<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Eli Botham (*'13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2214</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philimon Yosafat</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella Keesler-Evans</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 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:

"Running Prep"

"End quote" not necessary

I think that you might consider lengthening your explanation of what deontology commits you to defending. You might consider reading The Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals by Immanuel Kant or an iteration of deontology that is more modern as advocated by Rawls.

Would you agree that more than 2 years is a long time? Don't ask this kind of question since she might answer in a way that is undesirable for your arg.

Try to ask questions that are useful in the debate.

Sharing a negative light or non-negative light

Don't do that at your hand - it's a microexpression.

You don't need to say "That's time when her timer goes off." Anything is not ok. Sarcasm means - no good reply.

Protests on TV? Are they violent? I wouldn't ask these questions where he can respond how he wants.

Might consider having an alternative definition of the laws in violation of civilian law rather than civil.

I think that your ability to come up with examples is great. Keep doing this and TRYING to do this. This will help you win rounds! Judges love clarifying examples.

Your clarification of where the FW debate was lacking was good. This is worth discussing how your opponent underestimates them (or doesn't) is important to winning by this a compelling it's satisfying.

Coffee please turn arguments, cross-ex, weighing, etc.

Don't need to say "That's time when her timer goes off." Anything is not ok. Sarcasm means - no good reply.

And impact analysis underneath your FW or vit. Talk about what the impact means...
MACARTHUR, BRUCE  Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

NLD

Novice Lincoln Douglas  Bruce MacArthur ('20)

Round 4  Room 2210  Fri 10/04/19 07:30PM

Affirmative  Points  Negative  Points
Dens Mathew Sumesh  (25-30)  Sam Rivas  (25-30)
5 BASIS Peoria

The winner of this debate was
Affirmative  Negative
(Circle Winner)
Is this a low point win?  YES

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff. Long.
- CD REQUIRED TO PROTECT
  RIGHTS OF MINORITY
- CONCEDES THE CONTEXT
  OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVT.
- REDRESS GRIEVANCE
- EX. RED SCARE
- EX. CLIMATE CHANGE
  REQUIRES CIVIL D. TO
  CORRECT
- CONVERSATION STARTER
- PROVIDES MORALAUTONOMY
  TO INDIVIDUAL.

Cross Neg
- ASKED FOR RESTATEMENT
  OF CRITERIA.
- ASKED TO AGREE THAT
  LEGAL MEANS INEFFICIENT.

Neg. Cross
- ASKED FOR EX. OF LAWS
  REQUIRED CD.
  Answer - JIM CROW LAWS
- ASKED HOW CD WOULD
  CHANGE POLITICAL ORDER
- ACKNOWLEDGE THE LEGAL
  PROCESS WORKS. ANSWER NO.
- ASKED HOW IT WORKS
  PUBLICLY.

Neg. Construct.

Moral - Util. = Public
Officials Charged w/ Estab. Law.
- CD PROMOTES VIOLENCE
- CD IS LAW BREAKER.
- CD ALLOWS UNETHICAL
  BEHAVIOR - KKK.
- EX. WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE
  (CUTS AGAINST HIS CASE)
- Asked that CD involves a flawed sense of morality.
  
  - Justice = morality defined as in div. benefit.
  
  **AFF Rebut**

- Ex. Rosa Parks
  
- Ex. Climate change requires CD b/c not time to wait.
  
- Morality autonomy
  
- Arg. that CD is for oppressed
  
- Insists CD is peaceful.
  
**AFF Rebut**

- LD not required to effect change
  
**NEG Rebut**

- Climate change has happened via legal means.
  
- Legal passage of laws can be expedited
  
- Oppressed can unite legally.
  
- Struggled to fill time - be better to end strong even if early.

**AFF Rebut**

- Morally not adequately defined.
  
- Ineffective reliance on proposal that CD required to end climate change.
  
- Presumed CD morally justified.

**NEG Rebut**

- Decision based primarily on inability to show CD required to effect change.
  
- Lacked the development of examples.
NGUYEN, KHOA

Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

NLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Khoa Nguyen (*'15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 2207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Travis Fenn</td>
<td>Avi Agarwal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Mesquite High School</td>
<td>5 BASIS Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Points (25-30)</td>
<td>28 Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Khoa Nguyen

Judge’s Signature

Mountain View High School

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

A: The tone of voice you used was great! It made your argument sound more interesting and follow along compared to a monotone type of speech. Your speech is easy to follow along. But also include in your argument where your opponent case fails short in their argument and where they did not attack your points. This will help us judges to clearly see the strengths and weaknesses of each of your arguments. To add, it may have seemed that you added an additional piece of information into the final decision. But overall, you have all the basics down, keep it up!

N: You spread your case, which I said at the beginning not to, but still even so, I tried to follow along. Next time, pay attention to your judge’s paradigm to not upset and make them upset. In addition, they may make you lose at automatically if their paradigm is not followed. By the end of the debate, you were speaking at a quicker and slower pace, easier to follow. The arguments you made were clear and pointed out the holes in the aff’s argument. That was well done on your first tournament! Good job!

Both: That was the most fun debate of the day! Both of you pretty much have the basics down. Just fix the minor points for next time! Good luck!

RFD: The neg side provided a clearer argument where he pointed out the holes in the aff’s case. In addition, the aff’s argument broadened points argued made during the debate compared to the neg’s argument.
## NLD

### Novice Lincoln Douglas vs Robb Tyler (*20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 2209</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Affirmative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</th>
<th><strong>Negative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rayna Shaik</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kinâed Jaxon Sabine</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
<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**

---

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

**AFF**
- Excellent material & structure...practice your constructive so much that its presented more

- Always use all time
- Wonderful cadence, pace of speech & very self-possessed in cross X
- Needed to attack structural violence (Didn't address conventional)

**Neg**
- Excellent case built around structural violence, very well presented (Strong voice, good tempo, great inflection)
- Always use all time
- Watch your "uh" & "um," replace with breath
- Great logistics/structure & solid roadmapping

---

Sign posting:  

Cross X more

(you let her go on when you shouldn't)
### Novice Lincoln Douglas vs. Brandon Sumner (*9) - Round 4

**Affirmative**
- Tyler Thompson  
  21 Tempe High School  
  Points (25-30): 28

**Negative**
- Ethan Dean Nicoll  
  15 Mountain View High School  
  Points (25-30): 27

**Winner**
- **Affirmative**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Tyler made the moral connection of the resolution at the end of the debate.
- Good organization of value system & contentions.  
- Good distinction between moral & legal.  
- I think you had persuasive arguments for your contentions. They were logical.  
- I think you were going to defend your 3rd contention then changed your mind.

---

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

- Basis Phoenix Parent  
  Judge's Signature: Cheryl Buyama
...promises this...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Neel Chakkera (*6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 2216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn DeVos</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Gilbert Classical Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Marais</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Tempe 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:

Affirmative is the winner of this round. Evelyn, you display solid logic, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas towards your resolution.

To the negative, my suggestion is to work on your organization and research.

Great job both!!!

Congratulations!!!

Beautiful round!!!

❤️❤️❤️
**Novice Lincoln Douglas** | **Aniruddha Deb (‘5)**
---|---
**Round 4** | **Room 2204** | **Fri 10/04/19 07:30PM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billie Briner</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Connor Clark</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 McClintock 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]**

Negative

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

---

Affirmative agreed in cross examination that minority has equal contribution in making the laws in democratic society. Negative argued that if that is the case then there is no moral justification for civil disobedience from minority on majority.
## NLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Debbie Schneider (*'12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2200</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Merritt</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The winner of this debate was</strong></td>
<td><strong>(Circle-Winner)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is this a low point win?</strong></td>
<td><strong>no</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Judge's Signature**: Debbie Sch
**School / Affiliation / Occupation**: GCA

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Affirmative:**
  - Gives voice to oppressed civil rights.
  - Parks, Rosa Parks
  - Women's rights
  - Sit-ins
  - Non-violent or maybe later
  - Checks + balance
  - Peaceful protests not enough.
  - Must step up for peaceful protest if not violence.

- **Negative:**
  - Violence hurts.
  - Loss of life
  - LGBTQ
  - Homosexuality
  - Censorship "peaceful" violence?
  - Shootings?
  - Spy speech or heresy.
  - Always has to be harm?
  - Promotes violence?

- Violence against civil disobedience.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Sajjad Syed (*2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2212</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisa Kaplan</td>
<td>17</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>Cole Montei</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Tempe Preparatory Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

LOUISE

**GOOD WELL MANNERED PRESENTATIONS. TRY TO ADD MORE ENERGY INTO THE DEBATE.**
## Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

**NLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Prashant Patil (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2213</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryam Khan</td>
<td>Sofia Sills-Freeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td>1 Arcadia High School</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? **No**

**Judge's Signature**

Basis Peoria

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Nice presentation of all case well organized and included references.
- While presenting case there were times when there was loss of words.
- Summary well organized.
- Cross examination was specific and to the point.
- Summary within the framework and well organized.
- Instance when completed the case in a very short time with time left over.
- Had opportunity to deal with cross question. Don't seem to give away early.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Bita Taji ('2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 2215</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>Ryan Duong</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sophia Browder</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 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**

Judge's Signature: [Signature]

School / Affiliation / Occupation: ACP

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Both attack on the points and identifying weak points.
- Both make eye contact with the judge.
- Overall delivered a strong argument.
- Your speed and fluency were great.
- Aff Able to respond quickly to questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Jennifer Scott (*'2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2211</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pranav Tangallpalli</td>
<td>7 BASIS Scottsdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilio Ducomb</td>
<td>1 Arcadia High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Aff had a good solid case and was clear & easy to listen to.

The Neg started off well but did not have enough research & evidence to back up his case. He ended up conceding 1/2 way through the round.

The Aff won.
### Novice Lincoln Douglas

**Derek Chisman ("6")**

**Round 4**

**Affirmative**

Sophia MacArthur  
20 Sunnyslope High School

Points (25-30)  
2.9

**Negative**

Maria Bosco  
12 Gilbert Classical Academy

Points (25-30)  
2.8

The winner of this debate was

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

(Circle Winner)

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

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

- Have explicitly labelled contentions outlined.
- Try not to stop back and forth while speaking.
- Case only 4 minutes long. You have plenty of time left to further expand your claims.
- Good questions on MayDay example. in general was strong.
- Covered Neg case m rebuttal. You still had a minute left on the clock, so make sure you use that time to extend and strengthen your arguments.
- Compare world with vs. without civil disobedience is very strong.

Neg

- Most questions in cross were clarification. Try to have questions that set up your future arguments. Last question about potential roadblocks was good. Do more like that.
- Only used half of 1st speech. You have space to strengthen your case and then thoroughly attack the Aff.
- You stated at the end of your 1st speech that there are all alternatives to civil disobedience. Go ahead and explain what those alternatives are early on. You didn't bring these up until your 2AR.
- You had 4 minutes left on the clock in your 2NR. Use your time!

CPD: Aff successfully defended the argument that civil disobedience is necessary when the law itself is unjust. Neg was unable to provide evidence that alternatives are able to solve unjust laws.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Christine Theile (*1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2201</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Zhou</td>
<td>Amanda McAlphin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td>13 McClintock 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**

Aff case was well presented, value and criteria strong and not challenged by neg.
Neg had strong contenue w/ govt efficiency
but didn't challenge AFF contents at all
AFF examples were clear a strong
Neg seemed confused about own evidences and gave up a substantial amount of time in final rebuttal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 2203</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeleine Joslin</td>
<td>13 McClintock High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe Rossi</td>
<td>12 Gilbert Classical Academy</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:

Both debaters need specific example/evidence. Neg case not specific - not really arguments/contentions - more like ideas - needs to be fleshed out. Know your stuff - understand terms/concepts - both debaters need to do this. Round was decided based on F is Aff had some stronger in their contentions that supported the value/criterion. Aff is the winner.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Sarah Nicoll (*'15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 2208</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>Emma Jane Carns</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Sofie Chung</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 McClintock 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:

Good enthusiasm

Good foundation for LD - work on style, presentation, and delivery

- Need more than examples - need pragmatic evidence

- Don't argue the other side for them (gave definition for Rule of Law that hounded Human Rights to opponent)

Good, calm presentation and argumentation.

Stronger evidence for your case.