



PF OCTAFINALS

Online Ballot Comments

Octafinals

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

Vega & Mittlestedt vs Nguyen & Mathew

Bakhle



Bakhle, Ishaan

RFD

The round comes down to two voting issues: econ and IR. I vote for the pro on both. While both the pro and the con have a fundamental misunderstanding of the 93/7 debate, the pro successfully proves that any economic losses in royalties are brought back in control of the Arctic. Pro wins on econ there. On IR, the con fails to prove to me that UNCLOS's limitations on American negotiating power won't be outweighed by increased standing amongst powerful UNCLOS-compliant states such as Russia and China.

Comments for Vega & Mittlestedt

-The 93% answer doesn't consider that while the US still turns a profit, it's reduced.

-The evidence credibility argument is cool and I don't even disagree with it, but I think it's wiser to focus in on the flaws in the author's argument as opposed to just calling him out for being one sided. As much as I dislike research done by the two sources they call upon, you have to prove to me why the research itself is flawed.

-While cited sources are nice, the absence of them doesn't invalidate an argument.

Comments for Nguyen & Mathew

-I struggled to hear first speaker through the round. Make sure that you focus on speaking up if you have a judge that says they can't hear well like me.

-The 7% analysis was hard to follow. Focus on breaking down American economic losses a bit more clearly.

-Try to stay away from clarification in cross.

-Rebuttal: I know that y'all have a lot to cover, which is why it's important that you move fast. That being said, I need more warranting on the aff's C2.

-The fact that the US is still in a position of intl power doesn't prove that it's not losing it.

-The "Russia/China are going to share with the US" argument is a little bit hard to follow.

-If y'all are going to have numerous cards from the same author, make sure you number them when you extend them through in later speeches.

-You make some pretty crucial concessions down the road, try to phrase them with more nuance so you don't make them seem as glaring as they are.

-Your econ strat should have focused on precedent and IR should have focused on the lack of substantial influence that the US could gain.

Fernandez & Nguyen vs Frey & Flansbaum

Cohen



Cohen, Jordan

RFD

Rfd: con dropped econ, pro extends econ eez and ecs. Pro wins on diplo/unclos effectiveness with their turn to con's c3.

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