

	Round 1		Round 2		Round 3		Round 4		Points	Rks	4 avg	
Judge	Lundeen		Hingstman		Frappier							
Opponent	Maria-Steven		Austin-Wes		Marvin-Jim							
Result	L	NEG	L	AFF	L	NEG	BYE		0			
Canyon	27	4	28	4	28	4			83	12	110.666	
Michael	28	2	28.5	1	28.2	2			84.7	5	112.933	
											223.6	
Judge	Hingstman		TP				Pointer					
Opponent	Austin-Wes		Marvin-Jim				Austin-Wes					
Result	W	NEG	W	AFF	BYE		L	AFF	2			
Collin	28.5	2	28.5	2			28.5	3	85.5	7	114	
Derek	28.5	1	29	1			28.5	1	86	3	114.666	
											228.666	
Judge			TP		Frappier		Hingstman					
Opponent			Collin-Derek		Canyon-Michael		Maria-Steven					
Result	BYE		L	NEG	W	AFF	W	NEG	2			
Marvin			28	3	28.3	1	28.5	1	84.8	5	113.066	
Jim			28	4	28.1	3	28.5	2	84.6	9	112.8	
											225.866	
Judge	Lundeen				Nielson		Hingstman					
Opponent	Canyon-Michael				Austin-Wes		Marvin-Jim					
Result	W	AFF	BYE		W	NEG	L	AFF	2			
Maria	28.5	1			28.5	2	28.5	4	85.5	7	114 tie breaker most 1s	
Steven	27.5	3			28.8	1	28.5	1	84.8	5	113.066	
											227.066	
Judge	Hingstman		Hingstman		Nielson		Pointer					
Opponent	Collin-Derek		Canyon-Michael		Maria-Steven		Collin-Derek					
Result	L	AFF	W	NEG	L	AFF	W	NEG	2			
Austin	28	4	28	3	28.2	3	28.5	2	112.7	12	112.7	
Wes	28.5	3	28.5	2	28	4	28	4	113	13	113	
											225.7	
TEAMS												
1. Collin/Derek												
2. Maria/Steven												
SPEAKERS												
1. Derek												
2. Maria												
3. Collin												

ADI Fellows Tournament Debate Ballot

Round 1

Room: DISC 150

Judge: Dr. Dave

Ranks: You must rank the speakers 1-4. However, you can give the losing team lower ranks if you feel they spoke better, but still lost the debate. If this happens please check *low-rank win* below.

Points: Each speaker must be awarded 1-30 speaker points, with .5 increments. However, you can give the losing team lower points if you feel they spoke better, but still lost the debate. If this happens please check *low-point win* below.

Post-Round Comments: Comments and advice after the round are welcomed. PLEASE DO NOT DISCLOSE THE WINNER. Please type some RFD specific to the decision at the bottom and return this ballot to Adam Symonds (symonds77@gmail.com) after the debate.

Affirmative Team Name

Rumbaugh-Woodruff

1st Affirmative Speaker name:

Austin Woodruff Rank (4) Points (28)

2nd Affirmative Speaker name:

Wes Rumbaugh Rank (3) Points (28.5)

Negative Team Name

Roark-Ziegler

1st Negative Speaker name:

Collin Roark Rank (2) Points (28.5)

2nd Negative Speaker name:

Derek Ziegler Rank (1) Points (28.5)

Decision:

In my opinion the Neg with the name Roark-Ziegler won this debate.
(Delete the abbreviation for the losing team)

<<Please place an "X" on the line to the right if you have intended to give a Low Point or Rank Win _____>>

I ENJOYED THIS DEBATE! LOOK FORWARD TO SEEING MORE WITH YOU GUYS THIS SEASON.

Reason for Decision: (Explain why you voted the way you did & provide comments/tips below)

As I mentioned after the debate, I thought that Wes in the 2AR was smart to try to isolate a part of the plan-case advocacy that would escape the reps K. But I think that because this wasn't a bigger part of Austin's 1AR to begin developing this argument, Wes didn't have enough time to explain thoroughly how the Islamic representations of the plan did not contribute to the "great powers" impact in a way that fatally infected that part of the case as well in light of what was said in 2NR. Derek extends on the case that the Said? evidence includes the prejudice that the Egyptian military would contribute to instability by interfering in the Egyptian elections. Wes interpreted this as saying that the representation was that the Middle East was inherently unstable as a place, which is not a representation of a person but of an interstate system, so their escalation advantage is independent of the reps K. But he also said that the Egyptian military would cooperate with the Muslim Brotherhood or intervene and prevent the election, which is how the plan gets to its advantage of preventing escalatory wars. Thus I think the negative wins a link to the reps K from the operation of the plan, because it assumes that the military will act in ways that show "Islamic sympathies" of ideological interference. Wes perhaps revealed too much when he concluded the democracy advantage by saying "we prove imperialism might be good."

The arguments extended in the Aff rebuttals were defensive in the sense that they depended upon being able to win that the plan action did not participate in the indicted representations. Aff doesn't spend much time defending their representations, and in particular the claim that terrorists really are evil seem to feed the critique. Nor do they do much to undermine the conclusion that the critique turns the case. So if the negative wins a risk that the plan uses orientalist assumptions to justify its actions, that seems enough reason to vote for the K. I would have given the "epistemological focus" argument more weight if it had

ADI Fellows Tournament Debate Ballot

been applied specifically to what ontological discussion the negative excludes through its type of critical claim.

ADI Fellows Tournament Debate Ballot

Round 1 Room 250 Judge Lundeen

Ranks: You must rank the speakers 1-4. However, you can give the losing team lower ranks if you feel they spoke better, but still lost the debate. If this happens please check *low-rank win* below.

Points: Each speaker must be awarded 1-30 speaker points, with .5 increments. However, you can give the losing team lower points if you feel they spoke better, but still lost the debate. If this happens please check *low-point win* below.

Post-Round Comments: Comments and advice after the round are welcomed. PLEASE DO NOT DISCLOSE THE WINNER. Please type some RFD specific to the decision at the bottom and return this ballot to Adam Symonds (symonds77@gmail.com) after the debate.

Affirmative Team Name

Liu/Murray

1st Affirmative Speaker name:

Steven Murray Rank (3) Points (27.5)

2nd Affirmative Speaker name:

Maria Liu Rank (1) Points (28.5)

Negative Team Name

Brimhall/Masterson

1st Negative Speaker name:

Canyon Brimhall Rank (4) Points (27)

2nd Negative Speaker name:

Masterson Rank (2) Points (28)

Decision:

In my opinion the Aff with the names Liu/Murray won this debate.

(Delete the abbreviation for the losing team)

<<Please place an "X" on the line to the right if you have intended to give a Low Point or Rank Win x - points correct >>

Reason for Decision: (Explain why you voted the way you did & provide comments/tips below)

Close debate on Agamben. Obviously would have been nice for the neg to have another option in the block, hopefully neg has been able to resolve the catastrophic computer meltdowns that happened in this debate!

I ultimately vote Aff. I will admit I am something of a sucker for the kinds of thresholds the aff establishes in this debate. From the 1ac on they have pressed the neg for specific, potentially empirical proof of the claims of the K at the link, impact and alt level. I agree that the aff Yudkowsky ev is about psychological explanations of event vs. empiricism, but pointing this out is not the same as saying why the threshold of proof should not apply in the context of the criticism. This aff threshold argument magnifies the typical problem of making the K debate as specific as possible to the aff you are debating. Throughout the debate the neg makes the blanket claim that the plan is just an example of the sovereign mobilizing the population, but is unclear how and to what end in other than a very generic sense. The aff is able to leverage this to make in roads into the internal link to the impact.

Framework by the end of the debate seems to be a question of weighing the aff versus the K alt which politicizes life as long as the k links to the plan. Even if the neg wins some measure of link to the plan, unclear why the k impact outweighs aff impact scenarios or how the alt solves the aff. The assertion that in the world of the alt all issues in Syria would vanish is not compelling and needs much more work at two levels – 1. Framework - the neg needs to be controlling whether any of the debate access any actual change in Syria 2. Application of the K to the Syrian context where the aff is describing net freedom as a pre – requisite to even be able to challenge sovereignty. The neg does urge me to be skeptical of the aff impacts, but this is exactly the point at which the neg needs to be doing very specific work as to why these particular aff advantage claims are untrue, this is the burden of proof aff established above and a

ADI Fellows Tournament Debate Ballot

natural reluctance on my part to dismiss all aff impacts out of hand with very little challenge from the neg beyond a sweeping claim as to their doubtfulness.

The aff is also leveraging several pieces of defensive evidence against the terminal impact to the K, that biopower must be evaluated contextually, is sometimes good, etc. Aff is winning slightly better defense against an already amorphous biopower impact than the neg is against the multiple extinction scenarios of the aff.

The permutation may not resolve all of the links, but it certainly solves the case adv better than the alt, the impact to the k is minimized.

ADI Fellows Tournament Debate Ballot

Round 2

Room: DISC 150

Judge: Dr. Dave

Ranks: You must rank the speakers 1-4. However, you can give the losing team lower ranks if you feel they spoke better, but still lost the debate. If this happens please check *low-rank win* below.

Points: Each speaker must be awarded 1-30 speaker points, with .5 increments. However, you can give the losing team lower points if you feel they spoke better, but still lost the debate. If this happens please check *low-point win* below.

Post-Round Comments: Comments and advice after the round are welcomed. PLEASE DO NOT DISCLOSE THE WINNER. Please type some RFD specific to the decision at the bottom and return this ballot to Adam Symonds (symonds77@gmail.com) after the debate.

Affirmative Team Name

Brimhall-Masterson

1st Affirmative Speaker name:

Michael Masterson Rank (1) Points (28.5)

2nd Affirmative Speaker name:

Canyon Brimhall Rank (4) Points (28)

Negative Team Name

Rumbaugh-Woodruff

1st Negative Speaker name:

Wes Rumbaugh Rank (2) Points (28.5)

2nd Negative Speaker name:

Austin Woodruff Rank (3) Points (28)

Decision:

In my opinion the Neg with the name Rumbaugh-Woodruff won this debate.
(Delete the abbreviation for the losing team)

<<Please place an "X" on the line to the right if you have intended to give a Low Point or Rank Win _____>>
THANKS FOR GIVING THE OBSERVERS A GOOD DEBATE, AND GOOD LUCK THIS SEASON!

Reason for Decision: (Explain why you voted the way you did & provide comments/tips below)

When Canyon doesn't get back to the politics DA in the 2AR because of the 4.5 minutes on topicality, this becomes problematic for the affirmative's perm to the covert operations CP because the 2AC strategy did not include a solvency challenge to the ability of the counterplan to get Assad out of office. Michael argues in 1AR that presumption shifts to the counterplan when he straight-turns the politics DA, which means that the risk of a politics turn should outweigh the risk of a premature crackdown by Assad as the TV announcement is made and a Syrian crackdown ensue (By the way, the two sides had different views of what covert meant – does it keep the operation secret from the American people or from Assad? The negative develops the only analysis on why Assad is likely to find out – his paranoia and desire to keep power no matter what). But the moral obligation case advantage, assuming the complete solvency of the counterplan, is not a presumption shifter as defined by Michael in the 1AR. Austin in 2NR gets back to the politics DA and concedes that the uniqueness overwhelms the link, so the straight turn no longer has impact. Canyon in 2AR says that the perm "solves the entire DA," but doesn't get back to the defense of the turn scenario.

Another way to develop the presumption argument in 2AR would be to say that any risk that the covert operation might be delayed is a reason to make the moral stance, because the crackdown risk would happen equally with the perm and with the counterplan as the Assad crackdown comes from discovering a covert action in the making, not from an Obama denunciation or from the possibility of unspecified UN action. Canyon made parts of these arguments on the case, but didn't put it altogether in a way that persuasively overcame the failure to indict the cp solvency in the 2AC. The UN solvency was much less certain than the covert action solvency as it turned out, so neg wins a risk that the crackdown will happen merely from Obama's announcement and that covert action alone would be more likely to be a stance that would prevent a crackdown during the interim.

The topicality debate was pretty close, but as I said after the debate, the negative needed more offense against the affirmative claims (1) that their democracy assistance standard can only be evaluated by its effects, rather than the

ADI Fellows Tournament Debate Ballot

intentions of the aid givers, and that their standard looks to the intent of the giver and (2) that 3 countries would not be represented by cases on the topic unless rejection of the “assistance” was possible. Negative needed to argue (1) that Obama’s intentions would be unclear even if he was compelled to make the TV appearance, and that the offer would be tangible in the resources it promises to the potential recipient, (2) that 2 countries in the topic (Egypt and Tunisia) would be left out of the topic if the intent standard was applied, because a moral stance of condemnation would not have solvency evidence given that they have overthrown the dictators; and (3) that the “offer resources” standard is best for all countries because the aff can claim advantages either from acceptance or rejection of the assistance offered. I didn’t evaluate whether I would vote on topicality alone, but I was leaning aff.

ADI Fellows Tournament Debate Ballot

Round 2 Room DIS 150 Judge Theresa Perry

Ranks: You must rank the speakers 1-4. However, you can give the losing team lower ranks if you feel they spoke better, but still lost the debate. If this happens please check *low-rank win* below.

Points: Each speaker must be awarded 1-30 speaker points, with .5 increments. However, you can give the losing team lower points if you feel they spoke better, but still lost the debate. If this happens please check *low-point win* below.

Post-Round Comments: Comments and advice after the round are welcomed. PLEASE DO NOT DISCLOSE THE WINNER. Please type some RFD specific to the decision at the bottom and return this ballot to Adam Symonds (symonds77@gmail.com) after the debate.

Affirmative Team Name

Roark-Ziegler

1st Affirmative Speaker name:

Ziegler Rank (1) Points (29)

Rank (3) Points (28)

2nd Affirmative Speaker name:

Roark Rank (2) Points (28.5)

4) Points (28)

Negative Team Name

Carter-Sydnor

1st Negative Speaker name:

Carter

2nd Negative Speaker name:

Sydnor Rank (

Decision:

In my opinion the Aff _____ with the names _____ Roark-Ziegler _____
_____ won this debate. _

(Delete the abbreviation for the losing team)

<<Please place an "X" on the line to the right if you have intended to give a Low Point or Rank Win _____>>

Reason for Decision: (Explain why you voted the way you did & provide comments/tips below)

RFD: I already gave some advice to the debaters after the round but I ended up voting aff on the permutation. I think the neg spent too much time at the top of the debate and under-covered offence the aff had at the bottom of the 1AR/2AR like the social activism/South Africa stuff and the solvency takeouts to the alt. At the end of the debate I am persuaded by the permutation as the only way to solve the aff let alone any of the aff's offence on the K (necessity for an actor, Boggs, ect.)

NEG: I think to win this round you need to have more of an honest interpertaion of the framwork debate so you can gain more offence there. In a world where they are just asking for their aff I dont think you are winning the offence on this part of the debate. They changed their framwork...you should use this! perhaps id can be a link to your offence on framwork or even a link to the K. if you are ahead on that part of the debate the perm does not make in sense.

AFF: I already said it, but I think your interp of framwork could have been softer so they could never gain offence on that part of the debate. I think you all went for the right stuff in this debate but I would have liked to see the case args explained more and maybe so more of the Boggs stuff, we kind of talked about that after the debate.

ADI Fellows Tournament Debate Ballot

Round 3

Room: DISC 150

Judge : Frappier

Ranks: You must rank the speakers 1-4. However, you can give the losing team lower ranks if you feel they spoke better, but still lost the debate. If this happens please check *low-rank win* below.

Points: Each speaker must be awarded 1-30 speaker points, with .5 increments. However, you can give the losing team lower points if you feel they spoke better, but still lost the debate. If this happens please check *low-point win* below.

Post-Round Comments: Comments and advice after the round are welcomed. PLEASE DO NOT DISCLOSE THE WINNER. Please type some RFD specific to the decision at the bottom and return this ballot to Adam Symonds (symonds77@gmail.com) after the debate.

Affirmative Team Name

Carter-Sydnor

1st Affirmative Speaker name:

Marvin Carter Rank (28.3) Points (1)

2nd Affirmative Speaker name:

Jim Sydnor Rank (28.1) Points (3)

Negative Team Name

Brimhall-Masterson

1st Negative Speaker name:

Canyon Brimhall Rank (28.0) Points (4)

2nd Negative Speaker name:

Michael Masterson Rank (28.2) Points (2)

Decision:

In my opinion the AFF with the names Carter/Sydnor won this debate.

Reason for Decision: (Explain why you voted the way you did & provide comments/tips below)

Permutation means K not competitive. More detailed ballot with explanation coming.

(Complete ballot will be uploaded when available)

RFD: Neg - Liu-Murray

Speaker points – Rumbaugh 28 Woodruff 28.2 Liu – 28.5 Murray 28.8

The Ballot –

Does the question of the resolution and USFG matter?

Well first and foremost, the presumption and lack of aff framework arg. This seems to be a strategic error on the part of the aff not to vigorously defend policy making of some variety or at least your read on the “should”. The 1NC makes an argument that you have no agency over your aff – defacto you do nothing – vote neg on presumption. Given your discussion of a US should, there seems to be a disconnect between the value of the debate and the USFG should IMET Egypt. Although the neg argument is not particularly compelling in the 1NC, the aff doesn’t really ever develop much framework in the debate. There are probably ways to spin the Butler argument that would be better help you win some sort of relationship reason the US should. I am not certain the positing of Butler as talking about the USFG as a relationship to Egypt is really what she was envisioning (a stretch at best).

Is the aff seeking the other or are they at our gates?

In a sense the aff is always seeking the other, this is the aff’s relationality argument (Butler & sort of your framework). More directly, the aff doesn’t really have an answer to how we know the other. The negative wins the relationship to the other cannot be built objectively, but is rather a transcendental measure of a priori their good/badness. If this argument is the aff framework, then there doesn’t seem to be a way to determine our relationship to the other when constituting self without a prior sense of good/bad – at least the affirmative doesn’t explain how we can constitute the other without morality. (Side note: If we need them to know ourselves – this is a central neg argument. If we need them to know ourselves, but wait for them in our castle – how would we know ourselves prior to their arrival? The answer heavily implies the aff must go looking.) Also although the neg isn’t great at the impact level of some parts of their argument, it’s not like the aff ever really answers that in trying to know the other as good or bad we do violence to those we determine to be bad. The 2ar we need others portion (because we are soft and weak and would die) is an interesting extrapolation of relationality, but is a super new warrant and given it would become a turning point as it is the first offensive reason to vote for relationality in the debate, I am uncomfortable advancing this argument and would like to see it play out earlier. The Butler Nietzsche comparison based on the context of the nuclear era is new in the 2ar. This seems to be part of the adapting aff framework. The aff needs a conceptually consistent and clearer line of argument developed over the course of the debate.

Finally if they are out there, are we complicit if we don’t hunt them? (Even if only 1 time, aka the perm)

This is an interesting spin and I think a powerful one for the aff. Life is a pre-requisite to all of the neg impacts. I think this argument is fairly uncontested by the neg. This guilt argument is advanced by the neg often – that we can’t feel guilty for things that we are not responsible. This is the negative line that answers complicity and there is never an answer to until the 2ar begins to talk about how we would all die without relationality. The negative is answering the aff and the aff isn’t particularly responsive to the guilt debate. Why is guilt good? Is complicity different than guilt? Why am I responsible for another person starting a nuclear war? The answer to all these questions seems to be because I can stop it; therefore if I don’t I am responsible. I think this is the implied warrant of the aff, but the only overt

warrant is because we are all related to each other. Also part of the perm debate that is totally unanswered is the plan does nothing debate. Even if I accept the aff premise of the need to act, this aff doesn't provide me that option.

Is there an external value to human life? Or is that just egoism?

If every person provides their own value to life, then it seems as if life value is very "I" oriented even if determined relationally. The neg impact in the 2nr is that denying death is denying life. This is an attempt to answer the "we'll all die" case extension by the aff. Also, the aff must answer to the Hubris DA – humans are destructive to the world around them because they consider themselves so important.

The 2ar asks: What should I do when faced with a decision to act? This is a good guiding question for the debate. It seems as though the neg has developed a more coherent line of thought as the answer. The aff seems to be developing their line of thought with each speech. I think a better set of 2ac answers would help the debate. If you want to read framework, then you should do that.

RFD: I do default aff on the case debate given they are the only ones reading qualified authors and all the neg args start in the 1nr. I think under this stress that the aff defends the advantages well. Ultimately, I think they lose a presumption arg that's a clean neg victory and I think the aff is also losing that the way they choose to know the other is violent and the aff is overall a life denying approach to the world.

It was a good debate. Good luck with the season.

ADI Fellows Tournament Debate Ballot

Round 4

Room: DISC 250

Judge : Dr. Dave

Ranks: You must rank the speakers 1-4. However, you can give the losing team lower ranks if you feel they spoke better, but still lost the debate. If this happens please check *low-rank win* below.

Points: Each speaker must be awarded 1-30 speaker points, with .5 increments. However, you can give the losing team lower points if you feel they spoke better, but still lost the debate. If this happens please check *low-point win* below.

Post-Round Comments: Comments and advice after the round are welcomed. PLEASE DO NOT DISCLOSE THE WINNER. Please type some RFD specific to the decision at the bottom and return this ballot to Adam Symonds (symonds77@gmail.com) after the debate.

Affirmative Team Name

Liu-Murray

1st Affirmative Speaker name:

Steven Murray

Rank (1) Points (28.5)

2nd Affirmative Speaker name:

Maria Liu

Rank (4) Points (28.5)

Negative Team Name

Carter-Sydnor

1st Negative Speaker name:

Marvin Carter

Rank (3) Points (28.5)

2nd Negative Speaker name:

Jim Sydnor

Rank (2) Points (28.5)

Decision:

In my opinion the Neg with the name Carter-Sydnor won this debate.
(Delete the abbreviation for the losing team)

<<Please place an "X" on the line to the right if you have intended to give a Low Point or Rank Win_____>>

THANKS FOR A GREAT DEBATE! GOOD LUCK NEXT SEASON

Reason for Decision: (Explain why you voted the way you did & provide comments/tips below)

Negative is pretty far ahead on the framework debate, and this has implications for the evaluation of competitiveness and which project is the most desirable to encourage. Affirmative needs to do more to characterize their framework, which seems to be "let different people in debate do what they want to do for their own reasons, some of which may have nothing to do with masks or oppression, but rather with future policy-making" The negative framework is clearer – reclaim individual agency to develop strategies for overcoming oppression. Their indictment of the aff framework is that it steals the agency of the negative's voices and bodies by incorporation and encourages line-by-line/speed debating. The aff indictment of the negative framework is that those who want to roleplay government policymaking might be inhibited from doing so. Given the way this argument goes in the rebuttals, I am being forced to choose between the methodologies and the practice of the oppressed and the methodologies and praxis of the future policymaker.

The most decisive factor is this weighing is the mishandling of the "why future policymaking involvement is important argument." 2NR argues at the top that the case harms will be over by the time the future policymakers will be ready to take their positions of advising governance, and aff doesn't have an effective answer to that. As I suggested after the round, the affirmative needs to give examples of potential future great power war scenarios that will require the policymaking understanding that debate on today's issues will provide.

ADI Fellows Tournament Debate Ballot

One of the affirmative's strongest attacks extended in the rebuttal was the possibility that white privilege when challenged this way will take a "white flight" approach and start another activity, thus substituting isolation for assimilation. Here the aff needed to impact isolation of the oppressed, because negative kept a strong indictment of assimilationist tactics going in the rebuttals. That impact is probably related to the argument that the current structure encourages the education of young underprivileged debaters in the UDLs. Another affirmative argument that had potential was that colorblindness can be good and that the negative tended to divide the members of the debate community when they needed to be united. But again, it is unclear what impact debate community solidarity would have in terms of challenging systems of oppression – you needed more impacts that were not linked to the external (Syrian) impact claims.

Finally, there wasn't enough refutation of the negative's methodology and praxis, especially against the claim that the permutation "steals bodies and voices" and that speed is bad. Nor was it clear to me, as I mentioned after the debate, that the negative was arguing that everyone would be using the same project as theirs if we abandoned permutation as comparison or slower debate. The aff needed to make more out of the cross-examination of the first negative when it was suggested that it was always bad to wear masks. It needed to be clearer that the authenticity demands of the negative would be inconsistent with roleplaying in their new world of debate.

ADI Fellows Tournament Debate Ballot

Round 5

Room: DISC 150

Judge : Pointer

Ranks: You must rank the speakers 1-4. However, you can give the losing team lower ranks if you feel they spoke better, but still lost the debate. If this happens please check *low-rank win* below.

Points: Each speaker must be awarded 1-30 speaker points, with .5 increments. However, you can give the losing team lower points if you feel they spoke better, but still lost the debate. If this happens please check *low-point win* below.

Post-Round Comments: Comments and advice after the round are welcomed. PLEASE DO NOT DISCLOSE THE WINNER. Please type some RFD specific to the decision at the bottom and return this ballot to Adam Symonds (symonds77@gmail.com) after the debate.

Affirmative Team Name

Negative Team Name

Roark-Ziegler

Rumbaugh-Woodruff

1st Affirmative Speaker name:

1st Negative Speaker name:

Derek Ziegler

Rank (1) Points (28.5)

Wes Rumbaugh

Rank (4) Points (28)

2nd Affirmative Speaker name:

2nd Negative Speaker name:

Collin Roark

Rank (3) Points (28.5)

Austin Woodruff

Rank (2) Points(28.5)

Decision:

In my opinion the Neg with the names Woodruff-Rumbaugh won this debate.

(Delete the abbreviation for the losing team)

<<Please place an "X" on the line to the right if you have intended to give a Low Point or Rank Win X >>

Reason for Decision: (Explain why you voted the way you did & provide comments/tips below)

The aff doesn't win a solvency deficit to the counterplan. The aff's only attempt at a solvency deficit says that uncertainty about fluctuating numbers and future quotas prevent future applicants, but the neg wins that the CP would result in consistent rules and actual legislation on exempting students from the cap. This solvency deficit also makes no sense in light of the aff's link defense against the politics DA, where they say that the aff is just about student visas. Students have already made the decision to commit prior to graduation, so the solvency deficit that the aff is trying to win is not relevant to the aff. This is possibly a clarity add-on that the CP wouldn't resolve, but it is not a solvency deficit and the neg's arguments about the effects of the counterplan would resolve this anyway.

Does the counterplan link to politics? Definitely less than the plan. The neg evidence on sequencing and how the blame can be dumped on the court is more conclusive and more warranted than the aff's link arguments. The aff's best evidence is about how appointments are controversial, and how controversial court decisions lead to fights over appointments, not about future legislative agenda items. Aff is behind on both quality and specificity of evidence on this question.

The disad UQ debate – ugh. Neither side is very good on this issue, and it just winds up being a pile of disconnected cards. The neg has slightly better predictive evidence on the outcome of the meetings about SKFTA. Most troubling is the aff's claim that the AFL-CIO is attempting to block SKFTA, because this has a disastrous interaction with the aff's link claim of bipartisan support and the difference between student visas and the standard immigration debate. There's at least a substantial chance SKFTA passes now, although had the aff pushed harder on the timing of this claim in the wake of the debt ceiling controversy it would have helped.

Link vs. Link Turn – The neg ev and spin is pretty good on how the plan would be spun by the GOP as a pro-immigration action. The cards say it's a firestorm, and that opportunity will be seized by the GOP. The aff bipart turn really seems like a link defense argument to me, since there's no real argument extended about how the plan would increase political capital. There's no argument that the bipartisan support of the plan would build a larger bipartisan climate in Congress to spill over onto other agenda items. And besides, while there may be bipartisan support in some quarters for the plan, there is also bipartisan opposition from labor and anti-immigration Republicans.

ADI Fellows Tournament Debate Ballot

The aff puts themselves in a tough position vis-à-vis the CP and the DA. The 2AC doesn't have a great deal of offensive variety in the event that the CP solves the aff, and the 1AR chooses 2AC answers that aren't going to generate much offense against this strategy. While I think that the aff executes better than the neg on large sections of this debate, they never really overcome the strategic hole they dig themselves further in throughout the debate.

Did we really need to make a deal to debate immigration just to do courts, politics, and dedev? While I don't object to the deal in principle, this probably should not have happened at a camp tournament, where there are observers trying to learn how to debate the topic. We could have had a similar politics debate about the democracy assistance topic. And besides, the visas topic sucked.