### Novice L-D Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 908</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth Ellis</td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td>Ria Umesh Manathkar</td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Ironwood High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>35 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner) **NO**

Is this a low point win? **Yes**

---

**Ellis** - unless you'll address all elements of the definition, they seem forced

1. Takes away a right
2. Gets them out of a trial which lets dangerous criminals go- re-offend

Secured unprepared (was unprepared)

no cross x

no rebuttal

---

**Manathkar** -

- let him finish his response after you ask a question
- you address his content and process well
- your diplomacy at his lack of preparedness is impressive.
  - felt a little like you were toying with him at the end of cross

1. Organized crime and terrorism - El Chapo very topical
2. Court clog - not necessarily convinced of court clog as a result of a.

You set up NVAV well is cross x

Careful not to let emotion take you away.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 908</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Maggie Feng</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Perry High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Antonio Gomez</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

Is this a low point win? **No**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

---

**- Feng**
- Word choice is strong - wealth of contentions - fair evidence though word choice often exceeds thin quantifiable evidence
- Strong response to cross
- Let him finish his answers (even if they do take a minute)
- Mitigating structural violence (institutional) - who is Morris? example
- Taking time on cases seems to support court clog (not convinced by your rebuttal)
- Seemed more focused on rebuttal than presenting your argument as a whole

---

**- Gomez**
- Questions seemed rather curious & repetitive
- Expounded justice system & doesn't solve root cause (pretrial reform)
- Veil of ignorance - hard to follow logic here
- Spread didn't help - blanket statement of corruption in CJ seems an out of statement
- "Moral imperative" started strong
- Continual fiddling of pens, seems less certain
- Final summary fairly strong
LANCASTER, MARK

Novice L-D Debate
Mark Lancaster (*'26)

Round 2
Flight 2
Room 301
Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM

Affirmative
Lawrence Lindenbaum
43 Pinnacle High School

Points (20-30)
27.5

Negative
Zachary Jones
56 BASIS Phoenix

Points (20-30)
26

The winner of this debate was
Affirmative
Negative
(Circle Winner) No

Comments & Reason for Decision:
- Nice clarity on the Aff. Const.
- Good sites (Ex. 5th Amendment)
- Good examples (Supreme Court cases)
- Do you have other examples other than Alaska? Are they the only state to enact this ruling?
- Good statistics
- Good job in going against cross
- Cross Examination (Racism) interesting angle (Good)
- Good job in cross
- Nice clarity & tone on Neg. Const.
- Keep on topic to combat the Aff. Const.
- Good sites & examples to support your stand on Neg. Const.
- Try not to jump against US Justice System on a conspiracy type level (Though you did make some good points).
- Start to make a stand to back up claims.
- Human Rights Statement (Good Point)
- Monopoly on Justice (Expand on this point). I need to understand this within your Neg. Const.
- Supreme Court states about plea bargaining? You could add to this debate in Aff. Plea bargaining as well as Neg. going against the Aff. Const.
- Last rebuttal (Good) Points about the Neg. Const. Not going to contest your points directly.
LANCASTER, MARK

Bobcat Bonanza 2018

NLD

Novice L-D Debate | Mark Lancaster (*26)
--- | ---
Round 2 | Flight 1 | Room 301 | Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheanna Robinson</td>
<td>Logan Kraver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Odyssey Institute for Advanced and International Studies</td>
<td>42 McClintock High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative | Negative
--- | ---
(Circle Winner) | (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? | No |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **Affirmative:**
  - Nice clarity and opening on Aff. Point.
  - Court Rights (Good Stats).
  - Interesting points.
  - Nice angle (Innocent Incarceration).
  - Not sure why the plea bargain for financial need was wrong.
  - Be confident while getting more confident with opening Aff. Court.
  - Cross: Confident (try not to struggle for your words).
  - Ask strong questions (I like the one about child representation at incarceration).
  - 1st rebuttal: Good points on this point of interrogation. (starting to get off topic).
  - Good bringing this back to plea bargaining at the end.

- **Negative:**
  - NICE plea bargaining and had your opponent reeling a bit.
  - Good cross (Innocent?) not sure where this is going. I'll look for it in your Neg. Court.
  - Nice clarity & opening on Neg. Court.
  - Good points & stats to support your points.
  - Liked the support on your main points (statistics).
  - Nice addition of cross in your Neg. Court.
  - Interesting that you bring up government spending (good point).
  - Interesting reply to the child interrogation question. (Not sure you are on the right side here).
  - Neg. rebuttal: Good to bring back the interrogation (not very germane to plea bargaining).
  - Interesting about crowding up the courts & the funds it costs the tax payer.
  - Good point about risk assessment system... very interesting. Not sure about 85% stat.
  - I like this idea though.
  - Good point about personal trauma to victims.
### NLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>Sam Feng (*'48)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Flight 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room 903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Epstein</td>
<td>Grace Vohs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Shadow Mountain High School</td>
<td>30 BASIS Flagstaff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **No**

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

1. Both parties made good points and argued.
2. Affirmative point firmly contends data when negative argued model illness people & child care less strong.
3. Negative asked good question on right point that pre-lead guilt speeds up care & efficiency for our justice system.
4. Affirmative is win on strong point.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 903</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong>&lt;br&gt;(20-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong>&lt;br&gt;(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komal Matharu&lt;br&gt;35 Hamilton High School</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>logan phillip goulette&lt;br&gt;15 Centennial High School</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **NO**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both did good job to speak out point

1. Affirmative clearly point out 3 counter cues, but negative didn’t follow to attack & argue.
2. Affirmative answered well an negative’s questions
3. Negative focused on his ownly point pretty well, but not fully stay on Affirmative’s point.
4. Affirmative may used better body language.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 909</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice L-D Debate</td>
<td>Derek Chisum (*'56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affirmative**

Dong An Bui  
52 Copper Canyon

Points (20-30) 2-3

**Negative**

Sajni Patel  
35 Hamilton High School

Points (20-30) 7-9

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **N O**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Neg presented more convincing arguments. The Aff needs to convey your rebuttal in more confidence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>Derek Chisum (*56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Flight 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room 909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayla Allen-Coogen</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Ironwood High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Gutierrez</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Mountain View High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative** **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **NO**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both presented good arguments. But the Aff. had more convincing points.
### Novice L-D Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter Miller</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 McClintock High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damon Meyer</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Bonita Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative** (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **No**

---

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **Justice**
  - Individual rights vs neg affect
  - Right of others
- **Efficiency**
  - Bench trials
  - Agendas
- **Fairness**
  - Economic impact
  - Cost & bail
  - Cost & going to trial
  - Loss of income while waiting for trial

**Bench trials**
- Time to wait
- Cost & going to trial
- Cost & bail
- Loss of income

- **Perjury encouraged & organized crime level**
  - Discussed

---

- **Justice**
  - Pragmatism
  - Effectiveness & fairness as a result of efficiency
  - Court clog mentioned
  - Refutes bench trials
  - Statements not supported by study data
  - Attempts to refute economic impact statements not supported

Ignored perjury on this level
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>Jovilynn Maxwell ('22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Flight 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 401</td>
<td>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia Cartsonis</td>
<td>Anthony Mayo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td>20 Arcadia High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative** (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **no**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Good presentation skill
- Good conclusion
- Good choices
- Support

- Keep closer eye on clock or have judge keep time.
- Classy very good
- Asked for "new" proof
- Very strong closing presentation
- Told Aff to debut
- Both debaters used fresh and well thought out contentions and support.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 401</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayashree Vinod Adivarahan</td>
<td>35 Hamilton High School</td>
<td>Sriya Konda</td>
<td>55 BASIS Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very strong presentation. Well delivered, supported by good content. Well thought-out supported.

Negot well rebuttal. Very well presented.

Q: Reliance/Revision of 6th amendment could lead to a question in cross - should a defendant then not be allowed to plead guilt during arraignment.

Good presentation skills. Did a very good job keeping on with weight and in the debate room.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 304</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsa Amini</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Violeta Panayotova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td>36 Tempe Preparatory Academy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner) 

Is this a low point win? **No**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Affirmative**
- Outstanding style - great eye contact, articulation, speed, sound clarity of framework was great with good empirical data with proper quotes from sources.
- Rebuttal was very well done. On Negative. Address points such as
  - Back log due to Supreme Court Nominations
  - Data is only correct.
  - Stare Decisis, Torture, Bombs, hunting & some 100 in Totalitarianism & sound point
- Reemphasized his points
- Duress
- Gov System Bias
- Necessity & unfairness stressed

**Negative**
- Great posture & speed.
- Comes across very professional.
- Good inflection of voice to stress points. Clear points.
- On cross - didn't get too repetitiveness of slavery. Good response. That is unconstitutional.

Rebuttal - not good argued on slavery but focused on choice was good and to mention reform vs removal of plea bargaining. Not good rebuttal on Bronx date for whole USA.

K.F.D.: The affirmative was logical and well organized. Great use of quotes (less empirical evidence). Argument for affirmative were more sound and concise. Rebuttals on affirmative also more sound arguments.
Novice L-D Debate | Italo Pennella (*'21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 304</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aja Bribiescas</td>
<td>9 Betty Fairfax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail Soto</td>
<td>52 Copper Canyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Affirmative:

- **Style** - You came across confident and clear.
- **Evidence** - Excellent use of resources with empirical evidence of quotes
- **Arguments** - Nicely done on rebuttal pointing out lack of resources regarding scholars. Showing credibility lacks with negative arguments. Good use of Alaska case study to show there is no overcharging. Also good point on 6th Amendment doesn't guarantee plea bargaining.
- Stumbled at the end but arguments seemed more convincing. Could be style was more assertive which helped in this debate.

Negative:

- **Style** - Clear, Courteous well spoken
- **Evidence** - Contentions were well stated
  - Nice quote with Warren Burger Famous Supreme Court Justice. Plea bargaining is inefficient.
- **Arguments** - Weak in beginning with lack of scholar quotes. But came back with good neg rebuttal
  - Printed out new info on affirmative and should be stricken
  - Good point on money comes from taxpayers it hurts economy
  - Guilty people still guilty very effective + beneficial
- Preparation to use maximum time is recommended. Had time left to use.

R.F.D = **Affirmative** came across stronger. Close call on debate. Both had convincing arguments but Affirmative won out because of assertiveness style + pointing out lack of credibility of Negative on sources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NLD</th>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>Tracy Lynn Weaver (*53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Flight 2</td>
<td>Room 907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Delaney Krieger</td>
<td>26 Arizona College Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Xenia Zhao</td>
<td>35 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **No**

Judge's Signature

Trophy College Prep

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Strong Ck
- Slow down bl, saves bl, turns & timings
- Hard to hear I'm rusty
- Textbook Ck
- Good sign posting
- Cooling
- Signposting!!
- Never concede anything

R.F.D.: Proposition & Jenkins

- Do nothing from neg
- Impact back to neg
## Novice L-D Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 907</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong>&lt;br&gt;Brian Kur&lt;br&gt;56 BASIS Phoenix&lt;br&gt;Points (20-30) 28</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong>&lt;br&gt;Grace Martin&lt;br&gt;30 BASIS Flagstaff&lt;br&gt;Points (20-30) 27</td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong>&lt;br&gt;N</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong>&lt;br&gt;N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aff offers strong, well-developed arguments. Aff’s value is justice. She should revise her value criterion to “upholding the US constitution,” not just US constitution. Neg’s framework is problematic. Neg brings up Nozick and the protection of natural rights. Nozick’s main theory about the legitimate transfer of holdings seems to be misunderstood by neg or further links should be made. Neg’s rebuttal that plea bargaining cannot solve all the problems of the whole system is an argument which aff easily defend defended against. Aff responds that all problems may not be solved but the problems of innocents being coerced and justice being met would be. Both sides do not respond to all of their opponent’s contentions. So, rebuttals could be improved by both. The logic of the aff side was easier to follow. Neg should avoid the blanket generalization that the whole justice system is flawed and impossible to repair – stick to showing how plea bargaining is beyond repair.
Aff speaks clearly but should work on picking up speed. Also her value criterion is wordy: VC= justice for defendant because it is the best tool if my value is to be upheld. Reduce value criterion to a few words. To save time which could be used to explaining your framework and developing your arguments, you should define fewer words.

Your organization was great, clearly distinguishing three contentions with concise taglines. Contention 2 about Inconsistency was a bit unclear.

Neg offered a number of good reasons but could do a better job organizing his contentions and linking his value of efficiency to them. During neg rebuttal, many awkward pauses occurred.

Aff offered a few weak counterarguments. She tried to discredit one of opponent's sources by saying person is not qualified because he did nothing in law but teach it.

Neg had a more difficult time responding to aff's arguments. For example, he argued that racism and inconsistency was a problem caused by prosecutors and the justice system but did not connect how this justifies the retention of plea bargaining.
# Novice L-D Debate

## Round 2  |  Flight 2  | Room 902  | Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Jennifer Tran  
59' Mesquite High School | Logan Anaya  
45' Ironwood High School |

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **NO**

## Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative: Your definition of value was circular. Wonderful speaking demeanor with an outstanding Aff Case. Great links of case to remarks. You seemed to miss state “prosecutors working for defendants” - did you mean public defenders?

Interesting question on more value - where Order? provoke - where were you young. Focus a little more toward Framework - I wondered how to use infrastructure as collateral闹! But your & didn't focus questions on this enough.

I'd recommend off time reading before 3rd Aff extremely focused to resolve 2nd Aff analysis which essentially lead to ballot.

Neg: 1st Neg - most more time in prep so you familiarize with neg case will allow greater fluidity in delivery. Be sure to consider Framework analysis/weighting. Don't fall around with your card doing. 2nd. your analysis is 2nd Neg on voting issues needs further analysis & not merely restatement of case.

Justice - behavior
Criminal utilities

P.B. - agrees
C.J. - collective institutions
a) Low end
b) Judicial
c)6 negroes

Justice - behavior
Criminal utilities

Order
Infrastructure

P.B. v.
C.J.

APJ
Justice leads to order I Justice concepts for order

Ending
Justice
Cagargo
Cagargo caused by P.B.

P.B. after Civil War
Release value

Judicial error - more trials more error

Innocent people not the majority of people convicted of crimes, utilities

APJ
Sentence change highly unlikely
This assembel crowd uses analysis of end of law

Choice is undoubt
Innocent guilty
guilt

Voters
1) Court Clay
2) Judicial error
NLD

Novice L-D Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 902</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Nolan Murphy</td>
<td>26 Arizona College Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Czapek</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Bonita Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Nolan Murphy

Is this a low point win? NO

Judge's Signature

MCCUTCHEON Retired

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: Tremendous speaker. You should do oral and extemp for speech. Strong case! Great evidence on CTE. Careful on why you pumped framework? - You allowed Neg to argue case. Great? Follow up on

case load. Great 2nd alt analysis of framework rebuttal of Neg case. This is toughest speech of the year. You chose to hit exclusively Neg case & framework was a risky one. Very sophisticated 3rd alt integrating analysis on to voters. Clash to explain framework & weigh Justice v. Social Welfare

NEG: Methodology? - try asking apples to apples for comparing what modern to Black. You have a wonderful pressure & effective delivery style - I consider this a public speaking event - slow down be more flexible with Neg case & work on balance in 1st Neg on case & rebuttal. Really Neg case & work on balance in 1st Neg on case & rebuttal. Really

APPRECIATE your analysis of voters in 2nd Neg - very useful

DECL: AFF prevailed on framework although

This was a close decision.Neg's weighing of Justice v. Social Welfare was questionable.
NEB 7:00

Social Welfare: Utilitarianism

2. Public interest: social problem, to max justice, punish, maximize probability of application.
3. Abolition of IT only gives justice to accused - what about society? UK either hands or why?

CK time might be faster - more jury trials.

NEB

Rivals gives us 100% utility, is the key model - least advantage on the detractors.

1. No reason to demand storage cards, for example.
2. Empirical - units less damaged, more secure systems.

Rivals needs to consider costs alll of framework system.

CK time might be faster - more jury trials.

NEB 6

Key Users

1. Social Welfare
2. Transactions

Key Users

1. Social Welfare
2. Transactions

Key User
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 303</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shreya Balasubramanian</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Italo Pennella</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 Red Mountain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**  
(Circle Winner)  

Is this a low point win? **NO**

**AC** was good. Nice case, well read, good speed. Cross ex answers were excellent.
**NC** spent almost entire speech reading case. Neg case was good. Presentation was outstanding.
**AR** extended case in its entirety and hit neg case too.
**NR** focused on defending neg case, attempted to put new arguments on aff contentions.
**AR** did its job. Aff wins.
**Novice L-D Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 303</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella Lovelady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Tempe Preparatory Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason Brigham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **NO**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Aff was traditional. Good speed and clarity with a well constructed case.
- Neg was spent mostly presenting the neg case. Neg offered the same Rawlsian version of justice.
- Aff addressed neg case with only a half minute spent defending aff case.
- Neg was only 2 mins. Only used rhetoric, no extensions
- Aff covered major points. Aff wins.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Pooja Paode (*'17)</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30) 12</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30) 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Richardson</td>
<td>37 Chandler Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>Andrew Garcia</td>
<td>19 Mullen High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision: 4:00

- Construction
  - watch the spreading
  - don't stand on your feet
  - your value and value criteria must be clear -3
  - this sounds more like an essay than a case; shorten the content.
  - strong evidence - good command
  - make eye contact throughout the case
  - research the difference between value and value criteria.

- Questions
  - Is the system perfect
  - is too easy to answer!

Judge's Signature

Ironwood

School / Affiliation / Occupation
Final response

unbiased glibness

Hyp Hupp is valid

not make new argument in final response

20 points

Pleading a lesser, guilty sentence. Why about it?

worn, speed less time

Other opponents case: Their

do not make new arguments in final response.

Keep silent, bribe: Time coupled with

final response

unbiased glibness

Hyp Hupp is valid

not make new argument in final response.

20 points
## Novice L-D Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 302</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giana Vizcocho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Bonita Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahir Kabir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Perry High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**. **Negative**

(Is Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **NO**

--

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative

- watch the spreading at the opening
- Make the value criteria absolutely clear
- good eye contact
- refer to your value more, during your contentions
- can't measure morality, poor choice on VC good

Rebuttal

- point by point rebuttal of opponents' case good

Negative

- define VC
- socialism
- name repurcussing questions
- opportunities construction
- do not pick your nose
- watch the spreading
- make more eye contact
- Is your value equality or morality? -1
- refer to your value with more frequency
- could not answer incarceration rate question -1 you may have too much context
- Your answer was weak "True, but plea bargaining will fix it" -1
Final Response:

For the affirmative part, evidence is weak. Good.

30 points

The Negation: Good.

Alaska is weak—good.

20 points

You keep using "just" and "equalilize." No good.

"Justice." "Equalilize."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 901</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariana Saiz</td>
<td>52 Copper Canyon</td>
<td>Ryann Stanage</td>
<td>40 Desert Ridge High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: Aff. won, Neg. forfeit
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 901</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biplove Baral</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Paulina Zacharko</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Bonita Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **No**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**AFF:**
*Excellent time mgmt.*
*Clear delivery of case (lots of pts. covered, well-organized)*
*Nice use of inflection for emphasis, but as it comes across as "emotional," some obvious emotion helps to emphasize arguments, stress pts., etc.*
*The SCC rebuttal to Neg's "efficiency" worked well in this case. Maybe often use another example of a "screening method for cases? Just an idea.*

**NEG:**
*Good time mgmt.*
*Clear delivery of 1st constructive, but a bit more scattered during rebuttal.*
*Possibly listen first organize/prep after. Seems a couple of Aff's points were somewhat misunderstood/overlooked.*
*I actually liked the value of efficiency, but do not feel it was supported well enough in this debate.*
*Be careful with "emotion", seemed frustrated at times, "thrown off" at times, **Maybe this might mean slowing down, taking a breath** (for lack of a better way to explain).*

**RED:** Aff. was able to better defend his case and presented a stronger framework. Aff. also did a better job of addressing specific pts during rebuttal.