



PF ROUND 4

Online Ballot Comments

Round 4

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

Carns & Sanchez vs Warrier & Nair

Flores



Flores, Matthew

RFD

I think the round was really closed only because the CON didn't extend their 2nd and 3rd contentions that were responded to by the PRO. With that said, I do believe that the CON won on the environment and despite this error, they one the round as a whole.

McNamara & Hu vs Whitfield & Pak



Flores, Matthew

RFD

I think the CON had a better debating style, was able to properly extend arguments, and had proper refutation. However, the CON case/constructive gave me little offense to work with. The CON gave me "reasons to not vote for the PRO" as opposed to "reasons to vote for the CON". Because of this, the little offense the PRO had left became the only offense in the round, giving the win to the PRO.

Nimbkar & Rivera vs So & Vo

Cohen



Cohen, Jordan

RFD

Rfd: con dropped c2 and c3, pro had extended responses anyway. Economy is my sole voter.

Con drops c1b, pro cross aps it with c1 anyway. I buy that there is significant oil available in the artic and ecs. Con c1a royalties and research distribution turned and outweighed by pro.

Pak & Chai vs Fernandez & Nguyen

Wang



Wang, Christina

RFD

I voted for the Con side because both of their key voters flowed through. The first Key Voter, Senate Resources, was essentially untouched in both rebuttal and summary, and Con really emphasized and weighed the importance of their three impacts, immigration, debt, and healthcare. I also like the analysis of focusing on domestic issues that are more time-sensitive rather getting involved in international issues and potentially feeding undemocratic nations, which also went unrefuted. I also voted on economy because Con gives me a tangible empiric about how much it will cost the US through royalties, and Pro responds, but never really provides tangible impacts or weighs the argument they provide, which is that the US can support other nations economically through trade and resources. Furthermore, the Con's framework goes unrefuted, and it was upheld by their key voters, so I voted off of that as well. Great job to both teams!

Comments for Pak & Chai

Your case was pretty well organized, but I would like to see more impacts that I can weigh. The mention of protecting lives of service men and women is a good point, but it is not really impacted or warranted, and the Con side says that freedom of navigation dismantles this argument. I also would like to mention that I do not really buy the argument that because the military says we should join UNCLOS that we should, just because they're the military and we owe it to them. Furthermore, it would be a little better if there was more signposting in rebuttal. Overall, great job!

Comments for Fernandez & Nguyen

You both did a great job! Your confidence and speaking styles are great, and you went for the right things when you crystallized in summary (and did a good job following that in FF) which I really liked. The weighing in Summary and FF were also really good, and I appreciate y'all flowing everything across throughout the round. Great job!!

Kantrud & Tripathi vs Baur & Sigsworth

Mazzarella



Mazzarella, Annie

RFD

I don't buy any of neg's arguments, the US is obviously not the only factor in such a foreign policy-heavy resolution. (Will fill in more comments later, aff just gave me more to vote on, didn't really want to vote for either side though)

Flores & Franklin vs Amanti & Hepworth



Mazzarella, Annie

RFD

Neg gives me clear voters (econ, environment, sovereignty) and while I don't necessarily buy all of these arguments (especially about sovereignty and I recommend you better weigh them + edit the argument/impact in general) I flow them through and vote on them.

LaCrosse & Gurjala vs Jiang & Cheema

Shaffstall



Shaffstall, Jack

RFD

The Aff did a very good job emphasizing all of their voters. Their International Relations and Lives voters had more scope than the Environment voter and so they were able to widen the impacts of this debate. I feel if the Neg had really impacted the environment they would have done better when it came to weighing, but even still the Aff won the environmental impacts, as well.

Rajaboina & Karthikeyan vs Soni & Kumar



Cohen, Jordan

RFD

Rfd: pro's c1 completely flows through. I buy US hege increases under the pro C2 and the pro turn on con's c2. Under econ, the con misconstrued the royalties claim under the brookings ecs card, econ flows to pro under impact outweigh

Choi & Pallal vs Nolan & Zhang

Cohen



Cohen, Shayna

RFD

General:

- everyone can signpost a bit more
- if you say you have 2 key voters, make sure you actually use key voters
- thank you for not having a FW debate

RFD:

On the issues of economy and military, my ballot goes to the Aff. First, on economy, Aff clearly outweighed on their empirics against the warrant of royalties, since that was never really expanded upon. Then, on military, I buy Aff's warrants more than Neg's. Just because conflict happens between China and other countries, it doesn't mean that the US will have the same amount of conflict as a large Western power.

Comments for Choi & Pallal

Choi Constructive: This case is great! I think the structure needs a little work at times; you want your impacts to be short, clear, and to the point.

Choi Cross-fire: Great job taking control of cross-fire!! Be sure to know your warrants though.

Pillai Rebuttal: Your responses are great and confident! I think you could benefit from more organization by signposting/numbering your responses. That way you could have more to say attacking their actual case, have less pauses, and use all your time. Keep an organized blockfile so you have a lot to say about their case!

Pillai Cross-fire: Nice questions and answers!

Choi Summary: Thank you so much for using key voters :) Nice analysis on the 1st KV, especially the whole world vs u.s. impact analysis! However, I wish you spent more time on the second key voter, which I'm assuming was international relations, because that's where most of the clash is.

Grand Cross-fire: Nice job taking control again! Also, the laissez-faire question should have been asked earlier; it's barely even important at this point.

Pillai Final Focus: don't bring up new cards on the environment in FF, especially when it wasn't mentioned the entire round. Thanks for spending more time on military, because that's where the clash is. Just make sure you go over both sides and weigh impacts UNDER the key voters, not after them.

Comments for Nolan & Zhang

Zhang Constructive: This is a solid case! The main feedback I have is to a) clarify impacts, and b) read through your case more so you can enunciate really well without stumbling.

Zhang Cross-fire: Solid answers, but make sure that you're asking a lot of questions as well! You get a lot better at this as the cross-fire goes on :)

Nolan Rebuttal: I'm a little confused about why you begin your rebuttal on your own case instead of theirs. You eventually move on to their case, but I'm a little confused about where you're going on the flow. Please signpost and use all your time! It was a bit difficult to get clear responses on the flow, so say things like "in response to their Contention 1, I have 3 responses."

Nolan Cross-fire: You do a good job, but don't be afraid to be a little more assertive at first! Later on you start answering questions more confidently, but starting out that way would benefit you :)

Zhang Summary: I think your key voters could be a little bit clearer.

Grand Cross-fire: Your definition for laissez-faire sort of makes sense, but if you use that term, you really have to know what it means in the context of the US economy.

Nolan Final Focus: 3 key voters is a little much. Also, make sure your key voters line up with your partner's. Finally, weigh impacts in Final Focus, and explain why your arguments matter more.

Vega & Mittlestedt vs Quadir & Badireddi



Cohen, Shayna

RFD

General:

- grand cross-fire is late in the round to ask for cards. you can't make new arguments in FF

RFD:

This is an Aff ballot on the issues of economy and military. On economy, Aff explained their warrants better and successfully defended against the royalties argument while extending impacts from the Arctic contention. On military, I bought that they turned the developing nations impact and the only Neg response was a cross-application of framework to mitigate the impacts. The framework was responded to and dropped, so Aff won on both economy and military.

Comments for Vega & Mittlestedt

Vega Constructive: Nice enunciation with speed, just read through it between rounds to prevent stumbling :) Cut your case a little if it's too long

Vega Cross-fire: Thanks for asking targeted questions :) "Just scratch that" lmao obviously try to avoid that.

Mittlestedt Rebuttal: Try to avoid reading a block word for word for a long period of time; just know what your blocks are and paraphrase. Great job signposting! Make sure you use the word "turn" correctly, you turned the impact of their C1 but didn't say it and then said international stability was a turn when it wasn't.

Mittlestedt Cross-fire: Nice job taking control and explaining how royalties work and your warrants. Also, thanks for directing cross-fire elsewhere when it got redundant.

Vega Summary: You shouldn't have "responses" in summary; those are for rebuttal. Just summarize the round under key voters. YOU SPEND 1:30 ON YOUR 1st KV! Three key voters is always a bit risky, and I think your last two could have been combined into one. Just fix your structure and time allocation and you'll be golden :)

Grand Cross-fire: Solid job, but Miranda asked most of the questions. I know Taylor has very limited prep time, but she should still be engaged (you get better at this later).

Mittlestedt Final Focus: Thanks for pointing out that their summary is defensive! You spend 20 seconds on it though, so use a little less time on it. Solid warrants for 1st key voter, just weigh by saying they have no econ impacts. Ohhhh okay i think I get what you were saying about the turn from earlier. Nice job!!! I'd just try to weigh a little more with some two worlds analysis

Comments for Quadir & Badireddi

Badireddi Constructive: Make sure your impacts are clear; you can straight up say "the impact is." Your C3 seems pretty defensive. You need an offensive impact about why it's harmful, not why it's not needed.

Badireddi Cross-fire: Make sure you know answers to questions without needing help from your partner.

Quadir Rebuttal: You have solid responses, you just need to roadmap more. You tend to jump all over the flow. Instead of reading evidence word-for-word, paraphrase and make your own responses with clear warrants.

Quadir Cross-fire: Make sure you're well-versed in your arguments; don't let your opponents explain your own arguments to you.

Badireddi Summary: Use key voters! Also, all of the impacts you mention are defensive. If UNCLOS isn't necessary, why exactly shouldn't we affirm? Why is it innately harmful? Those are the impacts you should have extended.

Grand Cross-fire: You guys seem a little disheartened :(stay confident!

Quadir Final Focus: You can't extend your framework because a) they responded to it, and b) you dropped it, so I don't buy the credibility response. Please use key voters and weigh impacts! A lot of these responses should have been brought up earlier.

Nguyen & Mathew vs Shakir & Lee

Sidapara



Sidapara, Adi

RFD

Pro won my ballot for mining access. It was hard for me to evaluate the round on the basis of poor quantifications on both sides, but when Con couldn't quantify or empirically analyze the effects of China not listening and environment going bad, mining access was much more accessible to me as the judge.

Frey & Flansbaum vs Khanna & Chow



Wang, Christina

RFD

General Feedback: I ended up voting for the con side because I bought both of their key voters. Throughout the round, they had more impacts that they actively weighed throughout the round, and pointed out as well that the pro side was lacking in impacts and empirics, which was true.

Framework: I didn't really buy the Con's framework because I did find it mildly abusive, although that didn't end up mattering much in the round anyway because the two contentions on the Con side flowed through. In most any big international treaty or decision, there will be downsides for certain parties and it's impossible for everyone to enter an agreement without any reservations. Even on a small scale, every decision someone makes might be clouded by doubt at first or have minor setbacks, but that doesn't mean that at the end of the day, the person making the decision has "reservations" about it once their decision is made. It could be that the setback is something they accept responsibility for and have no reservations about their decision.

A couple specific things I'd like to mention on the flow: Con team, when Pro drops all of your impacts in C1, mention it. Chow did a pretty job cross applying contentions in rebuttal. The historical example about the Philippines was good. I think the point brought up in Pro Final Focus about a lot of impacts on the Con side being hypothetical was a good one, but it was brought up too late in the round for me to weigh it. I think next time if you want to make the argument that something is hypothetical, bring it up earlier, and ask for evidence if you want to question the legitimacy of the argument. I didn't get as much warranting on the Pro side, which is ultimately why Con wins both the key voters, that you guys seemed to agree on. Great round overall!!!

Comments for Frey & Flansbaum

I like your arguments, but I would prefer slightly more warranting and impacts, because you didn't have many actual empirics in your case. Flansbaum, in your rebuttal, make sure that you number your three responses because I only caught the first one signposted, and the other two you listed as "also." Great job guys!

Comments for Khanna & Chow

Ya'll had a pretty strong case from the get-go based on the way it was set up, with impacts directly following warrants. Great job!

Justice & Hays vs Badireddi & Meng



Sidapara, Adi

RFD

Voted for pro on the basis of econ, environment, and foreign relations.

Comments for Justice & Hays

extend logic and analysis more cleanly. weigh more.

Comments for Badireddi & Meng

use all your time and please extend!! also use carded responses.

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

[About](#) [Help](#)