



PF ROUND 2

Online Ballot Comments

Round 2

[Return to Schematic](#)[Return to Round Results](#)

Stork & Mosher vs Baur & Sigsworth

Lawrence



Lawrence, Martin

Comments for Stork & Mosher

C1: Should not ratify the Unclos

Without exceptions: Bad financial position. ISA up to 7% tax. 331 Bill in private capital.

23 Bill 170 Mill; drives away business.

30% has the capacity to be negatively impacted.

Abuse of the EEZ.

57 Every nation 200 Nautical Miles. Creates conflict by leaving a gap. China building islands in South China Sea. Legal purgatory for all nations involved

Fails to live up to the promise

Convention provisions have rekindled long standing disputes; South China Sea 5 way crisis

Framework: By not joining Unclos the US is better off

A: Russia and China are still going to be focusing on expansion.

B: Telecommunication systems, doesn't stop piracy.

C: Unclos, negative economic impact of contention 1.

May harm and destroy certain sectors. Negative impact 30% of all mining, specifically offshore.

Vague Policy: South China Sea puts them in a legal purgatory.

Doesn't live up to its promise Unclos has not resolved any global conflicts.

Failed to help deep sea mining: fisheries and hydrocarbon deposits

1 Mim used

1: US loses a significant amount of money. Wouldn't it be better if the royalties never happened?

2/3: Unclos is flawed of the EEZ; has not solved any problems.

Taxed on all of those resources; Losing 10s of billions of dollars.

FF: Upheld the framework, based on negative impacts.

Unclos will not do much and that it failed over its 30 year period.

South China Sea

Non-Unique as it would happen on both sides, will go after own interests. C2: Telecommunications is non-impactful. Does not stop piracy.

Wouldn't be any better protected.

Comments for Baur & Sigsworth

C1: A: Resources. Diplomat: US geo survey. 22% of undiscovered oil and gas. cannot take control of resources.

Harvard Law Review unable to take advantage of convention.

Extend continental shelf, submit a claim to the body

B: Freezing War gearing up. Russia militarize gets the arctic.

US gains opportunity to resolve territorial disputes peacefully

Almost assured; would also be instinctive as a global common.

C2: Telecommunication Systems:

Large business. Costs a large amount of money to fix. 3 months, 106 Miles of cables. 7.2 million dollars. Be better protected. Unclos provides and ex Ands the protections afforded to telecommunication cables. US will save millions of dollars.

48 Used

2:

A: Hydrocarbons and taxation is negative to the US. US actually has 5 years before taxation of hydro carbons. 1.6 Trill

B:EEZ: Conflicts in the South China Sea has and could affect the us.

C: Link the US to the problems.

56 Left

C1: Business lost: Us chamber of commerce. Companies are hesitant because we don't have the legal precedents to drill.

US will have good economic benefits not that it will stop piracy but how Telecommunications cables will be protected compared to status quo

Ownership over resources

Winning: Arctic very important. The amount of oil that is worth in the artic. 30+ Trill is in artic.

Inconsistency: 5 Year after production will allow for most if not all revenue gained.

Economic Debate and a lot of the amount is outweighed.

Frey & Flansbaum vs Carns & Sanchez

Shaffstall



Shaffstall, Jack

RFD

I voted on Econ here because of how much the Neg emphasized it whereas the Aff didn't really give me an exact area to focus on. The inclusion of lawsuits provided an econ detriment that was unaddressed by the Aff, but that the Neg brought up. Using their admittedly somewhat abusive framework (call that out Aff!!), they found one negative that went unanswered for in the round.

Gaudet & Exum vs LaCrosse & Gurjala

Cho



Cho, Yunuen

RFD

On pro: War on Drugs weak link, sovereignty was strong but it was outweighed by the hegemony key voter of the con. All of the con arguments were extremely solid and flowed through cohesively in the round. Pro I need to see more attack on their arguments and drop weak links when you notice they are weak. Overall great speaking to all of you.

Fernandez & Nguyen vs Kantrud & Tripathi



Lawrence, Martin

Comments for Fernandez & Nguyen

Accede ratify/agree

neg harms outweigh benefits

1: accountability: Friedman Negative soft power. South China Sea; Philippines submitted lawsuit. Freedom of navigation are NOT working. Diplomat: All states parties are ipso facto

: environment: reversing national ocean policy. Ocean monuments; negative effect since fisherman will need to find new grounds.

protect marine environment

3; extend economic interests: Control of a country ends are shelf

international permits not able to be given.

establish own set territorial waters.

questioning Canadian citizens in non mutual water.

200 nautical miles, win win for us

12 secs of prep

S2

Framework: Must benefit US and rest of the world. Does not state whole world

1: Royalties are minimal; revenue sharing are reasonable. 14% is beyond 200 Miles. Does not apply to areas within current areas. Industry supports the revision. Finally with a seat on the financial board.

2: Can't stop terrorism; navy wants to join Onclos. July 2016 US navy already goes to Onclos procedures. Enable rather than complicate the mission.

Mandatory disputed provision, allows us to remain sovereign.

5 secs used

C3: 1: Environment and Econ

Environment: US has left a ton of treaties and we have not been following a lot of our laws.

better for the US to join Onclos. Extended continental shelf. Increased revenue and GDP?

Royalties are minimal compared to amount of money gained. (Wrong framework)

pass because economic and environmental factors

FF: Environment and Economy

trump administration has currently not enforcing regulations sufficiently. Neg world the economy suffers. US does not have control over the shelf.

Economy: US navy supports Onclos. Other ways to fight terrorism

Royalties helps other countries. Improve the US and other countries.

Comments for Kantrud & Tripathi

Obs: benefits for both

onclos should not be changed

1: net negative profit, required to transfer royalties to developing countries.

substantial royalties; many of the valuables in the ISA.

2: 200 Nautical Miles, US continental shelf beyond 200 Miles. 10s or 100 bills over time. Yo yo 7% of the value. 15 trill in debt, net negative.

C2: terrorists and pirates on: foreign port, part 2 art 27.

active at stopping 2008 (old)

Attack on an oil tanker could do this terrible damage. (When has these happened)

NYT if Somalia is left alone will make things worse.

S2:

Environment: The is already follows these laws. Us naval war college.

needs Onclos for freedom of navigation; already has free navigation rights.

Balance of interests. Will not acquise to others use of the sea. US is already committed yo helping the international community.

Allow to mine in our own EEZ, we already have the EEZ. Maritime boundaries with nearby nations. 7% own royalties that we make from companies.

Annually after first 5 years. After 1% for each percent until 12th year.

always 7% royalty after 12 years. 12.5% required to transfer more than half of the royalty. Not able to even keep half of what it keeps. 7% goes to

authority which decides where it would go.

16 seconds.

3: US is the actor and only benefits need to go to US. The US should worry about coreign nations. Navy supports Unclos; but does not come into action for terrorism

1; Extreme terrorism to flourish. Giving away choice from helping other countries and from fighting off terrorism in general.

2; Economy: treasury is losing money because of 7%. 15 Trill in debt

FF:

1: Environment, did not provide evidence of environmental law. Still follow same environmental laws.

2: Economy; Royalties are minimal, they did not prove that 5% versus 7% is detrimental. Need to still be boosting our economy.

1:Economy: 5.5% left from Royalties.

2: Terrorism: not allowed to fight on other waters. Not allowed to attack other foreign vessels.

Environment: we still follow all the environmental laws that Onclos follows.

Warrier & Nair vs Khanna & Chow

Sidapara



Sidapara, Adi

RFD

Bought the idea of tradeoff between oil revenues and fiscal spending in coastal states. Also bought the idea of US intervention bad.

Comments for Warrier & Nair

Extend more warrants/impacts by name/figure rather than by idea, signpost, more analysis/weighing. GIVE ME KEY VOTERS!!

Comments for Khanna & Chow

Don't use an abusive FW.

Justice & Hays vs McNamara & Hu

Flores



Flores, Matthew

RFD

The debate was really good! I explained some of the issues of dropping arguments super early on (PRO Contention 1) or having contentions that aren't under the Framework (CON Contention 1). Overall, the debate came down to Econ Benefits and US Movement through the seas. These are two different impacts, but I chose the PRO because I have tangible numbers and clear impacts, but the idea of US movement wasn't impacted out as much.

Vega & Mittlestedt vs Nimbkar & Rivera

Cohen



Cohen, Jordan

RFD

Rfd: voter on Econ. Political Capital drops without warrant.
Economics of ECS and turn on royalties gives it to pro

Choi & Pallal vs Rajaboina & Karthikeyan

Bakhle



Bakhle, Ishaan

RFD

I vote on the two voters pointed out to me in the pro's FF: Econ and security. On econ, the pro proves to me that the economic losses that come from UNCLOS are outweighed by the gains, while the con fails to make this comparison. On terror, pro proves that despite the low likelihood of a terrorist threat to domestic security, the high magnitude of this impact makes it worth considering.

Comments for Choi & Pallal

- Focus on probability of the AC's impacts. They're relatively high in magnitude, but their likelihood is almost negligible.
- Try not to ask for the wording of a tag in cross, focus on the arguments themselves.
- The rebuttal should spend more time on the pro case. You spent no more than 30 seconds, leaving C2 unaddressed.
- Rebuttal needs to be more time efficient as a whole. You spend a good minute responding to the pro's answers to only one of your four contentions.
- I think dropping FW in the rebuttal was a good move. Maybe cut it out of the case as a whole. Unfortunately for y'all, the pro does a good job of running with your FW.
- There are a few key issues with the phrasing of your FW. Make sure you consider that the resolution uses the word "should," not "would."
- You spend so much time focusing on environment without clearly impacting it back to the US's well being, disregarding the FW.
- Make sure you make the impacts of America having to give its trade secrets away clear.

Comments for Rajaboina & Karthikeyan

- Try to stay away from clarification questions if possible.
- Try to take less prep before the first rebuttal so you don't put yourself in a difficult situation later in the round.
- When the con reads a four contention case, make sure you cover them all at least a bit. That being said, if you had to leave one contention without direct responses, I think you chose wisely with C3.
- I don't like the "corporations can safely/ethically deep-sea mine" angle. It's kind of hard to win that deep sea mining is a safe strategy, but even if it is, you need to prove that these ethical methods exist.
- If your soft power impacts come from the existence of an American veto privilege, know the scope and feasibility of that a bit better.
- I think dropping C2 in FF lost you a lot of good offense.

Amanti & Hepworth vs Lancaster & Javadpoor

Singh



Singh, Kshitiz

RFD

NC impact of royalties and lawsuits was the only one that flowed through and outweighed all AC impacts of benefits of cooperation and deep sea mining

Jiang & Cheema vs Whitfield & Pak



Bakhle, Ishaan

RFD

Both sides agree that args must impact back to the US. The pro has two arguments that somewhat clearly impact back to the US, but the con comes up short. This round is framed so that I vote for the side that maximizes utility for the US, and the pro succeeds.

Comments for Jiang & Cheema

- You take a risky strat by not impacting your C1 args back to the US. It's not necessarily wrong, but you might have to prove why you take that angle.
- Try not to ask for clarification on sources in cross, just call for them in prep. You lose a combined 41 seconds on source clarification.
- Focus on clashing directly with pro responses. There wasn't nearly enough clash in this round.
- Explain the lake thing a bit more clearly. A judge with no understanding of the South China Sea conflict likely would struggle to follow it.
- Take all of your prep, it can't hurt you.

Comments for Whitfield & Pak

- Be more careful when saying the US has no say in the 9-dash line claim.
- I'd phrase C3 as security.
- Phrase your answers to the con's C2 as "low likelihood of environmental lawsuit."
- Y'all should also stay away from clarification questions.
- Garner more clash by directly engaging with the con's offense.

- Run all your prep, it's not going to hurt you.
- I need more than claims that con args don't make any sense. Explain why the claims don't matter.
- Good job impacting everything back to the US.

Soni & Kumar vs Shakir & Lee



Singh, Kshitiz

RFD

NC contention 3 is outweighed and blocked in Aff rebuttal, internal affairs framework is both unclear and I buy the FF argument that the AC wins under both. Diplomacy argument in aff contention 1 flow through cleanly giving aff strong impacts, which outweigh the neg penalties of royalties. Contention 2,3 flow through on Aff, which adds more economic impacts

Pak & Chai vs Badireddi & Meng



Cohen, Jordan

RFD

Rfd: voted for the team that had more evidence. Most arguments on both sides were unwarranted and thus dropped. The con had the only arguments left (china blocks effectiveness while decreasing us sovereignty) and (royalties to other countries)

So & Vo vs Tambe & Meng



Flores, Matthew

RFD

I voted CON only because of the interpretation of the US' ability to mine in the Arctic. Although the US technically can't, the PRO stated that the US has the ability to do so. Given the information and interpretations in the round, the CON won the economic debate as the Arctic issue became non-unique. Had the PRO provided evidence or correctly interpreted US claims to mining rights, I would've voted PRO.

Flores & Franklin vs Quadir & Badireddi



Cho, Yunuen

RFD

ALL SPEECHES NEED ORGANIZATION!!! voted on the weight of climate change lawsuits

Nolan & Zhang vs Nguyen & Mathew



Shaffstall, Jack

RFD

I voted on Econ here, mostly. I felt as if the Aff did a good job of talking about why the economy would go up, though I still would have preferred some more quantifiable impacts on the Aff. This outweighed the Neg's econ impact because of what i discussed with you after the round, in that the existence of EEZ's already exists, and that as such the econ detriments y'all were trying to access didn't actually exist. The same things happen with the Neg's impacts regarding US intervention in that we already do it; UNCLOS won't change that status quo so we won't really access those impacts either. That's why I went with the Aff on International conflicts, as well, because the Aff provided even hypothetical evidence of the US relationship with China improving.

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