<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 2212</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 04:30PM</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>Rayna Shaik</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sofie Chung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 McClintock 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>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Judge's Signature:**

Sunny Slop
School / Affiliation / Occupation

**Affirmative Constructive**
- Definition Excludes Violence
- Human Rights
- Respects Law But Challenges by Violating
- Utilitarian Greater Good
- Ex. of disrupting Senate Hrs. Spur Public Debate + Change.

**Neg. Cross**
- Estab. That Civil Dis. Could Be Used to Overthrow Govt.
- Estab. That Majority Good Is Basis for Utilitarian.

**Neg. Constructive**
- Stability of Gov't
- Criteria - Uphold Security
  - a) Rule of Law
    - Ex. Socrates’ Hemlock
  - b) Risk of Violence
    - Civ. Disob. is a Form of Retaliation
  - c) Stability is More to the Good.
- CD Undermines Rule of Law
- Protest is Legal, If by Permit. Attack on Ex.
To Violence,
- Ex. of Gandhi + MLK on peaceful/effectiveness.

Affirm Reb.
- Social contract benefitted by CD.
- Agrees that CD leads to violence
  - Until benefitted by CD.

Neg. Rebuttal
- Error in characterizing opponent's case re: stability/security
  - Emphasized Violence
    - Ex. Hong Kong
  - Retaliation (not clear why immoral)

Decision based primarily on concession by affirmative that violence can occur through CD, but that peaceful CD still outweighs the virtue of stability for its own sake.
**CHOTALLA, MAANIK**

**Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Maanik Chotalla (*'9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2209</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagan Ram Vaidyanathan</td>
<td>Avi Agarwal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td>5 BASIS Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge’s Signature**

**BRophysical/Coach/Dinosaur Hunter**

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Good strong aff
- You gotta be less slippery in cross-x, just answer the questions man, like if it's asking if you have to break the law to have CD, the answer is yes
- Organization is by far your biggest issue, your aff was all over the place and made it hard to follow

---

**RPO:** I negate on the progress and role of law arguments. Neg argues against the aff examples to mitigate their impacts, only real impacts off the aff is marginal speed maybe whereas neg has this turn about progress for society which I negate on.
WEAVER, TRACY

Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

NLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Tracy Weaver (*'14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2216</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeleine Joslin</td>
<td>Tyler Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 McClintock High School</td>
<td>21 Tempe High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative** Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

"You should stand when you speak but don't look at your opponent. You are trying to ask them not to time your opponent.

Rebuild the argument about you having more knowledge about the US. 91% of Democrats are not strongly
favored argument would be that the US. has the largest standing democracy in the globe and the better arguments examples we've seen here.

Use your arguments in CI more they are good! especially your 2nd card/impact.

Extend your arguments more. Just build them down, they aren't gone. Build them up again.

FD: I agree with the Aff's argument of the voting, only happens after CD. Other concepts were given in oral critique.

Ends justify the means, and the illegal arguments on the Neg give my ballot to the Aff."
Maryam Khan
2 Arizona College Prep

Isabella Keesler-Evans
11 Desert Vista High School

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

**Affirmative** (Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Maryam agreed with Isabella in the first cross-examination, but it may have been put some of her points and could have defended it better (re: civil disobedience can turn violent), did a better job in the rebuttal. Both did a good job in defending their own points and negating their opponent.

Presentation of construct was clear and organized, easy to understand for the listener.

be confident in defending your own point, don't let your opponent railroad you if her point was not clear to you.

I liked the exchange, voting, both had good arguments.
**TYLER, ROBB**  

Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

**NLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Robb Tyler (*'20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2200</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda McAlphin</td>
<td>Joshua Marais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 McClintock High School</td>
<td>21 Tempe High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30) 26</td>
<td>Points (25-30) 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:

- "um" and "uh" getting in your way... drill your constructive and be more comfortable with it (like a speech) and that will get better.
- Use all your time in rebuttal even if you feel redundant... clarify, underline, signpost and fill the time.
- Excellent job illustrating / calling out how opponent didn't pull your contentions through.
- Refer back to cards in rebuttal.
- Use cross more aggressively, control your opponent's tempo and pace, don't let them reframe the case...
- Practice your constructive for better presentation.
- Didn't pull through all contentions (#2).
- Didn't connect the dots between your non-democratic examples to how it tied to the resolution.
- Use all your time always.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Prashant Patil (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2210</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisa Kaplan</td>
<td>Ethan Dean Nicoll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 McClintock High School</td>
<td>15 Mountain View High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- opening argument good but could have done better by trying to be more confident & forceful.

- Response to cross examination was very targeted and to the point. In some cases included references.

- One suggestion is try and make eye contact with opponent, rather than just reading out from laptop or paper. It will help the case be more convincing.

- opening argument started with confidence. In between seemed like either there was lots of words or bit nervousness.

- Cross examination was good. Could have been more consistent when the question where asked.

- Try not to say sorry. It was said quite a few times for no apparent reason. It breaks the flow of argument you are making.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Khoa Nguyen (*'15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2208</strong></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>Sam Rivas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan Duong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Basis Mesa</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative [ ] Negative [X]
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? [ ] no

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Sam was 45 minutes late. Forfeit.
### Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

**NLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Aniruddha Deb (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2203</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pranav Tangalipalli</td>
<td>Evelyn DeVos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 BASIS Scottsdale</td>
<td>12 Gilbert Classical Academy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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**

Judge's Signature: **Aniruddha Deb**

School / Affiliation / Occupation: BASIS PEORIA

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative argued that civil disobedience is the only way to address minority interest and has showed multiple examples of how civil disobedience ultimately changed society in a better way.

Negative argued that democracy by definition in a majority rule but could not establish why majority rule in morally justifiable.
Civil disobedience in a democracy is morally justified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 2201</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dens Mathew Sumesh</td>
<td>Connor Clark</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td>22 Tempe Preparatory Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The winner of this debate was</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Circle Winner)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is this a low point win?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**AFF**: Try in CX to directly respond to Neg question. There seems an inherent conflict in CT(2) - (3) of your case. Do not delve into the range of acceptable/illegal actions. Be precise and clear in CX. Don't ask Neg (CT2) eminent lawyer to civil disobedience. Careful in CX. Don't let Neg dominate CX. Avoid do you concede for other days to fix climate. Don't let Neg control CX. Avoid do you concede for other days to fix climate. Be systematic in 2nd AFF - 1st attack Neg than 2nd defend AFF. Be systematic in 3rd AFF - or vice versa. But don't jump around. Don't read cards in 3rd AFF. You need to give voters if you should have

**NEG**: Great CX - ask AFF how CX is measured by framework. You have a tremendous skill in family applicable questions. However avoid "Do you agree...you would know who you include in your case. Just..." Great use of voters hi Neg BUT explain why Demo process achieves justice

**BALLOT**: Neg - prevailed on Vale - Justice != successfully argued Demo > C.D. to weak justice.
# Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

## NLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Valerie Zelinski (*8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2215</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Affirmative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Negative</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emma Jane Carns</td>
<td>Emilio Ducomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td>Arcadia High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Affirmative was better prepared to support their position. More documentation + facts provided. More persuasive in arguing position.**

**Not as prepared as the affirmative. Hacked facts + documentation to support position. Conceded a round, not as persuasive in his arguments.**
**Novice Lincoln Douglas** | **Muzaffar Khan ('2)**
---|---
**Round 2** | **Room 2211** | **Fri 10/04/19 04:30PM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Affirmative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Points</strong></th>
<th><strong>Negative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Points</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophia Browder</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Cole Montei</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Sunnyslope High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 Tempe 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**

ACP / Event

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Good case was presented
- Defended the question very well
- Little more eye contact needed
- Good questions asked
- Good argument with data and examples
- Defended very well against the opponent’s questions
- Slowdown a bit

---

- Good question was asked.
- Pace and presentation was good, clearly communicated.
- Good defenses but could have done a little better.
- No eye contact, kept looking down all the time, look up and move eye contact with the audience.
- Could do a better job in defending

---

Affirmative presented and supported very well, good arguments to support.
All 3 Aff contentions flow through - Neg Did not attempt to block contentions with specific evidence (ex: x

Aff block 2NC -

Neg no evidence to support contentions - support your claims - they are not self-evident

For these reasons Aff is the winner
**Affirmative**
Hunter Travis Fenn
14 Mesquite High School

**Negative**
Maria Bosco
12 Gilbert Classical Academy

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative  Negative
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  No

---

**Judge's Comments**

Aff was winner. They were able to establish and follow 3 of their criteria. Neg never responded to the criteria and instead focused on value. Aff was able to portray neg cross into imp range position and also used item neg slanted as a vote to support aff position.

Great job using current examples. Did well in using first rebuttal to tackle key aff players and recast in new light.

Did aff bring criteria back to value in cross, good idea but don't feel it was effective.

Good build on construct or point to point.

Left time on table - use extra time to restate key voters.

---

**Affirmative**

Point 25-30: 29

**Negative**

Point 25-30: 27

**Judge's Signature**

Sunnyslope, Gov't
School / Affiliation / Occupation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Prameet Bhargava (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 2214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe Rossi 12 Gilbert Classical Academy</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billie Briner 13 McClintock High School</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature

BASIS PEORIA / Accountant

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

* Should be a little bit more direct in your arguments.
* Had good contentions but opponent was able to prove her value/structure.
* Did not see many mentions of evidence.

OVERALL **GOOD JOB**

DECISION: "Negative is a winner as she was able to prove her contentions better."
NLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Chetan Urunkar (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2206</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25-30)</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia Sills-Freeman</td>
<td>William Zhou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Arcadia High School</td>
<td>6 BASIS Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative <strong>(Circle Winner)</strong></td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Both of the contestants were exceptional for somebody who is doing this for the first time.
- William had examples which were resonating with the current environment as well as excellent arguments to some of the examples from Sofia.
- Sofia's argument around "rule of law" and "no other option" were excellent.
- William and Sofia were well organized and clear, and I wish them the best.
Aff

"Good example - ten miles a day, Keystone project"

Good answer in Barker
Civil group violate Malcolm

Secrecy is a good point
Cyber is a good point
Brown case a good point
Voiture

Lyle 7 laws vs región
Good argument

"No other option"

Haller

Rosa parks case along the side

Indians to court

Right to defend oneself free?

organized well prepared
## Novice Lincoln Douglas
### Round 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sophia MacArthur  
20 Sunnyslope High School | 25 | Phillimon Yosafat  
5 BASIS Peoria | 26 |

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Is Circle Winner)

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

---

**Judge's Signature**

**KCP Chandler**

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Need to be lot more affirmative and assertive in your conviction.

I liked your method of being articulate but not at the cost of disproving opponents convictions & arguments.

Good Presentation

Good overall arguments. except I would say that it is wrong to present history in a controversial way. For example Rosa Park was charged because she disobeyed a Jim Crow law (which enforced social segregation).