### VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Tom Chambers (22) - Brandon Favre (35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 881</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay Newfeld</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Tempe Preparatory Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexis Hatch</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Sunnyslope High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- **Affirmative**
- **Negative**

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

Judge's Signature

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Aff**

- Strong CX defense & offense
- Excellent line-by-line extensions in IAR & focus on Fw was good choice.
- Good weighing throughout
- Leave more time to attack the NC during the IAR.

**Neg**

- Solid defense & excellent topics in CX
- Good line-by-line in the NC
- Solid case, but consider adding cards w/ empirical estimations on impact that abolishing plea bargaining would have.

---

(F) Crisis in judicial system may dismantle large platform, but long-run reform outweighs. **Neg** wants essentially squo for protection of econ, but reform could still fix. Having to weigh on **Aff** Pw= Reform must come first, so reform is really only way to go about it. Thus, **Aff** victory.
Ultimately, in my utilitarian scenario, I have to weigh impacts. Here, the impact of court clog and the problems w/trials go largely unresponded to. Simply, less justice is done if courts can't keep up, and trials are risky to innocents, which is why PB is so effective for prosecutors in the first place. Both of you need to spend the time framing a good story at the end of the round. Lots of missed opportunities for both to claim the ballot. This will come with time experience. Keep working on it.

Ballot to Neg, on util impact of court clog
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 876</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:00PM</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>Vani Sanganeria</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mariah Hays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>48 Perry High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

aff: you were very hard to hear, you spoke way fast for how short you spoke. got to know your case,
neg asked questions and you couldn't explain it. Don't just re-read your case.

neg: you spoke clearly. Thank you.

LD: aff cannot validate her case. neg solves with plea points, aff causes court closings and can not prove any benefits that outweigh court closings.
I don't get the "pre-emptive perm" arg--
if the CD isn't mutually exclusive w/ the
p/c, it can still be competitive on net-
benefits.

You extend a lot of claims (i.e., "cap
causes all structural violence") w/o ext-
ending warrants

```

this goes for
the 2 NC as
well
```

You both extend solvency ev w/o extending warrants, but the
RAR mischaracterizes the McCoy evidence--there is empirical evidence that
disproves the Alexander ev. Since the RAR does not extend FW, I roll
w/ the K's ROB/FW, and a solvency defects argument to the Perm is
sufficient to negate on the K, w/ a high risk of a link.

Hey
The INC needs to sign--post

serious problems w/ the K after
CX--a big part of the MMM is the
homogenization & "Asian Americans."
By not being able to deconstruct that
yourself, you risk a significant perform-
ance contradiction.
**Varsity L-D Debate**

**Rhodes Kirkpatrick (’56)**

**Round 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isha Paode</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Raquel Rivera</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Chandler High School</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

Watch time in 2AR! You ran out of time for your voters.

The biggest argument you missed was reforming mandatory minimum sentences. I needed more evidence from you that this wouldn’t solve.

Response to count clay was good.

Limiting in 1X that getting rid of plea bargains lessens any undermining your case. You definitely have room to give that abolishing plea bargaining increases anarchy.

Sense of universality was weak. If we get morality by King within, how is that universal?

RFD: Neg got Aff to admit that taking away the option of plea bargaining harms autonomy. Neg also successfully attacked universality in Aff’s framework, being by the Neg’s framework of limiting structural violence. Neg’s evidence that reforming mandatory minimum sentences would solve better than eliminating plea bargaining won out.

Neg

Good job getting opponent to agree that taking away this choice on bargaining harmed autonomy.

Careful when arguing for “comprehensive reform” alt. An Aff case could easily perm that.

Argument that limiting structural violence comes before any ethical framework seemed shaky, but you argued it well.

NC was excellent especially your voters.
Argument:

I: Morality
   Reason: Respecting freedom in conjunction w/ universality, potential
   Note: Subjective differences

II: PB necessary
   Walsh '17
   Note: Mass incarceration, plan, then dehumanized citizen

C: Universal
   Note: Universality ignores structural violence
   Mr. sentence are agents to govern injustice
   PB avoids them
   Note: Unconstitutional, not part of PB
   Turn this to find w/o legal aid is worse
   Turn only Neg solves for war on crime
   Note: Incarceration creates more racism, turns to racism flow
   Only Neg helps least advantaged.

Neg

V: Morality
   Recognize subjective differences

C: Resisting structural violence
   Note: Before any ethical framework
   People create in groups and out groups
   So must resist SV if
   C/A coercion. All solves

C: PB necessary
   A. Enable system to function
   Note: Benefits are many if structurally, more needs would be okay in all world
   Import judicial collapse
   Count system still works
   Note: YIB is necessary action
   Count reform. Abolishing PB destroys system
   Note: Extent

Voters
   1. AF destroys CJ system
   - PB has short term benefits as well
   2. Reform mandatory min
   3. Less coercive option
   4. Protect innocents from
   5. Incarceration. Neg solves mass incarceration.
   Note: Neg wins role of the ballot.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Adele McGraw (*1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 878</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lili Chambers</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Mountain View High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waleed Tariq</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Chandler 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: Very close debate. I went with 'Aff' due to fact Lili understands the flow of LD which created a stronger argument.

---

**Lili - Aff**

Lili - I wasn't sure where you were going at first. Perhaps tie in the argument a little quicker with your contentions.

Watch your umm's and the word 'cool.'


A little 'salty' rather than being professional. (Eye rolling squish)

Good point on student/classroom setting against you opponent.

**Waleed - Neg**

Waleed - More practice rounds will assist you in learning the flow of LD.

Stay more on topic of the argument. Reaching perhaps video yourself during a practice round to play back and critique yourself.

This round was much more 'casual' than what I am used to. Be careful of almost being too relaxed. Seems like setup took too long time. Be prepared!
**Varsity L-D Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 869</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashish Dubey</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Kristen Arnold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 BASIS Chandler</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43 Pinnacle High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(Circle Winner) **No**

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- It's okay if you aren't able to follow but I'd say don't. It's clear that the opponent doesn't understand all the intricacies of the K and needs to go more in depth in general. A focus on the impact of the K and why it's important.
- Also don't talk to the judge about the argument directly. I'm not supposed to say anything.
- R-P: I can negate on the K impacts and the content in the neg which flows through pretty well. No need for more emphasis on how they delink.
## VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Stuart Newfeld (*'36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 823</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>Benjamin Hay</td>
<td>Saloni Biyani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Mesquite High School</td>
<td>35 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This was a well matched debate between 2 young contestants. At first I was unsure how I was going to argue and how I was going to win. After preparing my arguments and understanding my stance, I decided to focus on the affirmative stance. In my opening speech, I emphasized the importance of peace and the need to prevent violence. I argued that peace is a value that our society should strive for, and that it is essential for the well-being of individuals and nations.

On the other hand, my opponent, Saloni, focused on the negative stance and argued against the affirmative position. She highlighted the negative consequences of peace and suggested that violence is a necessary tool for achieving certain goals. However, I believe that peace is achievable and that it can lead to long-term stability and prosperity.

In rebuttal, I addressed her arguments and provided evidence to support my view. I also challenged her assumption that violence is necessary. I argued that peaceful means do exist and can be effective. In the final position speech, I summarized my arguments and called on the audience to support peace and work towards a world that values cooperation over conflict.

Ultimately, I believe that the affirmative stance is the better choice. I argue that peace is not only possible, but it is also necessary for the well-being of our society. Therefore, I claim victory for the affirmative stance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Tommy Stevens (*'48)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nivea Mahesh Krishnan</td>
<td>Hannah Littler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Hamilton High School</td>
<td>50 BASIS Ahwatukee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Nest got caught up in arguing minor points
Word definitions
- Wasted time

Court ads - courts are already clogged
- Should you have to experience something before you evaluate? - Suffering
- Circumvents judicial system

Excellent speaking from both

"Pragmat's" - not effective

forces prosecutors to let go of weak cases +
only focus on ones that matter
**Varsity L-D Debate**

**Brett Mallette ("27)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 860</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (20-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Yu</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Liam Huggins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Mesquite High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>42 McClintock High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Is Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Neg. could not refute the racial disparity present in plea bargaining. Aff. demonstrated how justice can be assumed by morality. Morality being what's best for all people. Neg. difficult to follow.

Slow down.

Ar. 6 min
Ck. 3 min

Ng. 9 min
Ck. 3 min

1AR 4 min
Ng. 6 min
2AR 3 min
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Jean Martin (*'26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armando Montero</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ayaan Patel</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 Brophy College Prep</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:

US ought to abolish plea bargaining

AFF - A LITTLE RUSHED 😞

- Equating mass incarceration with genocide is a bold but "dangerous" assertion
- Desiring judicial collapse - very bold - no examples of this working

NEG - GREAT CROSS-X QUESTIONS

- GREAT CROSS-X DEFENSE
- Point that AFF only focused on minorities not good of whole 😞
- Point that since majority already "racist," new system would also be racist 😞

You both rock! Argue on!! 😊
## VLD

### Varsity L-D Debate

**Round 2**

**Grumpy Gurtler (‘50)**

**Room 879**

**Fri 01/26/18 05:00PM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Side</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affirmative**

Kevin Yin  
25 Brophy College Prep

**Negative**

Jason Mittleman  
29 Desert Vista High School

The winner of this debate was  

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1. **Affirmative**
   - Objective morality is difficult to run. You should consider running a categorical imperitive. That will save you some time in constructing a framework. You mishandle the veil of ignorance. I love the long story. That dean is more realistic than veil of ignorance. You need to do a bit more work in establishing the framework for the rest of your case. Tell the judge why to prefer yours after attack his. How realistic something does not result in the strongest argumentation. Do not try to defend & attack everything. Prioritize points and then develop strong arguments. **DON'T GIVE OFF-TIME ROADMAPS.**

2. **Negative**
   - Veil of ignorance answered some of the parts, associated w/ Kent. Veil ignorance was a constant that forced everyone to treat everyone up as if no one knew where they stood. Don't give off-time road maps. Sign posting is better. Do a little bit more on the framework. By the 2NR both of you mishandled veil of ignorance. Look up some LD attack styles. Link turns and impact turns would have served you well this round. Don't save "solve" unless you are running a plant-text or you actually do something. You don't solve es studies go. Plus, it's an unnecessary burden. Prioritize your arguments! Focus where you focus on arguments you are winning.

D: **Neg** you turned on yourself w/ the links in. You should have linked into the framework for an easy win. You wasted time trying to advocate the veil of ignorance. of overwhelming & Att Fw.
### VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Craig May (*'9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karan Singh</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>Sartaj Malhi</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Chandler High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>38 Scottsdale Preparatory Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature: **Odyssey Institute**

School / Affiliation / Occupation: **Coach**

---

**Affirmative** - I'm glad you're going VLD a go! More practice will help the stumbling case up a bit. The criterion needs better labeling, and both should be connected or referenced in case and rebuttals. Thank you for remembering the tagline in the IAR. The ZAR got caught up in minor details and failed to leave time for framework/key voters. The additional jurisdictions should have been mentioned in IAR, but it's not a tipping point.

**Negative** - Total INC was on 9:33. There was much more you could have covered with that 2:27 left. I don't know if that could have been helped with using prep or not. Also, no value or value criterion was enumerated in your case. If the neg wants to adopt affirmative R/VC framework that needs to be explicitly stated, in the negative constructive. Only about half the time used in the NR while I applaud the desire not to repeat yourself endlessly or not), LD still uses a summation of why I vote in your favor, even if brief.

---

**RFD** - Both debaters show promise that is wonderful to see at an initial tournament - learn & grow from this experience. **Affirmative** is the only one to provide me with a value to consider, even dropped. Neg makes good arguments about court/jail overcrowding, the inevitability of gritty convictions, it doesn't outweigh the moral implications of plea bargaining as presented by Aff. **Affirmative** wins this round, barely.
## VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 833</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolas Kirk</td>
<td>25 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td>Joel Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</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:

**Nik** - passionate, well organized. Convo about other countries and upside down triangle (?) was confusing and seemed off topic. Ex - Joel started to unravel contention 2 but didn't go all the way. Aff contention 2 was unchallenged by neg.

Joel - contention 2 did negate Aff contention 2. Great job in cross. Did not touch Aff contention 1 much.

Both - extremely well prepared. Civil but passionate.

**Nik** - contention 1 - I don't understand the argument about how constitutional rights are being taken. But racism argument and stats are strong. Need to add how Aff can solve through.

Joel - made the point that neither side soleos for racism, but Neg has more benefits. Unable to understand the minority inflation remarks; made a couple times.

Neg did not adequately challenge Aff contention.
## VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Kshitiz Singh ('29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 837</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Katherine McGraw  
1 Mission Vista High School | Gilbert Neuner  
7 Bonita Vista High School |
| Points (20-30) | Points (20-30) |
| 28.5 | 30 |

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Careful what you call it. What is lawful is not always just, your definition implies this.
- The whole system is subject to racial bias, you need to establish that PB reinforces this and abolishing it would help to remedy this.
- Feel like you could find a better example of people feeling compelled to plead guilty from a college class.
- You spent too much time on FW - re-read it - it was a wash so both of your positions are valid here.
- "Stroker, hustler": these numbers exist, you need to cite them.
- Dropping my assumption that "plea bargaining is easy to make" (response in Cont. I) will come back to bite you.

- Be in mind that public defenders have an average of 7 minutes per case. PB is more complex than you think.
- Need to do better impact weighing regarding longer prison sentences vs more innocent ppl in jail.
- You need to tone down the # of impacts of your disadvantage - you are not solving for mass incarceration. You cannot claim you solve issue that exist in the system while upholding it.
- How does that evidence talking about suing a corporation even apply to plea bargaining? Plea bargaining apply to defendants, not prosecutors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Harminder Matharu (*'35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 836</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (20-30) 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan Cohen</td>
<td>58 Phoenix Country Day School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td>Points (20-30) 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Phillips</td>
<td>22 Mountain View High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Too fast in speech.
- Extensive references & material.
- Found out a point not addressed by the opponent.
- Good questioning.
- Almost all defended.
- Comprehensive material & references.
- Better coverage.
- Cross x 2

Judge's Signature: JT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calvin Tyler</td>
<td>25 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Harris Shadmany</td>
<td>2.8</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**
- Speaks too fast
- Belief system
- Must understand others to understand etc.
- Black defendants lower than white
- Dehumanizing prisoners
- Enables justice system to be racist

Plea bargaining enforces racism.

No counterplay

**Neg**
- Good front
- Reasons for racism?
- Why is plea bargaining the reason for racism?
- Value morality
- Look to everyone and every aspect
- Hugely inefficient to abolish the judiciary
  - Judge biases, jury bias
  - Discrimination everywhere
  - Affects everyone
  - Reform system
  - Race-blind process
  - Enable incarceration
Aff Rebuttal

- Enable = letting it happen
- Opponent disregards racism or plea-bargaining
- Misdeemers = largest category
- Slavery enabled

Talk a little slower and make points clearer.

Neg Rebuttal

- Never addressed custom
- Race-blind.
- Never addressed going to trial is worst for people.
- Alaska was at a very different time.
- No cause effect.

Talk a little slower and make points.

Addressing the facts better. More credibility.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Carolyn Evans (*'58)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affirmative**

Tran Nguyen  
22 Mountain View High School

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **O**  
Negative

*(Circle Winner)*

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

---

**Negative**

Mariana Acevedo  
25 Brophy College Prep

Judge’s Signature  
Chandler High

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Affirmative** needs to speak clearer and practice speaking. I was unable to hear majority of the case, made it difficult to evaluate her evidence and contentions. Needs to also speak louder.

- Negative spoke louder but needs to speak clearer. Clearer, give me an impact calculation especially with that impact card.

- Affirmative could’ve argued the time scope and probability of extinction. Dropped contentions and focused on FW, as well as

- FW debate: talk about dehumanization with the is no truth.

- Negative won FW debate. Neg FW worked under both FW. Not only gave me a good weighing mechanism to vote for a util FW, was able to show that util was necessary to evaluate the round rather than upholding legitimacy. Connected well with the contentions.

- **Contention debate:**

  - AFF dropped the Negative case, it was uncontested; thus

  Neg IMPACTS PROVED through. AFF did not defend her contentions well enough. Did not give me a reason why these cases are unjust or why we should look towards truth. Brought new argument of extinction in ZAR.

  Negative extended case really well. gave me a reason why these impacts are bad and connects it to the FW.
**Varsity L-D Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 866</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli Botham</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 McClintock High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Liu</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge’s Signature**

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Affirmative was slightly better - both were good at articulating their points, although both mischaracterized at least one point of the other. Both also “circled” repeated 3-4 x within the same block. The final difference came down to authority/weight of cited sources - Neg was more credible academically; Neg came across as opinion not expert.

Generally a good Jones team with your opening. At times pace got in the way of your articulation; excellent citations/evidence and generally good reasoning. Good examples of coercion. Got a little flummocked during 1st cross, ended well with point vs. public oversight. Good job on cross-x approach to your opponent’s arguments. Threw off your opponent with several good questions/points. Again excellent citations during rebuttal - established source’s authority. Got a little lost - silence time implied lack of confidence. Didn’t get to address all of your opponent’s points during rebuttal, but the first parts were solid (citizenship; racism’s effects - imperative). Final rebuttal was decent and helped clarify, though 2 or 3 points shaky (they didn’t say utilitarianism = equality)

Good approach to cross-examinations. Stayed calm and made your point. Kept the conversation where you wanted it with implication that racism was the core of your point. Good citations to support your point, though you didn’t always establish source’s authority. Kept calm during cross-x of your construction, though you got a bit thrown off. Your rebuttal began well, but started “circling” - repeating without adding new info or urgency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Joe Kubiak (*'39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrielle Paffumi</td>
<td>Edna Zuhric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Desert Ridge High School</td>
<td>42 McClintock High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both Aff and Neg argued the same values/criteria - this round came down to greater impact/solvency in this case, which case plan better promoted justice/equality in the system - Aff's case better exhibited this with cleaner links to solvency - while Neg's case argued for issues related to justice - it did not adequately address the framework created by Aff - stronger links to solvency in the Neg case at the outset would greatly improve Neg case. For these reasons I affirm Aff as the winner of the round.
### VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Clayton Guy ('20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 870</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Welsh</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohan Sidhu</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Brophy College Prep</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:**

Very good L- you could do a better job of explicating taglines. If you were understandable but definitely could have been a lot cleaner - lots of repetition & "ums" which you should work on.

If you had better addressed fairness + root cause, you would have won. Close round.

Neg did a much better job of explaining theory - his links + impact are a lot cleaner. I buy the fairness theory piece - do not think off adequately answered - just b/c Neg answered it does not mean that it's fair. I am not sure you convincingly won the "author was educated in a colonialist mindset," but off dropped the Jedi is clearly a point.
Both sides hyper focused on negating the other’s arguments rather than building their own case for/against plea bargaining. Instead both sides hyper focused on presidential involvement.

Although I did not see how 6th amendment rights weren’t upheld by plea bargains, and how keeping financial prudence wasn’t going to be negatively affected (one of negatives arguments) while operating under a ‘Veil of ignorance focus’, greed upon by both debaters, the affirmative side more thoroughly provided documentation, i.e. citation and references that supported abolishing plea bargains.

Neg: Both sides could have benefited by using more detail (i.e. statistics which could have supported negative’s position would have changed result drastically, instead of stated assumptions that had to be dismissed.

I appreciated both sides use of explanation, and was thoroughly impressed. Affirmative could pay better attention to time, while negative could have used time better to his advantage as well. Both individuals seemed rushed and hurried while reiterating multiple times the same point.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Anne Meyers (*'10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Savannah Groom Castillo</td>
<td>Clayton John Marfori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Bonita Vista High School</td>
<td>48 Perry High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature: [signature]

School / Affiliation / Occupation:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Congratulations to both debaters - well done!**

**Affirmative:**
- good pace
- clear opening
- cross mostly j ust clarifying

**Negative:**
- very good cross
- stretched on relevance of cartel violence and nuclear war
- good references

Very close debate!
# Debate Summary

**Varsity L-D Debate**

**Lawrence Groom-Castillo ("7")**

**Round 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Room 913</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 05:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry Chou</td>
<td>48 Perry High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Krenke</td>
<td>26 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Judge's Signature**

Kaylee Sifer

School / Affiliation / Occupation: Desert Vista

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Good use of ex for both, try y'all
- Neg: Spend more time answering ROB w/ why do I prefer yours over the att's? Why should we make a meet and solve their ROB better?
- Att: Spend more time on how the neg recites the evidence. Try to "solve for" good use of per-mand case outweighs arg.
- Att: Imagine rhetoric is also adelic.
- Att: Better use of IAC cards
- RFD

Voted att on:

1. perm > att can solve by first doing disruption then help create action for mental health funding
2. ROB - more analysis - voted on att's ROB and it solves better.
3. I thought that reform doesn't work