Judge Adrian Sendejas

Jessica Wang

Pts 28

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Joanna Zhao Joanna Zhao

Round 1

Aff

vs Bonnie Zhao

Judge Freddie Smith

WIN

Joanna Zhao

Pts 29

COMMENTS

Great clarity and endurance throughout the constructive! Slow down a bit in the rebuttals so you don't lose your breath. Good questions during cx and good job calling drops, this indicates a clean flow. I would also recommend speaking drills to eliminate filler words.

RFD

Great job to both debaters! This was a great round, you have both clearly worked hard these last two weeks! I voted aff on framework and flow. I bought the aff criterion of util over distributive justice because I bought the aff argument that there is nothing to guarantee than funds diverted from space colonization will go to solving current problems. neg also dropped a lot of aff's points which makes a clear ballot. Great job both!

Round 2

Neg

vs Clara Lee

Judge Adrian Sendejas

WIN

Joanna Zhao

Pts 29.5

COMMENTS

1) Dont read a new card in the 1NR if it is not in response to something 2) include your arguments about health effects 3) bigger push on the turn

RFD

NEG - 1) Aliens will launch a crippling attack on any colony we try to set up, which causes xtc 2) Increase space colonization efforts causes increased tension which turns the nuclear war scenario and now means it is neg offense.

Round 3

Neg

vs Enoch Xu

Judge Emanuel Vargas

Joanna Zhao

Pts 28.7

RFD

I vote affirmative because I think that the risk that space colonization solves catastrophes is greater than the risk it will lead to a negative impact. The negative main pieces of offense seem to be predicated on low-probability impacts, without a clear story for how space colonization accelerates other types of impacts. I think they're right that the argument on rapid tech advancement is somewhat dropped, but I think the aff needs to be taking a different angle on this. You only have to defend the value statement that space colonization is justified, not that its inherently possible. I'm not sure, coming out of the 2nr, why the aff would lead to a sort of crisis between countries. Con 4 about resources is probably strongest, but you move on too quickly without impacting it out. I think the fundamental misstep for the 2nr is that they are going for far too much. This speech definitely feels very defensive without a clear mechanism for how I should evaluate each thing.

Round 4

Aff

vs Angela Zhu

Judge Solomon Watson

WIN

Joanna Zhao

Pts 29.5

RFD

Good debate, voted aff. So, I think the aff is slightly ahead on util at the end of the debate, but frankly I don't think either side is debating this question decisively. But I also kinda don't think the fwk changes the outcome. So, I think the neg has the really persuasive space exploration good, space col bag kinda of angle which i think is smart. And should solve alot of these resource extraction arguments the aff is going for (the like extinction inev stuff is kinda in there but not really by the end of the speech. I think it was a mistake not really pushing more on the space explroation sovles all these impact — you make the argument in the block that mining is not space col, but you don't do the more offensive work of explaining why it sovles the affs impacts and means even if they o/w you still vote neg on space epxlroation and the inequality trade off da. I think from the aff's persective you want to say the only way to sustinably mine is to have a permenent presence, even if that doesn't require perment human statiniong. You kinda walk this direction but you need to be more specfic. However, i don't think I ever got an awns to the link arg from the aff that space col resoruces won't go back into the envrio or inequality. Finally the just like health compmlication and its not tehcnically possible debate was the other place I was lingering, i think the tech adveces arg is dropped so there isn't enough there for me to check out on pure defense BUT i feel like you were really light in yhourawnsers here. Read a card. cx — you gotta let your opponent awns questions — don't do clarification questions unless its absolutely ncessary, don't ask opened question is space col possible good questions Joanna don't have to say they say (insert whole argument) they are wrong for 3 reason just say they say health complications take out solvency — 1. 2. 3.

Octas Aff vs Melvin Ma
Judge Charlie Hale WIN

COMMENTS

2AC was good at using concessions from CX - notably that the inequality impact is non-ug and that theres no proof the money spnt on space col would go towards the poor.

RFD

try or die to space colonize, the neg did not say how the status quo solves climate change just that it WILL happen before 2050 and affect 9 billion people - with no intervening actors argument it's hard to believe we can survive warming without leaving earth. impact calc makes me not prioritize social injustice - i.e. we can't solve it in the future if we are all dead.

Octas Aff vs Melvin Ma
Judge Adrian Sendejas WIN

RFD

1—Offense - not sure what the negs is at the end of the debate - BUT i am pretty sure there is a risk of extinction from climate change and a ruined ozone layer or whatever that getting off the rock can avert 2—Maybe we can save earth? Idk. I dont think it matters as much as both of you want it to at the end of the debate. 2AR should have just entirely been "you agree CC is impending and catastrophic, only aff gives us a chance to survive" 3—Space exploration would only solve the minerals/tech coming back to earth, not getting off the rock to stop extinction.

Octas Aff vs Melvin Ma
Judge Jacob Skinner

RFD

Voting neg on util I think the Neg has better arguments about how they solve climate change. The neg has several reasons that solar panels won't work, while the aff just says "sun" and in the final speech (too late) advancements in tech. Then the neg won on timeframe, that by the time we do colonize CC will have happened. Combine that with resources having to be taken means the neg won.

Quarters

Aff

vs Manya Jindal

Judge Ronen Bowman

RFD

I thought that this was a good debate ! I ended up voting negative. I think there are a couple key issues for me that come out of the NR that the 2AR doesn't fully address. The first is a framing issue, the idea that structural violence is the most important in this debate because it is the only thing that is most likely in comparison to the ev that explain you are more likely to die from lack of food, water, or health care instead of nuke war makes it hard for you to argue that util is good with the same logic that the jackson ev is sort of link turning. The second issue is the question about meeting the resolution. I think it becomes very unclear if the aff even meets the resolution on two points first is the moral imperative and if that means benefits for the future or stopping violence now and the second is whether or not you are doing space colonization or exploration to get the tech needed to stop climate change. These become unclear for the aff which makes it hard on the top level frame. Then on the substance debate directly I find that it becomes a little hard to tell what the real impact is of the aff in comparison to the neg and what outweighs I think that this argument that resources in space are going to be hard to find out who gets access and where they will go and how they are divided up makes it hard for the aff to claim that it will go to solve climate change rather than increase the ongoing wealth gap. This means that climate change will still be felt first by people who are worse off in comparison to the rich in space.

Quarters

Aff

vs Manya Jindal

Judge Mak Kovar

RFD

Great debate! Voted neg because of the lack of uniqueness space colonization has to benefiting humanity - neg did a sufficient job of painting the risk of entrenching the wealth gap with resources that would be extracted and hoarded. Neg won framework, as her evidence was sufficiently extended and aff did not meet the burden of moral obligation. The current mitigation argument was not enough to prove the necessity of space colonization as the negative made the argument that the budget could be re-allocated to climate change mitigation. The aff didn't sufficiently link to solving extinction and spoke to space colonization as providing a "temporary backup" which contradicted the permanency burden for space colonization placed by the neg.

Judge Freddie Smith**COMMENTS**

Great job! I like your case, framework, and first observation. Your second observation about responding to all subpoints does nothing for me especially because you never brought it up again. Your clean energy point is especially strong and unique! You did a great job backing the neg into a corner during second cx. You lost me a bit in the 1AR, try to improve your organization and go in flow order, it helps the judge evaluate drops much easier. I liked your framework argument in the 2AR opening with a rhetorical "would you rather" question. Try to fill all of your time in all speeches, you had over 40 seconds left for your first and last speeches. Good job overall and good luck this season!

RFD

Congrats on quarters and great job to both debaters! I see a good season in both of your futures. I voted neg for a few reasons. 1- I did not buy that space col solves for CC better because aff did not provide evidence for this 2 - I bought that the clean energy advancements do not require permanent settlement 3 - neg wins the timeline argument Great round overall, I really enjoyed watching y'all debate! Good luck going forward and keep working hard :)

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Kathie Liu Kathie Liu

Round 1 Aff vs Jessica Wang

Judge Sean Newman

WIN

Kathie Liu

Pts 29

COMMENTS

Kathie, .General - You'll have to time yourself eventually - Project more .Round specific - Should define space colonization - Very good questions in CX2 - Left a lot of time on the table in the last speech - Should always attack your opponents value/criterion if it differs from yours

RFD

I vote Aff because the Neg did not contest the Aff criterion. While it doesn't help that the Neg's criterion also went uncontested, the Aff made their case workable under structural violence in some way. I think that under the utilitarian criterion the argument is very rudimentary, just saying that more people can exist if we colonize space.

Round 2 Neg vs Summer Li

Judge Cortez Proal

WIN

Kathie Liu

Pts 27

RFD

I vote neg the aff dropped the negs solvency take outs and fw. The neg does enough to convince me that their fw is best and that the aff doesn't solve risking worsening sv.

Round 3 Aff vs Annie Huang

Judge Solomon Watson

Kathie Liu

Pts 28.8

RFD

Good debate, voted neg. Think that it comes down to a lack of clash from the aff. So, i think your impact calculus instics are correct however that is your primary response to the negative's positions which is problematic because Annie is making a couple of arguments on your case that coplicate your ability to access your impact calq. So first is this colonization not possible/toruture fwk turn. Then there is this space exploration v space col with trade of da as a nb. These two arguments primarily really complicated your magnitude extinction first impact caql because I think the neg establishes that you don't solve extinction and there is at least a comorable chance the neg's case does.

Round 4

Neg

vs Jayden Chai

Judge Rafael Sanchez

Kathie Liu

Pts 28.3

RFD

by the end of the debate the aff is winning atht space col is preferable Ultiatley, at the end of the debate, the problem with teh neg is that there needs to be a much more direct response to the arguemtn athat space col would lead to trickle down effect where tech and innov is passed down which would directly hlep and alleviate structural vioecne. The negs argumetns of sv and climte chagne are very good, but wihtout a resopnse to this argument they jsut turn the whole contetnios.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Kevin Lin Kevin Lin

Round 1

Aff

vs Clara Lee

Judge Mak Kovar

WIN

Kevin Lin

Pts 29.5

COMMENTS

Good delivery during your constructive! You had a little over a minute left, this time could be for adding more warrants your case since it is already varied. Good job answering on your feet in cross examination. Try to move the debate forward in cx, you asked a lot of clarifying questions and had time left over. Great job signposting in the 1AR!!!! remember to keep it up more with impacts you want to weigh on the neg case but overall you did a good job of telling me where you were on the flow - phenomenal! Try not to cover everything in the 2ar, just go for the arguments you're winning so you dont run out of time for voters. You were already winning resource strain, so you didnt have to waste time on contention 4 the 2AR.

RFD

Aff won the framework debate so extinction mitigation was the lens I used in the round. Even under the neg framework AFF was able to solve to structural violence harms because the risk of colonization is so pressing due to the resource restraint.

Round 2

Neg

vs Emily Zhang

Judge Emanuel Vargas

WIN

Kevin Lin

Pts 29

RFD

This was a GREAT debate. I'm going to line by line a couple of things on the flow. (orally) I voted negative. I think that spacd colonization would lead to an alien war. While I don't think this is the best argument, and the answers given in the 2ar made a lot of sense and are the right ones to make, I think that these responses are given too late in the debate and I cant evaluate them. They win a couple of ticky tacky things that give sufficient defense on the aff's case. They win that given all the talk about sanctuaries in space for the aff, extinction due to climate change would happen before we have the means to be able to enact those, since terraforming the surfaces of moons or planets would take way too long.

COMMENTS

I dig teh ET contention, but it lacks an impact or uniqueness, especially when the card you read says they could be here already. Make more clear how colonization will lead to a unique impact them or lead to a negative result. Also you had 2 minutes left at the end of your NC. Slow down or add info. NR was good. Would like more than just climate will kill us before we get off the rock to develop in the NR. It was just repeated and not positioned as a moral imperative or why the aff's imperative is wrong. Minus a reason the aff speeds it up, I need a reason to not make it a moral priority. We will die firts is defensive if you don't make a case how we could solve it or need to focus on climate not space. It may feel implied, but it needs to be explicit. Also colonize by 2032 is kind of damming for this argument.

RFD

A good debate. Since extinction prevention is agreed on by both sides it is a question of who can do the best to prevent. The aff and the lunar and spin offs seem more likely to help than the fact that climate change could get us first. That is not a direct result of the aff or the aff position. The negative arguments largely lack uniqueness or direct counter to the aff .

Round 4

Aff

vs Melody Huang

Judge Erick Berdugo

WIN

Kevin Lin

Pts 29.4

COMMENTS

I like you didn't have list of predetermined questions for your CX. You had 1:30 remaining in your 1AR - you are focusing too much on the speed of your delivery. Your 1AR was missing true weighing or analysis. You need to focus on making the argument well structured with good explanation of how the space colonization solves extinction. You claim extinction but don't explain how this is going to happen and then don't explain how space colonization solves for it. Impact scenarios need a good clear explanation as to how the impact scenario will occur. IE need to fully explain the cause and effect. This is referred to the link chain story.

RFD

General comments for Both debaters 1) did an excellent job of referencing and explaining their evidence. 2) Road mapping is too specific. Don't need to tell me you are going to attack and then extend specific arguments. Just tell me where you are going to start (IE AFF OR NEG) how you intend move through the debate, it assumed you will do things like extending/cross applying and weighing. 3) General rebut outline 1) Sign post where you are on flow 2) Extend your evidence across their attack OR cross-apply your evidence when attacking their case. 3) Explain why you are right with the reasoning of your evidence. 4) Explain WHY this is important: a) why you are winning the time frame b) why you are winning the magnitude Number is the summary that provides a voter **SPEACIL NOTE:** It is obvious both debaters had the majority of there rebuttal speech written. This prevents adapting and especially prevents adapting to mistakes of your opponents. While you feel might feel more comfortable it will lock you on a path that prevents you talking advantage of your opponent's mistakes while at the same time prevent you from answering attacks you did not include in your prewritten speech. CX is about breaking the logic of your opponent. If you only use a predetermined list you are incapable of adapting to any possible mistake and taking advantage as you will focus on the next question on the list versus asking about the logic of their answer. RFD: The negative had an excellent opportunity to leverage the time frame of colonizing space vs. the under developed extinction scenarios of the AFF to show that the real moral imperative is to focus on the real world problems that will lead to the extinction scenario as they failed to do so I essentially have to give full weight of the link story of the extinction impacts that were essentially dropped.

Octas

Neg

vs Jayden Chai

Judge Cortez Proal

RFD

I vote aff. The aff wins that colon solves the structural vulnerability of all of humanity being on one planet means eventually we will go extinct. The neg has ev that could push back on this Malik, but never uses it here. The neg could have won this round had they leveraged the Malik evidence and pushed harder for the aff can't solve the most direct threat climate change and causes ALIEN WARS, but since the Malik evidence is never used to answer extinction inevitable, I view the "you solve too slow to avoid the impact of cc" as defense since the aff wins any risk that we can avoid extinction is how I should evaluate the round. That leaves me with ALIEN WARS the neg never identifies the warrant in his card, while the aff explains we have searched for advanced life a la seti and found nothing. That means I don't see ALIEN WARS as a probable scenario for ext. However, had the neg used the affs 1% framing of ext impact means you have to give it 100% weight argument and leveraged the Malik card it would have made it harder to vote aff.

Octas

Neg

vs Jayden Chai

Judge Rafael Sanchez

RFD

by the end of the debate the aff is winning that space col is the only way to avoid extinction. Ultimately, the aff is winning that getting off the rock is the only way to eliminate existential risk because any other solution is just a band aid and doesn't eliminate the underlying conditions that it only takes one to eliminate humanity. On cc, the problem here is that there is a lack of explanation for why the aff would cause climate change and why the aff would accelerate it, and ultimately, the aff is winning that the development of space col would develop the tools to help deal with climate change. On aliens, the problem here is that there needs to be more substantive work to explain why aliens are more likely than any of the existential risk that the aff is describing and more importantly, more evidence for why offensive aliens are true.

Judge Solomon Watson**WIN****RFD**

Good debate, very close, I voted neg. Think Kevin was smart to identify clashing over fwk was a waste since yall essentially have the same fwk. Kevin's best argument for space colonization, in my eyes, was the argument that technological breakthroughs that emerge in the process will have terrestrial applications. And in the middle aff speech you were a little better at responding to space exploration solves but dropped the argument in your last speech. And this feels kinda intuitive to me. Especially since all the examples you list, which are good, are all examples from space explroation. I think citing some specific types of tech that can only be used for space col (clean energy, terraforming) these might be a better angle. I also though Kevin was smart to go for it takes a really really long time to get a selfsufficient colony and the porbobilty that a planetary extinction event would happen is essentially the same as if we would spark an alien conflict. Maybe alien stuff is a little lower. but it is an extinction scenerio with somewhat comperable probaility so on ballance I think squo is better. Do some space exploration, don't mess with the aleins, and pray some tehc comes in.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Lily Qiu Lily Qiu

Round 1

Neg

vs Nila Rajkumar

Judge Erick Berdugo

WIN

Lily Qiu

Pts 29.5

COMMENTS

Speaking - good and clear. Need to be more organized when refuting. Simple outline: 1) refer to where you are responding. 2) Extend or cross apply your evidence 3) Explain they are wrong and you are right 4) Explain why this important and a reason to vote for you.

RFD

General comments for Both debaters 1) did an excellent job of referencing and explaining their evidence. 2) Road mapping is too specific. Don't need to tell me you are going to attack and then extend specific arguments. Just tell me where you are going to start (IE AFF OR NEG) how you intend move through the debate, it assumed you will do things like extending/cross applying and weighing. 3) General rebut outline 1) Sign post where you are on flow 2) Extend your evidence across their attack OR cross-apply your evidence when attacking their case. 3) Explain why you are right with the reasoning of your evidence. 4) Explain WHY this is important: a) why you are winning the time frame b) why you are winning the magnitude Number is the summary that provides a voter **SPEACIL NOTE:** It is obvious both debaters had the majority of there rebuttal speech written. This prevents adapting and especially prevents adapting to mistakes of your opponents. While you feel might feel more comfortable it will lock you on a path that prevents you talking advantage of your opponent's mistakes while at the same time prevent you from answering attacks you did not include in your prewritten speech. RFD: Aff does not answer that CC will increase do to a focus on the space colonization Aff basically concedes Nuc War impact because the possibility of NW will increase with a focus on space colonization.

Round 2	Aff		vs Annie Huang
Judge Erick Berdugo	WIN	Lily Qiu	Pts 29.8

COMMENTS	1AC Excellent delivery 1AR Good use of FW - using it to evaluate the impacts 2AR Primary as about giving reasons to vote for you.
-----------------	---

RFD	General comments for Both debaters 1) did an excellent job of referencing and explaining their evidence. 2) Road mapping is too specific. Don't need to tell me you are going to attack and then extend specific arguments. Just tell me where you are going to start (IE AFF OR NEG) how you intend move through the debate, it assumed you will do things like extending/cross applying and weighing. 3) General rebut outline 1) Sign post where you are on flow 2) Extend your evidence across their attack OR cross-apply your evidence when attacking their case. 3) Explain why you are right with the reasoning of your evidence. 4) Explain WHY this is important: a) why you are winning the time frame b) why you are winning the magnitude Number is the summary that provides a voter SPECAIL NOTE: It is obvious both debaters had the majority of there rebuttal speech written. This prevents adapting and especially prevents adapting to mistakes of your opponents. While you feel might feel more comfortable it will lock you on a path that prevents you talking advantage of your opponent's mistakes while at the same time prevent you from answering attacks you did not include in your prewritten speech. RFD: The negative does a good job of explaining the impacts but ultimately they do not respond to AFF arguments that tech research and applications will solve for the problems proposed the negative.
------------	---

Round 3	Aff		vs Kevin Lin
Judge Toby Whisenhunt	WIN	Lily Qiu	Pts 29.1

COMMENTS	Your CX questions can be prepared but try not to just read them at him. You can paraphrase them and make them sound more natural. Could be more efficient but your instincts on what to extend is solid. Good focus on time frame and consistent argument through out the debate. Focus on short term tech spin offs and the adv of a lunar base to help earth.
-----------------	---

RFD	A good debate. Since extinction prevention is agreed on by both sides it is a question of who can do the best to prevent. The aff and the lunar and spin offs seem more likely to help than the fact that climate change could get us first. That is not a direct result of the aff or the aff position. The negative arguments largely lack uniqueness or direct counter to the aff .
------------	--

Round 4

Neg

vs Manya Jindal

Judge Emanuel Vargas

Lily Qiu

Pts 28.7

RFD

This debate was excellent I voted affirmative on framework. I think that extinction matters more. I am so willing to vote for the negs framework, and I think it makes a lot of sense. I also like the arguments on capitalism. My biggest problem is that you aren't giving me the explanation I need on your framework, and on the contrary, they are. The negative also concedes that a bunch of things can happen at any second like war, but to me that's probably a reason why the aff is a good idea, and I'm not sure what offense that gives you. If the neg did more explanation on what it means to treat someone as an end rather than merely a means to an end (I can presume what this means in the context of your arguments, but you need to do that work for me) and then impacts it out under that framework, I think the neg probably wins. As it stands, the affirmative has made claims that hijack the negative's framework about how no one can be their own end under extinction, and the affirmative solves that. The 2NR gets to the weighing work for a second, but not long enough.

Octas

Aff

vs Jessica Ouyang

Judge Cortez Proal

RFD

I vote neg. The aff does not do enough to respond to the neg's fw or solvency take outs. The neg also has two pieces of offense on case that the aff does not answer in the 1nr. The aff banks on the argument that her op conceded human survival is prior to justice. However, the neg responds to this argument in her speeches arguing that justice is a prior question to survival. Even then the turns on case are enough to mitigate aff solvency at best and turn the impacts to the neg at worst. Either way it justifies a neg ballot.

Octas

Aff

vs Jessica Ouyang

Judge Rafael Sanchez

RFD

by the end of the debate the neg is winning that colonization would accelerate cc Ultimately, the big problem at the end of the debate from the aff is that there needs to be a much more substantive response to the rocket turn that the neg is going for. I think your current response is insufficient because even if we do launch rockets from the moon, in the interim when we are developing space col, it would accelerate warming too fast for us to get off the rock in time. which would kill us through cc.

Judge Solomon Watson

RFD

Good debate, voted neg. Thought Lily did a really good job in the rebuttal to do impact calculus and re-center the debate to the question squo vs case. Think there are some technical arguments that Jessica is making that make it difficult for me to vote aff. So, I do think jessica is ahead on fwk, although I'm not sure what exactly that means either in imapct caql or the debate more braodly other than I should probably wieght mag of inequality higher. I think Jessica did a really good job essentially winning the increase in emessions for space col would accelerate warming faster than a lunar base could offset those emessions (even if abstractly its true) and that there is evidecen read that specifcally identifies this catch 22 as decking solvency. The fact the base is also not permenent but still reliant on the earth means all the farming args about try ro die and get off the rock don't make as much sense to me because you couudn't live on the moon alone. Jesscica speak up more and don't be afraid to use the space exploration good arg more.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Lydia Hea Lydia Hea

Round 1

Aff

vs Elijah Lau

Judge Ronen Bowman

WIN

Lydia Hea

Pts 28.8

COMMENTS

You do really well on the line by line which is good so keep that up but make sure you do not drop certain arguments and you could be a little more effective by grouping certain arguments together. I would also suggest making sure to use less filler words in your speech you can do a redo of this debate or other speeches and everytime you use a filler word such as "like uh umhs and but" restart the time and the speech and try again. I think that your last speech was good but you didn't go as hard as you could have and really explain to me why nuclear war is more important and also blow up this new argument about plan good but wait like what !

RFD

I vote aff I think that the neg is lacking behind on the actual substance of the debate and what the actual link story is on the argument about climate change and poverty I am not sure why space colonization makes climate change worse or poverty worse at most I think these are kinda non uq and think the aff is winning their impacts happen unless we colonize space and also that space tech is helping right now track and contain things like climate change and natural events and issues.

Round 2

Neg

vs Bonnie Zhao

Judge Rafael Sanchez

WIN

Lydia Hea

Pts 28.7

RFD

by the end of the debate, the neg is winnign that the space col will likley results in worse outcomes for poor pple and climate chagne Ultaimtely, the neg iswinnign taht space col would take too long to ever be able to resolves any of those problems andthe onlything that we can do is to try to provent the proximate cause of the ipmact

Round 3	Neg		vs Grace Moore
Judge Jacob Skinner	WIN	Lydia Hea	Pts 28.8

COMMENTS

You need to spend more time on framework proper. While your arguments on contentions were very good, you lacked responses to longtermism. If there was more aff extension and work on it, then they could have easily won on framework and shown that I need to think about longterm solutions.

RFD

I am voting for the negative on Framework and that we need to solve for Structural Violence. There are several arguments that Space Colonization is unlikely, and we need to focus on what is currently happening. I don't think the aff contends with these arguments. At the same time, there were many arguments and pieces of evidence that we can't feasibly colonize, which the aff doesn't have enough to.

Round 4	Aff		vs Chloe Sun
Judge Mak Kovar		Lydia Hea	Pts 29.9

COMMENTS

Great enthusiasm and using all of your speech time in the AC! Remember to look at the judge and stand during cross examination. You could be a bit firmer in your position in cx. Great job pressing the neg cx (asking questions). Remember to use all of your time in the 1AR, you still had 20 seconds left and a bit you could have covered. Good job weighing impacts in the 1AR. You needed to answer the urgency of extinction better in the 1AR, since the negative is pressing that it is not urgent/necessary by moral standards to colonize space. Make sure to be specific why certain drops matter, not just mentioning the drops and be more specific on the weighing on impacts generally - ex: saying why you outweigh on magnitude not just that you do (gives more context).

RFD

Great job to both debaters, very close round - both of you have a highly engaging speaking style and it was very entertaining! The round boiled down to the urgency of the obligation to colonize space. Neg presses the Aff to address the uniqueness of colonizing space, Aff's answer was not specific enough to meet the Neg's burden. Aff needed to answer it in the 1AR, related answer was given in the 2AR but it was new and about the reduction of extinction risk being the real importance so was not weighed against the burden. Neg was able to contextualize the burden and frame Aff's impacts of space colonization as unnecessary but admirable in the face of having space exploration as an option.

Octas

Neg

vs Emi Takeuchi

Judge Charlie Hale

WIN

COMMENTS

try not to take neg prep for the 1nc - you get pre-round to look at their case and prep your speech. also just have the timer run down from 5 minutes or however long u get - don't try to guess how much u need. The neg can concede climate change will be mitigated, but extend that it effects the most marginalized populations first - then the AFF no longer has an extinction scenario but you still have a structural violence contention. 2NR was good - i'd collapse more - i think on your case you should just extend framework and the inequality impact - on their case extend the opportunity cost and tradeoff argument - winning space col impossible is hard because the AFF just has to win a 1% risk that it is to justify investing into it endlessly to stop extinction. I thought the Mars uninhabitable warrants were good - but doesnt answer satellite systems and moon colonies.

RFD

I can't explain why space col saves us from a specific extinction scenario - the innovation driven by it has been described as renewable energy that solves climate change - a dire but manageable risk in the status quo. With no clear extinction scenario, I default to the negative's impact of resource competition and tradeoff - there is little to no defense to it - so i believe it is the most likely to potentially cause war or extinction - and it also causes the largest amounts of structural violence. This means the Colonization Competition argument is a moral imperative to stop under either criterion.

Octas

Neg

vs Emi Takeuchi

Judge Adrian Sendejas

WIN

COMMENTS

Ask follow up questions. Cutting your opponent off is good and cool, but sometimes you wanna let them ***explain themselves*** into a trap.

RFD

1—Space col redistributes violence and the problems of humanity onto other planets - means no solvency for any x risk bc they get recreated - on top of the fact that i dont think the likely target (mars) is habitable - args for this are radiation, lack of water, and i think one or two more things. 2—Issues back home are solveable - pandemic prep, nuclear security, asteroid defense systems - means A) not necessary and B) money can instead be put into resolving ineq - aff leans into this by also saying things like CC can be managed - but not answer the alternative that the neg gives to solve it, which is space exploration 3—Space exploration solves any benefits to tech or knowledge, satellites example, not sure what the difference is between that and space col

Octas	Neg	vs Emi Takeuchi
Judge Jacob Skinner	WIN	

RFD

I am voting for the negative because I don't think the aff proves that we need space colonization to solve for threats or that it is viable. The aff does argue that colonization doesn't require mars, I don't think that answers colonies are dependent on earth, and that all colonies aren't viable. Therefore, Space Colonization won't ensure survival. At the same time, on the technologies debate, I don't think the aff does enough to prove colonization, not exploration is necessary. Therefore, colonization itself isn't an obligation. On the human flourishing angle, I don't think the aff responded to giving better lives to the rest of humanity.

Quarters	Neg	vs Chloe Sun
Judge Elisabeth Kiu	WIN	

COMMENTS

I think your case was pretty strong here, and the clash you presented in the round was great. I think you could have responded a little more extensively to the C3.

RFD

A really great round from the both of you! I voted neg off of probability. I felt like the responses from the aff were largely defensive, and that the neg case worked under both frameworks.

Quarters	Neg	vs Chloe Sun
Judge Rafael Sanchez		

RFD

by the end of the debate the aff is winning that space col is a moral imperative. Ultimately, I think a big problem at the end of the debate for the neg is that there needs to be a much more direct link between how the aff would lead to a direct tradeoff with solving for other issues. I think you do a little bit of this about how colonization wouldn't be self-sufficient, but the problem here is that it's unclear to me how the self-sufficiency would trade off with any of the other solutions that you have described. Ultimately, there needs to be more of a direct link for how the aff would lead to a deprioritization of other social issues, or, why the aff would make those other social issues worse.

Judge Emanuel Vargas

RFD

This was a tricky debate for me to evaluate because I think the aff is winning 1. FW a. the way they ask me to frame this round is conceded. The aff says I should not evaluate this debate on a binary but rather understand that affirming space col as a moral imperative does not mean we have to forego other moral imperatives. I think this is important because it serves as a framework mitigator, that tells me the aff doesn't just forego structural violence completely in its affirmation of existential risks. They are also winning their framework is a prerequisite. This was conceded. I dont think this is an incredible framework argument but I do think that it is dropped, and because of that I think that stopping extinction has to come first before looking toward other things. 2. Offense. I think its important for me to affirm a way out of extinction Closest I am to not voting for the aff is on offense. The aff doesn't extend probably their best pieces of offense, arguments that I would lke to see like the quality of life/better resources arguments. This would have given you way more offensive reasons to prefer you under their framework.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Lynetta Jin Lynetta Jin

Round 1

Aff

vs Angela Zhu

Judge Toby Whisenhunt

Lynetta Jin

Pts 29.1

COMMENTS

Solid presentation of the AC. Good job in CX on both answering and questions. Good command of arguments. Solid structure in all speeches, but could spend more time addressing your opponents case in the AR. From a strategy point of view, focusing on time frame instead of magnitude or even probability is counter to the long term commitment the aff side of the resolution calls for. The structural violence your opponent points out is happening now and thus much faster. You have to push why long term preservation of humanity is worth sacrifices and push back on the negatives examples of abuse or tradeoff.

RFD

The aff in the 1AR dropped a large part of the negative case / defense to colonization. Also the affirmative leaned hard into timeframe despite the case needing to push magnitude. The negative ends up ahead on time frame and the immediate impact of structural violence.

Round 2

Neg

vs Emi Takeuchi

Judge Erick Berdugo

Lynetta Jin

Pts 29.5

COMMENTS

You need to work on the link story. The link story is what establishes the cause and effect of the impacts an what your opponent is doing and this where you need to break their cause and effect.

RFD

General comments for Both debaters 1) did an excellent job of referencing and explaining their evidence. 2) Road mapping is too specific. Don't need to tell me you are going to attack and then extend specific arguments. Just tell me where you are going to start (IE AFF OR NEG) how you intend move through the debate, it assumed you will do things like extending/cross applying and weighing. 3) General rebut outline 1) Sign post where you are on flow 2) Extend your evidence across their attack OR cross-apply your evidence when attacking their case. 3) Explain why you are right with the reasoning of your evidence. 4) Explain WHY this is important: a) why you are winning the time frame b) why you are winning the magnitude Number is the summary that provides a voter **SPECAIL NOTE:** It is obvious both debaters had the majority of there rebuttal speech written. This prevents adapting and especially prevents adapting to mistakes of your opponents. While you feel might feel more comfortable it will lock you on a path that prevents you talking advantage of your opponent's mistakes while at the same time prevent you from answering attacks you did not include in your prewritten speech. RFD: The Aff does a better job in weighing within the FW of the debate. IE they do a better job explaining the moral imperative as the terminal impact of the debate.

Round 3

Aff

vs Andy Yue

Judge Adrian Sendejas

Lynetta Jin

Pts 29

RFD

NEG - I dont think colonization is physically or biologically possible after the 2AR which means it is not try or die, its just die - moral recklessness AFF needs the card from the 1AR - says mars was possible Both sides need to be better on organization 2AR shouldnt be reading new cards

Round 4

Neg

vs Penny Lin

Judge Erick Berdugo

WIN

Lynetta Jin

Pts 29.2

COMMENTS

You are extending evidence in your first speech. This does not make any sense. An extension of evidence occurs as a way to respond to an attack. You can cross-apply your evidence to your opponent's case when attacking. Is SV more important than existential risk? As the NEG your answer is YES. the simplest answer is time frame - the probability of an extinction scenario is more than being able to get to space colonization before the scenario. You need to frame using evidence to this claim and weigh within the FW.

RFD

General comments for Both debaters 1) did an excellent job of referencing and explaining their evidence. 2) Road mapping is too specific. Don't need to tell me you are going to attack and then extend specific arguments. Just tell me where you are going to start (IE AFF OR NEG) how you intend move through the debate, it assumed you will do things like extending/cross applying and weighing. 3) General rebut outline 1) Sign post where you are on flow 2) Extend your evidence across their attack OR cross-apply your evidence when attacking their case. 3) Explain why you are right with the reasoning of your evidence. 4) Explain WHY this is important: a) why you are winning the time frame b) why you are winning the magnitude Number is the summary that provides a voter **SPECAIL NOTE:** It is obvious both debaters had the majority of there rebuttal speech written. This prevents adapting and especially prevents adapting to mistakes of your opponents. While you feel might feel more comfortable it will lock you on a path that prevents you talking advantage of your opponent's mistakes while at the same time prevent you from answering attacks you did not include in your prewritten speech. **RFD:** The 2AR does not spend any time responding to the partial weighing of SV versus Space Colonization spending being used to solve the problems on Earth.

LD: Manya Jindal Manya Jindal

Pts 30

Great job to both debaters! I can tell you've worked hard these last two weeks and I think you will both go far this season. I voted on the neg arguments that the aff's case is not specific to colonization and all aff benefits can be reaped via exploration as well as the neg argument that aff proves there are benefits to colonization but fails to prove a moral imperative. Both sides did great, this was close.

Pts 28.3

by the end of the debate the aff is winning that space col is the best method to prevent extinction I think ultimately a big problem at the end of the debate for the eng is that there needs to be more explanation for why the tradeoff between space col and solving social issues exists, especially in a world where the aff is making claims that space col would lead to innovations that would trickle down to solve those problems

Round 3	Neg	vs Melody Huang
Judge Erick Berdugo	WIN	Manya Jindal Pts 29.7

COMMENTS

Avoid the yes/no questions. A good opponent will be able to answer it the way they want to so that it will always be in favor. collaboration - you should ask where is the warrant that this collaboration will happen. The evidence is not specific just the idea that it will happen. Your evidence is not specific to the time frame, it implies a short time frame, so when you claim that space cc

RFD

General comments for Both debaters 1) did an excellent job of referencing and explaining their evidence. 2) Road mapping is too specific. Don't need to tell me you are going to attack and then extend specific arguments. Just tell me where you are going to start (IE AFF OR NEG) how you intend move through the debate, it assumed you will do things like extending/cross applying and weighing. 3) General rebut outline 1) Sign post where you are on flow 2) Extend your evidence across their attack OR cross-apply your evidence when attacking their case. 3) Explain why you are right with the reasoning of your evidence. 4) Explain WHY this is important: a) why you are winning the time frame b) why you are winning the magnitude Number is the summary that provides a voter RFD: Like above I stated above both did a great job explaining impacts and used their evidence. However, the link story on the AFF is not really explained how space colonization will solve the world's problems and even if they did the time frame is not there as AFF does not answer that the lack of focus will prevent them in the time necessary. **SPEACIL NOTE:** It is obvious both debaters had the majority of there rebuttal speech written. This prevents adapting and especially prevents adapting to mistakes of your opponents. While you feel might feel more comfortable it will lock you on a path that prevents you talking advantage of your opponent's mistakes while at the same time prevent you from answering attacks you did not include in your prewritten speech.

Round 4	Aff	vs Lily Qiu
Judge Emanuel Vargas	WIN	Manya Jindal Pts 28.8

RFD

This debate was excellent I voted affirmative on framework. I think that extinction matters more. I am so willing to vote for the negs framework, and I think it makes a lot of sense. I also like the arguments on capitalism. My biggest problem is that you aren't giving me the explanation I need on your framework, and on the contrary, they are. The negative also conedes that a bunch of things can happen at any second like war, but to me that's probably a reason why the aff is a good idea, and I'm not sure what offense that gives you. If the neg did more explanation on what it means to treat someone as an end rather than merely a means to an end (I can presume what this means in the context of your arguments, but you need to do that work for me) and then impacts it out under that framework, I think the neg probably wins. As it stands, the affirmative has made claims that hijack the negative's framework about how no one can be their own end under extinction, and the affirmative solves that. The 2NR gets to the weighing work for a second, but not long enough.

Quarters

Neg

vs Joanna Zhao

Judge Ronen Bowman

WIN

RFD

I thought that this was a good debate ! I ended up voting negative. I think there are a couple key issues for me that come out of the NR that the 2AR doesn't fully address. The first is a framing issue, the idea that structural violence is the most important in this debate because it is the only thing that is most likely in comparison to the ev that explain you are more likely to die from lack of food, water, or health care instead of nuke war makes it hard for you to argue that util is good with the same logic that the jackson ev is sort of link turning. The second issue is the question about meeting the resolution. I think it becomes very unclear if the aff even meets the resolution on two points first is the moral imperative and if that means benefits for the future or stopping violence now and the second is whether or not you are doing space colonization or exploration to get the tech needed to stop climate change. These become unclear for the aff which makes it hard on the top level frame. Then on the substance debate directly I find that it becomes a little hard to tell what the real impact is of the aff in comparison to the neg and what outweighs I think that this argument that resources in space are going to be hard to find out who gets access and where they will go and how they are divided up makes it hard for the aff to claim that it will go to solve climate change rather than increase the ongoing wealth gap. This means that climate change will still be felt first by people who are worse off in comparison to the rich in space.

Quarters

Neg

vs Joanna Zhao

Judge Mak Kovar

WIN

COMMENTS

Great job in 1st CX of pressing at the logic of the aff and trying to get her into a bind/burden to prove.

RFD

Great debate! Voted neg because of the lack of uniqueness space colonization has to benefiting humanity - neg did a sufficient job of painting the risk of entrenching the wealth gap with resources that would be extracted and hoarded. Neg won framework, as her evidence was sufficiently extended and aff did not meet the burden of moral obligation. The current mitigation argument was not enough to prove the necessity of space colonization as the negative made the argument that the budget could be re-allocated to climate change mitigation. The aff didn't sufficiently link to solving extinction and spoke to space colonization as providing a "temporary backup" which contradicted the permanency burden for space colonization placed by the neg.

Quarters	Neg	vs Joanna Zhao
Judge Freddie Smith	WIN	

COMMENTS

Fantastic! Your speaking, case, transitions, and handling of cx are very impressive. I really liked your cx question of "so you're suggesting moving climate change to another planet?" it was very effective! You can slow down a little in rebuttals so you don't have to take as many pauses. Despite these pauses you are a fantastic speaker and debater. Great job arguing how you win under either framework. I really think you'll go far this season!

RFD

Congrats on quarters and great job to both debaters! I see a good season in both of your futures. I voted neg for a few reasons. 1- I did not buy that space col solves for CC better because aff did not provide evidence for this 2 - I bought that the clean energy advancements do not require permanent settlement 3 - neg wins the timeline argument Great round overall, I really enjoyed watching y'all debate! Good luck going forward and keep working hard :)

Semis	Aff	vs Sophia Zhou
Judge Mak Kovar	WIN	

RFD

Great debate! Voted Aff on Mundivar evidence because of the risk to help human kind. Aff framing for util as basis governmental decision making was adequately extended and unanswered. Aff sufficiently addressed the need for moral imperative and address the lack while not having the burden to provide a plan text.

Semis	Aff	vs Sophia Zhou
Judge Adrian Sendejas	WIN	

RFD

1—Try or die - climate change is coming and catastrophic, biggest impact in the round bc i filtre through util 2—FW - neg is a big tough here because not sure what you gain from this if in the 1NC CX you give them "aliens dont exist" - then its basically just util 3—even if it doesnt work, its better to try and risk some initial issues with colonization than allow humanity to die out

Semis

Aff

vs Sophia Zhou

Judge Emanuel Vargas

WIN

RFD

I think the aff is winning framework, and likely solve extinction. They are winning that the negs framework is bad because all form of progress have us take some form of risk, which is offense for them. Ultimately I think the most important argument however is this one about climate change. I believe ultimately that the 2NR offense is predicated solely off of climate change coming too soon and we wont be able to get off earth, OR that space col leads us to allocate the resources elsewhere. I agree with the aff however that the neg conceded the arguments that space col is necessary for coming to new scientific discoveries that can allow us to mitigate c change on earth. This happens through things like finding new clean energy and moving polluting businesses to space. I dont think neg addresses time frame enough, and even if this is not true, the aff is try or die for moving off of earth into space in order to stop extinction, which is offense since they are winning util is best.

Finals

Aff

vs Enoch Xu

Judge Ronen Bowman

RFD

I thought that this was a very good debate and congrats to both sides for making it this far and having a great final debate. For me this came down to a couple key things and ended up narrowing down to mainly one impact. At the end of the debate the neg has come down with two main issues and points of contentions the first is climate change and the second is alien life. I do not think that this alien impact is really all there for me and at most I agree with the aff that you just prove that alien life does exist but not the war aspect. SO this come downs to the argument of climate change and who's impact is greatest in this debate and I just end up thinking that the neg is winning that the time frame issue of the climate change issue is most important and something that the aff has good responses too but I think it is a little too late breaking for me and just doesn't really answer the argument about what colonization really does to solve the idea that exploration cant already do or has already done.

Finals

Aff

vs Enoch Xu

Judge Rafael Sanchez

WIN

RFD

by the end of the debate, the aff is winning that space col is a moral priority ultimately, the big problem with the neg is that there needs to be a much more robust explanation for why the aff would lead to a direct tradeoff with cc policies. ON the arg that the aff would lead to more emissions, the problem here is that the aff is pretty ahead on this question that the aff would lead to more scientific innovation which would result in overall cc solutions which owe the emissions that comes from rockets. This also means that even if you do win that space col takes forever, that doesn't matter because the process of scientific innovation from space col doesn't happen in a vacuum which means that all the existential risks that would arise in the interim would still be mitigated in the process prioritizing space col

Finals

Aff

vs Enoch Xu

Judge Emanuel Vargas

RFD

I think the negative is winning the time frame question. They have specific evidence that says it will take decades for climate change to kill us, and the aff evidence agrees. Even if I agree that space colonization gives us some good resources to help stop that from happening, it would take far too long, both sides agree that climate change is on the brink. I don't think the aff ever answers the neg's time frame changes which matters because it determines who's impacts turn who's. Also, even if rocket emissions are short term and the aff is a long term solution, we are so on the brink, it still exacerbates it. That's bad. I guess I kind of think that there's a reason to believe the aff doesn't trade off, but the aff hasn't done an robust enough job to point this out to me, especially considering they have evidence (frank) that says thinking we can have a "plan b" is exactly what exacerbates the impacts. I think neg is best for stopping extinction, or at least positively affecting the time frame of extinction. ALL other risks don't matter if climate change comes first.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Melody Huang Melody Huang

Round 1

Aff

vs Summer Li

Judge Sean Newman

WIN

Melody Huang

Pts 29.5

COMMENTS Melody, .General - Good job with the roadmaps - Good questions

RFD

I vote with the Aff because I think they did more work to push their criterion and the argument that space colonization gives a backup plan works with the extinction arg.

Round 2

Neg

vs Penny Lin

Judge Solomon Watson

WIN

Melody Huang

Pts 28.9

COMMENTS

do no answer probably in the tone you stated but, also understand that you need to say yes as cooperation is a main argument for being able to solve CC or nuclear war scenarios. Her answer to the SV she gave is just a claim, force them to tell you specifically where in the evidence that Space Colonization actually increase SV. IE force them to explain the link of SV and space Colonization. You need to adapt in questions, you just read a list of pre determined questions as a result you did not adapt some of her answers that were clearly lacking in establishing real links between SV and the impacts.

RFD

General comments for Both debaters 1) did an excellent job of referencing and explaining their evidence. 2) Road mapping is too specific. Don't need to tell me you are going to attack and then extend specific arguments. Just tell me where you are going to start (IE AFF OR NEG) how you intend move through the debate, it assumed you will do things like extending/cross applying and weighing. 3) General rebut outline 1) Sign post where you are on flow 2) Extend your evidence across their attack OR cross-apply your evidence when attacking their case. 3) Explain why you are right with the reasoning of your evidence. 4) Explain WHY this is important: a) why you are winning the time frame b) why you are winning the magnitude Number is the summary that provides a voter RFD: Like above I stated above both did a great job explaining impacts and used their evidence. However, the link story on the AFF is not really explained how space colonization will solve the world's problems and even if they did the time frame is not there as AFF does not answer that the lack of focus will prevent them in the time neccesarry. **SPECAIL NOTE:** It is obvious both debaters had the majority of there rebuttal speech written. This prevents adapting and especially prevents adapting to mistakes of your opponents. While you feel might feel more comfortable it will lock you on a path that prevents you talking advantage of your opponent's mistakes while at the same time prevent you from answering attacks you did not include in your prewritten speech.

COMMENTS

Your are just going through a list of CX questions. This is not the most optimal way to run a CX. IT keeps you from adapting or really listening to the logic of their answers. Rather, you become more interested and focused on getting through your list. CX is about breaking the logic of your opponent. If you only use a predetermined list you are incapable of adapting to any possible mistake and taking advantage as you will focus on the next question on the list versus asking about the logic of their answer. Aff extinction scenarios are not well explained - you need to point this out, next you win on time frame because the focus should be on solving those things that could lead to human extinction as space colonization is such a massive undertaking that the amount of time before it happens for real is so far off that if we fail to address the issues on Earth will lead to the extinction before the space colonization can solve the problem.

RFD

General comments for Both debaters 1) did an excellent job of referencing and explaining their evidence. 2) Road mapping is too specific. Don't need to tell me you are going to attack and then extend specific arguments. Just tell me where you are going to start (IE AFF OR NEG) how you intend move through the debate, it assumed you will do things like extending/cross applying and weighing. 3) General rebut outline 1) Sign post where you are on flow 2) Extend your evidence across their attack OR cross-apply your evidence when attacking their case. 3) Explain why you are right with the reasoning of your evidence. 4) Explain WHY this is important: a) why you are winning the time frame b) why you are winning the magnitude Number is the summary that provides a voter **SPEACIL NOTE:** It is obvious both debaters had the majority of there rebuttal speech written. This prevents adapting and especially prevents adapting to mistakes of your opponents. While you feel might feel more comfortable it will lock you on a path that prevents you talking advantage of your opponent's mistakes while at the same time prevent you from answering attacks you did not include in your prewritten speech. CX is about breaking the logic of your opponent. If you only use a predetermined list you are incapable of adapting to any possible mistake and taking advantage as you will focus on the next question on the list versus asking about the logic of their answer. RFD: The negative had an excellent opportunity to leverage the time frame of colonizing space vs. the under developed extinction scenarios of the AFF to show that the real moral imperative is to focus on the real world problems that will lead to the extinction scenario as they failed to do so I essentially have to give full weight of the link story of the extinction impacts that were essentially dropped.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Melvin Ma Melvin Ma

Round 1 Aff vs Advika Baditela

Judge Adrian Sendejas

WIN

Melvin Ma

Pts 29

COMMENTS stop looking at your opponent, seriously

RFD

rfd - aff - risk of nuclear war is rapidly increasing, miscalc is possible, accidents in the past - all mean risk of nuclear escalation is likely to happen and kill us sooner than CC

Round 2 Neg vs Jessica Wang

Judge Solomon Watson

WIN

Melvin Ma

Pts 29.1

RFD

Good debate, basically I think the neg is winning that social justice fwks best access morality values which link turns your fwk — that means I think less about the magnitude of your impact in turns of deaths and more in terms of access to resources. This space opens up resources argument is good but I think the neg is doing a really good job contending with the inevitability framing and the tf of solvency. Which means a small risk of a structural violence da o/ws. jessica — probably too long on util/fwks, stand up straight, bending down and over will contract your diaphragm which is where all of your lung capacity comes from and therefore projection ability melvin —

Round 3 Neg vs Sophia Zhou

Judge Rafael Sanchez

Melvin Ma

Pts 28.3

RFD

by the end of the debate the aff is winning that space col ow the neg Ultimately, a big problem at the end of the debate for the neg is that the nr was largely defensive, because most of the argument were about how space col is largely obsolete because we can solve for existential risk in other methods, but the aff then only has to win a risk of offense to prove try or die.

Round 4	Aff	vs Ishana Gautam
Judge Jacob Skinner	WIN	Melvin Ma Pts 29.4

COMMENTS

I would recommend prioritizing what you are going to say in later speeches. You responded to and extended a large amount of defensive arguments, but left offense on the table. There were several times the negative said that abandoning earth would cause humanity to be reckless. You didn't respond to them and had they said more about us not making it to mars, you would have lost. You also extended too much on certain flows, but not enough on others.

RFD

I voted on Framework and that the Aff save humanity from extinction. Okay, in CX the Negative said that if people go extinct we can't have morality and the aff used that to force the framework debate to be about saving life. I think that the aff is winning on extinction. There is more from them arguing that leaving the earth is necessary and that there is a chance of the aff saving humanity from extinction. Largely, this comes down to argument framing. While the negative is winning that many people will die from space colonization (due to us leaving people here) and that earth will be left to get destroyed, there is not enough contestation throughout the debate that all people will die.

Octas	Neg	vs Joanna Zhao
Judge Charlie Hale		

RFD

try or die to space colonize, the neg did not say how the status quo solves climate change just that it WILL happen before 2050 and affect 9 billion people - with no intervening actors argument it's hard to believe we can survive warming without leaving earth. impact calc makes me not prioritize social injustice - i.e. we can't solve it in the future if we are all dead.

Octas	Neg	vs Joanna Zhao
Judge Adrian Sendejas		

RFD

1—Offense - not sure what the negs is at the end of the debate - BUT i am pretty sure there is a risk of extinction from climate change and a ruined ozone layer or whatever that getting off the rock can avert 2—Maybe we can save earth? Idk. I dont think it matters as much as both of you want it to at the end of the debate. 2AR should have just entirely been "you agree CC is impending and catastrophic, only aff gives us a chance to survive" 3—Space exploration would only solve the minerals/tech coming back to earth, not getting off the rock to stop extinction.

Octas

Neg

vs Joanna Zhao

Judge Jacob Skinner

WIN

RFD

Voting neg on util I think the Neg has better arguments about how they solve climate change. The neg has several reasons that solar panels won't work, while the aff just says "sun" and in the final speech (too late) advancements in tech. Then the neg won on timeframe, that by the time we do colonize CC will have happened. Combine that with resources having to be taken means the neg won.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Nila Rajkumar Nila Rajkumar

Round 1

Aff

vs Lily Qiu

Judge Erick Berdugo

Nila Rajkumar

Pts 29

COMMENTS

Speaking - good and clear. 1AR - the main problem is you are not focusing in on the main position on her attack. She is conceding that the SPACE colonizatio could be a moral imperative in the future. Thus, you need to focus in on how it is a moral imperative NOW. Next, your responses to NUC War are set up to say you solve for NUC War but you do not provide evidence of that. While escape of a NUC War might be a reason of space colonization the time line does not fit. Nor does it answer how a focus on spACE colonization will expedite the probability of a NW. CC - you are not answering how space increases CC. Need to be answering how space colonization will increase cooperation that will solve for both impacts of the negative. Need to be more organized when refuting. Simple outline: 1) refer to where you are responding. 2) Exrend or crosappluy your evidence 3) Explain they are wrong and you are right 4) Explain why this important and a reason to vote for you.

RFD

General comments for Both debaters 1) did an excellent job of referencing and explaining their evidence. 2) Road mapping is too specific. Don't need to tell me you are going to attack and then extend specific arguments. Just tell me where you are going to start (IE AFF OR NEG) how you intend move through the debate, it assumed you will do things like extending/cross applying and weighing. 3) General rebut outline 1) Sign post where you are on flow 2) Extend your evidence across their attack OR cross-apply your evidence when attacking their case. 3) Explain why you are right with the reasoning of your evidence. 4) Explain WHY this is important: a) why you are winning the time frame b) why you are winning the magnitude Number is the summary that provides a voter **SPECAIL NOTE:** It is obvious both debaters had the majority of there rebuttal speech written. This prevents adapting and especially prevents adapting to mistakes of your opponents. While you feel might feel more comfortable it will lock you on a path that prevents you talking advantage of your opponent's mistakes while at the same time prevent you from answering attacks you did not include in your prewritten speech. RFD: Aff does not answer that CC will increase do to a focus on the space colonization Aff basically concedes Nuc War impact because the possibility of NW will increase with a focus on space colonization.

Round 2	Neg		vs Jayden Chai
Judge Toby Whisenhunt	WIN	Nila Rajkumar	Pts 29.5

COMMENTS

Good CX questions and push back. NC was really good. Solid case and NC. You had plenty of time to address the aff case, and leveled solid arguments on all parts. Well done - great refutation. Good round calculation and comparison. Solid flowing.

RFD

This was a close debate. Both sides did a good job extending and putting some arguments on the other case. In the end I found the negative argument that the aff is proving extinction bad but not colonization is the only hope. More emphasis on that and this could have easily gone the other way.

Round 3	Neg		vs Ishana Gautam
Judge Mak Kovar	WIN	Nila Rajkumar	Pts 29

COMMENTS

Good job leveraging your framework in the 1NR. It's good to be rooted in your position for CX to answer easier, you did a good job at answering tough questions.

RFD

Very close round!!!! Neg sufficiently won the frame work debate, though it was close thus the moral imperative was to decrease structural violence. This was supported best by the focus on the negative to solve climate change with the resources we have and the improbability of a nuclear war that was uncontested. The aff's time frame to colonization and nuclear war was a bit muddled but the neg was able to cast doubt on whether space colonization would be a sufficient way to prioritize life if by the aff's time line, humanity would be taken out by nuclear war in 3 years whereas space colonization would be 7 year. Thus if it's muddy but nuclear war is unlikely then we can solve for structural inequalities tied to climate change first before considering "fleeing to space: Remember to look at the judge in CX!

Round 4

Aff

vs Sophia Zhou

Judge Toby Whisenhunt

Nila Rajkumar

Pts 29.9

COMMENTS

Much of the aff spends time on climate and such but is a little light on colonization other than the Mulvinar card late in the case. Contention 2 and nuke war suffers from the same issue. Much more time spent on harms than on how colonization is necessary and sufficient to solve. The rebuttals were a bit more challenging this time. Having to deal with more arguments against case can make things more complex. You can choose the key elements to go for and make them voters along the way. More specific spin offs help all would be good. Also might not need to prove sovency if moral obligation is true.

RFD

Very close debate. The energy levels and fatigue popped up in this debate. Both spent more time on their case than the opps. The framework debate I feel the affirmative made some good points but the negative had some better case arguments. The negative could talk more about safety and short term in teh rebuttal. The neg Etzioni card is good but I feel like the lack of framework but the aff extension of framework was also very general.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Penny Lin Penny Lin

Round 1 Neg vs Grace Moore

Judge Cortez Proal

Penny Lin

Pts 27

RFD

The aff wins that there are multiple existential threats to Earth. They also extend their FW in the rebuttals. Even though the aff conceded almost all of the negs solvency take outs, the neg does not extend their fw nor do they have an impact in this round. Therefore, I have to vote aff.

Round 2 Aff vs Melody Huang

Judge Solomon Watson

Penny Lin

Pts 28.7

Round 3 Neg vs Caroline Ge

Judge Erick Berdugo

WIN

Penny Lin

Pts 29.1

COMMENTS

You need better explanation of the link. You have to be specific of the cause. You are good at explaining the results of the impacts.

RFD

General comments for Both debaters 1) did an excellent job of referencing and explaining their evidence. 2) Road mapping is too specific. Don't need to tell me you are going to attack and then extend specific arguments. Just tell me where you are going to start (IE AFF OR NEG) how you intend move through the debate, it assumed you will do things like extending/cross applying and weighing. 3) General rebut outline 1) Sign post where you are on flow 2) Extend your evidence across their attack OR cross-apply your evidence when attacking their case. 3) Explain why you are right with the reasoning of your evidence. 4) Explain WHY this is important: a) why you are winning the time frame b) why you are winning the magnitude Number is the summary that provides a voter **SPEACIL NOTE:** It is obvious both debaters had the majority of there rebuttal speech written. This prevents adapting and especially prevents adapting to mistakes of your opponents. While you feel might feel more comfortable it will lock you on a path that prevents you talking advantage of your opponent's mistakes while at the same time prevent you from answering attacks you did not include in your prewritten speech. RFD: The negative did a slightly better job of explaining the link story and that unlikeliness of space colonization and that the process means we should focus on solving earth problems./

RFD

General comments for Both debaters 1) did an excellent job of referencing and explaining their evidence. 2) Road mapping is too specific. Don't need to tell me you are going to attack and then extend specific arguments. Just tell me where you are going to start (IE AFF OR NEG) how you intend move through the debate, it assumed you will do things like extending/cross applying and weighing. 3) General rebut outline 1) Sign post where you are on flow 2) Extend your evidence across their attack OR cross-apply your evidence when attacking their case. 3) Explain why you are right with the reasoning of your evidence. 4) Explain WHY this is important: a) why you are winning the time frame b) why you are winning the magnitude Number is the summary that provides a voter **SPECAIL NOTE:** It is obvious both debaters had the majority of there rebuttal speech written. This prevents adapting and especially prevents adapting to mistakes of your opponents. While you feel might feel more comfortable it will lock you on a path that prevents you talking advantage of your opponent's mistakes while at the same time prevent you from answering attacks you did not include in your prewritten speech. **RFD:** The 2AR does not spend any time responding to the partial weighing of SV versus Space Colonization spending being used to solve the problems on Earth.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Rachel Ke Rachel Ke

Round 1

Neg

vs Chloe Sun

Judge Adrian Sendejas

Rachel Ke

Pts 29

COMMENTS

1) More examples of tradeoff, what we should be investing towards instead 2) More on FW 3) Numbering 4) Space dev solves the entire aff

RFD

RFD - AFF. I think the AFF is doing a better job at the end of the debate telling a clean story - that we have fundamentally put all our eggs in one basket and we are falling victim to the downsides of that. Aff has 2 args i find persuasive. 1) Reversability 2) No tradeoff Structural violence and all iterations of the neg impact require a populace to exist in order to solve or better, which makes the aff impact a pre-requisite. Neg args also assume there is a tradeoff between space col and whatever you think is good to do now - but you need to go harder on specific examples.

Round 2

Aff

vs Enoch Xu

Judge Cortez Proal

Rachel Ke

Pts 28

RFD

The neg proves that colonization takes too long to solve and that the squo is sufficient to avoid climate change, The aff does not respond to the neg's impact defense which means under the shared UTIL fw I vote neg because they save the greatest number of lives.

Round 3	Aff		vs Jessica Wang
Judge Mak Kovar	WIN	Rachel Ke	Pts 29.7

COMMENTS

Remember to look at the judge in CX. Good job being rooted in your position during CX (answering). It was kind of you to prompt the neg to read her case first for the 1NR. Try not to get tripped up if your opponent struggles to answer your questions in CX, take it as a concession and bring it up in the rebuttal (as a reason to vote for you). Great use of analogy in the 2ar for the storytelling overview!!! Remember to crystalize your voters, you did a good job of weighing the impacts in the 2ar.

RFD

A lot of the aff was dropped at the specific level, neg was able to provide descriptive overviews. Aff won the frame work. Neg did a good job of addressing urgent need but the extinction level prioritization followed the logic of the aff, it would have been interesting to hear an argument about how focusing on the means to solve structural violence would prevent extinction. Overall good debate between both competitors! Keep at it! Voted on the aff because of the moral imperative to save lives on the extinction level and that the spill over effects of space colonization would be beneficial to the solving climate change.

Round 4	Neg		vs Andy Yue
Judge Adrian Sendejas	WIN	Rachel Ke	Pts 29

RFD

NEG - 1) AFF does NOT stop extinction. It redistributes humanity and our issue with overconsumption to different places which recreates x risks associated with things like climate change or international tension that would cause conflict or war. 2) Neg does NOT respond to the argument that only the rich benefit from space col because they are the ones that go to space. Instead, we can distribute benefits into climate change mitigation programs or building cooperation. 3) Not even sure what requires us to get off the rock at the end of the debate. "Asteroids and disease" is not an impact explanation.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Ryan Arora Ryan Arora

Round 1

Neg

vs Sophia Zhou

Judge Elisabeth Kiu

Ryan Arora

Pts 27

COMMENTS

Great job, Ryan! I think you have some great foundational speaking skills. I think developing your flowing skills will help immensely, as well as signposting. I felt like you were a little wishy-washy on your value of QOL, and a lot of your opponent's points go dropped. Other than that, I think you're on the right track! Remember to keep your order clean and to directly clash.

RFD

I voted aff on probability. I felt like the affirmative was able to provide me with better substance to solve for extinction.

Round 2

Aff

vs Dittu Tandon

Judge Mak Kovar

Ryan Arora

Pts 29

COMMENTS

Make sure to use prep before the 1ar, it was a bit unorganized. You tried to make up for it in the 2ar but it was too little to overcompensate for the lack of answering and extending the aff. The work in the 2ar needed to happen in the 1ar. Good effort!

RFD

Remember to look at the judge in cross examination! A lot of the negative was dropped by the aff. Neg won the frame work of stewardship and sustainability. Bought it was imperative to solve for climate change now as space colonization will exacerbate classism and leave the marginalized to die while entrench the cold-war esc tensions internationally from space competitiveness.

Round 3	Aff		vs Jenny Gu
Judge Jacob Skinner	WIN	Ryan Arora	Pts 28.4

COMMENTS

I think you did a really good job. I think you should keep extending your turns to put more pressure on the other team. There were many arguments about Space Colonization fighting Climate Change, which should be through more of the 2ar. Compare how your tech is helping, how it will become better, and contrast that with the negative. Here you could add that we spend far more on current issues (the add one more percent argument).

RFD

I voted Aff on Util. I don't think the aff was able to prove there was a better solution other than going off planet. On Framework, I the Negative was not able to convince me that we should prefer structural violence. There wasn't enough comparison or work showing me that inequality will increase.

Round 4	Neg		vs Cindy Wang
Judge Toby Whisenhunt		Ryan Arora	Pts 28.8

COMMENTS

In CX questions should go one way. Don't let your opponent take over and ask questions. Get to the aff case in the NC and attack it explicitly, both framework and contentions. NR should be more focused on the structure of other cases. Its why FW - Aff - Neg is such a good default approach. You kind of spoke about stuff for 6 minutes but lacked a clear focus and no voters until the very end an extinction assertion. Spend more time on colonization won't solve extinction and Quality of Life is more certain and short term. It is not about extinction.

RFD

This was a ships passing kind of debate but in the end I think the aff does a better job explaining their framework and why it comes first.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Sophia Zhou Sophia Zhou

Round 1 Aff vs Ryan Arora

Judge Elisabeth Kiu

WIN

Sophia Zhou

Pts 28.6

COMMENTS

Great job, Sophia! I think you speak with conviction and confidence, which is a quality that will take you far in debate. You did great on extending cards and case, but continue to do so in your last speech as well.

RFD

I voted aff on probability. I felt like the affirmative was able to provide me with better substance to solve for extinction.

Round 2 Neg vs Advika Baditela

Judge Toby Whisenhunt

WIN

Sophia Zhou

Pts 29.4

COMMENTS

NC is really well put together. I like the arguments you chose and you have a very consistent point of view and framing. It is structurally and strategically solid. Good use of evidence to support your case. Your rebuttal and language is next level with even if analysis.

RFD

This was a good debate, but the affirmative failed to address the negative case. Too much time was spent extending the affirmative and even reading new arguments. Focus down on what you need to win the debate instead of trying to extend it al. It is hard on the affirmative to cover all the negative. That being said all the answers to colonization bad only came up in 2AR so they are too late.

Round 3 Aff vs Melvin Ma

Judge Rafael Sanchez

WIN

Sophia Zhou

Pts 28.5

RFD

by the end of the debate teh aff is winning that space col ow the neg Ultiamtley, a big rproblem at the end of the debate for the neg is that the nr was largely defensive, becuase most of the argumetn were about how space col is largely obsolete because we can sovl for existential risk in other methods, but the aff then only has to win a risk of offense to prove try or die.

Round 4

Neg

vs Nila Rajkumar

Judge Toby Whisenhunt

WIN

Sophia Zhou

Pts 30

COMMENTS

Case is still good. A little less energy this time. Try and keep focus even though you are tired. Rebuttal was ok once you got going. Good extension of case cards and Etzioni

RFD

Very close debate. The energy levels and fatigue popped up in this debate. Both spent more time on their case than the opps. The framework debate I feel the affirmative made some good points but the negative had some better case arguments. The negative could talk more about safety and short term in teh rebuttal. The neg Etzioni card is good but I feel like the lack of framework but the aff extension of framework was also very general.

Quarters

Neg

vs Jayden Chai

Judge Ronen Bowman

WIN

RFD

I thought that this was a good debate! I find somet hings to bee a little unclear for me at the end of it which makes me very skeptical of voting aff. I think that the neg is winning that there is a big time frame and plan question a well as this argument that does get some air time in the 2AR but not enough to where I think it was responded too enough. The idea that space colonization and exploartion are different thing is almost dropped in the debate and think that the aff has some foot work on it in the end but at the same time don't respond that these colonies are only able to exist if the earth is there in the first place as well as lacking a valid response to the inequaility that is created by the exitsence of space colonization. this makes things a little unclear for me if that space colonization actually does "trickle down" and what that would look like for the people on earth and how they get access to it. A lot of the neg's offense is coming from these sort of question and persumption like pushes to the aff's case that make it hard to really understand how sound the aff is at the end of the day. I think we are also could be a little more clear on how we get to extcuintion at the end of this debate for the aff and what that looks like for the rest of the negs offense I think the neg does a good job putting their impacts into perspective to the aff and who is actually affected.

Quarters

Neg

vs Jayden Chai

Judge Mak Kovar

WIN

COMMENTS

Great 1NR you painted a great burden on the AC to earn an moral imperative for space colonization. Great job pressing for space colonization versus exploration in the cross examination. You had a great pace in your delivery, you could be a tad louder (re-calibrating volume to the room since it was a little larger- minor critique though). Remember to look at the judge during CX! Great answers in cx. signpost in the 2NR, it was jumping around a bit too much (when going from the NC to AC to NC again). Overview and voters at the end could use some work. Great job cross applying your NASA backup planet arguments to the affirmative contention 1, remember to say the words "cross apply" and discuss the impact

RFD

Voted Neg. The Neg sufficiently painted space colonization as non-unique to climate change and population benefits of space exploration. The Aff was framed as taking irresponsible actions that harm majority of the human race and allow for humans to repeat the mistakes made on earth to other planets (thus, spreading around the suffering to other potential species and those left on earth).

Quarters

Neg

vs Jayden Chai

Judge Freddie Smith

WIN

COMMENTS

Masterful handling of cx! Especially considering that your opponent was not being courteous. You have a unique case which I like, especially the part about alien life, and you present it very well. Good clarity at speed. Try to use all of your time in the rebuttal, you could have spent more time deconstructing the aff case. Good luck this season, I think you'll do very well!

RFD

Congrats on quarters and great job to both debaters! I can tell you've both been working hard these last two weeks. This was a very close round for me as both sides had great arguments. I ultimately voted neg because of the aff's blunder about exploration vs colonization, and the neg's callout of it. Aff- I know you called it a misflow in your last speech, but your cx questions were exploration-specific and the neg was right to call you on it. The aff point about technology derived from space is supporting marginalized communities almost won me over, but the neg's callout and better decorum pulled through. Both sides should work on impact calculus. Good job bringing up your own impacts, but tell me exactly how they stack up to the other side's impacts and outweigh them. Great close round and have a great season!

Semis	Neg	vs Manya Jindal
Judge Mak Kovar		

RFD

Great debate! Voted Aff on Mundivar evidence because of the risk to help human kind. Aff framing for util as basis governmental decision making was adequately extended and unanswered. Aff sufficiently addressed the need for moral imperative and address the lack while not having the burden to provide a plan text.

Semis	Neg	vs Manya Jindal
Judge Adrian Sendejas		

RFD

1—Try or die - climate change is coming and catastrophic, biggest impact in the round bc i filtre through util 2—FW - neg is a big tough here because not sure what you gain from this if in the 1NC CX you give them "aliens dont exist" - then its basically just util 3—even if it doesnt work, its better to try and risk some initial issues with colonization than allow humanity to die out

Semis	Neg	vs Manya Jindal
Judge Emanuel Vargas		

RFD

I think the aff is winning framework, and likely solve extinction. They are winning that the negs framework is bad because all form sof progress have us take some form of risk, which is offense for them. Ultimately I think the most important argument however is this one about climate change. I believe ultimately that the 2NR offense is predicated solely off of climate change coming too soon and we wont be able to get off earth, OR that space col leads us to allocate the resources elsewhere. I agree with the aff however that the neg conceded the arguments that space col is necessary for coming to new scientific discoveries that can allow us to mitigate c change on earth. This happens through things like finding new clean energy and moving polluting businesses to space. I dont think neg addresses time frame enough, and even if this is not true, the aff is try or die for moving off of earth into space in order to stop extinction, which is offense since they are winning util is best.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

LD: Summer Li Summer Li

Round 1 Neg vs Melody Huang

Judge Sean Newman

Summer Li

Pts 27

COMMENTS

Summer, .General - Have questions planned out - Use more time in your speech - Good job with the extensions

RFD

I vote with the Aff because I think they did more work to push their criterion and the argument that space colonization gives a backup plan works with the extinction arg.

Round 2 Aff vs Kathie Liu

Judge Cortez Proal

Summer Li

Pts 26

RFD

I vote neg the aff dropped the negs solvency take outs and fw. The neg does enough to convince me that their fw is best and that the aff doesn't solve risking worsening sv.

Round 3 Aff vs Bonnie Zhao

Judge Adrian Sendejas

Summer Li

Pts 28.5

RFD

1AR coverage issues means theres not really any offense to vote aff in this debate

Round 4 Neg vs Jenny Gu

Judge Cortez Proal

WIN

Summer Li

Pts 27

RFD

I vote neg. The neg wins that we can solve climate change without colonization. Since the aff's fw is util the neg wins that they solve the biggest existential risk in the round which means they win.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

PF: Erin Sun & Mia Chen Sun & Chen

Round 1 Pro vs Lazebnik & Moturi

Judge Rafael Sanchez

WIN

Erin Sun
Mia Chen

Pts 28.4
Pts 28.5

COMMENTS

good debate, you were doing a very good job on the line by line, especeially when you are responding to their renewables claims that data centers arent being powered by clean energy and itll take too long inthe future. However, you need to have more extensions of your own case, especeially more impact calculus becuase you have a lot of arguemtns agaisnts teh opponenets arguemtns but are not really direcelty extnding and leveraging your case to ow the negs case.

RFD

by the end of the debate the pro is winning that ai data center likely leads to cc ultimatley, the big problem at the end of teh debate fro teh con is that there really isnt a direct response to the affs args on cc and more importantly, lack of a impact calc at the end of the debate means theey can more easily leverage why cc should be prefered.

Round 2 Con vs Taparia & Wu

Judge Ronen Bowman

WIN

Erin Sun
Mia Chen

Pts 29
Pts 29.1

RFD

This was a good debate I though that it was very well debated and both sides spoke very well! I think that the con is winning a little bit more and ahead on the fact that things like permits that are currently in place make sure that the impact of climate change is very limited as well as even if it is given full weight the way that ai is able to develop and mitigate climate change with a faster development rate means that it is a net positive trade off because eventually it will be able to solve it or work towards solutions. Plus ai being able to solve and work towards bettering health care and prescriptions and life saving medicine was sorta dropped by the aff which is very important impact the con gets to weigh.

Round 3	Pro		vs Hasan & Dong
Judge Clea Snell	WIN	Erin Sun Mia Chen	Pts 29.3 Pts 29.2

COMMENTS

Make sure to continue to work on enunciation for your speech as well as volume control. Good use of data and sources in your speech. Good rebuttal questions and use of information to persuade the audience, especially when mentioning the dangers to workers. Some of the questions during crossfire were strong, but some of the questions could have been redirected to be more affective for your argument. Good questions asked during the crossfire, and good use of evidence to invalidate your opponent's claims. You mention some data in your final focus, but you sometimes don't give the sources. Make sure to provide these when available to back up your numbers.

RFD

The evidence and rebuttals presented by pro helped to invalidate many of the points presented by con. Pro also presented strong questions during the crossfires and a variety of sources to support their claims. Con presented some claims that seemed insensitive at times toward issues like employee deaths, but this could have been better redirected with strong points and questions. Pro final points continued to have strong claims backed up by evidence and good counterarguments.

Round 4	Con		vs Lazebnik & Moturi
Judge Clea Snell	WIN	Erin Sun Mia Chen	Pts 29.3 Pts 29.1

COMMENTS

You have good points and evidence to support your claims. Good points for why you need more data centers as well as how it can improve the economy. In crossfire, make sure to back up claims with evidence, but for the most part, you had good evidence to back up your claims. You did a good job with providing sources and evidence in your rebuttal and explaining why they were wrong with their claims. Good points brought up with how health workers utilize AI and explaining why temporary jobs reduce unemployment. Make sure to check whether the sources are biased before including them in your case. After the second crossfire, you had good points and evidence, but try to include hard evidence to back up every claim. In the last crossfire, you did a good job with your questions and asking for evidence. In your final focus, you had good points in your argument as well as examples to support these claims.

RFD

Both sides did extremely well. However, when con was asking questions during the final crossfire, pro was not able to provide hard evidence for why new data centers should not be built. Con also gave more detailed information for why these data centers would be helpful.

Round 7	Pro		vs Taparia & Wu
Judge Mak Kovar		Erin Sun Mia Chen	Pts 29.8 Pts 29.7

COMMENTS

Mia - Great reading the constructive, very compelling delivery. Great job asking questions in cross fire, you have improved a lot! Remember to look at the judge in cross fire. Great job signposting in the rebuttal! Erin - Great passionate/urgent delivery, came off as adequately persuasive. Great job covering the Con, Remember to have less context in your questions in cross fire (less build up, go straight for the questions - good job with trying to undermine the logic of the Con). Both- Good job flowing on paper, allows you to remember more about the round since it it's being written by hand.

RFD

Great debate to both, it was very very close!!!!!! Bought data centers have a significant effect on the economy, bought a 6-12 month pause would scare away opportunity and send it to other countries - including the permanent jobs that would advance because of the construction. It was unclear how a moratorium would be uniquely beneficial for the timeline for integrating new regulations that couldn't be integrated throughout construction because of the risk of economic shock. Pro did a great job focusing on the health effects, this should have been carried through more than the unemployment rates - I needed more context on how a moratorium would uniquely benefit health effects- the policies referenced focused more on the environment than health effects (so if you have the evidence ot support it, read and bring it up more)

Round 8	Con		vs Hasan & Dong
Judge Sean Newman	WIN	Erin Sun Mia Chen	Pts 29.4 Pts 29.3

COMMENTS

Mia, .Good job reclaiming your time in cross Erin, .Good questions.

RFD

I vote neg because while Pro won their case, Neg won their case AND did weighing on the impacts.

Round 9	Pro		vs Virk & Zanzaria
Judge Elisabeth Kiu	WIN	Erin Sun Mia Chen	Pts 28.4 Pts 28.2

COMMENTS

Good job, you two! I think overall you guys were well-spoken and stood your ground when things got a little confusing about definitions and arguments. I think something that could be worked on for both you and your opponent, though, is judge instruction and voters. As I said in verbal RFD, final focus is a speech that should be dedicated to crystallizing the round and making sure that the judge understands why they should vote for you. Additionally, when things got confusing in terms of evidence. I think you should do more work in explaining why the judge should prefer your evidence over your opponent's. Work was done to do this, which was great! Make sure to extend some of those responses, though.

RFD

Great round, guys. I voted pro because I felt like the pro properly outlined to me why I should prefer them due to the quality of life, as well as preservation of life impacts.

Round 10	Con		vs Virk & Zanzaria
Judge Freddie Smith		Erin Sun Mia Chen	Pts 26 Pts 28

COMMENTS

Both of you are good and clear speakers! Please improve your flowing before you incorrectly call drops. Good job using all of your time. Evidence integrity DOES matter so don't claim it doesn't during crossfire. Good luck this season!

RFD

This round was grueling. All debaters please improve your flowing and decorum lest all of your rounds devolve into yelling at each other and the judge. Cases both have potential and debaters are all solid speakers, hopefully the chaos was just due to it being late at night at the end of two weeks of debate. Good luck this season!

PF: Griffin Lazebnik & Medha Moturi Lazebnik & Moturi

Judge Rafael Sanchez

Pts 28.3

Good debate, you are doing a very good job at extending for you case especially the parts of how data centers can be clean and more environmentally concouius or that data centers are needed for the ai race. I think really what is needed at the end of the debate is that there needs to be more direct responses to the affs arguments and their specific nuances, for example like more direct responses to the climate solutsion for data centers either dont exist or are not in the US, because absent these direct responses, it puts you pretty behind on these flows.

by the end of the debate the pro is winning that ai data center likely leads to cc ultimatley, the big problem at the end of teh debate fro teh con is that there really isnt a direct response to the affs args on cc and more importantly, lack of a impact calc at the end of the debate means they can more easily leverage why cc should be preferred.

Judge Sean Newman

WIN

Pts 29
Pts 29.5

Medha, .You are making arguments in crossfire. If your opponent allows you to do this then its fine occasionally, but try to restrain yourself. Griffin, .Good job with the signposting. Same crossfire critique as with your partner.

I vote Pro because the air pollution impact is not properly contested, the water impact seems to exist, and the agricultural land impact comes out good. The China escalation argument is too speculative.

Round 4	Pro		vs Sun & Chen
Judge Clea Snell		Medha Moturi Griffin Lazebnik	Pts 29.2 Pts 29

COMMENTS

Overall, the presentation of your speeches was good. You have good contentions and good use of evidence and sources to back up your claims. In crossfire, make sure to ask your opponent's for proof of their claims or if they have evidence. Your rebuttal had good evidence and sources to invalidate your opponent's claims. Good job looking into the sources and whether they are bias or not. You had good points in your rebuttals, and in the last crossfire, you had good questions. However, when asked about transportation, there could have been a stronger answer, so make sure to do more research on this aspect of your claim and why data centers and transportation are different in regards to CO2 emission. In your final focus, you had strong claims, but make sure to provide more evidence to support your claims.

RFD

Both sides did extremely well. However, when con was asking questions during the final crossfire, pro was not able to provide hard evidence for why new data centers should not be built. Con also gave more detailed information for why these data centers would be helpful.

Round 5	Con		vs Taparia & Wu
Judge Clea Snell	WIN	Medha Moturi Griffin Lazebnik	Pts 29.2 Pts 29.1

COMMENTS

You have good contentions, evidence, and sources to support your claims. During crossfire, good job with providing evidence with your claims, but make sure to provide that with all of them to have stronger support. When asked about how many people were dying/becoming sick, there was not a specific number. In the rebuttal, you did a good job with invalidating the points of your opponent. In the second rebuttal, you did a good job with arguing against your opponent's points. In your grand crossfire, you had strong questions and evidence to support your claims. In your final focus, you did a good job in supporting your claims and invalidating your opponent's.

RFD

Although both sides did well, Griffin and Medha did a good job with providing more hard evidence and in the crossfires and rebuttals, they did well in invalidating their opponent's claims.

Round 6**Con****vs Virk & Zanzaria****Judge Emanuel Vargas****WIN**Medha Moturi
Griffin LazebnikPts 28.8
Pts 28.7

RFD

I think the con is winning the economic benefits outweigh the potential detriments of data centers. I think the fundamental issue with the pros approach here is that you are just extending arguments into your later speeches, not actually engaging with what the con is saying. They have a bunch of ticky tacky defenses to your arguments like data centers have renewed commitments or that data centers actually help regions adapt to changes because they bring in so much income. They also have arguments that there are alternative causes to the problems the pro is talking about. Ultimately I think halting AI growth is a bad idea, given that data center companies use their income to help local economies and also create new ways to help local economies that can ultimately help the environment. What everyone can do better. Pro - Call out the times they make assumptions with no/weak and probably bias evidence. The con sounds very utopianistic and assumes coporations are so nice and dandy, challenge this. Con - IMPACT, this is at the end, but should be earlier.

Round 7	Con		vs Hasan & Dong
Judge Erick Berdugo	WIN	Medha Moturi Griffin Lazebnik	Pts 29.3 Pts 29

COMMENTS

Neither of you flowed the debate Using prep time before cross-fire is a bad habit. next, the 20% is dumped that still enough. Think about what is being stated. You had long winded "questions", which were really long phrases which I suspect was also written primarily by AI. It is obvious your speeches and questions were written mainly by AI. This inhibits growth in your ability to adapt within a debate as you will focus on what you "prepared" versus listening to any contradicting or inconsistent statements of your opponent. It also limits your ability to break apart and understand an argument. If you intend to grow you need to start writing your own stuff if you insist on having prepared speech and questions.

RFD

General comments for Both debaters 1) did an excellent job of referencing and explaining their evidence. 2) Road mapping is too specific. Don't need to tell me you are going to attack and then extend specific arguments. Just tell me where you are going to start (IE AFF OR NEG) how you intend move through the debate, it assumed you will do things like extending/cross applying and weighing. 3) General rebut outline 1) Sign post where you are on flow 2) Extend your evidence across their attack OR cross-apply your evidence when attacking their case. 3) Explain why you are right with the reasoning of your evidence. 4) Explain WHY this is important: a) why you are winning the time frame b) why you are winning the magnitude Number is the summary that provides a voter **SPEACIL NOTE:** It is obvious both debaters had the majority of there rebuttal speech written. This prevents adapting and especially prevents adapting to mistakes of your opponents. While you feel might feel more comfortable it will lock you on a path that prevents you talking advantage of your opponent's mistakes while at the same time prevent you from answering attacks you did not include in your prewritten speech. CX is about breaking the logic of your opponent. If you only use a predetermined list you are incapable of adapting to any possible mistake and taking advantage as you will focus on the next question on the list versus asking about the logic of their answer. Need to learn to give basic road maps. RFD: The PRO did a better technical job. Greener solutions - CON cannot say that they agree with you - they already grant that there are greener solutions just that they are not vastly out there. What you need to say is that we can incorporate without having a moratorium and there will not be as big of impact.

Round 9	Pro		vs Taparia & Wu
Judge Ronen Bowman		Medha Moturi Griffin Lazebnik	Pts 28.1 Pts 28.2

RFD

I thought that this was a good debate. I voted for the con. I think that the con is ahead on the idea that green solutions are being implemented now but a ban would prevent on them from being passed on further and on new and current ones that do not have them in the first place. I think also the impacts outweigh from the con on economic growth since that allows for more finical growth while also preventing harms from happening.

Round 10

Pro

vs Taparua & Wu

Judge Elisabeth Kiu

Medha Moturi
Griffin Lazebnik

Pts 28.3
Pts 28.4

COMMENTS

I think you guys did a really great job overall, especially on extensions. I think for the 1AR there needs to be some more work done on clashing with your opponent's case. I noticed several drops, so make sure to try to respond!

RFD

I voted con due to the alternatives provided going uncontested. I felt like the alternatives solved the pro's burdens.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

PF: Harsh Virk & Aaryan Zanzaria Virk & Zanzaria

Round 2

Con

vs Lazebnik & Moturi

Judge Sean Newman

Aaryan Zanzaria
Harsh Virk

Pts 28
Pts 28.5

COMMENTS

Harsh, .Good job with the speed. Give the first speakers the first question. Aaryan, .Good job with the drop callout. Make the questions shorter in crossfire

RFD

I vote Pro because the air pollution impact is not properly contested, the water impact seems to exist, and the agricultural land impact comes out good. The China escalation argument is too speculative.

Round 3

Pro

vs Taparia & Wu

Judge Clea Snell

WIN

Aaryan Zanzaria
Harsh Virk

Pts 29.1
Pts 28.7

COMMENTS

Practice enunciating your speech, when talking fast it can cause information to get lost. Good use of evidence and sources to support your claim. Good use in sources when supporting claim during crossfire as well. Good rebuttal to the the con's claims and evidence was used to back up these claims. During the crossfire, you had good questions, specifically when asking for evidence of claims. Make sure to get to points faster when answering questions during crossfire because it is such a short amount of time. The summary had good points, but some of them could have been stronger. Work on the presentation of this a bit more, even if you need more prep time to do so. There were some points in the summary that could have been stronger, but most of them conveyed the importance effectively. Overall, good job, but make sure to have more counterpoints to the con as well as evidence ready to support your claims.

RFD

Both sides did very well. However, pro was able to support their claims and back them up with evidence more often. They were also able to asked multiple questions and provided multiple pieces of evidence to invalidate the claims of con during crossfires.

Round 4	Con	vs Hasan & Dong
Judge Ronen Bowman	Aaryan Zanzaria Harsh Virk	Pts 28.3 Pts 28.2

RFD

I thought that this was a good debate. I think that the aff is winning that data centers hurt the taxes and even if they do provide some sort of lower tax rate for families they still have higher water and electricity rates which balances it out. I think that the impact of climate change outweighs but also the impacts of Digital economy is not really there as well as you don't respond to the ai leadership take over not true and the gap is already too big.

Round 5	Pro	vs Hasan & Dong
Judge Elisabeth Kiu	Aaryan Zanzaria Harsh Virk	Pts 26.8 Pts 26.9

COMMENTS

I think you guys do a great job of speaking confidently and with conviction. Try to work on providing a roadmap and making sure your judge is ready before speeches, however. Additionally, you guys ask some good questions in cross, but don't forget to flow well. Your opponent's C2 goes virtually uncontested, and you guys utilized the 1AR and other speech times mostly to extend case. Utilize your 1AR especially to clash and respond to your opponent's points.

RFD

I voted neg due to the econ impacts going virtually uncontested. While the aff does a good job in addressing environmental impacts, econ impacts are not addressed during speech times.

Round 6	Pro	vs Lazebnik & Moturi
Judge Emanuel Vargas	Aaryan Zanzaria Harsh Virk	Pts 28.6 Pts 28.5

RFD

I think the con is winning the economic benefits outweigh the potential detriments of data centers. I think the fundamental issue with the pros approach here is that you are just extending arguments into your later speeches, not actually engaging with what the con is saying. They have a bunch of ticky tacky defenses to your arguments like data centers have renewed commitments or that data centers actually help regions adapt to changes because they bring in so much income. They also have arguments that there are alternative causes to the problems the pro is talking about. Ultimately I think halting AI growth is a bad idea, given that data center companies use their income to help local economies and also create new ways to help local economies that can ultimately help the environment. What everyone can do better. Pro - Call out the times they make assumptions with no/weak and probably bias evidence. The con sounds very utopianistic and assumes coporations are so nice and dandy, challenge this. Con - IMPACT, this is at the end, but should be earlier.

Round 8	Con	vs Taparia & Wu
---------	-----	-----------------

Judge Sean Newman

Aaryan Zanzaria
Harsh Virk

Pts 29.4
Pts 29.2

COMMENTS

Harsh, .Don't let the other side ask questions for the entire cross Aaryan, .Good job having rhetoric

RFD

I vote for pro because they did weighing on the water and electricity points that they won. Econ could be a wash for both sides, but the rest of the con case was not extended or impacted out.

Round 9	Con	vs Sun & Chen
---------	-----	---------------

Judge Elisabeth Kiu

Aaryan Zanzaria
Harsh Virk

Pts 27.9
Pts 27.8

COMMENTS

Great job, guys. The key thing to work on for you guys is to format speeches in a more linear way. It was really hard to follow you guys on the flow at times. While you guys would provide a roadmap at the start of speeches, it wasn't necessarily followed during the actual speech. Additionally, judge instructions and voters is imperative in final focus. I think that final focus is a speech that should be dedicated to crystallizing the round and making sure that the judge understands why they should vote for you. Lastly, I think what could be helpful for you guys is to utilize your prep throughout the round instead of using it all up before final focus, so that you guys can properly address certain arguments.

RFD

Great round, guys. I voted pro because I felt like the pro properly outlined to me why I should prefer them due to the quality of life, as well as preservation of life impacts.

Round 10	Pro	vs Sun & Chen
----------	-----	---------------

Judge Freddie Smith

WIN

Aaryan Zanzaria
Harsh Virk

Pts 30
Pts 25

COMMENTS

Harsh- I recommend speaking drills do improve mumbling Aaryan- please stand still when speaking and silence your phone during round. You went an entire minute over on your last speech so please time yourself.

RFD

This round was grueling. All debaters please improve your flowing and decorum lest all of your rounds devolve into yelling at each other and the judge. Cases both have potential and debaters are all solid speakers, hopefully the chaos was just due to it being late at night at the end of two weeks of debate. Good luck this season!

MGCMS Camp Tournament

PF: Saif Hasan & Nicholas Dong Hasan & Dong

Round 1 Pro vs Taparia & Wu

Judge Rafael Sanchez

Nicholas Dong
Saif Hasan

Pts 28
Pts 28.3

RFD

by the end of the debate, the con is winning that a morat is worse Ultiamltey, the big problem at the end of the debate, is that thereneeds to be more work done by the pro to explain why a morat would influence current data centers and why a morat wouldnt lead to adverse conseq. the con is ultimatley winning tht the morat would lead to wrose outcomes becoaseu it leads to less investmetns and current data centers are uq worse

Round 3 Con vs Sun & Chen

Judge Clea Snell

Nicholas Dong
Saif Hasan

Pts 28.9
Pts 28.6

COMMENTS

Work on improving delivery as well as enunciating your speeches. Make sure to have data/evidence ready to support your claims. Try using a variety of trustworthy sources, Microsoft was consistently used as the source in the rebuttal. You mention other data centers, so try finding evidence from them as well. In the crossfire, you mentioned the AI race, but make sure to describe the impact of this and the importance, it felt like you were repeating yourself when asked about why it was important that we win. Try finding evidence to defend the AI race, and why it is important. During crossfire, this evidence would have been useful. You mention the closed loop system, maybe give a brief description of what that means. Also explain how the AI race will affect the economy more in-depth.

RFD

The evidence and rebuttals presented by pro helped to invalidate many of the points presented by con. Pro also presented strong questions during the crossfires and a variety of sources to support their claims. Con presented some claims that seemed insensitive at times toward issues like employee deaths, but this could have been better redirected with strong points and questions. Pro final points continued to have strong claims backed up by evidence and good counterarguments.

Round 4	Pro		vs Virk & Zanzaria
Judge Ronen Bowman	WIN	Nicholas Dong Saif Hasan	Pts 28.5 Pts 28.4

RFD	I thought that this was a good debate. I think that the aff is winning that data centers hurt the taxes and even if they do provide some sort of lower tax rate for families they still have higher water and electricity rates which balances it out. I think that the impact of climate change outweighs but also the impacts of Digital economy is not really there as well as you don't respond to the ai leadership take over not true and the gap is already too big.
------------	---

Round 5	Con		vs Virk & Zanzaria
Judge Elisabeth Kiu	WIN	Nicholas Dong Saif Hasan	Pts 27.4 Pts 27.2

COMMENTS	Good job, guys! Make sure you do basic things, such as making sure the judge is ready before jumping into speeches and filling up your entire speech time. Remember to also make eye contact with your judge.
-----------------	---

RFD	I voted neg due to the econ impacts going virtually uncontested. While the aff does a good job in addressing environmental impacts, econ impacts are not addressed during speech times.
------------	---

Round 6	Con		vs Taparia & Wu
Judge Emanuel Vargas		Nicholas Dong Saif Hasan	Pts 28.9 Pts 28.6

RFD	I think there's some great happening on both sides. I am close to voting either way. I ended up concluding pro. I think the issue that the pro faces is the impact work. I agree you're winning some impact mitigators, but I think the con is winning both impact defense and turns case arguments. What I mean by this is the biggest thing the con is winning are arguments about econ. But I think the final couple speeches conceded a couple of important pro arguments here, like AI overusage of resources, and trickle down costs to homeowners in the region through spiked utility costs. I am close to voting con on AI race, but I think this is an important lesson on weighing arguments. I agree you seem to have high magnitude, I disagree that the last summar/final focus does this work for me. I think there's a higher chance AI is bad for environemnt than it is for econ, given the pro has reasons AI is bad for regional econ as well.
------------	--

Round 7**Pro****vs Lazebnik & Moturi****Judge Erick Berdugo**Nicholas Dong
Saif HasanPts 29.1
Pts 29.2

COMMENTS Neither of you flowed the debate. Always give a road map :)**RFD**

General comments for Both debaters 1) did an excellent job of referencing and explaining their evidence. 2) Road mapping is too specific. Don't need to tell me you are going to attack and then extend specific arguments. Just tell me where you are going to start (IE AFF OR NEG) how you intend move through the debate, it assumed you will do things like extending/cross applying and weighing. 3) General rebut outline 1) Sign post where you are on flow 2) Extend your evidence across their attack OR cross-apply your evidence when attacking their case. 3) Explain why you are right with the reasoning of your evidence. 4) Explain WHY this is important: a) why you are winning the time frame b) why you are winning the magnitude Number is the summary that provides a voter **SPEACIL NOTE:** It is obvious both debaters had the majority of there rebuttal speech written. This prevents adapting and especially prevents adapting to mistakes of your opponents. While you feel might feel more comfortable it will lock you on a path that prevents you talking advantage of your opponent's mistakes while at the same time prevent you from answering attacks you did not include in your prewritten speech. CX is about breaking the logic of your opponent. If you only use a predetermined list you are incapable of adapting to any possible mistake and taking advantage as you will focus on the next question on the list versus asking about the logic of their answer. Need to learn to give basic road maps. RFD: The PRO did a better technical job. Greener solutions - CON cannot say that they agree with you - they already grant that there are greener solutions just that they are not vastly out there. What you need to say is that we can incorporate without having a moratorium and there will not be as big of impact.

Round 8**Pro****vs Sun & Chen****Judge Sean Newman**Nicholas Dong
Saif HasanPts 29.5
Pts 29.2

COMMENTS Saif, .Good job staying on top of extensions Nicolas, .Good speaking style Make sure you guys are weighing in the rebuttals**RFD**

I vote neg because while Pro won their case, Neg won their case AND did weighing on the impacts.

MGCMS Camp Tournament

PF: Varalika Taparia & Hannah Wu Taparia & Wu

Round 1 Con vs Hasan & Dong

Judge Rafael Sanchez

WIN

Hannah Wu
Varalika Taparia

Pts 28.6
Pts 28.7

RFD

by the end of the debate, the con is winning that a morat is worse Ultiamltey, the big problem at the end of the debate, is that thereneeds to be more work done by the pro to explain why a morat would influence current data centers and why a morat wouldnt lead to adverse conseq. the con is ultimatley winning tht the morat would lead to wrose outcomes becoaseu it leads to less investmetns and current data centers are uq worse

Round 2 Pro vs Sun & Chen

Judge Ronen Bowman

Hannah Wu
Varalika Taparia

Pts 28.7
Pts 28.8

RFD

This was a good debate I though that it was very well debated and both sides spoke very well! I think that the con is winning a little bit more and ahead on the fact that things like permits that are currently in place make sure that the impact of climiate change is very limited as well as even if it is given full weight the way that ai is able to develop and mitigate climate change with a faster development rate means that it is a net positive trade off because eventually it will be able to solve it or work towards solutions. Plus ai being able to solve and work towards bettering health care and prescriptions and life saving medicine was sorta dropped by the aff which is very important impact the con gets to weigh.

Round 3**Con****vs Virk & Zanzaria****Judge Clea Snell**Hannah Wu
Varalika TapariaPts 29
Pts 28.8**COMMENTS**

Practice enunciation and volume control when presenting your speeches. Good use of sources and evidence in your constructive. Good questions during crossfire to invalidate your opponent's claims. Good use of sources to support your claims during rebuttal, but some of the claims could have been stronger. Specifically the claim against farm lands. When talking about employment rates, try to provide more evidence and sources to make this claim stronger. Try talking about the effectiveness of the closed-loop cooling system, and make sure to have this evidence ready to use. Make sure to use sources to support your claims during the summary. You stated that only a small amount of farming land was used for AI facilities, provide the evidence for this. In the last crossfire, there were some points that could be stronger. Specifically when you are trying to convey the importance of new data centers. Overall, good job, but make sure to have more counterpoints to the pro as well as evidence ready to support your claims.

RFD

Both sides did very well. However, pro was able to support their claims and back them up with evidence more often. They were also able to ask multiple questions and provided multiple pieces of evidence to invalidate the claims of con during crossfires.

Round 5**Pro****vs Lazebnik & Moturi****Judge Clea Snell**Hannah Wu
Varalika TapariaPts 27
Pts 29**COMMENTS**

Make sure to work on volume control. Your points and evidence are good, but make sure to also state the sources along with them. There were times where you forgot to do so. During crossfire, good job with asking for hard evidence of your opponent's claims. In your rebuttal, you did a good job with providing evidence and sources to help support your argument. In the second crossfire, make sure to provide the exact law when saying something is illegal. In your second rebuttal, good job in listing the various jobs created by the data centers, make sure to provide numbers. It could even be helpful to say how long these jobs would be around for. When defending your contentions, provide numbers to help support your claim to make your argument strong. In the grand crossfire, you did a good job in using evidence to support your claims. In your final focus, you did a good job in emphasizing your points and explaining the long-term affects of the bills.

RFD

Although both sides did well, Griffin and Medha did a good job with providing more hard evidence and in the crossfires and rebuttals, they did well in invalidating their opponent's claims.

Round 6	Pro		vs Hasan & Dong
Judge Emanuel Vargas	WIN	Hannah Wu Varalika Taparia	Pts 28.8 Pts 28.7

RFD

I think there's some great happening on both sides. I am close to voting either way. I ended up concluding pro. I think the issue that the pro faces is the impact work. I agree you're winning some impact mitigators, but I think the con is winning both impact defense and turns case arguments. What I mean by this is the biggest thing the con is winning are arguments about econ. But I think the final couple speeches conceded a couple of important pro arguments here, like AI overusage of resources, and trickle down costs to homeowners in the region through spiked utility costs. I am close to voting con on AI race, but I think this is an important lesson on weighing arguments. I agree you seem to have high magnitude, I disagree that the last summar/final focus does this work for me. I think there's a higher chance AI is bad for environemnt than it is for econ, given the pro has reasons AI is bad for regional econ as well.

Round 7	Con		vs Sun & Chen
Judge Mak Kovar	WIN	Hannah Wu Varalika Taparia	Pts 30 Pts 29.9

COMMENTS

Hannah - great reading the constructive, you had a minute left so you could have added a little more to the first contention. Good job focusing on the impacts at the end. Great job defending your position in cross fire. Varalika - Great coverage in the rebuttal - you jumped around a little so you could fine tune your organization a bit (go in order down the flows - signposting. Fantastic enthusiasm in cross fire! Glad you offered voters at the end of final focus!! Both - Good job flowing on paper, allows you to remember more about the round since it it's being written by hand.

RFD

Great debate to both, it was very very close!!!!!! Bought data centers have a significant effect on the economy, bought a 6-12 month pause would scare away opportunity and send it to other countries - including the permanent jobs that would advance because of the construction. It was unclear how a moratorium would be uniquely beneficial for the timeline for integrating new regulations that couldn't be integrated throughout construction because of the risk of economic shock. Pro did a great job focusing on the health effects, this should have been carried through more than the unemployment rates - I needed more context on how a moratorium would uniquely benefit health effects- the policies referenced focused more on the environment than health effects (so if you have the evidence ot support it, read and bring it up more)

Round 8	Pro		vs Virk & Zanzaria
Judge Sean Newman	WIN	Hannah Wu Varalika Taparia	Pts 29.5 Pts 29.3

COMMENTS	Hannah, .In cross, you are making arguments Varalika, .Good job with holding your own in crossex
-----------------	--

RFD	I vote for pro because they did weighing on the water and electricity points that they won. Econ could be a wash for both sides, but the rest of the con case was not extended or impacted out.
------------	---

Round 9	Con		vs Lazebnik & Moturi
Judge Ronen Bowman	WIN	Hannah Wu Varalika Taparia	Pts 28.3 Pts 28.4

RFD	I thought that this was a good debate. I voted for the con. I think that the con is ahead on the idea that green solutions are being implemented now but a ban would prevent on them from being passed on further and on new and current ones that do not have them in the first place. I think also the impacts outweigh from the con on economic growth since that allows for more finical growth while also preventing harms from happening.
------------	---

Round 10	Con		vs Lazebnik & Moturi
Judge Elisabeth Kiu	WIN	Hannah Wu Varalika Taparia	Pts 28.7 Pts 28.8

COMMENTS	Great 1NR! I think you guys are very strong speakers. I noticed that you guys get pretty heated in cross, though. It may come off as disrespectful to some judges. Allow your opponents to answer questions.
-----------------	--

RFD	I voted con due to the alternatives provided going uncontested. I felt like the alternatives solved the pro's burdens.
------------	--
