## VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Kehiliz Singh (129)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter-Finals</td>
<td>Room 922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Shadmany</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Basis Mesa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolas Kirk</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

---

**AFF**

Good opening; good pace, volume, intonation. Good use of citational evidence from A-rated sources. Really good job of pre-emptying NegCounter-proof. Handled yourself well during cross-examination; didn’t get drawn into his logical traps and kept your cool. Kept your points. Good questions during cross-ex of NC. Good rebuttal—excellent points regarding their main argument of your opponent logically laid out. Arguments with specific flow, citations & linkage. Good points on final rebuttal. Once again clear and compelling both about the technical aspects of your debate as well as the actual arguments. Your close was outstanding.

---

**NEG**

Asked good questions during 1st cross-ex, tried to lure opponent into a logical trap. Not a consistent interruption. Aggressive, some thought provocation on reforming a system within/without. Strong opening. Although pace was a little fast, affecting articulation, you were very good at emphatic speaking. Good citation of sources. Generally very good with delivery—good claims regarding “bad for debate.” Neg rebuttal was your best performance—logical, connective & well spoken. Influenced interesting but challenging to handle. Argued against trials which is part of the social contract as well as your promise. You are a great mind and a great speaker. I recommend slowing it a little and being even more descriptive about both the framing and the substance of your arguments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter-Finals</th>
<th>Room 924</th>
<th>Sat 01/27/18 01:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah Irizarry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Krista Arnold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative: Isaiah Irizarry
Negative: Krista Arnold

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?

Judge's Signature: [Signature]

School / Affiliation / Occupation: Brophy College Prep

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Less伦勃朗 in CX
- Less defense; lead in CX
- Try not to start in CX
- Less defense
- Hen on sign party
- Be less troubadour
- You don't need to yell
- Don't admit you don't respond (reason)

R&D: no time to think for Aff; blank

- 1st pass turn -> negative / control
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Grumpy Gurtler (&quot;50&quot;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter-Finals</td>
<td>Room 921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20-30)</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayaan Patel</td>
<td>Gilbert Neuner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Grumpy**

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

**Basis Ahwastekee**

**Grunt**

**AHWASTEKEE**

**Nea:** Fantastic CX!!! The policy question re: uniqueness of aff solvency. Good job using *surviving* prep. Too many people are afraid to use it. Good job building speed. Interesting strategy. I like it. Conceding framework gave you more time to weigh impacts. Don't repeat your opponent's arguments. You don't want me to hear his arguments again. Don't give off-time road-maps. Sign-post as you go. That is so much more important. Sign-posting improved greatly once the cleavage got going. I buy the turns. You put the work into making sure that they were whole argument turned... I buy the "apples and oranges" argument w/ Serena. Pakistan. Your legalization argument w/ Seren. Pakistan. Your legalization could use some work. Focus on weighing the work. Could use some more work on weighing. You should have pointed out that the KVI's. You should have pointed out that the KVI's. You can never read a plant. It isn't quite the same... even with a trial since he does have anything. Even with his wax, advocacy.

**RFD:** This is a very ballot. We linked to Aff's framework and weighed the most salient impacts. I buy the 2 independent turns, though Aff won regarding the Alaska card. I ended up just washing the Alaska, Serbia, & Pakistan arguments. Good job!
FLIP: 25 Mariana Acevedo v. 29 Shawn Yousefelahi

Varsity L-D Debate

Brandon-Favre ('35)

Quarter-Finals

Room 923

Sat 01/27/18 01:45PM

Affirmative Points
Shawn Yousefelahi 24

20-30

Negative Points
Mariana Acevedo 25

The winner of this debate was
Affirmative

Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Comments

+ Aff

Excellent volume/clarity
Great call on what being racist
With regards to util she mentioned
That her util while good in greatest amount of people
But specifies maxim pleasure minus pain

You asked me to vote on the resolution
That gave me hope for reform
Actually that would have been good to mention in your last AR.

Reasoning

I think both sides had excellent cases and equally well done.

Aff's case declared the rule of the ballot

To vote for the best policy action to combat racism. Neg never defended

Her util well enough for it to be applicable in her case. Success

The brief spot only justice similarly put the case in Aff's favor.