<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 1134</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Goldstein</td>
<td>275 261</td>
<td>Maryam Khan</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 BASIS Flagstaff</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**  
(Circle Winner) **No**

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

I vote neg b/c Aff dropped framework, and all of their contentions, in the AR. There was nothing I could weigh the arguments that made it to the 2AR with. The 2AR should have been the IAR. They needed 2:47 of time; they could have used to properly extend case.
In case use of "totalitarianism" may pose some issues in rebuttal / try to make it less US centric

- don't waste time in CX w/ asking about their day
- start w/ V/C (FW) first - card your FW/r 2 v4 rep. may pose issues in rebuttal
- some w/ violence argument & Putin corruption
- you don't need to explain your app. argument
- you should be asked if we min. app. we achieve equality
- oh so no card... tell me why that's important (FW/1)

Just get to ZNR / you don't need to argue unless your app. says

KV should be in ZNR

Interesting take on "dem." is not full-democracy but it does you no favors

Need evidence that voting works

ZAR can be a bit more organized

I vote **AFF** because on FW, I guy that a prereq to safety is justice. The KV the neg brought up on voting actually harmed the neg, especially when you argue full-dem." not required. They being said the AFF wins on that arg. because of silencing of CRA w/ Cat.3 of legal channels flowing through
**Round 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Duong</td>
<td>Rayna Shaik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td>22 Arizona College Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 (25-30)</td>
<td>26 (25-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- I think you’d be able to cut cards down to 5-6 add more sup.
  evidence. China is an interesting example to use.
- Don’t need to ask to use prep.
- FW should be outlined differently.
- Careful using HOBBES in conjunction with deco.
- Don’t explain their arg. For them, which S/P? Just because all countries aren’t demo. CC action shouldn’t occur.
- Find a pace in your rebuttal so you don’t have dead air.
- You don’t need to restate the resolution at the beginning of 2NR.
- Hobbes response needs to extend.

I vote **AFF** because I buy that HR are a pre req. to dem. eff.

Also, I buy AFF’s arguments against Hobbes that Hobbes promotes an absolute power. On CC, I thought the China issue didn’t quite cut the same (the amount) I bought that protests in some dem area are protests that fell into the res.
## NLD

**Novice LD Debate**

**Round 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cooper Somora  
7 Perry High School | Gagan Ram Vaidyanathan  
11 BASIS Phoenix |
| 28 | 29 |

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative** (circle winner)

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

**Judge's Signature**

Brody/Coach/Walrus Pal

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- You gotta be careful about what concessions you make in cross-ex, explain your arguments.
- Don't make your argument in cross-ex.
- Also, don't let your opponent dominate your cross-ex focus on asking questions.
- Organization was really missing from your IAR, be more specific as to what you are responding to.
- Impact your points, I'm not sure the impact of your contention 4.

---

**AFF**

- Really good cross-x questions.
- Agreed to that.
- Your 2NR had pretty much 20 impact analysis if I negotiate I'm not really sure what I am voting for.
- Most of your args are just defense, including your case, so I'm not really sure why I negotiate like at the end of the day why is civil disobedience BAD.

---

**NEG**

- This was a very confusing round, very very messy, I am truly unsure what neg impacts there are but off is basically mooted as well. I tentatively negotiate on the violence any.
# NLD

## Novice LD Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1135</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan Dean Nicoll</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>William Zhou</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Mountain View High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Aff**

- **Solid aff**
- You're spending way too long clarifying at the beginning of cross-x
- Your rebuttals really need more impact and analysis back to the framework in particular

**Neg**

- **Solid neg, do more in responding to the framework of the aff**
- You gotta spend less time clarifying the question and actually answer it
- This democracy argument is interesting but I think it isn't as big as your making it out to be

---

**AFA: I end up affirming on the point of having autonomy to follow conscious. I buy this idea of democracy not being there in the aff C2 but the neg needs more on the C1 given the framework so I affirm.**
TARIQ, WALLEED
Jim Fountain Classic

NLD

Novice LD Debate

Walleed Tariq ('36)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 1122</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Emma Jane Carns</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Frank Banister</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td></td>
<td>Willow Canyon 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

Judge's Signature

Chandler High School
School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff:  
C1: Struct Opp.  
C2: Gov Acc  
- Few Murderers on the run Point back?

Neg:  
- Suggest: Needs to flow  
- Barely dealt w/ proposed
- Did not know the structure of debate framework
- No questions asked during Cross X
- Did not relate Aff's case in Neg Constructive

Reason For Decision: Aff was well versed in the structure of debate as well. Neg agreed with in at least two rebuttal & Cross X statements. Neg also did not flow or write down a single contention or sub-point for Aff. Neg had no real rebuttal & asked minimal questions in Cross X.
A

[Incoherent text that does not form a coherent paragraph or thought]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Dens Sumesh 32 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Andrew Xie 4 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

Is this a low point win? [ ]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Social Contract!

- Negs Cross X of Aff was good.
- Aff needs to speak more clearly, wrinkle case a little.
- Neg addressed Aff framework at contentions well.
- Aff Cross X was decent however Neg was able to clearly answer questions in a way that supported their case.

Reason for Decision:

- The Negs contentions and framework were better suited for the Aff's case.
- The rebuttal for the Neg correctly dropped contention of Aff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 1125</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kináed Jaxon Sabine</td>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>Jackson Gordwin</td>
<td>2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td></td>
<td>36 Chandler 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:

**Aff** - Good 3 contentions (good definitions, value)

1st Aff speech, well done; organized, has source, nice job. 2nd Aff negative was good attack on contentions (d) what opponent said - do not just set claim at end. Last 30-45 seconds - improve & mention why to vote against - have better conclusion. Terms found of procedures; contentions flowed. Good debate; nice work.

**Neg** - has only 1 contention - can add more. Make sure to list it for own opponent. Contentions - your general arguments are good but did not mention opponent's speech directly. Had good recent examples, can get more for other/related issues.

Judge's Signature

Readia H1S

School / Affiliation / Occupation
## NLD

**Novice LD Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1125</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avi Agarwal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kayla Lewis</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Willow Canyon 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:**

*Affirmative: Avi - Good 3 contentions - good rebuttal speech; attached other case & mention the item does not stop it. Use examples of reasons to stop case. Total value & criterion. Nice debate.*

*Neg: you need to use your time - 1st Neg was 5 minutes & did not attack other side - had 2 minutes. You need to use prep time & flow the debate. Keep in your case - add more details & facts. Add to your contentions - specifics & details.*
## Novice LD Debate

### Round 1  
**Flight 1**  
**Room 1124**  
**Fri 10/25/19 03:00PM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Muntaha Islam  
4 Hamilton High School | Jhaj Baaz  
34 Desert Vista High School |

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

**Judge's Signature**  
Joleson Union High School/Chemistry Teachers

### Comments & Reason for Decision:
- **Civil Disobedience - Pro**  
  - Democracy  
  - Republic?  
  - Constitutional  
  - Min. Prejudice  
  - Allowing people to protest  
  - Examples

- **Affirmative - Negative**  
  - Requires practice when  
  - Cross can only  
  - Effects - great ex  
  - Current?  
  - Small fraction of people

- **Need extra thoughts on examples**  
  - Is change good? Give ex

- **Moral or Right?**  
  - Inequality of life  
  - Hands - voice

- **Do all people follow law?**  
  - No examples -

- **Excellent on both sides**

**Shunman**

**2x**

**John Locke**

**Lost time**

**Which one**
## Novice LD Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Harms</td>
<td>5 Willow Canyon High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Travis Fenn</td>
<td>19 Mesquite High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Morality
  - Publicity has action not been covert. How is moral from system? Flawed system.
  - When does take action? Great Example: Malcolm X.
  - People are flawed - could minorities be flawed as well? Don’t take to get away from Britain.
  - Moral is ethical.

- Logical flaw: all that is moral is ethical.

- Two things must make: Q1: Would you consider civil disobedience a flawed system?

- Q2: What percentage is very rarely - provide evidence.

- Q3: Provide evidence.

- Violence powerful - less important to have publicity than to protect its people.

- Great job on prohibition example, but better w/ a law that impacted "political" in a different way.

- Spectrum rule of law.

- Defiance of authority.

- Government hearing voice to become laws - provide example. I believe....

- Democracy - equality not being met. Legal channels - long time. Civil disobedience helped to speed it up.

- Good - subjective.

- Put into own words: Put into own words.

- Crossed out basic questions.

- Just asked basic questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 1121</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aidan Zerafa</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ryan B Gan</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 BASIS Flagstaff</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The winner of this debate was</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is this a low point win?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg - Wins an Framework debate
Neg - Overall delivered a stronger argument
Able to respond to questions.

Aff
Net - a good framework.
You jumped all around and it was hard to follow.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1121</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Sofia Sills-Freeman</td>
<td>3 Arcadia High School</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Philimon Yosafat</td>
<td>32 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Overall both delivered a strong argument. This was a difficult round to decide on.
N ey Able to respond quickly to questions and wins on frame work.
Aff good job identifying weak points and a good attack on Neg. Both try to make eye contact with judge.
Both strong points made.
## Novice LD Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 1123</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 Tempe High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was <strong>Affirmative</strong>: (Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win? <strong>NO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judge's Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School / Affiliation / Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Joshua - Too much paper shuffling, try to look up and at the judge. Be organized, practice your construction speech. You should not be stumbling over words, too many pauses. Too many "stories" cite your sources and add additional contentions! Give roadmap before time starts.

Sasha - Great eye contact during speeches.
- You had a better construction speech than Joshua.
- I did not agree with "equality is a prerequisite to safety"

I agree with neg that security as a value is more important than equality. However, Aff had stronger arguments and contentions.
**Novice LD Debate** | **Aster Measho ('32)**
---|---
**Round 1** | **Flight 2**
**Affirmative** | **Negative**
Queen Keza | Anushka Suneel Mitbander
7 Perry High School | Hamilton High School

**Points**

| 2.4 | 2.6 |

*(25-30)*

**The winner of this debate was**

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

**Is this a low point win?**

**Judge's Signature**

**ACP**

*School / Affiliation / Occupation*

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

*Ask for paradigms - neither of you did.*

**QueeN** - Great eye contact during construction speech; great pace of speech; great questions in cross; give road map off time; need to use all your time in rebuttal; you used less than 1 minute and did not address her contentions or warrants at all!

**Anushka** - your evidence and cards were great; your construction speech was very good; work on addressing your opponent's case; needs to be smoother and more thought out; it was choppy; watch the quavering in your voice; be confident!

**AFF** evidence was not as strong as negs.

**NEG** dropped your cz because examples were not in a democracy.

Overall - neg's case was stronger.
### NLD

**Novice LD Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 507</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhishek Jaiswal</td>
<td>Sarah Savage</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Chaparral High School</td>
<td>7 Perry High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't need a det for morality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More on definition for 3-4 actually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sure to time yourselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is very! 1 minute X-tra in the Aff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There's nothing for me to vote off of when there is little to no worth to dare on either side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take more time to prep for your SAR so that you can do better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You used 54 seconds BEFORE SAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You got this. You're super not confident and you have great points — structure of Russia, China, Shum Huang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Aff could go down the Nye flow and just point out inconsistencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Negative is wholly logically consistent with itself. More impact analysis over north w.w.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Judge's Signature**

McClintock HS

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

The extension was on both sides, highly limited.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 507</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pranav Tangallapalli</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mia Osmonbekov</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 BASIS Scottsdale</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 BASIS Flagstaff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Don't need to say Card 1c. 2.. 3

You might consider in the Cherwath card study the methodology of that card and discussing how the study is strong.

- Proof Question will lead to Anarchy good
- You are light years ahead of where I was as a novice. Keep it up!
- One thing that I think you underplayed in the TAR was in your extensions. Specifically say the words "Extend" that card - or extend and cross-apply when you are going into arguments where you use your AC's argu as cross applications.

The 1% of people vs. 99% is a good theoretical argument. It also can be used as a response to his concern of minimizing opposition which is one of which you successfully identified.

If you can't think of these words and try to use examples of how social protection and quality of life for minorities is improved with C.D.

You don't have to concede his definition of C.D. that includes murder. You could make an argument about how violent C.D. is key not ground.

CD = Civil Disobedience
- Might consider standing during CX
- Try to continue asking Q's for CX
- Clearly concepts you don't know
- Can ask to view opponents case during CX
- Talk about example of other ways to make a in a democracy w/o a civil disobedience
- When you're not sure what to do next, go to the Aff flow and make arguments against it.
- Don't panic! Just make arguments that make sense to you.
- Be confident! You have knowledge and the tools to think. I can tell in your eyes you're ready.
- More analysis for how if everyone broke laws, it would not allow for social protection. The Aff provider examples of how social protection and quality of life for minorities is improved w/c D.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1126</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konz Santos 5 Willow Canyon High School</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>Miranda Jarvis 35 Phoenix Country Day School</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Neg:**

"Your case is cool as heck! You seem to understand and explain it well. Against the aff contentions, it would have been really effective to argue against the aff contentions. As it is, you repeat the points you made in your case, but this leaves a lot of room for the aff to extend their contentions and link to your framework. Your opponent's framework is basically a less developed version of yours, one that could have saved you time reading redundant arguments and given you an advantage."

"Your opponent's framework is basically a less developed version of yours, one that could have saved you time reading redundant arguments and given you an advantage."
Aff:

- In the 1AR, try taking some time to reiterate your case arguments. You talked a lot about the third contention in your case, which was good, but you left a lot of the arguments you made in your first speech untouched.
- You come back to C1 and C2 in the 2AR, but it's a bit late for it to seem impactful at that point. In general, try to respond to your opponent's arguments more.

RFD: I vote neg based off of the neg contentions 1 and 2. It's more or less dropped that there are better alternatives to CD, which is probably enough to vote neg right there. There's also the conceded argument that CD causes violence, which is effectively linked to util as "the economy is for the majority of people."

Neg:

- The arguments in your case seem really good! You understand and argue them well.
- That being said, your responses to the AC seemed a little lacking. You reiterated arguments from your case, but it would have been really effective to respond to the specifics of the aff (e.g., reasons why civil disobedience is NOT effective or DOESN'T spread to other communities) instead of repeating yourself.
- If you don't have a citation for something, don't say it's a card (I am confused.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NLD</th>
<th>Jim Fountain Classic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CARNS, SARAH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice LD Debate</td>
<td>Sarah Carns (*'11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>Flight 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole Montei</td>
<td>Isaiah Joiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Tempe Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>1 BASIS Flagstaff</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><strong>NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision:</td>
<td>Work on cross-examination questions for opponents. Contentions. Good eye contact. Watch &quot;uh's&quot; and &quot;um's.&quot; Great confidence and poise and ability to present your side effectively. Unfortunately, you agreed with your opponent during cross-ex. However, your comfortability with material and presenting is why you still scored high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Jue Carns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge's Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School / Affiliation / Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**NLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Sarah Carns (*'11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Marie Sherwood</td>
<td>30 Paradise Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joey Antonelli</td>
<td>7 Perry 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:**

**Civil disobedience: and moral justification**

- The right to rebel is a human right
- Ex. Rosa Parks, Vietnam War

**Chaos would arise**

- Slow down while reading from laptop and work on eye contact and shorten contentions/quotes so that you have more time. Good volume.
- Great questions in cross-examination.
# NLD

**Novice LD Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1202</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 03:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Ann Jones</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Emilio Ducomb</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Desert Ridge High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Arcadia 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:**

**Aff**

1. Author queries: could be quicker, only use author last name/journal if your required
2. The contentions were very persuasive, but would be especially potent in a defense or why these papers were successful because they were inegal.
3. If you evidence favorably in cross-ex, never grant an inch
4. Re-examine your witness' excuses: State troopers' aggression isn't proven, it's faint
5. Start with the angle in the case: where your offense is located
6. Choose one flow at a time to dedicate attention

---

**Neg**

1. Practice flowing on separate sheets of blank paper in organized columns.
2. Kant should be the value criterion in the ICO, incompatible w/ harm case.
3. Hobbes would be a better social contract theorist, i.e. the Leviathan.
4. Face judge in Ex, speak through them.
5. Demonstrate conventions/impact more clearly, evidence in KKK example.
6. Organize your speech by offensive argument or each flow.
7. Spend time contextualizing impacts within an impact calculus.

---

RFO:

I vote affirmative because civil disobedience is useful in challenging structural oppression, as in the case of Muslim women in Denmark.

Social contract theory is extended through ink in the ICO and arguments about civil disobedience being misused are not contextualized to the ICO examples. Furthermore, the act leverages a definition of civil disobedience to frame-our instances like the KKK & rioting.
I vote negative because alternatives to civil disobedience (like peaceful protest) solve structural oppression equal to civil disobedience and does not risk violence, illegality, or the rule of law. LAC Soviet is not intrinsic to civil disobedience as legal transgression.
I vote aff because the neg did not engage with the failability of democracy. The aff explained in every speech. There was also no impact case on what the world would look like with people participating in civil disobedience. Too many claims, not enough impact.