Both sides will benefit from creating providing clarity on topic and position (a bit unclear, but chalk up to nerves).

Affirmative side had multiple talking points/evidence - but clustered not drawn out.

Negative 1st rebuttal was well-structured & framed, more learning toward setting up their side but truly addressing opposing case.

Affirmative - creative and listening was more active and frequent questioning. Closing was rushed - benefit from slowing down to truly address/define ideas through higher level questioning.

Negative - Approach seemed more rehearsed and prepared - questions were perceived to be more general then connected to points from opposition.

Ending statements shifted decision. Affirmative reestablished position.

Negative brought brand new evidence examples into concluding statements. Focus more on summarizing argument.
Confidence will come in time.

Second Rebuttal:

Incorporation of opposing side's attack.

New evidence that supports our position.

End of rebuttal.

Topic wasn't clear at first.

Structured transition from idea to idea.

He was using his LT civil disobedience.

4 pieces of evidence:前置印、 Firmness

Violence (M writ)

Repetition of ideas/loss of direction

Flow from idea to idea.

Eye contact with hair

Clarity of delivery

Grammar

Must start

Conf fort is evident

Restated position

Could strengthen but missed opportunity.

Fallen missed opportunity.

Good tie in to topic.

Approach on target.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 2216</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice Lincoln Douglas</td>
<td>Anmarie Stone (’20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Marais 21 Tempe High School</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Hunter Travis Fenn 14 Mesquite High School</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Negative** 
(Circle Winner)
Is this a low point win? **No**

**Judge’s Signature**
Anmarie Stone
Sunny Slope

---

**Speaking**: Know your subject at little better so you can speak to the audience. You did a good job laying out your contentions. Easy to follow (-thank you!). Red 4 Ed example nice and current + topical. Great Rebuttal “Sometimes the law is not correct.” And laws always changing. Like that you brought up that protests occur because legal route hasn’t worked. Im not sure you worked in the “Morality” value as much as you could have.

Win goes to Neg. for value Rule of Law. Good job showing that even peaceful protests have capability for violence + that the ones that stay peaceful tend to be an anomaly. All your contentions flowed through.

Thank you for being a very gracious debater. You helped a lot with our timing & helped give advice to Aff. Citizenship Adj.

Good job laying out contentions and analysis.
Great job dismantling Aff. You had several strong “talking points”: 2 wrongs don’t make a right, “Assault Rule of Law”, “No man above law”. Good job eliminating Red 4 Ed as an example (Anomaly). You also refuted Aff’s “Morals” value - possibility for violence always exists.
BHATTACHARYA, ABIR

Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

NLD

Novice Lincoln Douglas | Abir Bhattacharya (*7)
---|---
Round 1 | Room 2211 | Fri 10/04/19 03:00PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connor Clark 22 Tempe Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kinäed Jaxon Sabine 6 BASIS Phoenix</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:

\[...\]

- Accepting justice: ✓
- Pro: Presenting (general)
- Total
- Danzau (strong example)
- Rev. Austin answer
- Good point on how it starts the cycle /
- Body step progress - good point

I am very impressed with the candidates. It is obvious they have put in a lot of effort. I wish them the very best!
Democratic discourse

good point on how it align
begin a cycle

Non-violent movement
(succeded)

Gun control,
Black Panther 
Cops (can we accept)

baby steps (good pt)
with new movement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Armando Montero (*'11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2210</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Thompson</td>
<td>Emma Jane Carns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Tempe High School</td>
<td>6 BASIS Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(<strong>Circle Winner</strong>)</td>
<td>(<strong>Basis Peoria / Accountant</strong>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The winner of this debate was **
Affirmative

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

* Good questions for proving your contentions

* Being a 1st time judge, requested to slow down so please keep that in mind for future

* Did not provide evidence to support how "bad for Ed" worked as civil disobedience (not to satisfaction)

---

**Decision**: Affirmative won because he was able to prove his contentions better.

* Both of them did great *
**AFF**

- Careful with your opponent's argument: it seems like you misunderstood the construction.
- Careful w/ religion: it can be exceedingly difficult to universalize beyond its insular culture.
- Careful w/ time management; lots of time yielded.
- Further, it is easy to use against you as Neg did here (vis-a-vis oppression).
- The Black Panthers should be considered because they were not civil.

---

**Neg.**

- 30 seconds short in a constructive way.
- Your argument was clever, but you could use more explicit threads binding its points together.
- "Co-opted by ruling class" arguably true, but can you say how the world would be with an alternative?
- Good use of the Black Panthers as non-civil protest action.
- But, I am again concerned w/ the scale. Why can we say the Black Panthers were "more effective" than, say, MLK?

---

**Time management**

- Both arguments are largely example-heavy; more logical connectives would be preferable.
- Careful talking past each other; some points were left unaddressed on both sides.

---

Ned's argument was more tightly structured and coherent, and thus I award neg the win.

Note: neg's argument was very hypothetical.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Wayne Montes de Oca (*'21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>Room 2208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Zhou</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 BASIS Phoenix</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

Tempe High, English Teacher

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg was very polished and composed. Very convincing and persuasive. Great evidence. 

3 categories of CW

Excel written long time ago

Not as confident.

Very good facts.

Vague and unclar points.

Even on time x2

Too much information! Need to slow down thinking.

Good arguments.

Good attack on Aff basis of CW (Bible), Christianity outdated?

Can violent too?

Confident! Well versed in topic.

Clear specific points.

Very good flow

Very precise in presenting arguments.
# NLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Patrick Stone (*'20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2212</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethan Dean Nicoll</td>
<td>Maryam Khan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Mountain View High School</td>
<td>2 Arizona College Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Points (25-30)</td>
<td>26 Points (25-30)</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:**

- The **aff case** was well structured. Was a bit fast on the construct. Did good in establishing value categories w/in criterion.
- Very good on rebuttal showing how two constructs flow and especially on #2. Also, was good at eliminating neg. #1 as example was not from demo.
- Did well slowing down in later speeches to allow clearly and see flow.

- Neg case was well structured and construct was good. Built good themes on criteria.
- Got trapped up in 2nd neg rebuttal on concept of just versus unjust.
- Did well on gory against aff criteria but ran out of time to really attack aff #2.
- Good job on prep for cases.

- Aff won this debate as they were able to eliminate the key neg. example of Tiananmen Square as that was not in democracy. Aff also flowed through idea of how civil disobedience has been successful w/specific examples. Also the neg was unable (time) to interrupt why aff criteria 2 should flow.
## NLD

**Novice Lincoln Douglas**

**Neel Chakkera (*6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 2207</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philimon Yosafat 5 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Louisa Kaplan 13 McClintock 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:

- **Positive**
  - Good use of evidence
  - Good off 1st rebuttal
  - More passion and articulacy in his points
- Weak response to cross exam
- Unclear cross exam of Negative on many points

- **Negative**
  - Very fast speech, somewhat difficult to follow
  - Company social issues with scientific issues is somewhat weak

- **To Improve**
  - Could be more clear and elaborate in responses to cross exam questions
  - Needs to show more passion and elaborate on key points
  - Did not have a variety of rebuttals to affirmative (kept repeating the safety argument)

- **Both participants were very polite and respectful of each other**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 2203</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Novice Lincoln Douglas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Duong</td>
<td></td>
<td>Madeleine Joslin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 McClintock High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeleine Joslin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 McClintock High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is this a low point win?</strong></td>
<td>☑️ NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Better content more fact based
Madeleine seemed more relaxed
Winner was better prepared / more documentation to support their proposition
Loser not persuasive enough, not enough strong facts to support position
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 2209</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Merritt</td>
<td>Zoe Rossi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td>12 Gilbert Classical Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The affirmative stayed on topic regarding civil disobedience and impacted out their arguments.

I think the negative needs to focus more on the impacts of civil disobedience and state why it could be bad.

Additional comments were given in round.

Feel free to email me for any questions:

@ bsumner16 @brophybroncos.org
### NLD

**Novice Lincoln Douglas**  
**Sarah Nicoll ("15)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 2205</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Avi Agarwal  
5 BASIS Peoria | Sam Rivas  
4 Basis Mesa |  |
| Points (25-30) | Points (25-30) |  |
| 26 | 27 |  |

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

Is this a low point win?  
X

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**
- Slow down and speak clearly
- Adapt to lay judge
- Argumentation about rich people didn't advance your argument.
- Show more passion
- Speak louder
- Be confident in your argument.
- Trade off contention is good - expand

**RFD -**
Better framework in place  
Better argumentation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 2200</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn DeVos</td>
<td>Rayna Shaik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Gilbert Classical Academy</td>
<td>2 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></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>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Time management = (good) liked C3 - power/respect
- connection to structure of grammar = good
- Your speaking style is great! I like it.
- Good speed for nearly all judges (I can't imagine someone doing you for too fast.)
- Maybe more cited evidence (studies, etc., Harvard, etc.)
- Nice approach to CX for statistics
- Good job being polite & definition level is good
- Your examples that you cross-apply to Counterpoint's case are good!
- (ex: concern, minority) Explaining the fact that you and your opponent both here is smart.
- Go for extensions! Clarification of your arguments more in the round.
- Offense, teams, defense
- Whipping (like prefer my Harvard
  Chan card over my opponent's card)

Use cross to find flaws in your opponent's case! Figure out what your opponent's FW means!

Face judge first before talking, less hypothetical.

Don't cross too much in CX that it is individual right to be NONINFRINGEMENT.

I think you need some more examples to crystallize your points about totalitarianism.

Claim, warrants, impact

Don't restate your cards, respond to her argument and then weigh underneath FW.

Instead of use examples like: "A small terror group..." or "Anarchist..."
### Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational NLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Jennifer Scott (*2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2206</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofie Chung</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 McClintock High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dens Mathew Sumesh</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 BASIS Peoria</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:

**Sofie**

Great AFF 1.

and AFF 2 you were able to rebutt all the contentions.

Spoke clearly and had a great concluding statement.

very persuasive.

**Dens.**

Did very well with your contentions, and your rebuttle was able to argue all her points.

Work a little on being able to understand you, and maybe have a stronger stance on your value utilitarianism.

I believe Sofie won this round due to her ability to be persuasive, and conclude w/ certainty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 2204</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Bosco</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sophia Browder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Gilbert Classical Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Sunnyslope 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**
- Case too historical
- Need to present more results of that
- Integrate opposing arguments more
- No new arguments in final speech

**Negative**
- Stick to questions in CP
- Elaborate in rebuttal with more specific examples
- Connect back to Util. when rebutting points
- Good attack on imprints usually being violent

- Good description of states are flawed

Strong 1st Round!!

**Ref.**
- Att. failed to extend many arguments:
  - Yemen Civil war
  - Civil Rights
  - Att. doesn't defend the need for violence in progress
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 2213</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella Keesler-Evans</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Amanda McAlphin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 McClintock High School</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:

your language is very clear and eloquent.
good job.
Try to make eye contact with judge.
This makes strong points.
Good attack on Neg's value.

she was not able to give a strong enough reason to Aff.

Good examples on evidence and not clear communication.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 2201</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billie Briner</td>
<td>Sofia Sills-Freeman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 McClintock High School</td>
<td>1 Arcadia High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Aff**

- Good solid stock off
- Bring your points back to the framework more clearly, it is conceded so use it as leverage
- Make more proper extensions and impact analysis from your aff case

**Neg**

- Always take all your cross-ex time, it is basically free prep!
- Make sure you have a case ready to go beforehand
- In your first neg speech, make sure you make responses directly to the aff case
- You need to do more framework interaction and impact discussion, good job with the Ferguson point but that point alone can't win you this round

RFP: I end up affirming on the point about how more radical change can result from civil disobedience. Neg just needs more impact analysis to outweigh and win the round and that just isn't there.