

Room: Walker 201
Start: 4:00
Junior NPDA

SEMI

Bjerregaard, Mal

TH should build the keystone project.

UW1

81ST MAHAFFEY MEMORIAL

Linfield College

November 11-13, 2011

Do NOT announce - bring ballots to tab

USU RJ (Chelan Rogers & Justin Jerez) vs. UW Bothell MK (Ismaila Maidadi & Jeff King)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

W Bothell
Jeff King & Ismaila Maidadi
Chelan Rogers & Justin Jerez
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

M:0
U.S. Rogers & Jerez
UW Bothell Maidadi & King
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

*use all
writing
if looks
weak
to redo*

The better debating was done by the AFF from UW Bothell

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

P-12/ lots of vocal fillers. Increase substructure w/ arguments & watch broad logic - Got to open your public speaking skills - you seem flustered
Co/ Good logic & speaking speed. Don't forget to get a firm grasp on current status Quo. Make on quicker too. Good rebuttal & clear.
ns] Good answer to her question - but more - you are wasting time. But solid job w/ analysis. This is a general critique for you - you do this same thing w/ rebuttal. Great job hitting all call out and you were needed
MO] you are making claims that they didn't refute & are providing same arguments or none - false when your judges find don't assume we'd just buy that. Define what you are saying is States Quo - you also ignore a lot of his points & just restate your own which is not best for direct rebuttal. wow! EPA can't ever make mistakes to be good? That's a stretch of logic - That was a hard one to get through....
[RFD] Decent clash between the two teams, but arguments, on by far stuck w/ just environmental impacts. you'll need to branch out w/ that so it isn't just a shot. So - w/ voters. Neg also #1: vote on Disad of environmental impacts & that non-unique clash doesn't hold. ~~FAIR~~ Global warming is here & you never gave warrants beyond 2%. That said it will be much worse & which ones could be linked directly to the tar sands. Disad #2 = vote on turns - dropped China turn & Health. I'll give you China turn but not H.C. And China turn was weak & not really developed so that doesn't really matter too much. Voter 3 = Impac calc = ~~FAIR~~ you didn't gain as much ground w/ me as you thought. QOR voter 1 = Disad is non-unique = agree ~~with~~ ^{and provided no} warrants ~~for~~ for you it would ~~be~~ increase. 2. HR dropped = yep. so you get that & 3. The advantages & impacts are large on your side = yep -
Good debater but both teams found several cl... cl... cl...

81ST MAHAFFEY MEMORIAL

Linfield College
November 11-13, 2011

Do NOT announce - bring ballots to tab

UW Bothell MK (Ismaila Maidadi & Jeff King) vs. USU RJ (Chelan Rogers & Justin Jerez)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

UW Bothell

USU

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Aff from UW Bothell
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

DA - Turn send extraction is heartble, I buy the ψ so I don't evaluate the global energy impact. There is also enough defense on the perceptual shift away from alt energy for me to rule that argument there

Solvency Defense becomes a non issue, ~~not the team really~~

Ad 2 - Turn on ehha should be supported despite ans var the ad 2 scenario that supporting HR is bad = HR Impact to Aff

Ad 1 - enough defense was done on the healthcare turn for me to look at the dropped internal link of preventing foreclosures = Econ Impact (not terminated really)

Room: Walker 221
Start: 4:00 draw
Novice NPDA

SEMI

Miller, Audrey
UW

81ST MAHAFFEY MEMORIAL
Linfield College
November 11-13, 2011

Do NOT announce - bring ballots to tab

Boise State DC (Sabonn Dammarell & Norell Conroy) vs. UW Bothell TB (Kseniya Tsurkanov & Matthew Bennett)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the _____ from _____
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This House should win the case on Pipeline.

81ST MAHAFFEY MEMORIAL + Chair
Linfield College
November 11-13, 2011

Do NOT announce - bring ballots to tab

UW Bothell MK (Ismaila Maidadi & Jeff King) vs. USU RJ (Chelan Rogers & Justin Jerez)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

UW Bothell MK

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

USU RJ

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Gov from UW Bothell MK
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: TH Sh build the keystone pipeline

Gov: Make sure your impacts are positive

MG: your responses are killer

pp: Sign post!

tick w/  press.

make your DA more clear w/ what happens in CA and what in gulf. This would have helped with clarity.

FD: I vote Gov. I think the non-unique on the whole DA, that goes essentially touched is pretty hupp. So w/ that, it comes basically down to jobs. I buy Gov. Right now, all jobs are good jobs.

81ST MAHAFFEY MEMORIAL
Linfield College
November 11-13, 2011

Announce in round - and chair return ballots to tab please

Carroll RR (Zach Robinson & Matt Rodriguez) vs. UW BP (Daniel Beasley & Sam Pizelo)

AFFIRMATIVE

Carroll RR

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

UW BP

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Neg from UW BP
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Joe Provencher

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I think the double bind is spot on. The Aff really undercovers the most offensive part that if they fail in 6 months (many reasons they will) leading to immediate default, which would turn case.

That, or *quo solves* is very persuasive. There's no offence on the DA, so if I look there there is only a chance that I vote neg.

Room: Walker 221
Start: ASAP
Open NPDA

QUAR

JOHN NELSON
~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

UW I

81ST MAHAFFEY MEMORIAL

Linfield College
November 11-13, 2011

Announce in round - and chair return ballots to tab please

→ do do do do do

UW BP (Daniel Beasley & Sam Pizelo) vs. Carroll RR (Zach Robinson & Matt Rodriguez)

AFFIRMATIVE

CARROLL RR

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

VS

NEGATIVE

UW BP

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from UW BP

NEG

UW BP

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed:

John Nelson

University of Oregon
B.A. in Communications

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Nice presentation of a workable plan. Good question "can you tell me how Germany created the gateway effect?" Good argument regarding German investors in Turkey will solve the problem. Include "because it is part of our plan. Please state this out loud." Repeat advantages.

Zach

Good topicality of reform argument to start with. Excellent response to Aff plan proposal & attack on advantages. Excellent observation that "are you claiming advantages from countries who aren't members of the EU. Excellent rebuttal claim that if Russia will cut off oil to Germany and Ukraine then the entire European union would also collapse." SAU

good attack on status quo and their present failure to solve. good claim regarding that voting stability is a key to political stability. Be specific why they don't have inherency. Good austerity argument related to economic benefits to society.

Matt

Good observation about Russia's choice to invest in the Mideast rather than EU. and they are choosing to cut off the flow of oil from Russia to European countries. Awesome reality point! Also good answer to CX question that Russia is non-responsive about the oil question because they have a monopoly. nice impact claims! Daniel

Room: Walker 221
Start: ASAP
Open NPDA

QUAR

Wood, Trent

I Am voting Gov, BECAUSE I BUY YOUR Germany, Russia, Bulgaria, ^{UW!}
But YOUR PLAN is Really RUSHED And Muddled
And you could HAVE EASILY LOST TO A MORE ^{complete} ~~Chair~~ ^{mature} team.

81ST MAHAFFEY MEMORIAL

Linfield College
November 11-13, 2011

L.O. REBUTTAL:
OVER TEN, TAKE ME
RIGHT TO YOUR VOTERS, RUSSIA BACKLOG

All of these items should be
Listed As 2

Announce in round - and chair return ballots to tab please

VOTER I RUSSIAN BACKLOG

EVERYBODY IN THIS
ROUND NEEDS TO ENCOURAGE
MERCHMAN

2 Germany ^{leaves} Carroll RR (Zach Robinson & Matt Rodriguez) vs. UW BP (Daniel Beasley & Sam Pizelo) JUST ABOUT

3 STATUS quo **AFFIRMATIVE**

NEGATIVE EVERYTHING YOU
SAY NOW SHOULD
BE VOTERS

4 Not enough time, new ARGUMENT?
CARROLL RR

UW BP

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

MO: SLOW DOWN, GOOD JOB OF DROPPING ARGUMENTS RISETH THAT YOU ARE
NOT GOING TO PURSUE, SLOW DOWN, TRY TO ACCOMMODATE YOUR OPPONENTS QUESTIONS

The better debating was done by the GOV from CARROLL RR

AFF OF NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

THANK YOU FOR STANDING WHILE
ASKING QUESTIONS.

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

PM: YOUR STARTS FAST, I KNOW, YOU THINK YOU WANT HAVE ENOUGH TIME
TO SAY WHAT YOU NEED TO, BUT YOU DO YOU HAVE PLENTY OF TIME

SLOW DOWN, YOUR PLAN TEXT IS DEVOID OF STRUCTURE I FILLED

IN a) DEF STANDS b) DEBT c) DEFICIT STANDARDS YOU NEED

TO SIGN POST THESE INTERNAL LINK?, JUST GIVE ME AD 1

DO NOT USE LANGUAGE THAT WILL CONFUSE LAY JUDGES, SLOW DOWN!

YOU ARE REALLY TRYING FOR STRUCTURE, BUT YOU ARE COMPLICATING IT TO MUCH
AND TALKING TO FAST.

L.O: TALKING TO FAST, IS THIS A TOPICALITY ARGUMENT? JUST AN

ABUSE ARGUMENT? NO STRUCTURE, OR TRYING TO FAST, SOME STRUCTURE

IN DA 1, THEN IT IS OVER COMPLICATED, INTERNAL LINK? DA 1 ^{Germany a)}

MO: T IS ALWAYS FRIVOLOUS, EXCELLENT RESPONSE, SLOW DOWN DO

YOUR BEST TO ACCOMMODATE YOUR OPPONENTS QUESTIONS, YOUR CROSS TALK FROM
PM IS EXCESSIVE, "FLOW THROUGH" IS GOOD, TRY "PULL IT ACROSS" OR "WE SAID IT, THEY

did not respond it is non fact

Room: Walker 202
Start: ASAP
Open NPDA

QUAR

Bjerregaard, Mal

+ chair

81ST MAHAFFEY MEMORIAL

Linfield College
November 11-13, 2011

Announce in round - and chair return ballots to tab please

Lewis & Clark TH (Emily Tribble & Emily Halter) vs. Carroll LB (Ryan Lorenz & Andy Burton)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Meg from Carroll LB
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

pm: Why not standing? Why not all time? S:27 hurts a true level
MG: you have to address questions sooner. increase direct line by line clash.
various arguments but missed "they say" too often
LO: Good clear speaking - speed was a bit much at times but logic was solid.
no great delivery & line by line. Really easy to follow your logic and
see the direct refutation.

RFD Both teams had great clash and logic. Both did a good
job w/ overall refutation. but Meg line by line was much
clearer to follow. Based on voters - OPP 1 = Govt money 200 Bill would be huge
impact & unnecessary strain on Green due to states and currency rolling. (True)
Two clones w/ AFFS voter #1 - which I disagree w/. Saying 200 Bill is just a few
billion dollars w/ little impact on bail economies defys logic. (2) EU dead shows
largest impact on economy; This becomes a mute voter for me since both sides address
inequality. (True) voter #3 = Dead 2 will harm greens to collapse which harms an economy
= True I felt this was never adequately refuted by AFF & a major hole
in their case. For AFFS voters. #1 was false. #2 That 200 Bill is Gov money
that will appear & not impact economy = false comes from tax revenue = impact econ.
voter #3 = other institutions won't solve = False - says who. you never provided warrants
for this. & voters 5 & 6 are dead which I already voted for.
So nice work - keep improving line by line (Gov) and voters at end (Gov)

81ST MAHAFFEY MEMORIAL

Linfield College
November 11-13, 2011

Announce in round - and chair return ballots to tab please

Lewis & Clark TH (Emily Tribble & Emily Halter) vs. Carroll LB (Ryan Lorenz & Andy Burton)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

L & C TH

Carroll LB

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the ^{NEG}~~AFF~~ from Carroll
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This debate comes down to whether Greece/Italy or the Banks are Ground zero for Euro collapse leading to Global collapse. DA 1 & ~~AD 1~~ AD 1 are Interacting & ~~AD 1~~ kind of come to a stand still, however DA 2 gets uncovered by the AFF & is gone for by the Neg from Carroll

The EU (G) enact Systematic Economic Reform

Room: Walker 202
Start: ASAP
Open NPDA

QUAR

Hall, Lucas

81ST MAHAFFEY MEMORIAL

Linfield College
November 11-13, 2011

Announce in round - and chair return ballots to tab please

Lewis & Clark TH (Emily Tribble & Emily Halter) vs. Carroll LB (Ryan Lorenz & Andy Burton)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Lewis & Clark

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Carroll

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the

Aff
AFF or NEG

from

Carroll
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff drops IL scenario on grace and rely on. Would have needed to win inevitable error collapse, but I think you needed better Uniqueness. Neg also has defense on case solvency.

Room: Walker 312
Start: ASAP
Open NPDA

QUAR

Pierini, Chris

81ST MAHAFFEY MEMORIAL

Linfield College
November 11-13, 2011

Announce in round - and chair return ballots to tab please

Carroll BA (Sarah Brown & Casey Almas) vs. WWU CS (Nick Carlson & Sheridan Slater)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Carroll BA

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

WWU CS

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from Carroll BA
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Chris Pierini

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Cap Totus
- ≠ (S) Transition

Room: Walker 312
Start: ASAP
Open NPDA

QUAR

Ashley, Seth

81ST MAHAFFEY MEMORIAL

Linfield College
November 11-13, 2011

Announce in round - and chair return ballots to tab please

Carroll BA (Sarah Brown & Casey Almas) vs. WWU CS (Nick Carlson & Sheridan Slater)

AFFIRMATIVE

CARROLL BA

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

WWU CS

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from CARROLL
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Charles Kin KINCY
BELLEUE

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

LO: DEDEV BETTER DS K
THAN DA

MO: ALT IS YOUR
JOB IF YOU
ARGUE FRAMEWORK
B/C IT'S NOT
A UNIQUE DA

Room: Walker 312
Start: ASAP
Open NPDA

QUAR

Gafney

* chair

81ST MAHAFFEY MEMORIAL

Linfield College
November 11-13, 2011

Announce in round - and chair return ballots to tab please

WWU CS (Nick Carlson & Sheridan Slater) vs. Carroll BA (Sarah Brown & Casey Almas)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Carroll BA

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

WWU CS

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Aff from Carroll BA
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD looking back on the flow, I don't see the D-Development argument to be fully developed and was built by some very historic impacts that were not well-supported by solid warrants without those impacts, Gov wins.

Gov slow down and stop sanding away all the time, it ruins your ability to communicate. You both are charismatic when you drop the intensity.

OPA If you're going to run D-Dev, go all-in, maybe even present a collapse-inducing counter-plan, would have made for a better (or, at least more interesting) debate round.