

ires State Championships: Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate Ballot

AX-Westview BL vs AX-Westview SZ
 Room: 28 Start: 1 pm
 Novice CX -- Rd 2

Time _____

Judge Eric Lowe

Affirmative Code westview BL

Negative Code westview SZ

First Aff. <u>Sim</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 26 <u>25</u> 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*	First Neg. <u>Arushi</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 <u>26</u> 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*
Second Aff. <u>Maya</u> Circle Rating: 30 <u>29</u> 28 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*	Second Neg. <u>Elanhe</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 <u>26</u> 25 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 Westview BL (Team Code) representing Aff (Aff or Neg). Check if Low Point win.

Judge's Signature _____

Judge's School Wilson

Topic: Armed Drones

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.

Aff - first speaker needs to calm down a little, the degree to which you were being aggressive really didn't correspond to this round (it would have been appropriate in an open round.)

Neg - you have good intuition but if anything you need to be more assertive. If you don't understand the plan, ask questions! Then, on a procedural that says they should read the plan text early. protect yourself. Instead of asking a vague question about how plan relates to the "domestic surveillance" part of the resolution, run topicality!

RFD: No-like argument on the all drones / armed drones distinction. I don't know how to weigh the offense for armed drones (drug interdiction on the Mexican border) against all the offense the Aff is accessing.

(To Be 14" in Length)



AX-Westview WS vs AX-Westview KB
 Room: 27 Start: 1 pm
 Novice CX -- Rd 2

Tires State Championships: Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate Ballot

Time _____ Judge Marissa Yang Bertucci

Affirmative Code AX Westview WS

Negative Code AX Westview KB

First Aff. <u>Austin</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 <u>28</u> 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement* <i>↳ great last speech!</i>	First Neg. <u>Bhaskar</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 26 <u>25</u> 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*
Second Aff. <u>Prenay</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 28 <u>27</u> 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*	Second Neg. <u>Emory Kim</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 <u>26</u> 25 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 AX Westview WS (Team Code) representing Aff (Aff or Neg). Check if Low Point win.

Judge's Signature [Signature] Judge's School Mreshamais

Topic: USFG submit. curtail 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.

Both: *good job & good luck, y'all! Welcome to CX! ♥*
- It took a long time for y'all to engage actively with each others' cases! CRASH!
 Oral critiques are not allowed.

- Kind of sloppy that we started the round 15 minutes late, y'all! If you're gonna need extra time to deal with fussy laptops, try to plan ahead!
- Time management! Pay attention to the structures of your constructive speeches - just because it's CX doesn't mean you can skip style!! Don't be running advantages right up until the last second - leave time to extend arguments, crystallize ideas, & respond to your opponents. (Really use your last speeches to rebut & crystallize instead of repeating case)
- If your partner is ever not quite getting it, it can be advantageous for confidence / presenting a united front to just let it be & compensate in your own speech!

RFD: links to extinction > privacy not clearly stated. Neg did not convince me that the status quo does not adequately "prevent terrorism" & that we're in a brink situation where we need more drones. This was largely a clarity & links issue.

could have easily prepared info for turn



Time _____ Judge P. Johnson

Affirmative Code	Negative Code
First Aff. <u>Jaden</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 <u>26</u> 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*	First Neg. <u>Sarajane</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 <u>28</u> 27 26 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*
Second Aff. <u>Jon</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 <u>26</u> 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*	Second Neg. <u>Radhika</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 <u>28</u> 27 26 25 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 AM-Lake SG (Team Code) representing Neg. (Aff or Neg) Check if Low Point win.

Judge's Signature [Signature] Judge's School Westview

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.

- No paradigm request? (ex. would've been helpful to know I'm not a fan of extraction arguments)
- Taglines need to be brief and numbered - speed is fine, but not on taglines, no one seemed to notice I was not flowing 1A.
- 1N noticed, nicely done keep tags clear
- 2A - roadmap would have been helpful
- also not a fan of "next" when what I really want is 1, 2, 3, etc.

RFD agreed w/ Neg. Politics of Fear impact

(To Be 14" in Length)



Time 0 Judge Samaira Jones

Affirmative Code Clackamas HL

Negative Code Cleveland HS

First Aff. <u>Pria</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 26 25 <u>24</u> 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*	First Neg. <u>Mathias</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 <u>26</u> 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*
Second Aff. <u>William</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 <u>26</u> 25 24 23 22 21 20 Superior Needs Improvement*	Second Neg. <u>Quinn</u> Circle Rating: 30 29 28 27 <u>26</u> 25 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 Neg (Team Code) representing Cleveland HS (Aff or Neg). Check if Low Point win.

Judge's Signature Samaira Jones 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.

Oral critiques are not allowed.

- IRC: slow down only for taglines - to differentiate them from the rest of the text. Speed drills! Signpost! Authors? Dates? Signposting? try using a stronger voice. Hard to hear you.
- IAC: ~~Give me a roadmap~~, "And" is the same as "next", seriously, signpost. Labels so I know where to flow. When in doubt about time, make up analysis on the fly. Hit more of case + line by line.
- 2AC: Freaking signpost. Please. Label. You only read 1 argument against the presidential powers disad. You need more arguments in general. Answer their case turn on case. Don't drop arguments. Why are you reading a line turn on case? You spend way too much time reading case cards, answer the line by line.
- 2AC: You start right in just reading cards - what is this responding to? Instead of piling on mpr, address their args. signpost - tell me where you are going on the flow for the love of God. On cyber attacks - they have at least 6 arguments you drop - instead you just spew cards. Work on your line by line.
- 1AR: Address the perm first, otherwise your other args mean nothing. More "ands". I need signposting. I don't have your speech in front of me. You literally read 7 new solvency cards - get to the line by line!
- 1AR: Speak up! 😊. Extend your args! They dropped so many args. If you extend + tell me why they outweigh - you win. You guys straight up need to learn to label/signpost. Answer the line by line. Argue the perm! You're spending way too much time on encryption. Counterplan? on case? I literally don't know where to flow your arguments.
- 2AR: Good job with the line by line. You win when you extend your args + they didn't extend theirs. Do impact comparisons - don't just say "there is no way they can win" (To Be 14" in Length)

2AR: Great roadmap: Great args - but they are too late!. Good line by line, but again, too little too late. !



Tires State Championships: Oregon Style Cross-Examination Debate Ballot

Time _____ Judge Jacobs Buck

Affirmative Code _____

Negative Code _____

<p>First Aff. <u>AM 18</u></p> <p>Circle Rating:</p> <p>30 29 28 27 <u>26</u> <u>25</u> 24 23 22 21 20</p> <p>Superior Needs Improvement*</p>	<p>First Neg. Casey <u>Casey</u></p> <p>Circle Rating:</p> <p>30 29 28 27 26 25 24 23 <u>22</u> 21 20</p> <p>Superior Needs Improvement*</p>
<p>Second Aff. <u>AM 1</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>Jonathan</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>

*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 AD-L (Team Code) representing Neg (Aff or Neg). Check if Low Point win.

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

Topic: US Fed Gov should substantially curtail its 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.

I know I was pretty liberal with my paradigms, but literally reading your partner's arguments for her was a bit loose guys, I won't count it against anyone, however. Even if the Aff didn't let a plethora of links from the Neg side flow and lose to the K, the majority of your 1st was conceded. Neg ~~proved~~ unnecessary pursuit of unsolvable issues thru inevitable security increases is a pooppy idea.

(To Be 14" in Length)

1 AC

2:48

Inherency

- nothing stands in way of FDA using DNA
- Expansion
- medical adv.
- patient → doc trust
- citizens control meds
- hinder adv in DNA
- fights diseases
- lack of antibodies cause extinction
- reduce impact of climate change
- warming causes extinction

impact of disease?
timeframe for warming?

Plan: us should have

Solvency: data collection

- count rules not sufficient
- affecting data = transparency
- need consistent law enforce w/ data

2 AC

- pathogens on airlines
- parasites adapt
- extinction thru disease
- ~~climate change~~

0% change of solvency for warming

- Judge use policy for fairness
- Topic specific discuss
- use K under framework
- can use impacts
- method is fine if plan works
- K must engage fairly
- policy isn't bad or is scapegoating
- ontology freeze intelligent sources

1 AR

- concede that softpower is bad
- concede disease
- must attempt to solve warming
- opp uses epistemological argu in K
- Framework meets predicability and education

Impact: world is good or bad

security: is inevitable, attempt necessary

Neg must defend status quo

2 AR

- Neg says warming is inevitable
- ~~X~~
- concede framework, world w/ a plan is better
- Neg links back to K; apply same evaluation

1 NC

17s 23s 128s

- seeking security threatens human existence
- disease creates perm state of warfare
- health & security coexists
- health issues are merely political thru other means
- power play via state of emergency
- hegemony
- higher powers pressure US
- reject Aff security discourse ^{link → disease} US → Leadership
- alt. theoreticals support security ^{Im-value to US} Im-terror
- Adv.
- preventing climate change is essential
- loses fighting poverty
- warming is unsolvable

2 NC

- ~~initial~~ serial policy turns debate
- ~~the~~ our method creates better policy
- K is critique of framework
- Any risk of link ruins ~~epistemo~~
- there is no impact
- warming is inevitable
- 1% try-or-die is terrible argument
- no defenses, Neg aside
- cold conceded, K proper
- they cannot solve security
- no reason to incorporate 1 AC
- must analyze epistemology to find policy
- no good epistemological reason provided
- self-sustaining policy

1 NR

- no timeframe
- warming is inevitable
- not try or die, it's try & die
- concede softpower failure
- Increase in Heg provokes war
- any strange country is threat to US
- US arrogance provoking war

2 NR

- K turns case
- counterbalance Neg
- K proper
- Aff is endorsing security, not logical to retreat
- alt. is prereq for case
- conceded link
- still pursue policy, consult flow
- warming is bad, 99% risk is try & die
- it has off and def
- extinction is only possible thru US
- the point was conceded