



First Debate Jury feedback 1

First of all, what we want to say is that everyone competed very well. We made the decision by majority vote. We will explain in the order 4th, 3rd, 2nd and 1st. Opposition opening, closing opposition, closing government, opening government

We would like to talk about an important situation in the debate. You make a very good argument in the debate. You trust it very much. But if you can't explain its mechanism well, it may be meaningless. Now we will evaluate starting from the 4th team. The culture argument remained with speaker 1. He made a good point, but the opposition was refuted by the closing. But the service sector and economy narrative given by the second speaker was sufficient. Although he mentioned it later in the closing moments, the argument remained in the opening and was one of the strongest arguments in the match. One argument remained standing. The innovative immigrant's argument was good but was refuted by the government opening 2nd speaker. The feminism speech was irrelevant and out of context. It could have been way better. But you did not explain why the population should be increased. The other side did not claim such a thing. They even complained about the increase in population. Hence the argument was left out of the match. As for the government shutdown. The definitions were nice. The best argument was the situation analysis. We are already in a good position as a country in the European Union. Why do we need more qualified immigrants? In this way, the opposition opening was refuted once again. The narrative of a prospect of a better future came from the closing opposition and because of this argument they surpassed opening opposition.

Final Debate Jury feedback 2

Thank you very much everyone for the speeches. You really used every argument we could think of. But every race has a winner. Our winner is the opposition opening team. He explained that if a number of nuclear power plants explode, they cause great harm to humanity. He said that instead of water, wind and solar energy can be used. But the opposition team refuted this argument by citing climate change. Also, the Dutch example was a good example of this. They mentioned that the possibility of power plants exploding is low. They mentioned that although the cost of establishing power plants is high, it becomes cheaper in the long run. The descriptions of the government wing were also good. Also, the Chernobyl disaster was one of the important arguments of the match and the opposition wing could not refute it. But since the opposition had more standing arguments, they were the winners of the match. Thank you everyone for the enjoyable match.