### VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Gurkaran Chotalla (*'25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 871</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>Waleed Tariq</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Alexis Hatch</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Chandler High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>54 Sunnyslope 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:

- Slow down on our claims
- Emphasize evidence
- Content cx &
- Emphasize the "Justia Define"
- Cross cut all cards = filing arg.
- "But content cx is not important to debate"
- Might be weak to get a wet from judges
- Cool Down

Vote Clean on Con 2

A string of commit
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Joe Kubiak (*'39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 913</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>Rohan Sidhu</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mariah Hays</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td>48 Perry High School</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: [Signature]

School / Affiliation / Occupation: [Basis Meso]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Great debate.

Aff clearly understood the nuances of Neg's counter-plan and was able to effectively block most points. Additionally, Aff was able to get Neg to concede to a lack of solvency for the Neg counter-plan and accordingly, the counter-plan had to be dropped as a determining factor.

Both debaters were fantastic, but Aff's experience showed in that he recognized the opportunities to undermine Neg's case (plan).

For these reasons, I affirm Aff as the winner of the round.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 882</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amrita Chakладar 39 Basis Mesa</td>
<td>Kevin Yin 25 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30) 29</td>
<td>Points (20-30) 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was <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>YES!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Guys, I cannot express how much I enjoyed judging this round. Amrita you did an exceptional job of rolling out your Cape 6 and tying it directly to plea bargaining and the prison industrial complex. Kevin, you responded with the perfect response. Overcrowding benefits the prison industrial complex and removing plea bargaining enhances this! Amrita your conclusion that the overcrowding resulting from removing plea bargaining would collapse the prison industrial complex was simply incredible. AFF won the framework debate and convinced me to vote on who addresses capitalism better. Ultimately I felt the NEG had the better solution by keeping plea bargaining.

**AFF**
- I am often wary of theories like this in LD. However you did a very good job of linking plea bargaining with the prison industrial complex and by extension capitalism. Good start!
- I worry you took a little bit on strong stop when you discuss tearing down the system.
- Great Attack on Util!!
- Strong Debator.
- Higher Speak Points

**NEG**
- A very good start! Really effective critique on AFF Cape K. The link between court clong benefiting the prison industrial complex is key.
- Well done in NR. You have a tendency to repeat yourself a bit. Work on organizing your thoughts a little better. You did well overall.
- Great Job!
- Because of your disorganization I gave you a low point win.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Lawrence Groom-Castillo (*7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Liu</td>
<td>Benjamin Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td>22 Mountain View 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

NEG: I voted for the Negative in support that plea bargaining ought to be abolished from the Criminal Justice System for these reasons:
1. PBS reduces court clogging open up for more serious cases.
2. PBS reduces jail over crowding by jailing criminals that commit the most serious crimes.
3. PBS reduces the possibility that minority criminals will be discriminated against.
4. PBS save more in the courts and jail systems.

The debater was very clear in his vocals, well organized in the structure of his material and presentation. The debater stayed on topic did not deviate from argument.

AFF: The debater was very articulable, good vocal tone and platform use.

The debater needs to be more organized and to display that organization in the delivery of his material in support of a convincing argument.
# VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Richard Glover ('42)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30) 28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Sun</td>
<td>35 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30) 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Hay</td>
<td>53 Mesquite High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Try to minimize the # of clarification questions, since.
- Good job pointing out how meta studies are better.
- Morality is not a value.
- Missed quite a few of the aff's most important arguments in your NR.
- I ended up having to do more work in this round than I would have liked to. **PLEASE** be clear in extensions.

**RFDO**

*Frameworks were functionally the same by the end of the round. I give slight edge to the aff on cont. clog being a good BLT. It disrupts the system, so the neg's counterplan functions.*

Questions about the round? eringranillowalker@gmail.com
## VLD

**Varsity L-D Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Kaylee Silber (*'29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffy Yu (53 Mesquite High School)</td>
<td>Calvin Tyler (25 Brophy College Prep)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</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:**

1. I don't buy that Kneat is more moral because they never address the neg's claim that trying to solve the interests of the minority is bad and will only exclude the minority.
2. I buy the neg's impact of extinction, also the impacts to outweigh the actual impacts.

---

**Aff:** Focus more on talking about your case - i.e. how you solve and spend more time on your race disadvantage.

**Neg:** Spend more time on re-framing part of the debate and their coherence on argument.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varsity L-D Debate</td>
<td>Saloni Biyani</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Lauren Welsh</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adele McGraw (*1)</td>
<td>35 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>29 Desert 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 had a better flow and argument.**

Saloni **AFF**

Very clear in speaking and articulation. Easy to follow thought process. Good listener. For example

"How does this link to deportation?"

Lauren **Neg**

Well spoken and a strong case. However I feel you were focused on your contentions and did not answer your opponents. Doesn't an immigrant have to commit a crime in order to be deported?
### VLD

#### Varsity L-D Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 832</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Katherine McGraw  
1 Mission Vista High School | Isha Paode  
17 Chandler High School |
| Points (20-30) | Points (20-30) |
| 28 | 23 |

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**AFF**

**Good Opening:** Good tone & tempo, volume, pace affected articulation. A bit of good citations, eye contact and emphasis/improvements.

**Construction:** Went on. Well-articulated construction; handled herself very well during cross-x. Kept cool, articulated points, confident. Did a great job on cross-examining - neg after construction. Brought up several good points that threatened to stump your opponent - you called out their lack of evidence, kept your cool and took control. Great job during rebuttal - very clear and addressed every point. Emphasis and persuasive; you could have slowed it down a little. Cited evidence, and pointed out her opponent's lack thereof.

---

**NEG**

Cool and measured during cross-x. Did you lose an opportunity? Let opponent take control of conversation. Construction stilted, was so cast as to allow this to happen. Flow, despite paradigm given. Good citations of evidence - several examples brought in nuclear proliferation in Pakistan & society would fall if there were no court case. Did you let your opponent take charge during cross-x? Frustrated you but kept your cool at the same time. Had good answers.

Good rebuttal of your opponent's example. Kept coming back to "extinction" through court case. You started to get lost in a few places, good points about people lingering in jail. You misstated your opponent's contention.

Finally connected court case to nuclear war - very shaky. Your pace, inflection, were at their best during the last rebuttal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Maanik Chotalla (*'25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tran Nguyen</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Mountain View High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli Botham</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 McClintock High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative | Negative
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? [ ]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Do more work on the warrants of the counter-plan
- I just need better defense on the nay the CE is just flowing too well
- When you extend the counter-claim, do some more compelling analysis
- EXTEND MORE!!

RPQ: I negate this round on the counter-plan. The aff doesn't do a ton to combat the subversion and the neg does a good job analyzing the problem law. I negate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edna Juric</td>
<td>42 McClintock High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Varsity L-D Debate**

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

**Negative**

**Room & Date**

Room 863

FRI, 01/26/18, 07:30 PM

**Points**

(20-30)

**Affirmative**

Sam Feng (48)

**Negative**

Kristopher Wolfalk

29 Desert Vista High School

**Points**

26

**Comments & Reason for Decision**

Is this a low point win? No

Contribution & Persuasion

VLD

Bobcat Bonanza 2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Tracy Lynn Weaver ('53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 835</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Nivea Mahesh Krishnan  
   35 Hamilton High School | Clayton John Marfori  
   48 Perry High School |
| Points (20-30)    | Points (20-30)          |
| 26                | 30                      |

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

**NO**

Judge's Signature

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**AFF:** I shared paradigm no spreading. If you ask your judge you should adjust. Too fast. I can only judge what I hear understand. LD is a sick feeling event. 2nd AFF was dissuaded. Org unit signpost for judge. That said - you did provide feedback for AFF solving. In 2nd AFF

**NEV:** Great questions on weighing? Elementary use of CX to attack AFF & reveal 3rd of links & weakness in solvency. Neg read - great intro. Though we are still on rest of case, very unique & extremely effective.

**ALLOT:** Great debate. Really a pleasure to see how 2 excellent debaters put their craft. Once I adjusted to speed I found analysis/flash the argumentation of this round of extraordinary effectiveness. A pleasure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Tom Chambers (*'22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Neuner</td>
<td>3D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Bonita Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariana Acevedo</td>
<td>3D</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><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:
aff: great speaking; your tone and speed were great. you explained your case very well. great analysis
neg: also great speaking. great use of analysis.
hard head. you both made great argument; you both understand everything you were saying. but...

REO voting on line turn that neg dropped
justice system created the issue and cannot be used to justify the problem. fix also neg never really proves that immigration will become a problem that will lead to economic downturn and explanation from charging plea bargainings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Autumn Frey (*'40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce Florey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Phoenix Country Day School</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Lili Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 Mountain View High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision:</td>
<td>Pierce - strong opening. Well spoken, passionate and professional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lili - Cross x was a bit &quot;immature&quot;, to be honest. A lot of &quot;cool&quot; and &quot;like&quot;. Try to elevate your vocabulary and you will elevate your presentation, as a whole. I don't think it was a well-used cross.</td>
<td>翼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lili - NC had zero relevance to the topic at hand. 7 minutes of Asian - American rights, but has nothing to do with the resolution. Anti-justice system rhetoric does not help your case as far as refuting Aff., and you didn't make an actual contention of your own. I'm not seeing the connection at all. Pierce - Such a respectful, thoughtful reply. You affirmed lili's passionate views and tried to bring them back to the case at hand. Professionalism like I have rarely seen. lili - I think you would be a wonderful speech contender, but it just didn't link to the topic at hand.</td>
<td>翼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge's Signature</td>
<td>Meridian Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School / Affiliation / Occupation</td>
<td>4th Grade Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VLD

Varsity L-D Debate
Khanna Vivek ("3")

Round 4
Room 870
Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM

Affirmative
Ethan Cohen
58 Phoenix Country Day School

Points (20-30)
24

Negative
Nikolas Kirk
25 Brophy College Prep

Points (20-30)
28

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

Is this a low point win? NO

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF:
Prepares definition
Presents evidence
Effective delivery

Cont’d:

NEG (Research) – CROSS EX

1: Numbers provided based on CA only, how does this number apply to the nation
   AFF: Unable to support applicability of HS on a national basis

2: Verify role that plea bargaining trials take less time.
   AFF: Answered question with supporting evidence. Needs more conviction behind his answer.

   AFF: Satisfactory reply.

NEG: Stalemate clearly, presents evidence, effective delivery, has emotional appeal

AFF: Abolishing plea bargaining
   Well organized

NEE (CROSS EX)

NEG supports answer with evidence, presents logical arguments

AFF (Roadmap)

Not enough evidence provided to prove opponent wrong.
Can be more persuasive with examples/evidence.
Can have more emotional appeal.
NEG (Roadmap)
- Breakdown opponents' points methodically, with evidence, emotional appeal & persuasion, logically.
- Uses evidence with example to support his point.
- Has good understanding of content citing references for evidences.
- Summarizes overall case with persuasive language.
- Looks into the eye while presenting his case.

AFF (Summarize)
Roadmap: MCAC
- Can be more persuasive by presenting better logic, evidence.
- Does not look into the eye.
- Needs more...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Harminder Matharu (*35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Arnold</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Pinnacle 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:
- Breadth of arguments with sound reasoning & confidence.
- Answered almost all questions reasonably well.
- Asked specific question exposing narrow examples/focus of the opponent.
- Exploited opponent's weakness well. Uses opponent's arguments against the opponent. Very clever!
- Countered all argument of the opponent very well.

Asked very specific questions, asking for data of support.
- Good questioning.
- Good breadth of arguments, sound reasoning.

Continued with narrow focus, counters some of the arguments of the opponent well.
VLD

Varsity L-D Debate

Pooja Paode (*'17)

Round 4

Room 875

Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM

Affirmative

Savannah Groom Castillo
7 Bonita Vista High School

Points
(20-30)

23

Negative

Chur Tam
50 BASIS Ahwatukee

Points
(20-30)

29.5

The winner of this debate was
Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - You did a good job addressing the neg case - good, clear speech. However, you missed a couple of points on the neg side. Make sure to systematically go down your opponent's case and prioritize key points! There were a few points you went too in-depth on.

Neg - You did a good job of establishing and holding up pragmatism. I think you slightly misunderstood the "weak case" card a little bit, so that argument against the aff did not hold up. You were thorough and systematic.

RFD]

- negative framework debate
- aff should have used the "moral obligation" rebuttal here
- govt obligation vs indiv obligation might have worked

Solvency - neg adequately demonstrated that aff was not solvent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 836</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah Irizarry</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Kerry Chou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Bonita Vista High School</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48 Perry High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</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:  
*slow down - you're slurring words*  
*your voice needs to be clearer*  
*contention #2 - primary source - good! +1*  
*during contentions, keep referring to justice*  
*answer to racism - good! +1*  
*good response to his questions*  
*clear and organized +2*  
*please don't interrupt*  

Questions:  
*How does banning PC stop racism?*  
*Minimum sentencing - let him finish his point - don't interrupt.*

Construction:  
*slow down! You're hard to understand.*  
*make eye contact*  
*You are much more persuasive when you stand.*  
*Your volume is fine, but you need to relax.*  
*State your value and value criteria - make it clear -2*  
*Some terms are mangled and misused. You really should slow down. +1*  
*Refer to your value throughout.*  
*Good job responding to his questions regarding racism from prosecutors +1*
22 points

36 points

You need to match the contracction with the court chopping response to evidence this round +1. The real thing have logic needs to be cleared.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Aradhana Kumar (*'29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashish Dubey</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 BASIS Chandler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sartaj Malhi</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Scottsdale Preparatory Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

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

(Circle Winner)

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

**Kayhood**

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation: Brophy Prep

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I voted **AFF** b/c case outweighs court clogging and that was the only defense stated by NEG. NEG also dropped the IAC in 1st speech.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Shadmany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Basis Mesa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raquel Rivera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Bonita Vista 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:

This was a well matched debate between AA with a progressive argument, profit conservation, taxes, and the ballot. My content was well formed, with both the ballot and student voting with logical and clear contentions. There was great clash on the issues of courtship, the judiciary and legislation, and the role of the system of the role of the judiciary. At the conclusion, there was a standstill, but the conclusion formed and especially role of the ballot and the role of the content of both contentions.
### VLD

#### Varsity L-D Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 879</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vani Sanganeria</td>
<td>Jason Mittelman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Hamilton High School</td>
<td>29 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Is circle winner)

**No**

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Good contentions, well-cited w/ statistics
- Good points on structural violence
- CX: Contested Veil of Ignorance constructively
- KE: Good eye contact, good job pointing out Neg's contradictions
- Persuasive

- Confident
- CX: Great questions, very direct
- Good use of time
- Veil of Ignorance: would like to have seen more
- Well thought out rebuttals

RED: "Not every one person can ideally agree on one philosophy" was the argument that persuaded my decision to vote Aff.
Ultimately, this round went to the Aff due to an unfortunate blunder what resulted from that in the latter half of the debate. For what it's worth, the Neg basically did as much as they could to recover in the moment & decided did not give up the round easily. It's difficult to more meaningfully evaluate this round because of the dynamic established in the latter half of the debate, though arguments were well met where possible.
### VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 862</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayaan Patel</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Anderson Zhang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 Mountain View High School</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**: Style: Well spoken, perfect speed + clarity of thought.

Resources: Several used. Good tactics + case studies to support racism.

Rebuttal: Covered key points on negative rebuttal. Example: Gay rights has no correlation and cant discount 30 yr study without prove of change. Only study which showed inherent racism in study. Good use of card (Alexander) on court flip + policy issue with massive incarceration.

**Negative**: Style - too fast, gave indication to slow down. Did for awhile then speed back up. Came across very confident and concise in argument.

Resources: Several also used.

Rebuttal: Racism is framework must focus on this. Didn't respond to this in aff. Good point of 30 years - what change, only study to refer to. But gay rights etc have come into play. Later rebuke.

Good job handling & attacking the contentions of affirmative case.

R.F.D. = Affirmative was more articulated with speed, logic and fluency because I was able to follow the reasoning the affirmative gave.
Affirmative not only used great references and studies specifically. Citing plea deals with reputable references, also explained those studies how they apply to debate.

Affirmative could have improved by answering with facts and not just conclusions to Negative’s stance and argument.

Both could have improved regarding clarity, details and confidence in communication.

Negative provided no citation or reference to studies, publications only referencing the 6th amendment, but not following through with intended point. No Value criterion presented; no applicable rebuttal to Affirmative’s Value criterion and in the end, Affirmative provided more facts and less assumptions, generalizations and opinion.

Both can work on confidence and attitude during opponents perspective - time making facial expression reactions could have better benefited by utilizing energy to build own case.
VLD

Varsity L-D Debate
Jean Martin (*26)

Round 4
Room 869
Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM

Affirmative
Points (20-30)
Liam Huggins
42 McClintock High School
30

Negative
Points (20-30)
Gabrielle Paffumi
40 Desert Ridge High School
29

The winner of this debate was
Affirmative
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Comments & Reason for Decision:
PLEAS SHOULD BE ABOLISHED IN U.S.

AFF - CLEAR & METHODOICAL
• GREAT CONTENTIONS
• FOUND THE EQUA L & DUE PROCESS (TRUE JUSTICE) ARGUMENT COMPPELLING
• PLEAS "FAIR TO REWARD, WRONG TO PUNISH" BEING SCHIZOPHENRIC - GOOD POINT
• INCARCERATION VS. "POSSIBLE" DEATH SENTENCE & EFFECT ON LIVES & COMMUNITIES - GOOD POINT
• SHIELDING RAPISTS - INTERESTING ARGUMENT

NEG - GREAT ENTHUSIASM & PRESENCE
• BLACKS UNEQUALLY REPRESENTED SERVING ON JURIES - GOOD POINT
• RIGHT TO CHOOSE BETWEEN PLEA OR JURY - GOOD POINT

TOO DRAMATIC TELLING, JUDGE MUST VOTE NEG OR CONDEMN BLACKS TO DEATH "NEED FACTS TO BACK THAT ONE UP"

GREAT JOB! KEEP ARGUING!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 860</th>
<th>Fri 01/26/18 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armando Montero</td>
<td>Joel Joseph</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td>53 Mesquite High School</td>
<td>28</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:

**Armando Montero** - 1. Most good 2. UTIL - poorly informed 3. tradeoffs
   - 1. Mass incarceration - sessions / drug crimes / people of color - entrapment (this felt emotional)
     - Marked as dangerous "violence would not exist?"
   - 2. Solvency - too many judges needed - not a slippery slope here?
   - 3. Method - neoteric skepticism - solid word choice - evidence!
   - Cousin the system to create change
   - Not sure the "people go to jail on both worlds" helps
   - Policy makers agenda fit a little conspiracy theorist
   - Both impacts is a good solution - impressive
   - He didn't bring up the recidivism, though - does he have to solve it?

**Joel Joseph** - making him restate was a good tactic - good clarification - got a little repetitive, though.
   - Utilitarianism of morality
     1. Increasing efficiency - pursue more cases - deter crime

- Over-crowding - quantity over quality - most in status quo - misguidance
- Solving for court clog (citation program) - solution is compelling
- Mass incarceration rebuttal got away from you a bit
- Live the people (crashing system designed to fail)