

ires State Championships: Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate Ballot

AD-Clackamas LL vs AM-Lake Oswego GL  
 Room: 31 Start: 9:30  
 Open CX -- Rd 1

Time 0 Judge Samaica Jones

Affirmative Code AD/Clackamas LL Negative Code AM/Lake Oswego GL

First Aff. <u>Casey</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 <u>(26)</u> 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*	First Neg. <u>Gabriel</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 26 <u>(25)</u> 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*
Second Aff. <u>Schaathon</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 <u>(26)</u> 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*	Second Neg. <u>Cal</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 26 <u>(25)</u> 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*

\*If one of the debaters was rude, please report it to the ballot table. Otherwise, you may not rate below a 20.

The debate was won by Aff (Team Code) representing AD clackamas LL (Aff or Neg). Check if Low Point win.

Judge's Signature [Signature] Judge's School 0

Topic: 0

Constructives: 8 min; Cross-Examinations: 3 min; Rebuttals: 5 min; Prep Time: 5 min

WRITE THOROUGH COMMENTS TO EACH DEBATER. GIVE REASONS WHY YOU VOTED FOR ONE SIDE. PLEASE STATE WHAT THE LOSING DEBATER NEEDED TO DO TO WIN. you all did awesome. keep at this. Policy debate is awesome.

Oral critiques are not allowed.

- IAC: You need to signpost, not just say "next" - it will be easier to extend later. Speed drills!! Don't let your partner answer all your CX questions, or ask them for that matter
- INC: You shouldn't need prep before this speech, prepare a strategy during the IAC. Be sure to signpost, instead of just saying "next". Your circumvention offcase/GR needs mpx. Speed drills! Your cyberwar oncase is actually a DA, run it offcase, it is at the very least a case turn. Tell me where you're going on case ie solvency contention?, instead of reading a slew of cards that I don't know where to flow
- 2AC: Good. Though, don't just say "they conceded" - extend your cards, & apply them. Signpost! slow down just a tiny bit for tags. Don't talk over your partner, seriously.
- 2AC: Everyone in this round needs to signpost. Work on your line by line, answer their specific arguments instead of just reading extensions. Use all of your time, just make it up even! Get to know your evidence more, you didn't answer a single question!
- 1AB: Answer the line by line - they have impact turns, etc you need to address, don't concede anything. Just reading a bunch of new evidence doesn't answer their args. Give me a roadmap. Signpost.
- 1AB: Don't let your partner talk over you. Great line by line. Extend +, & apply your cards, especially your obligation to poverty card. Your partner didn't need to reexplain your turns - you did it fine on the flow. Use all of your time.
- 2AB: Roadmap!! Address their turns! They will pretty much automatically if you don't, extend your args
- 2AB: I would have given you higher <sup>speaks if you didn't tool your partner,</sup> (No Be 14" in Length) extend your impact turn!! - you spent a lot of time on it in the 1AR

Sample Roadmap: 2 off case, then solvency, then contention 1. ~ short + sweet



AM-Lake Oswego SM vs AD-Clackamas HL Fires State Championships: Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate Ballot

Room: 133 Start: 9:30

Open CX -- Rd 1

Time \_\_\_\_\_

Judge Marissa Jane Bertucci

Affirmative Code AM Lakeo SM

Negative Code AD Clack HL

<p>First Aff. <u>Jaden</u></p> <p>Circle Rating:</p> <p>30 29 28 (27) 26 25 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p>Superior Needs Improvement*</p>	<p>First Neg. <u>Priya</u> <del>William</del></p> <p>Circle Rating:</p> <p>30 29 28 27 26 25 (24) 23 22 21 20</p> <p>Superior Needs Improvement*</p>
<p>Second Aff. <u>John</u></p> <p>Circle Rating:</p> <p>30 29 28 (27) 26 25 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p>Superior Needs Improvement*</p>	<p>Second Neg. <u>William</u></p> <p>Circle Rating:</p> <p>30 29 28 27 (26) 25 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p>Superior Needs Improvement*</p>

\*If one of the debaters was rude, please report it to the ballot table. Otherwise, you may not rate below a 20.

The debate was won by AM Lakeo SM (Team Code) representing Aff (Aff or Neg). Check if Low Point win.

Judge's Signature MYRO

Judge's School Gresham HS

Topic: USFBI should substantially curtail its dom. surveillance

Constructives: 8 min; Cross-Examinations: 3 min; Rebuttals: 5 min; Prep Time: 5 min

WRITE THOROUGH COMMENTS TO EACH DEBATER. GIVE REASONS WHY YOU VOTED FOR ONE SIDE. PLEASE STATE WHAT THE LOSING DEBATER NEEDED TO DO TO WIN.

Good job & good luck, y'all! :)  
Oral critiques are not allowed.

PPD: Neg needed to adjust to directly engage with Aff's case OR first state why it was "abusive" to limit debate to H.C. surveillance. Neg also dropped key args. about corruption in local data collection agencies (like "New Jim Crow Eugene's" in local police enforcement).

Aff: Good, clear questions - esp. John. Latter speeches started to lose structure & confidence, & engaging with Neg w/ more specificity (vs. "they were all over the place" - when?) will help.

Neg - Priya, don't be discouraged, but develop your signposting & structure!

William - Nice delivery w/ elements of your own case in mind, but need to be able to spell out links in CX!

Both: A lot of clear internal links were missing - more explicit signposting esp. in constructives would help fore y'all to bridge those. It was kind of like two separate debates were going on - burden on

(To Be 14" in Length)

Neg to directly address Aff's case, but 2AC could have engaged a little more meaningfully as well.

[Illegible text at the top of the page]

[Illegible text in the upper middle section]

[Illegible text in the middle section]

[Illegible text in the lower middle section]

[Illegible text in the lower section]

[Illegible text in the lower section]

[Illegible text in the lower section]

[Illegible text at the bottom of the page]

ires State Championships: Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate Ballot

Time \_\_\_\_\_ Judge Eric Lowe

Affirmative Code Lake O SG

Negative Code Cleveland KS

<p>First Aff. <u>Radikha</u></p> <p>Circle Rating:</p> <p>30 29 <u>28</u> 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p>Superior Needs Improvement*</p>	<p>First Neg. <u>Mathias</u></p> <p>Circle Rating:</p> <p>30 29 28 <u>27</u> 26 25 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p>Superior Needs Improvement*</p>
<p>Second Aff. <u>Sara</u></p> <p>Circle Rating:</p> <p>30 29 28 27 <u>26</u> 25 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p>Superior Needs Improvement*</p>	<p>Second Neg. <u>Quinn</u></p> <p>Circle Rating:</p> <p>30 29 28 27 <u>26</u> 25 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p>Superior Needs Improvement*</p>

\*If one of the debaters was rude, please report it to the ballot table. Otherwise, you may not rate below a 20.

The debate was won by Lake O SG (Team Code) representing Aff (Aff or Neg). Check if Low Point win.

Judge's Signature [Signature]

Judge's School Wilson

Topic: Surveillance

Constructives: 8 min; Cross-Examinations: 3 min; Rebuttals: 5 min; Prep Time: 5 min

WRITE THOROUGH COMMENTS TO EACH DEBATER. GIVE REASONS WHY YOU VOTED FOR ONE SIDE. PLEASE STATE WHAT THE LOSING DEBATER NEEDED TO DO TO WIN.

Oral critiques are not allowed.

USFG & sub. curtail its domestic surveillance

Aff needs to generate offense against the CP

Neg needs to deal better w/ the "politics of fear" dump which is the only aff offence (aff also links to this w/ talk of Nazi's!)

Neg wins CP/case debate but fundamentally mishandles the AFF K of the DA, which outweighs.

(To Be 14" in Length)



# Tires State Championships: Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate Ballot

AX-Westview SZ vs AX-Westview WS

Room: 28 Start: 9:30

Novice CX -- Rd 1

Time \_\_\_\_\_

Judge Jason Miller

### Affirmative Code

### Negative Code

<p>First Aff. <u>Elaine Zhang</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Circle Rating:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">30 29 28 <u>27</u> 26 25 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Superior <span style="float: right;">Needs Improvement*</span></p>	<p>First Neg. <u>Pranay Sharma</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Circle Rating:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">30 29 28 27 26 <u>25</u> 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Superior <span style="float: right;">Needs Improvement*</span></p>
<p>Second Aff. <u>Arushi Singhal</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Circle Rating:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">30 29 28 27 26 <u>25</u> 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Superior <span style="float: right;">Needs Improvement*</span></p>	<p>Second Neg. <u>Austin Wang</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Circle Rating:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 <u>22</u> 21 20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Superior <span style="float: right;">Needs Improvement*</span></p>

\*If one of the debaters was rude, please report it to the ballot table. Otherwise, you may not rate below a 20.

The debate was won by Westview SZ (Team Code) representing Aff (Aff or Neg). Check if Low Point win.

Judge's Signature [Signature]

Judge's School Wake Oswego

Topic: \_\_\_\_\_

Constructives: 8 min; Cross-Examinations: 3 min; Rebuttals: 5 min; Prep Time: 5 min

**WRITE THOROUGH COMMENTS TO EACH DEBATER. GIVE REASONS WHY YOU VOTED FOR ONE SIDE. PLEASE STATE WHAT THE LOSING DEBATER NEEDED TO DO TO WIN.**

Oral critiques are not allowed.

- 1A - The opening contention includes piloted flights (that we know the FBI has been doing) that is a massive solvency gap in your drone-only plan.
- Your plan does nothing to stop domestic drone weaponization.
  - And the historical racism/profiling isn't solved for either → Again, piloted surveillance was going over Baltimore.
- 2A - -1SP interruption
- 2U ex - -1SP Racism (If we're only looking @ Blacks for criminal activity, then that's where we're only going to "find" criminal activity.)
- 1U - Inherency claim is fluff until you get to the "thermal imaging" card.
- But the FAA isn't in a position to insist on defending the 4th & 4th amendments.
- 2NCX - -1SP Lack of Proof is not Proof of Lack. For example, white collar crime.
- 1SP prep time interruption
- 2A - If you're not rewriting warrant rules for surveillance, then what are you doing?
- Public anonymity is gone b/c Stingray + Cellphones, drones don't solve.
  - Yes, I heard these cards when your partner read them.
  - Terror dead answer has nothing to do with drones.
- 1NCX - -1SP cross examine during cross examination. And the qualifier on your ev specifies non-surveillance use.
- 2A - Only the government needs a warrant. FAA is domestic use construction.
- Mounting a stingray to a drone gives it cell-intercept ability. This has been true for 34 years.
  - You just made your econ argument non-unique. → Econ ↓ despite major drone interest for commercial interest.
  - If you're going to read the 4th amendment, then do read the 4th amendment.
- 1U - What, Due Process is bad for profits? → Dubious Priorities.
- We DO NOT already have FAA regs, they are in progress and not relevant to due process of law.
- 2U - -1SP doubling down on racism.
- It was 24 pilots in a decade, not a year. Know your ev better.
- 2A - New argument responding to pilot death: -1SP. New card on anonymity: -1SP
- 2U - -1SP interruption
- RFD - Aff maintains a defense of inherency throughout but is woefully vague as to what their plan does. Neg has a card - SCOTUS ruling on thermal imaging - that seems like it should scrub Aff inherency based on what aff says effects are, but it is never brought up or even alluded to after it incoherently appears in the 1NC. Voting on framework principles (that plays into SP) going Aff here.

(To Be 14" in Length)





# State Championships: Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate Ballot

AX-Westview KB vs AX-Westview BL  
 Room: 27 Start: 9:30  
 Novice CX -- Rd 1

Time \_\_\_\_\_ Judge Jacob Burk

**Affirmative Code**

**Negative Code**

First Aff. <u>AX 24</u> <span style="float: right;"><del>24</del></span> <p style="text-align: center;">Circle Rating:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">30 29 28 27 26 25 <u>24</u> 23 22 21 20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Superior <span style="float: right;">Needs Improvement*</span></p>	First Neg. <u>AX 33</u> <span style="float: right;"><del>33</del></span> <p style="text-align: center;">Circle Rating:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">30 29 <u>28</u> 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Superior <span style="float: right;">Needs Improvement*</span></p>
Second Aff. <u>AX 15</u> <p style="text-align: center;">Circle Rating:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 <u>22</u> 21 20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Superior <span style="float: right;">Needs Improvement*</span></p>	Second Neg. <u>AX 54</u> <p style="text-align: center;">Circle Rating:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">30 <u>29</u> 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Superior <span style="float: right;">Needs Improvement*</span></p>

\*If one of the debaters was rude, please report it to the ballot table. Otherwise, you may not rate below a 20.

The debate was won by AX (Team Code) representing Neg (Aff or Neg). Check if Low Point win.

Judge's Signature [Signature] Judge's School MHS

Topic: The US should substantially curtail domestic surveillance

Constructives: 8 min; Cross-Examinations: 3 min; Rebuttals: 5 min; Prep Time: 5 min

**WRITE THOROUGH COMMENTS TO EACH DEBATER. GIVE REASONS WHY YOU VOTED FOR ONE SIDE. PLEASE STATE WHAT THE LOSING DEBATER NEEDED TO DO TO WIN.**

Oral critiques are not allowed.

- 1 Aff First question period was quite aggressive, but ~~was~~ in the following speeches and questions no attacks were made on opp's case. Rebuttle speech just felt like a 3rd constructive.
- 2 Aff You were a bit difficult to understand in your 1st speech. 1st speech was a minute over, 2nd was three minutes under. Both Aff speeches lacked confident presentations.
- 1 NEG Well rounded speeches, 1st question period wasn't very aggressive, but following compensated. Not to sound like a snob, but giggling during prep is not recommended.
- 2 NEG Very confident speaker, and had excellent points thru out. Almost too arrogant in 2nd cross.

The Neg won this debate because their points flowed and this was ~~was~~ brought up several times in the closing speeches. Aff's case has no solvency, lower impacts, and they aren't topical and created an unfair debate.

(To Be 14" in Length)

IBC 7:36

Ob: ~~Int~~ Inherency

- informant undocumented
- informants in current form should end
- profiling
- Muslim Americans cooperate \*
- use of informants has been failure
- no suspicion
- better relations w/ community = ↓ terrorist issue \*

Ob: Adv

- minimal Muslim terrorism in America
- most informants are unofficial
- gov. forcing terrorist label

INC

8:00

- recruitment thru cryptic websites
- surveillance in communities is essential for prevention
- terrorism causes extortion → makes

topicality

- not substantial, Muslim pop is .8% of US pop ? economy
- unfair to neg

- informants are successful

- informants intimidates and disrupts terrorists
- ↑ Islamophobia
- ~~plan~~ doesn't solve
- trust w/ officers & Muslims is tense

ZARC

9:30

- entrapment → constitutionally approved
- use of informants creates tension w/ community
- toxic profiling
- gov is overzealous
- partnerships w/ informants cause them to feel used & betrayed

Impact

Neg has it

ZNR

7:27

- 60% of arrests involve informants

- mosques are already off-limits

- ~~aff~~ cannot solve racial profiling
- aff doesn't fix local police attitudes
- no solvency w/ aff

AFF CANT SOLVE