## Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

**NLD**

**FLIP: 6 Kináed Jaxon Sabine v. 12 Evelyn DeVos**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Clayton Guy (*1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2227</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kináed Jaxon Sabine</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evelyn DeVos</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was
- **Affirmative**
- **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _**ALL**_

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Affirmative:**
- `Profit`
  - Value: majority
  - Criterion: utilitarian - most people, most harm
  - Effectiveness, peaceful protests - women's suffrage
  - Chain of reasoning: control laws might not work
  - Consistent with the value, most effective
  - Good methods to get rights - only 1 example, SC office must rep all
  - Did good job on sample, defined CD - ends correctly

**Negative:**
- `Value: protection of right of majority`
  - **Criterion:**
    - Utilitarianism - greatest good
    - Threat to democracy; Lincoln about Union law
      - Social contract - French revolution - examples
      - Laws hold no bearing
    - Respect to violence - sparked violence/fragile
      - Abused children, boycott troops, recall initiative in CA
      - Civil liberties - SC used criterion in argumant
      - Good leads to support - added today for example - did good job
      - Won argument & finished well - 2nd speech
    - Used criterion in argument

*Judge's Signature:*

`Arcadia HS / Coach`

School / Affiliation / Occupation
**Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational**

**NLD**

**FLIP: 6 Kinæed Jaxon Sabine v. 12 Evelyn DeVos**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Muzaffar Khan (*2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2227</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinæed Jaxon Sabine 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn DeVos 29</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 start and clear in speaking.
- Eye contact and presentation.
- Made presented good points in support.
- Good defence of his position was able to defend very well.

Cross:
- Good cross examination questions.

Defender:
- Defended and explained well.
- His position - no ambiguity.

Attacks:
- Was short and to the point.

Before Round:
- Defence of Senatorial was very good.
- Round 2 - Good defence.
- Round 3 - Good defence and example of shared French recess and stability.

**Negative:**
- Good cross examination, the question were good but the opponent defended his position very well.
- Case was presented well and not able to support the position.
- Answers were good but could have defended better.
- Attacked attacking a French Revolution position should have given more language.
- Very good defence presented for idea position.
- Shown confidence in attacking and defending her position.
FLIP: 6 Kináed Jaxon Sabine v. 12 Evelyn DeVos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Khoa Nguyen (*'15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Finals</td>
<td>Room 2227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kingard Sabine</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evelyn DeVos</strong></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:
- Kináed
  - Cross - Battled by argument?
  - Good defense
  - Logical, but minimizing
  - Few pieces of evidence
  - Seemed to be very nervous - Becalmed

- Evelyn
  - Good flow very thorough
  - Guest Counter
  - Very confident
  - Guest Strength of Knowledge
  - Clear Evidence
  - Specific Counter with evidence
  - Provided rebuttal of Aff's Counter

Judge's Signature:
J. Tempor High English Teacher
School / Affiliation / Occupation
FLIP: 22 Connor Clark v. 7 Pranav Tangallpalli

Semi-Finals

Affirmative  Points (25-30)
Pranav Tangallpalli  29

Negative  Points (25-30)
Connor Clark  27

The winner of this debate was
Affirmative
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? N

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

* Aff brought strong points in first address, bringing points from both sides.

* Neg slow down and ensure speech is understood.

* Neg great job opening up democracy and justice.

* Neg used great points to identify civil disobedience.

* Aff great argument points in crossfire; providing clear evidence for stance.

* Neg remember key argumental evidence in crossfire.

---

Aff (Pranav) built strong argument structure in crossfire.

* Provided strong evidence behind opening up decisions toward Aff, ultimately giving Aff the match.
**THEILE, CHRISTINE**

**Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational**

**NLD**

**FLIP: 22 Connor Clark v. 7 Pranav Tangallpalli**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Christine Theile (*1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2225</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pranav Tangallpalli</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor Clark</td>
<td>28</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 values and framework held. While NE6 was persistent in universal application of morality AFF was effective in taking apart the NE6 definitions and contentions. AFF value of civil disobedience to uphold justice and diminish oppression was not adequately contested. AFF argument & contentions were strong and flawed.

Both sides were well prepared and presented well.
Novice Lincoln Douglas | Tristan Brown (*9)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Finals</td>
<td>Room 2225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pranav Tangallpalli:</td>
<td>Conor Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**  
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- even though neg's "universal applicability = morality" argument wasn't responded to that adequately, I think the aff's response to "all people being equal = justice" in the form of legal protection not being applied equally was really strong.

- neg's argument of minority forcing will on majority was going fire until the end of the last speech when you used the civil rights movement as an example

  by white supremacists use that justification which I think also intersects the morality and universal applicability, which aff called out as a logical fallacy. That also played right into aff's criterion of minority oppression.

- also I think that even though, as neg says, democracy upholds values of justice "the best," that still doesn't necessarily mean it's a totally just system (i.e. segregation, slavery, women's suffrage) which again, were aff examples.