



## PF ROUND 3

Online Ballot  
Comments

## Round 3

[Return to Schematic](#)[Return to Round Results](#)Flores & Franklin vs  
Soni & Kumar

Cohen



## Cohen, Jordan

## RFD

Rfd: con dropped their entire case. Pro flowed through 2 contentions dropping one. Con's rebuttal of pro c3 for econ not being specific doesn't block. Accepted framework is economic as the most important impact.

Kantrud & Tripathi vs  
Amanti & Hepworth

Sidapara



## Sidapara, Adi

## RFD

Voted for pro on the basis of economy and safety. Economy impacts were not quantified, but I bought the access to resources. Safety was most important for me, and Con would've had the ballot if they had the card for their link to UNCLOS restricts anti-piracy operations. Overall, good debate.

Whitfield & Pak vs Vega  
& Mittlestedt

Mazzarella



## Mazzarella, Annie

## RFD

Aff hardly puts anything on my flow for me to vote on. They don't give me voters and they drop almost the entirety of neg's case (52 s rebuttal) Neg tells me to vote on political capital and national security and they are able to extend all of their impacts from such, so it's a simple decision. Unfortunately, there isn't a lot of clash in this round and there wasn't much discussion. Aff was not BAD by any means (y'all are at camp to learn and grow!) but they need to significantly beef up their speeches and organization within said speeches to have been comparable in this round.

## Comments for Whitfield &amp; Pak

All of the speeches are significantly under time. Rebuttal only 52 seconds, summary 1:40, FF 1:50. Use all of your time to put as many responses on their case and arguments as you can. Even when you don't have blocks cut or prepared, use logical responses, cross-apply your own case, talk about

as many things as you can. It's okay, it's a process, you will get better. But you need to keep practicing. Keep watching rounds. You need to use as much content as possible and you just didn't.

## Comments for Vega & Mittlestedt

Rebuttal: good/true/correct responses but speaking a little fast and a little disorganized. Go down your flow and be very clear about what you're responding to where; I kind of end up just flowing your responses next to the tags on their contentions.

Summary: You don't talk about voters until a full minute in. If your issues on the flow are quick, note them at the beginning, but otherwise, group them UNDER the voters.

FF: a little disorganized. I'm voting for you at this point, but just go directly into your voters and extend everything Taylor said in summary.

---

## Nimbkar & Rivera vs Gaudet & Exum

Flores



---

### Flores, Matthew

RFD

The round was super close, but I ended up buying the PRO extensions of a legal basis given to US actions in the sea, as well as the positive economic benefits. Although the terrorism argument was well made by the CON, a seat on the ISA is better than nothing, and because the CON has no other offense the US should have no other reason not to join.

---

## Lancaster & Javadpoor vs Quadir & Badireddi



---

### Cohen, Jordan

RFD

Rfd: The con's C1 isn't a reason to negate. Weighing on economy, con's c2 was flows through and pro's econ case is nonunique

---

## So & Vo vs Choi & Pallal

Berlat



---

### Berlat, Kevin

RFD

In the framework debate, Pro does not answer, and Con provides reasons why the framework is superior in the round.

## Comments for So & Vo

Oral critique.

## Comments for Choi & Pallal

---

## Justice & Hays vs Warrier & Nair

Shaffstall



---

### Shaffstall, Jack

RFD

As much as I disagree with the rhetoric surrounding the vulnerability section of Contention, I felt as if it not being addressed by the Aff in the rebuttal was a mistake as it gave the Neg access to really strong impacts. I considered the national security arguments, too, and still found that the Neg was on top due to their assertion that the United States needed more flexibility in how it responded including the ability to be covert. Regarding the Aff's final focus, I felt as if the Neg did an adequate job even with their final focus talking about how environmental impacts are only hypothetical and that the environmental restrictions are unenforceable. Regarding the Aff's voter of the South China Sea, I feel like this could have been very strong had you drawn the impacts out and told me exactly what stopping the S China Sea conflict would mean.

---

## Baur & Sigsworth vs LaCrosse & Gurjala



---

### Sidapara, Adi

RFD

Economy access. International affairs w/ countering Russia. Key voters were weighed well.

---

## Stork & Mosher vs Tambe & Meng



---

### Flores, Matthew

RFD

The round was SUPER close. However, the PRO did concede to the fact that we don't need UNCLOS to reach the Arctic. At that point, the US is losing money when it doesn't have to, with little to no benefits outside of the Arctic. Because of that, the CON wins on negative economic impacts to the US.

---

## Nguyen & Mathew vs Badireddi & Meng



---

### Shaffstall, Jack

RFD

I weighed for the most part on Econ. I felt as if the points on International Relations were barely mentioned in Summary and Final Focus, and even then only by the Neg, so it went to them. Going back to Econ, I preferred the Neg's evidence on econ because they had more quantifiable impacts than the potentiality of increased trade relations.

## Khanna & Chow vs Rajaboina & Karthikeyan



### Mazzarella, Annie

#### RFD

Round comes down to US credibility and stability. I vote aff because I buy the idea that UNCLOS ratification deters Chinese aggression better than what is currently in the status quo, as well as the fact that neg gave me nothing to vote on (framework is not a voter) so I have to flow aff's voters through. Neg needed to show the status quo is significantly better off re: Chinese aggression.

#### Comments for Khanna & Chow

Good rebuttal, but be more clear about what you're responding to when. You make good/true responses but I end up kind of just randomly flowing them next to the tags on the contentions instead of down my flow. Summary: good choice with the voters and I do end up flowing them through but you need to be significantly more organized. Slow down a bit and group things in a more logical sequence. You say the correct things but I would have liked to see more extending/weighing.

#### Comments for Rajaboina & Karthikeyan

Both speak too quickly and leave too much time in speeches. You need to slow down as well as add more content, EVERY single one of your speeches is significantly under time. You could have certainly used that time to argue back against Chinese aggression which became the main decision in the round. FW is not a voter, you need to use key voters in your summary and FF. We discussed all of this after the round, but I really needed to reiterate all of it.

## Frey & Flansbaum vs Shakir & Lee

Cho



### Cho, Yunuen

#### RFD

Shakir Lee won the framework debate just because they said net benefits were being discussed in the round. Frey Flansbaum won the round because sovereignty pushing there would be no extra rights and linked it to losing power to China and being vulnerable. I also bought the royalties. Even if the US had access to arctic and other parts of the sea they may be gridlocked and that was what I perceived from the round.

## Pak & Chai vs Nolan & Zhang

Cohen



## Cohen, Shayna

### RFD

RFD by Coach Yunuen - Con weighed their impacts, they show how US has more access to the seas. More confidence with all of your speeches and more organization will help.

## McNamara & Hu vs Fernandez & Nguyen



## Cohen, Shayna

### RFD

General:

- PLEASE USE KEY VOTERS! AND WEIGH IMPACTS!
- on FW: the US isn't the only country that should be impacted to. It's an international treaty!!!!
- this round was pretty muddled :(

RFD:

I'm voting Aff because they made the round clearest to understand. They brought up the issue of the environment that seemed to be dropped a lot by the Neg, so that was the easiest issue, but also their responses on economy regarding the Arctic were effective. Overall, it was close mainly because it was pretty muddled.

### Comments for McNamara & Hu

**McNamara Constructive:** This case is solid, but you spend a lot of time on FW that isn't totally necessary to spend a lot of time on. I think your 1st contention is good evidence-wise, but the argument is defensive (you're just saying it's unnecessary, so why shouldn't we affirm?) and the impact about the American people is a stretch. Just because people in one state don't know a lot about an issue, does that mean it isn't worth solving? Also, solid speed for a flow judge at least, but try to enunciate just a bit more :)

**McNamara Cross-fire:** Nice job asking targeted questions!

**Hu Rebuttal:** You spend a lot of time in rebuttal explaining what they say instead of your responses. This speech is called the rebuttal, not the rehash! I really like the response you do end up making though, just try to avoid long pauses like the one you had. Power through!!! :) Something that might help you avoid pauses is roadmapping and numbering your responses, so that you're organized and always know exactly where to go on the flow.

**Hu Cross-fire:** Ask a few more questions and take a little more control! It's okay to be a bit more assertive.

**McNamara Summary:** This feels a little more like a rebuttal and less like a summary, at least at the beginning. It's great that you emphasize clash, but please make sure that you use key voters! Also, you have a great speaking voice! Focus a little more on organization and actually summing up the biggest issues of the round in a way that benefits you.

**Grand Cross-fire:** Carrie, thanks for not doing the novice turn! Solid job being assertive this cross-fire :) wait, Savannah had a solid line of questioning and wasn't being stopped, so continue it! It is the other team's responsibility to succinctly answer your questions and reject any follow-ups.

**Hu Final Focus:** It's good that you bring up the environment, but I think it was dropped earlier. Also, please weigh and use key voters!! They're important and make things much easier for the judge!

### Comments for Fernandez & Nguyen

**Fernandez Constructive:** Great case and great enunciation! Just be sure to look up a bit. I think it's great that you have solid examples and warrants that explain them :)

**Fernandez Cross-fire:** Great job being polite, but be sure to ask targeted questions about warrants, not just taglines. Also, don't say sorry or apologize! Be confident!!!

**Nguyen Rebuttal:** The beginning is a little confusing, make sure you have a solid idea for the opening of your speech. You do a great job allocating time for their C2, but barely touch on their 1st contention. Great job numbering responses in response to their C2! Just try to read a little less from your laptop and speak more extemporaneously. I know their C1 is defensive, but you still spent WAYYY too much time opening and their C2. I didn't get much on the flow for their C1 from you, so it might lead to a clean extension.

**Nguyen Cross-fire:** Great job having a lot of questions and making them targeted at specific warrants!

**Fernandez Summary:** PLEASE USE KEY VOTERS! They make the round so much clearer and ensure that you focus on clear issues that encapsulate the whole round. Instead you just kind of focus on your own case.

**Grand Cross-fire:** Ask questions as well! A majority of the cross-fire is spent with you answering their questions! Say "may I ask a question"! Take control!

**Nguyen Final Focus:** OMG THANK YOU FOR FINALLY MENTIONING KEY VOTERS! They need to be introduced in the summary speech. They could still use more structure and a lot more weighing, because your speech ends up a little bit all over the flow.

## Jiang & Cheema vs Carns & Sanchez



### Cho, Yunuen

#### RFD

General:

- pleaseeee don't have evidence debates in grand cross
- use key voters and signpost!!! organization is way more important than you might think it is

RFD:

The issue to vote on in this round is economy, and the Neg seemed to win on it. The Neg had the clearest warrants and had the most weighing on the issue of royalties, so they get my ballot.

#### Comments for Jiang & Cheema

**Cheema Constructive:** Solid case, just read through it a lot to prevent stumbles/unintended pauses. Also, be sure to make eye contact and stay engaged with the judge.

**Cheema Cross-fire:** It's okay to ask for clarification on evidence, but don't let it take up a lot of time. Also, even when experiencing disruptions, stay professional.

**Jiang Rebuttal:** Don't say "you", say "my opponents". Try to avoid reading stuff word for word in rebuttal. Nice analysis on the 93% idea. Try not to look at your partners flow in the middle of your speech or have a long pause, and always try to use all of your time.

**Jiang Cross-fire:** Nitpicking about evidence isn't as effective as attacking links/warrants. Don't read evidence in cross-fire; they can use their prep time to read it on their own.

**Cheema Summary:** Please use key voters! Evaluate the two main issues instead of jumping all over the flow.

**Jiang Final Focus:** You needed to weigh impacts in Final Focus! Otherwise there's no point to the speech.

#### Comments for Carns & Sanchez

**Carns Constructive:** Going fast is fine, just enunciate a lot and try not to run out of breath :) Mario - giving your partner sticky notes (Especially during a pre-written constructive) comes off as a bit sketchy. Finally, cut your case! You were 30 seconds over time reading quickly.

**Carns Cross-fire:** Nice enthusiasm! Make sure you have a lot of questions prepared though

**Sanchez Rebuttal:** Speak off of your flow, not off of sticky notes. Also, try to have more substantial responses instead of nitpicky ones (you get better at this as the speech goes on). Nice mitigation on the economy point with royalties! Try to be more organized so you have less pauses. Always end with a solid "please negate" :)

**Sanchez Cross-fire:** Good job being assertive and asking targeted questions! Also, nitpicking about evidence isn't as effective as attacking links/warrants. Ask questions, not statements.

**Carns Summary:** Thanks for having at least one key voter! Mario-stay seated, showing your partner stuff in the middle of the speech looks bad to the judge and seems to disrupt the speech. It's distracting. Emma - just breathe! Go slow if you need to, it seems like you're running out of breath.

**Sanchez Final Focus:** Framework doesn't matter in this round, so don't focus on it.

---

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