Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024
Lincoln Douglas Debate Rd. 1 Sect. AC (Room E134)

Judge: BD1 Lynn Beeson

B65 Joshua Jordan (Aff/Pro) vs. B04 Maadhav Puvvada (Neg/Con)

Joshua Jordan: 28
Maadhav Puvvada: 27
Winning debater(s): B65 Joshua Jordan

Comments for Joshua Jordan

Clear and well stated case based on the contention of US complicity in war crimes by supporting autocratic government in the region. Nice job in the 2AR refuting the point about Russian and China stepping in to gain hegemony in the region--provided specifics about their constraints and highlighted their ties to Iran. It was an advantage for you to speak last--left a strong argument. Clear and confident delivery--good job in the round--especially rebuttal.
NVI: it's EXACERBATE (not exasperate)--to make things worse

Comments for Maadhav Puvvada

Strong case for hegemony supported by lots of evidence--nice use of sources. Good statement about impact on the global economy. Your point about trade routes was strong--especially its impact on the global economy. Good use of evidence in the NR with the Russia/China argument, but Aff's answer about their ties to Iran turned it to his side. And, of course, that was the last word. Very close decision. Confident delivery--nice job in the round.

Reason for Decision

The Affirmative (B65) wins the debate based upon his argument in the 2AR that China and Russia are in no position to seize control in the region thus negating Neg's hegemony contention. Neg's argument about trade routes was strong and convincing, but Aff prevailed in rebuttal.

Lincoln Douglas Debate Rd. 1 Sect. I (Room E108)
Judge: AP12 Elangovan Sivaswamy

B63 Kyle Meonske (Aff/Pro) vs. B86 Lilly Loomis (Neg/Con)

Kyle Meonske: 26

Lilly Loomis: 27

Winning debater(s): B86 Lilly Loomis

Comments for Kyle Meonske

Nicely presented the arguments.

Provided good response to the questions.

Some of the arguments are not provided with facts and it is generic.   Exceeded the time limits while summarizing.

Comments for Lilly Loomis

Observed and questioned well.

Justified counter arguments well.

Rushed at times while Affirmative responding to the questions.

Reason for Decision

Neg B86 - She questioned well and justified well

Lincoln Douglas Debate Rd. 1 Sect. U (Room E120)

Judge: T12 Tiffany Woods

B15 Adhya Duggal (Aff/Pro) vs. B64 Andrew Faluhelyi (Neg/Con)

Adhya Duggal: 29

Andrew Faluhelyi: 27

Winning debater(s): B15 Adhya Duggal

Comments for Adhya Duggal

Aff B15 was a very strong LD debater! They provided outstanding sources and were able to weaken the negs argument regarding the need for US presence to support US economic interests by countering with Iran's nuclear development. They spoke clearly and stayed on point. Near perfect score, but marked down a point for going over time during the aff construction and their 1st rebuttal.

Comments for Andrew Faluhelyi

Neg B64 spoke clearly, provided definitions to clarify their value and VC, provided strong sources supporting their contention, and asked pointed questions during their cross ex. While I feel they were a very strong debater, they failed to address the 4th contention presented by the aff and could improve their flow when attacking the aff contentions during their 1st and 2nd rebuttal.

Reason for Decision

Aff B15 wins. Value, VC, and contentions were clearly presented, defined/clarified (when needed), and supported by a variety of peer-reviewed sources and real-life scenarios. While they built their case during each of their construction and rebuttal phases, they solidified their win during the cross ex by asking pointed questions that helped weaken the negs value criteria and contention.

Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024

Public Forum Debate Rd. 1 Sect. D (Room E126)

Judge: AY3 Trisha Keefe

C45 Blayne Gaddis and Marc Ionescu (Aff/Pro) vs. C49 Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre (Neg/Con)

Blayne Gaddis and Marc Ionescu Points: 28

Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre Points: 29

Winning debater(s): C49 Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre

Comments for Blayne Gaddis and Marc Ionescu

c45 pro. Did good. Try to find some support evidence on why your topic can help stop the bad websites.

Comments for Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre

c49 con. did good

Reason for Decision

Cons C49 wins because they had support to the findings and was able to debunk the other teams

Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024
Public Forum Debate Rd. 1 Sect. O (Room E311)

Judge: BC7 Martin Zwergel

C28 Anna Trenta and Talie Koch (Aff/Pro) vs. C48 Andrew Klush and Grayson Maghes (Neg/Con)

Anna Trenta and Talie Koch Points: 28
Andrew Klush and Grayson Maghes Points: 26
Winning debater(s): C28 Anna Trenta and Talie Koch

Comments for Anna Trenta and Talie Koch

Strong case and strong delivery. Good calling your opponents on the dropped transparency arg.

If your opponents had had a more airtight link to stronger impacts this round would have been harder to decide. Digging deeper into more impacts (read, quantifiable, practical when possible) will make your case stronger and harder to rebut.

Comments for Andrew Klush and Grayson Maghes

Case has strong points. Digging into more research and arguments to have ready to defend your tech sector impacts and reinforce the role S230 would have in court clog will make your case much stronger.

Even if you don't have a perfect rebuttal for an argument, it's better than dropping it entirely. Transparency went undiscussed after the Pro constructive.

Do not bring in cards in final focus. Pro did a lot of rebuttal in Final Focus but they framed it within the context of voting issues args which made their final focus speech strong.

Reason for Decision

C28 Pro wins because one of their major contentions was dropped by con, and pro effectively argued against impacts for all of con's major points, which con did not reinforce strongly enough to stand. Pro impacts could have been clearer and stronger but they defended their case more strongly.

Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024
Lincoln Douglas Debate Rd. 2 Sect. AD (Room E135)
Judge: AU3 Jenn Franken

B64 Andrew Faluhelyi (Aff/Pro) vs. B108 Ishan Chahande (Neg/Con)

Andrew Faluhelyi: 24
Ishan Chahande: 25
Winning debater(s): B108 Ishan Chahande

Comments for Andrew Faluhelyi

You speak far too quietly, please speak up in the future. Your speed and enunciation also suffered. You also had like 50 seconds left to expand your case. Your case is very informative, but this doesn't feel like an argumentative case, more like an informative essay. Also, look up from your computer as you read. Possibly practice flowing, you're asking a lot of questions that were answered on the flow already. Also, don't ask your opponent to do things that are outside of the resolution. Go down the flow in your rebuttal speech so I don't think you're dropping an argument. Watch your time during your first rebuttal speech. You did not get back to your speech to try and defend it. Since you dropped all attacks made by your opponent, they must flow through the round. Use all your prep time, you still had two minutes left. This could even help with speech organization. Remember, don't make new arguments during your last speech. The economy vs. human lives point sounded newish.

Comments for Ishan Chahande

Good question about structural violence not being caused by the US. Try to expand your questions beyond asking "do you have proof for that." You ask one question after another without making any real follow ups. Go down the flow to make it easier for the judge. Framework could use more warranting, but contention level stuff was strong. Time allocation was a little off, but you used plenty of cards to back your arguments during your rebuttal speech. Good catch on Israel not needing to be our only Middle Eastern ally.

Reason for Decision

Neg B108 wins this round because the affirmative dropped all the attacks made against the affirmative case during the first affirmative rebuttal speech. This round was a bit strange. Both debaters presented cases that read like informative speeches and not argumentative cases. Very little direct clash was created. On both sides of the debate, framework felt like it was just tacked on and never used. The drop during the 1AR was key, and the negative debater needed to point this out.

Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024
Lincoln Douglas Debate Rd. 2 Sect. AF (Room E204)

Judge: AS4 Sarah Myers

B23 Harjote Kaur (Aff/Pro) vs. B65 Joshua Jordan (Neg/Con)

Harjote Kaur: 27
Joshua Jordan: 28
Winning debater(s): B65 Joshua Jordan

Comments for Harjote Kaur

1AR: I wanted to hear more on your C2. Good contention!

CX: When your opponent would ask you a question, you gave a politicians answer by not directly answer. I appreciate the strategy but at points it felt like you might not have understood the question. Also it got to the point where you would not let him ask another question.

1AR: FW debate, the examples brought up regarding the needing protests to elicit change were good. However, I wanted how the affirmative's case upholds Utilitarianism best.

Comments for Joshua Jordan

CX: If your opponent is taking over your CX time to ask you a question, you can politely interrupt to ask another.

1NR: During speech stated Yemen not at war. Since this topic is constantly changing, yesterday the news was updated to show Houthi's attack Yemen causing war in this region.

Reason for Decision

Neg (B65) wins because when evaluating framework the negation was able to show the best method in how to evaluate by making stability a prerequisite. Then, if utilitarianism is to be the framework to be upheld, the negation overall creates the less harm to the most people by preventing a nuclear war.

Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024
Lincoln Douglas Debate Rd. 2 Sect. B (Room E Lib 1)
Judge: BC11 Zachariah Sayre

B53 Zach Iler (Aff/Pro) vs. B63 Kyle Meonske (Neg/Con)

Zach Iler: 25
Kyle Meonske: 24
Winning debater(s): B53 Zach Iler

Comments for Zach Iler

Good job. You won the round based on your ability to better tie your contentions to your value and VC along with multiple arguments not being addressed by your opponent. A few things I would consider to possibly improve your case, expect the rebuttal of collateral damage and while civilians may die in conflicts the killing of terrorists may negate many civilian deaths and fear to perpetuate from terrorism. Try not to persuade based on just taking your value or VC, need to add some context as to why your value and VC should be preferred. You had a great 2AR where you wrapped things up nicely. Good job.

Comments for Kyle Meonske

Good job. You had some strong arguments with the power vacuum as part of your contention. You were a little pressed for time so continue to work on time management. You had a good opportunity for refuting your opponent by addressing that by killing terrorists it allows for potentially thousands of lives to be saved (think sept 11th). You let some of your opponents arguments to go unchallenged, make sure you address all of their arguments. You brought up morality a lot, you might decide to just go straight to using that as your value. Keep up the good work!

Reason for Decision

AFF wins the round, AFF was B53.

AFF wins based on carrying more arguments through the round that went unchallenged by his opponent. AFF further supported their win by tying their contentions to their value and VC.

Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024
Public Forum Debate Rd. 2 Sect. P (Room E311)
Judge: BC7 Martin Zwergel

C49 Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre (Aff/Pro) vs. C42 Daphne Tucker and Amrita Deo (Neg/Con)

Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre Points: 28
Daphne Tucker and Amrita Deo Points: 27
Winning debater(s): C49 Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre

Comments for Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre

You argued impacts well, but the only reason you won this round was because con failed to call you on an inconsistency in your case. You flip flopped between arguing benefits of companies moderating closely (terror and misinformation) or not at all (rebutting their cloud storage arg.), ignoring the fact that if companies choose not to moderate at all it effectively prevents the case from solving for your misinformation and terror harms. A more aware team will call you on this and probably win the round off it if you were to do it again against a team that realized your inconsistency.

You argued your impacts very well and if you can avoid that inconsistency in your arguments (and provide proof that companies under your world will moderate CLOSELY, stick to and defend that point as your two major contentions rely on it), then youll have a very solid case.

Comments for Daphne Tucker and Amrita Deo

Well argued and solid case. Specific examples in your constructives on the first amendment contention would give you more material to work with. Your censorship argument is fairly weak at the moment, it would be good to link it to some clearer impacts or drop it to take that time to reinforce other points in your case.

Pro had a huge hole in their case in that they flip flopped between the benefits of companies moderating very closely (terror and medical harms solve) or not at all (when rebutting your cloud storage harms), but I couldn't flow your way on that because you did not call them on their inconsistency. If you had argued a point about this you would probably have won the round.

Reason for Decision

C49 (Aff) won this round as their impact arguments flowed more cleanly and were more effectively quantified. Con's impacts were greater if taken at face value but the urgency and currency of pro's harms and impacts were argued better.

Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024
Public Forum Debate Rd. 2 Sect. T (Room E316)
Judge: L1 Taylor Nicholson

C11 Shreya Singh and Sanna Dawas (Aff/Pro) vs. C48 Andrew Klush and Grayson Maghes (Neg/Con)

Shreya Singh and Sanna Dawas Points: 26
Andrew Klush and Grayson Maghes Points: 25
Winning debater(s): C11 Shreya Singh and Sanna Dawas

Comments for Shreya Singh and Sanna Dawas

First speaker had great volume and eye contact as well as speaking mannerisms. First speaker spoke too fast and stumbled too often during the first speech, making it difficult to follow the contentions initially.

Second speaker makes great eye contact and has a good volume for speaking. Speaker 2 has lots of passion in the rebuttal and during CF rounds, but needs to allow the other team to respond to questions more adequately.

Both speakers would benefit from reeling in emotion/intensity to make it easier for the judge to follow.

Comments for Andrew Klush and Grayson Maghes

First speaker good speed and volume, couldn't win CF1. First speaker also shows a bit too much aggression during CF rounds.

Second speaker had great composure and was able to defend contentions and make good rebuttals against opponent. Had good reasoning during CF2. Second speaker won CF2 and GCF due to composure and solid evidence/questioning for the other team.

Reason for Decision

C11 (Aff) wins this debate. C11 had two solid contentions, Accountability and Transparency, and they were well-defended and could not be refuted well by C48. Additionally, the KVI of unethical profits was especially well-defended. C48's first contention regarding court clogs seemed weak and much discussion from both teams regarding the frivolous cases from this contention didn't have much substance or connection to Section 230. Even though C11 wins this debate, CF2 and GCF were decided in favor of C48. The rebuttals against C11 were good, but C11 had better contentions and were able to defend them better.

Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024

Lincoln Douglas Debate Rd. 3 Sect. AN (Room E213)

Judge: P1 Trisha Rhodes

B65 Joshua Jordan (Aff/Pro) vs. B88 Anthony Casey (Neg/Con)

Joshua Jordan: 25

Anthony Casey: 27

Winning debater(s): B88 Anthony Casey

Comments for Joshua Jordan

Good solid case! Your oppo was strategic but still gave you plenty of time to explain further nuances of your framework in CX. Interesting to see where they take this. The "nuclear proliferation" counterpoint turns the Neg to the Aff. Legitimacy is the key to both Aff/ Neg winning the round. You discredit all current gov't who are allied to the US with a broad brushstroke at the onset. If the local govt is satisfactory to allow countries to "fend for themselves", then the oppo is correct that hegemony protects the people from the new illegitimate gov't that will establish after the old is eradicated. You dig yourself a hole by discrediting all allied gov'ts that side with US by proxy or directly. Your oppo's cards deal with this logically and economically.

Comments for Anthony Casey

Your case was outstanding in that it withstood the claims of the Aff at their C level. You win the def. debate at the framework level, but oppo's Air Force arms card presents problems by proxy, as they stated in case. They attempt to apply it calling the US an illegitimate gov't. However, your oppo cannot provide evidence of what a legitimate gov't in the Aff world would then look like. Thus, your hegemony arg w/thstands the warrant/ impacts of the Aff's attacks at both the 1AR and 2AR. Great job not allowing yourself to be unsettled by your oppo's claims.

Reason for Decision

B88 Neg wins the round due to a substantially more logical (and historically successful reason) for the SQ as opposed to a utopia of ever shifting local regimes. Hegemony wins because otherwise all humanitarian rights lose in the Aff.

Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024
Lincoln Douglas Debate Rd. 3 Sect. L (Room E111)

Judge: AV1 Megan Dzurec

B111 Preetam Kassetty (Aff/Pro) vs. B64 Andrew Faluhelyi (Neg/Con)

Preetam Kassetty: 26

Andrew Faluhelyi: 27

Winning debater(s): B64 Andrew Faluhelyi

Comments for Preetam Kassetty

Strengths:
Preetam--you provided sound contentions and research. The examples you provided in support of your citations was tangible and you connected the use of the military and diplomacy to support your contentions. You confidently rebutted your opponent and demonstrated an understanding without referring to your notes.

Growth areas:
During the 1st REB, there was a lot of repetition. Instead of stating "things such as Isis" or "the Isis", refer to "Isis" or "terrorist groups". There was no support in your rebuttal regarding civility or humanitarianism (probably due to time constraints), but this was a large part of your argument. One more recommendation....do not have gum in your mouth during a debate!

Comments for Andrew Faluhelyi

Strengths:
You thoroughly researched and presented a robust argument to support your stance. You provided examples and citations to demonstration your understanding and asked for specific information from your opponent in a respectful, informative way. In the REB, you had great eye contact and clearly used the prep time effectively. The focus of your KVIs, along with your confidence in the REB round, was solid.

Growth areas:
Slow down, especially during CX. Many of your points were unintelligible due to the rate of your words. Remove your outer coat prior to the debate and always try to face the opponent or judge rather than the well. The room set-up was awkward, but remember your voice gains volume and your eye contact is evident when facing forward.

Reason for Decision

NEG (B64) WINS the debate as the support of his argument was more thorough.

Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024
Lincoln Douglas Debate Rd. 3 Sect. Q (Room E116)

Judge: J1 Beth Balough

B63 Kyle Meonske (Aff/Pro) vs. B91 Kristien McCockran (Neg/Con)

Kyle Meonske: 26

Kristien McCockran: 25

Winning debater(s): B63 Kyle Meonske

Comments for Kyle Meonske

get through definitions quicker, you don't need the definition describing how many countries are in each region

I would shorten your Palestine contention and add another contention, I don't think its wise to focus so intently on only one region.

be concise in cross ex

speak quicker and more concisely

in my opinion you wasted time on the framework debate, you should've spent more time disproving your opponents case

you claim your opponent doesn't propose other regions but they did multiple times

Comments for Kristien McCockran

I think your speaking pace is a bit too quick

you use the word connotations way too much

where did justice come from? you can't change your framework halfway through the round

you should be attacking your opponents case in your last speak

be more structured in your last speech, follow the flow

Reason for Decision

speaker B63, aff, won todays debate because they won the framework debate and provided clear, concrete details and solutions that provide solvency for both sides of the case. Neg fails to provide specifics for how military presence solves for terror and violence, while aff proves that decreased intervention benefits all parties

Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024
Public Forum Debate Rd. 3 Sect. B (Room E122)

Judge: AP9 Amit Gupta

C48 Andrew Klush and Grayson Maghes (Aff/Pro) vs. C45 Blayne Gaddis and Marc Ionescu (Neg/Con)

Andrew Klush and Grayson Maghes Points: 26

Blayne Gaddis and Marc Ionescu Points: 27

Winning debater(s): C45 Blayne Gaddis and Marc Ionescu

Comments for Andrew Klush and Grayson Maghes

Andrew and Grayson had good contentions with data backing up their contentions. Andrew and Grayson brought a lot of energy to the debate. Unfortunately, their contentions about terrorism and malicious misinformation was blocked by opponent team with solid arguments.

Keep up the good work!

Comments for Blayne Gaddis and Marc Ionescu

Blayne and Marc had good contentions. They successfully blocked other team's contention of illegal content and terrorism. Their contention of court clogging was solid backed up with data.

Great job!

Reason for Decision

NEG C45 wins because they successfully blocked the main contentions of opponent team about terrorism and misinformation.

Good job by both teams.

Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024
Public Forum Debate Rd. 3 Sect. V (Room E320)

Judge: C7 Ahana Dey

C40 Adam Stano and Dylan Molter (Aff/Pro) vs. C49 Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre (Neg/Con)

Adam Stano and Dylan Molter Points: 29

Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre Points: 28

Winning debater(s): C40 Adam Stano and Dylan Molter

Comments for Adam Stano and Dylan Molter

Speaker 1- Great summary. Good job on frontlines to attacks and weighing mechanisms.
Speaker 2- Great rebuttal and responses. Make sure to mention your impacts briefly and how your defense relates to those impacts in rebuttal. Great final, make sure to flesh out weighing as done in summary.

Comments for Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre

Speaker 1- Good summary. Good job extending partner attacks and responding to the other side. I would recommend spending more time weighing why your impacts are more important in the round when compared to theirs at the end of the speech.
Speaker 2- Good rebuttal. Good weighing at the end of the speech. Good final!

Reason for Decision

Aff C40 wins because of overview, weighing framework, Tech Crash, and the Banking contention. This was a very close round for me and ultimately came down to the two contentions stated above. Starting with the overview, I gave to Aff as they showed that the reforms being discussed required Section 230 repeal. Court clog is a wash for both sides. Thus, I ultimately voted for the Banking contention. The Aff side was able to prove that bots are not protected under free speech. However, even if this was a wash, Aff extended through every speech that it didn't matter because the argument is perceptual, companies will start cracking down on bots because they don't want to get sued. Regarding Tech Crash, Neg wasn't able to adequately respond to how small tech has a smaller duty of care, and they would not be affected as much, as well as other Big Tech responses. Given these notes on the contention level, when weighing impacts I bought Aff's weighing framework when voting for the round. Again, great job to both teams!

Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024
Lincoln Douglas Debate Rd. 4 Sect. AD (Room E135)
Judge: AS4 Sarah Myers

B113 Will Davis (Aff/Pro) vs. B63 Kyle Meonske (Neg/Con)

Will Davis: 26
Kyle Meonske: 23
Winning debater(s): B113 Will Davis

Comments for Will Davis

1AC: When you started reading your contentions, you had 3 minutes left. I felt like you could ave had more specific information on your C2 on how US prevents counterterrorism measures, but since it took so long to get through the framework it shortens your contention arguments.

1AR: You started off strong, easy to follow and strong points. Probably the last 30 seconds you lost me on the flow and not sure what arguments you were making because I felt your pressure because you were running low on time.

2AR: FW: That could have been A LOT clearer "act of intervening now, not intervening, intervening....." I really wanted in that speech what you said you would give in your off time road map. In turned into observations, to line by line to "oh, I forgot, KVI's". If you need to take the last 36 seconds of prep to get your thoughts together, please take it.

Comments for Kyle Meonske

CX: Your opponent was asking you questions about your value political realism. Either he got your confused by the questions, or you were not so confident with value. Also, when he asked about the war that Russia is fighting with Ukraine, you could have answered with how large Russia's military is that they could expand it in two places.

1NR: For the AFF C2 it was stating if US stays in the region we are doing more harm than good because causing more terrorism. Your argument of staying in the region to keep trying, not give up may not be the best attack on that contention.

2NR: I followed your KVI's beautifully. You did a wonderful job explaining the most important items in the round. In this speech, I needed a better breakdown of your framework debate. I think both sides became confused in the end to be honest. Also, evidence in the 1NR against your opponent's arguments would strengthen your case.

Explanation RFD: (FW) The FW was flawed when the Aff stated if there is no actor for morality, there could be immorality that influences political realism. Therefore, aff won the FW debate. Also, the neg made good claims and good arguments, but if there is no evidence to support it, while the other side has evidence - I have to go with the evidence.

Reason for Decision

Aff (B113) wins because the affirmative was able to show a better framework and evidence to support claims.

Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024
Lincoln Douglas Debate Rd. 4 Sect. AE (Room E201)

Judge: BI1 Sofie Meyers

B64 Andrew Faluhelyi (Aff/Pro) vs. B74 Kerstin Bender (Neg/Con)

Andrew Faluhelyi: 24

Kerstin Bender: 25

Winning debater(s): B74 Kerstin Bender

Comments for Andrew Faluhelyi

AC:
Your case is good! Make sure to slow down your speaking a little bit so everyone can understand better. You had about 55 seconds left in this speech, so you could definitely slow down! Also, I think you need a more clear cut definition for what military presence is. I don't really think anyone believes that military aid includes military presence, it's kind of the other way around... Military presence is a part of military aid.. idk about this, but maybe your opponent won't contest it.

CX: Good line of questioning here, you did a good job not getting flustered and keeping a calm demeanor during CX.

AR1:
I would make sure that if you give a roadmap, make it easy and follow it, just say you'll go over your opponents case then defend your own. That way you don't have to go back and forth so much. You need need need to signpost your speech and go down the flow. This was a super confusing speech to follow because you don't tell us where you're at. You didn't really address FW at all and then I really struggled to find whose side you were talking about and at what points. Suggestion: Address all the FW together at the beginning, show why yours wins over the opponents, then go right into attacking your opponent's case, go down the flow ("On my opponent's first contention... second contention..."), then go to your side of the flow ("On my first contention my opponent says... [add your defense]") This should hopefully help you out because not a lot of ground was covered in this speech and I'm not really sure what the main arguments are at this point in time. Also your opponent dropped your entire FW and first contention, I would make sure to say that.

AR2:
Make shorter taglines for your KVI's, taglines are usually 1-4 words something like that, the tagline was just super long and not easily referable. You also give the first KVI and then talk about a lot of other points within this. At that point I would just separate the points into more KVI's.

Comments for Kerstin Bender

CX: Great job keeping pressure on this line of questioning! You do a great job of making CX interesting and keeping a great back and forth with your opponent.

NC/NR1:
Great job! You speak very confidently and you have a lot of great points in your case. Your observations in your case were perfect, and your whole case is well structured with good points and evidence. This speech kind of fell apart when you moved to address your opponents speech. You kind of just skip over the FW and affs C1. You didn't signpost (tell me where you're at in the speech, like "moving onto address my opponent's contention 1..." something like that). I could kind of infer what points of the aff speech you were referencing which all fell into C2 but make sure you tell the judge and your opponent where you're at... go down the flow, it makes it super easy. Using some prep time before this speech might have also helped you plan more args or attacks on the FW and C1 if you didn't have anything. You have a great speaking voice and great content in your speech, I think your attacks and rebuttal just need a bit of development.

NR2:
Once again you don't really attack or respond to the FW, you just kind of mention that it exists. You need to tell me why yours wins or supports the round better than your opponents does. You need to signpost as well. This speech was super confusing because I didn't really know where you were at or what you were responding to the whole time. You have great explanations for a lot of things, I'm just not really sure where these points fit in, in the scope of the round. Your KVI's were okay, I wouldn't say dropped points is a great KVI for this round considering you dropped a lot of your opponent's points too. I did like your other 2 KVI's of conflict management and governmental legitimacy though! Overall, good speaking voice and great confidence, you just need to organize though !

Reason for Decision

B74 Neg wins. neg wins because they were able to provide more attacks to the aff case and provide more defense to their own case.

This round was really hard to judge based on the lack of signposting, organization, and just general arguments made. Everything got really muddled and it seemed like the two debaters were arguing for the same thing at times. Lots of work needed but both debaters have lots of potential to do really well.

Overall good job! Suggestions and help for future in the comments ^^

Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024
Lincoln Douglas Debate Rd. 4 Sect. L (Room E111)

Judge: AM9 Sandeep Duggal

B06 Lucy Papini (Aff/Pro) vs. B65 Joshua Jordan (Neg/Con)

Lucy Papini: 26
Joshua Jordan: 27
Winning debater(s): B65 Joshua Jordan

Comments for Lucy Papini

Aff's constructive argument was organized and cleanly delivered with supporting cards.

Good cross ex round

Opportunity to better manage time especially in the AR1 round

Comments for Joshua Jordan

Strong signposting of arguments.

Good passionate delivery of your case. It was very believable. Also, your rebuttal rounds were very organized and clearly presented and easy to follow.

Reason for Decision

Neg B65 Joshua Jordan won the round as he was able to make a stronger case of not affirming the resolution as that will lead to destabilization and more harm.

Aff + Neg: both had very clear statement of value & criteria.

Overall a close round with slight edge to the Neg debator

Each sides flows had nice opportunity for clash and opposition. Overall, this was a good debate

Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024

Public Forum Debate Rd. 4 Sect. K (Room E303)

Judge: AF5 Prabhanjan Mungi

C24 Ana Sverko and Dylan Wise Warnement (Aff/Pro) vs. C48 Andrew Klush and Grayson Maghes (Neg/Con)

Ana Sverko and Dylan Wise Warnement Points: 28

Andrew Klush and Grayson Maghes Points: 27

Winning debater(s): C24 Ana Sverko and Dylan Wise Warnement

Comments for Ana Sverko and Dylan Wise Warnement

Comments for Andrew Klush and Grayson Maghes

Reason for Decision

Pro(C24) won the debate, They bolstered their arguments with compelling examples and court cases.
The arguments pertaining to the tech crash and court clogging were skillfully articulated and countered,
leading to a shift in the debate in their favor.

Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024
Public Forum Debate Rd. 4 Sect. N (Room E308)

Judge: AP9 Amit Gupta

C23 Lukas Graber and Liam Wright (Aff/Pro) vs. C49 Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre (Neg/Con)

Lukas Graber and Liam Wright Points: 28

Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre Points: 29

Winning debater(s): C49 Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre

Comments for Lukas Graber and Liam Wright

Lukas and Liam had very good contentions related to AI. Good rebuttal of court clogging contention. Good points in Grand Cross to defend misinformation.

This was a great debate. Both teams were tied till the very end.

Great performance by Lukas and Liam!

Comments for Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre

Evan and Alaina had very good contentions backed by data. Court clogging contention was good. Good responses to court clogging rebuttal by citing Zoom online cases during pandemic. They repeatedly cited 466k incarcerations throughout the debate and very impressively highlighted this fact multiple times.
Great job!

Reason for Decision

C49 NEG wins by the slightest of margins. This was a wonderful debate and both teams performed wonderfully. C49 wins by smallest margin with an impressive closing in Final Focus.

Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024
Public Forum Debate Quarterfinal Sect. D (Room E302)
Judge: F3 Alex Kalmar

C49 Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre (Aff/Pro) vs. C40 Adam Stano and Dylan Molter (Neg/Con)

Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre Points: 27

Adam Stano and Dylan Molter Points: 28

Winning debater(s): C40 Adam Stano and Dylan Molter

Comments for Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre

Comments for Adam Stano and Dylan Molter

Reason for Decision

Neg C40 won the round on their monopolies argument.

Ultimately, Neg proved that monopolies create security risk. Aff never really addresses the specific argument, they just say that security is better with big companies.

Misinformation argument wasnâ€™t really weighed as the question of solvency was raised by the 1st Amendment, and that being protected speech.

Terrorism was interesting but if both sides see terrorists using secure transmission methods neither side accesses solvency.

Good overall round, both teams are talented debaters.

Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024
Public Forum Debate Quarterfinal Sect. D (Room E302)

Judge: AD1 Becky Weaver

C49 Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre (Aff/Pro) vs. C40 Adam Stano and Dylan Molter (Neg/Con)

Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre Points: 28

Adam Stano and Dylan Molter Points: 29

Winning debater(s): C40 Adam Stano and Dylan Molter

Comments for Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre

I preferred your debating style and liked your case arguments but overall felt the other side was able to poke a few holes in it which is why they prevailed (example, terrorism, monopolies, common carriers) This was a very close debate as evident by the score. You did a great job.

Comments for Adam Stano and Dylan Molter

You were very good debaters. You have a different style than the opposition and were able to effectively make your case in point out some opportunities in the other side (monopolies, vaccines/the next pandemic, terrorism, common carriers). You both did a great job as evident by the score which was very close.

Reason for Decision

Con side C40 won because overall they had better evidence and were more effective at refuting the opposition. Both teams were amazing debaters but the Con side was able to attack a few opportunities in the Pro's case leading to concessions.

Wooster's Sharen B Althoff Rotary Invitational - Jan. 12-13, 2024
Public Forum Debate Quarterfinal Sect. D (Room E302)

Judge: L1 Taylor Nicholson

C49 Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre (Aff/Pro) vs. C40 Adam Stano and Dylan Molter (Neg/Con)

Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre Points: 28

Adam Stano and Dylan Molter Points: 29

Winning debater(s): C40 Adam Stano and Dylan Molter

Comments for Evan Updegraff and Alaina Sayre

First speaker: Had great eye contact and explanations during the first crossfire regarding the EFF ruling and how cloud companies do not fall under Section 230.

Second speaker: Made good eye contact and had good rebuttals against the other team. She was able to win CX2.

Comments for Adam Stano and Dylan Molter

First speaker: Could have used the remaining 5 seconds for an additional statement. Had great input during the first CX and GCX that stumped the opponents.

Second speaker: Had outstanding presentation and composure. The 10 rebuttals against the opponents' contentions secured the victory because the majority went unaddressed and flowed through.

Reason for Decision

C40 (Con) wins this debate. This team had two solid contentions. The first contention about Data disasters had two subpoints, the first of which was rebutted well by C49 regarding the fact that according to the EFF ruling, cloud companies don't fall under 230. This could not be refuted by the winning team. The other subpoint about monopolies flowed through.

The second contention about AI was not refuted and therefore flowed.

C49 had two good contentions, but C40 was able to provide a total of 10 rebuttals against these contentions--the strongest being an argument that these platforms would become common carriers if section 230 is repealed. This was not refuted by C49, and therefore flows to C40.

CX1 went to C40, CX2 went to C49, and the GCF flowed to C40.