



PF FINALS

Online Ballot Comments

Finals

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

Gaudet & Exum vs Frey & Flansbaum

Cohen, Flores,
Mazzarella, Sidapara,
Srinivasan

Cohen, Shayna

RFD

General:

- in grand cross-fire, please don't do the novice turn :(

RFD:

given in round

Comments for Gaudet & Exum

Exum Constructive: I love your enthusiasm and your first contention! The second contention is okay, but it seems a little defensive. You eventually turn to an offensive analysis by explaining the chance of the US losing its rights from Proclamation 2667 by ratifying UNCLOS, but you either need to a) emphasize that more, or b) stick this in your block file

Exum Cross-fire: Nice job taking control of the cross-fire while still being super polite! :)

Gaudet Rebuttal: Solid energy! Numbering your responses and have an organized block file would have probably made it easier to a) not have a period of time when you're trying to find something, and b) limit cross-applications of your own case. Be sure to have other cards cut for blocks that aren't in your own case. It will give you more offense on the flow.

Gaudet Cross-fire: I LOVE the analysis on challenging US rights in the SQ that you bring up in rebuttal and continue in cross-fire. I hope this probability mechanism is extended through Summary and weighed in Final Focus. (also, you start to novice turn a little bit, which is easier to do when your opponent is looking at you, but always look at the judge!

Exum Summary: Nice job weighing warrants and explaining why your arguments make more sense than theirs. I don't think the military over diplomacy overview is necessary; just try to win on each key voter because just saying that military is better at the top of your speech isn't a meaningful use of time.

Gaudet Final Focus: I wish you extended the probability method of weighing, and just generally weigh impacts a little more, but overall solid job!

Comments for Frey & Flansbaum

Frey Constructive: You don't seem very passionate when reading your case. The constructive is the time to put some energy into your voice and emphasize impacts! I think your case is solid, but more examples on how other countries truly believe the US doesn't have rights to think like the ECS would make your argument on legitimacy much stronger.

Frey Cross-fire: Try to ask targeted questions instead of "Can you elaborate on..." It allows your opponents to take control of the cross-fire.

Flansbaum Rebuttal: You could benefit from more organization and signposting your responses. Make sure all of your responses directly correlate with their claims, links, and warrants. A lot of their links are about how UNCLOS forces the US to think about legal consequences before acting, but you focus on backlash from China without addressing the warrant that feeds into it. Also, use all your time!

Flansbaum Cross-fire: Don't do the novice turn! Instead of looking at your opponent, look at the judge! They're the only person who matters in the round.

Frey Summary: Your analysis on the diplomacy key voter seems to ignore warrants. Their C1 wasn't about China not listening, but about the US not having as much ability to use military power in the SCS. Also, you focus A LOT on their case without extending your own, which limits the amount of offense you can have at the end of the debate. Summary is the time to weigh your warrants and prove why your arguments make more sense, so make sure that's what the speech is about.

Flansbaum Final Focus: I like the impacts and rhetoric you bring up! However, I think you could have weighed your impacts more against the impacts they're trying to provide in the Neg world. You weigh that any possibility of benefit is better than having nothing, which is awesome, but those aren't really the impacts they're going for in the round.

Flores, Matthew

RFD

Although there were no hard impacts, I think that the PRO won on the Econ, which gave me a reason to vote PRO. CON gave me reasons to not vote PRO, but very few offensive points.

Mazzarella, Annie

RFD

I vote neg because I buy the idea that China won't play nice. Econ becomes a wash for me because neither team uses dollar amounts and I vote off military/diplomacy.

Sidapara, Adi

RFD

Voted on military > diplomacy. Econ was wash. Need more quantifications.

Srinivasan, Shik

RFD

international relations boils down to diplomacy and military relations

- i agree neg wins here that military outweighs diplomacy. no weighing was done between the two, so i have to intervene and i'm not convinced that we would lose the right to challenge under unclos
- only warrant is giving credence to china's gorund

economy boils down to the arctic and this 200 mile zone.

- aff is arguing that we need legal certainty for oil, fishing, and shipping. the one (rare) instance of clash is the aff saying this outweighs the arctic, as well as defensive arguments about why we would still keep access to the arctic. i think the aff wins here

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