

**PF ROUND 1****Online Ballot  
Comments****Round 1**[Return to Schematic](#)[Return to Round Results](#)**Khanna & Chow vs Baur  
& Sigsworth**

Shaffstall

**Shaffstall, Jack****RFD**

Voted on Econ and Credibility. I felt that the Aff did a great job with proving that the US being in UNCLOS was key to stopping the South China Sea situation. That tied into econ with the 6% decrease in the overall exports of the US, from my perspective of how much we export, being a bigger drop than the potentially tens or hundreds of billions that isn't really specified.

**Jiang & Cheema vs So  
& Vo****Shaffstall, Jack****RFD**

I think there was a lot of nervousness in this round which led to some messy debating. That said, the Neg did a good job extending things from speech to speech and ultimately tying it all up in the final focus that focused on more than just the Arctic voter, which was kinda confused throughout the round. The Neg also talked about econ, which gave a big impact to the Neg side, and ultimately the win.

**Amanti & Hepworth vs  
Justice & Hays**

Mazzarella

**Mazzarella, Annie****RFD**

Aff had more conclusive evidence and stronger impacts, they also put more responses on the neg and I was able to continuously flow aff through throughout the round. Neg rebuttal and summary were too disorganized and sporadic. However, this round had the potential for a lot of good clash had speeches been more organized. This round comes down to environment for me, (the most contentious throughout the round,) and I vote aff because they continually show without strong refutation that ratifying UNCLOS will lead to protected environmental resources + economic benefits of such not only for the US but for our allies.

**Comments for Amanti & Hepworth**

Amanti: good speaking (pace + volume) probably the best speaker in this round! You need to reorganize your constructive though. Second contention is way too short and impacts on first/third are weak. WHY is it important to democratize other nations? WHY does it matter that UNCLOS is vague? Explain more in your summary too. You keep saying aff's args are non-unique but don't clearly relay them to me.

Hepworth: rebuttal is way too disorganized. Work on going down the flow and responding to each argument/card one by one. Cross-applying your own case is good (like I said, this round had the potential for a lot of clash) but you need to be more organized going about it. Practice flowing and putting ink next to every single card they read (even if it's not a great one) and then read that ink down the flow to get more organized in responses. FF was 1:45, use all your time (you didn't take prep time before, maybe you should have so you could have filled all the time?)

## Comments for Justice & Hays

Justice: strange time allocation in constructive. Your second contention starts at 3:12, which means it's very skewed and leads me to believe your entire case is only riding on one contention. Equalize them. By summary I'm ready to vote aff based on the arguments that have been made and rebuttals that have happened, but you need to use voters to tell me exactly what I'm voting on. Summary is pretty disorganized and would have benefitted from you GROUPING your extensions and weighing under key voting issues. Tell me more explicitly what the round has come down to and why you've won.

Hays: Good blocks prepared but don't let them do the work for you, put more analysis of your own on your responses in rebuttal. Be clear in FF about what I can extend, you should have run with this more because your opponents dropped a TON of stuff.

---

## Tambe & Meng vs Flores & Franklin




---

### Mazzarella, Annie

#### RFD

Aff told me exactly what to vote on: US economy and US credibility. This round had the potential to have clash surrounding the environment but none of y'all really focused on it enough for me to vote on it. I vote aff because they mostly successfully show UNCLOS ratification bettering US economy and credibility.

#### Comments for Tambe & Meng

Be more organized in rebuttal, summary, FF. I liked your voters and you picked good ones but you need to be more organized in grouping your extensions under them so I can more clearly weigh things. Rebuttal needs to go down the flow and be explicitly clear about each card/argument in case you respond to.

#### Comments for Flores & Franklin

Need better tags on contentions, need to spend more time on speeches (all of them are at least 10 seconds under time) USE VOTERS. Clearly tell me what I'm voting on in summary/FF.

---

## Lancaster & Javadpoor vs Nimbkar & Rivera

Cho




---

### Cho, Yunuen

#### RFD

Pro won bc royalties non-unique/the fishing chain of logic I don't buy. China also isn't doing illegal things (yes they are but con didn't bring them up as heavily and defined in speeches).

## Badireddi & Meng vs Soni & Kumar



### Cho, Yunuen

RFD

I flowed royalties through, there was debate over it.

## Nguyen & Mathew vs Quadir & Badireddi

Sidapara



### Sidapara, Adi

RFD

don't search for cards during cross look at the judge don't get hung up on random stuff that's irrelevant Stick to teams signpost Refer to specific cards w names + numbers/empiric WEIGHING

### Comments for Nguyen & Mathew

Need to lay more responses on opponents.

### Comments for Quadir & Badireddi

Need to extend better.

## Rajaboina & Karthikeyan vs Gaudet & Exum



### Sidapara, Adi

RFD

Con unsuccessfully attempted to delink econ deep seabed mining for pro, but post evaluation, only offense for pro that was extended was \$500mil. Econ was wash vs. the billions of \$\$ that go as royalty payments. No offense for either team in data cables. Key voter is navy presence. I weighed the loss of intel gathering across the world over 4x increase in nautical limit and strait protections b/c we are at time of peace. Also weighed data sharing leads to loss of military IP to foreign adversaries such as China. Poor response by Amy that US gains something too, as it was uncarded and logic didn't stand empirically against neg's specific american losses. Super close round--remember to use ALL your time. This isn't novice for you all.

key votes pro con navy expanded scope less intel, exposed submarines, IP lost protecting data russia wont do anything leaves us exposed econ access to ECS, deepsea mines taxes and royalties

# Shakir & Lee vs Pak & Chai

Cohen



## Cohen, Shayna

### RFD

General (see individual feedback for comments on specific speeches)

- this round felt like two ships passing in the night, address each others' arguments please!
- focus less on evidence and more on logical warrants to wreck arguments
- I know the set up is weird, but please look at the judge during speeches and cross-fire - not at each other or at the ceiling!

Reason for Decision (RFD):

I think argument-wise, there wasn't a lot for me to weigh in this round. The only things on the flow by the last speech are AFF's concession on the economy being harmed by UNCLOS and vague responses about diplomacy, and the economy concession was emphasized in NEG's FF speech, so I voted Neg on the issue of economy. Great round everyone!!

### Comments for Shakir & Lee

**Lee Constructive:** great job!!! You have a solid case, but I think it could use more warrants explaining some of your arguments. Also, all of your contentions should grant you OFFENSE, so your 2nd contention seems like mitigatory defense you'd read in rebuttal. I'd edit the case to spend more time on your 1st and 3rd contention :) also, for delivery, read through your case a lot to make sure you're super articulate, even when you go fast

**Lee Cross-fire:** slay queen! you asked a lot of questions this cross-fire, and had a lot of authority! Just make sure you ask targeted questions (i.e. NOT "do you have a framework") and don't apologize mid-round or get quieter when you don't understand an answer. Pressure them to make sense!

**Shakir Rebuttal:** Great speech! You have some solid logical responses, but I'd love to see some cut blocks with evidence being used. Also, numbering your responses is always a fantastic idea (this will be easier with block files with evidence and numbered responses) and make sure you clearly state which contention you're responding too/respond to every contention.

**Shakir Cross-fire:** Nice job taking control of this cross-fire. I'd just say to stop asking as much about cards and start asking more about their actual warrants/impacts.

**Lee Summary:** Nice job mentioning arguments, but it seems like you just say that everything is dropped and to flow through your speeches. Mention specific arguments from rebuttal and explain why those flow through and why other arguments are dropped, or else you're just saying things that seem unsubstantiated. Additionally, you said "key voters", but didn't use them! Signposting is your friend :)

**Grand Cross-fire:** solid job asking about actual arguments!

**Shakir FF:** you focus a lot on evidence which is not the best in FF, but thank you for calling out that they conceded to econ and why you outweigh!

### Comments for Pak & Chai

**Pak Constructive:** great case! You read quickly which is fine, but make sure you enunciate! I like your case, but I don't think the C2 has a strong impact. The military is great, but there is sooo much more to think about when debating an international treaty!!!

**Pak Cross-fire:** Good job! Make sure you ask just as many questions as your opponent and keep them targeted (i.e. not "do you have a card")

**Chai Rebuttal:** Keep going! You have a long pause, just try to have a clear roadmap of what to say before you speak! When in doubt, refer to your own case, and if you need to end the speech, that's okay too! Also, please cut blocks; it will make your rebuttal speeches SOOOOO much easier. Finally, I know the set up for this round is weird, but make sure that you still make eye contact with your judge! It's easier to be convinced when you interact with me on a personal

**Chai Cross-fire:** Thank you for being so polite! However, you can be polite and still ask a lot of tough questions. Also, you're on the first speaking team, so you should ALWAYS take the first question!

**Pak Summary:** this is a solid speech, but make sure you structure the round in terms of 2-3 key voting issues for the judge. Nice job summing up your arguments and going for strategic points that will give you the most ground, but I think including the Neg case a little more would also be beneficial.

**Grand Cross-fire:** Nice job! This was the best cross-fire in the round, just be more confident in yourselves!

**Chai Final Focus:** Be more confident! You got this! Try to use key voters, and focus more on IMPACTS next time. That's what this speech is all about!

## Vega & Mittlestedt vs LaCrosse & Gurjala



### Cohen, Shayna

#### RFD

General:

This was a fun round to judge. Overall, everyone did a great job; just remember to WEIGH in final focus and extend links/warrants for your arguments all the way through the round.

RFD:

I'm voting Aff on the issue of economy. Both sides boiled the debate down to 1) economy and 2) international credibility, so those were the issues I looked at on the flow. On international credibility, Aff lacked warrants for why UNCLOS solved conflict, but Neg lacked a link from the United States and conflict to conflict between China/SK/Japan and France/Canada. If those links were brought up, that would have been a substantial voting issue, but they were dropped making credibility a bit of a wash. So, the main issue is economy, which both sides focused more on anyway. The C2 on Aff was really strong on emphasizing how the US gains access to the Arctic under UNCLOS and why that uniquely benefits the US more than having existing mining that would be stripped if we do ratify. The Neg has a lot of great cards, but overall a) lacked responses to Aff's C2, allowing them to extend a lot of key impacts, and b) didn't weigh impacts of existing resources against future access in the Arctic. Aff does a great job of saying that we are dependent on natural resources, like Neg says, but they will be the same if not more abundant in the Affirmative world. Overall, the Aff weighed most clearly on economy and had more unrefuted arguments, so they get my ballot.

#### Comments for Vega & Mittlestedt

**Mittlestedt Constructive:** Nice case! Good job packing in a lot of warrants while being fast and fluent.

**Mittlestedt Cross-fire:** Good job being assertive in cross-fire!

**Vega Rebuttal:** YAY NUMBERING RESPONSES! I loved the organization of this speech, so the main feedback I have is about your actual responses. I think all 6 are really solid and make sense (especially on FW), but some need a little more explanation (i.e. how exactly does UNCLOS solve for China and France). You have time for more explanation, so use it and try to stay as fluent as possible :)

**Vega Cross-fire:** Great job being assertive!

**Mittlestedt Summary:** Nice job clearly and concisely explaining why your FW is better. I think the first key voter of economy is really solid with statistics, but the second key voter needs more examples and warrants. In case they give me examples of UNCLOS signatories having conflict, so what does UNCLOS do to prevent that? You need to explain that link more.

**Grand Cross-fire:** If you're first team, you should always take first question

**Vega Final Focus:** Thank you for following the same structure, but I think this could have been better with more weighing and kind of an aff/neg world comparison

## Comments for LaCrosse & Gurjala

**La Crosse Constructive:** I think this is a really strong case! You clearly know a lot about UNCLOS, just read it a few more times to prevent stumbling :)

**La Crosse Cross-fire:** I like your calm presence in cross-fire, and this is nitpicky especially since the set-up is so weird, but try not to look at your opponent during cross-fire.

**Gurjala Rebuttal:** You numbered some responses, which is great, but I think your speech overall could use more structure. The content of your responses is great and I think the stats you bring up are helpful, you just need to specifically address their sub points and have a lot of structure and clear responses to all of their taglines.

**Gurjala Cross-fire:** Thanks for asking targeted questions!

**La Crosse Summary:** I think your second key voter could be a little clearer, because you have a lot of ground on conflict. Focus on that! Some more direct weighing of arguments like ECS vs Alaska would have been beneficial for the 1st key voter

**Grand Cross-fire:** I like the fact that you focus mainly on arguments, but using the last 30 seconds to talk about FW isn't super effective going into the final focus speech.

**Gurjala Final Focus:** Thanks for extended key voters, but more weighing and the extension of warrants for why these examples matter for the US would have made your second key voter much easier to vote on.

## Kantrud & Tripathi vs Warrier & Nair

Brown



**Brown, Tristan**

RFD

-pro team had to go maverick because partner wasn't here

## Whitfield & Pak vs Frey & Flansbaum



**Brown, Tristan**

RFD

-aff arguments stronger and less refuted

## McNamara & Hu vs Choi & Pallal

Cohen



**Cohen, Jordan**

RFD

RFD: econ benefits for us 93% remaining after royalties vs chance of un giving roy money to terrorist orgs

us actor framework - prefer us ben econ demoestically

---

## Nolan & Zhang vs Carns & Sanchez

---



### Cohen, Jordan

RFD

Rfd: pro extended through their constructive. Con dropped c1. C2 needed warrant and data.

I voted on the only arguments that remained on the flow: pro's us cred and security

---

---

## Fernandez & Nguyen vs Stork & Mosher

---

Flores



### Flores, Matthew

RFD

This was a great round overall and I can tell y'all did a lot of work to prepare. The main reason I voted PRO was due to the amount of offense. The PRO gave me various econ benefits to oil companies that outweighed the CON's offense of royalties. As I said in round, don't get caught up in implementation (fiat), but rather the impacts.

---

[Join the National Speech & Debate Association](#)  
[Contact](#)

[About](#)

[Help](#)