<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Sharon Pocian (*7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Room 1133</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri 10/25/19 05:00PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhaj Baaz</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Harms</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Willow Canyon High School</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Affirmative]</td>
<td>[Negative]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aff:**
- Need to follow through on impacts more completely.
- Excellent block points in rebuttal
- Give stronger voters and connect back to framework

**Neg:**
- Flowed rebuttal through framework of rule of law very well.
- Excellent voter claiming rule of law is stronger than opponent's framework, but need to develop the reason why.

**RFD:** Aff had more counter points linked to evidence.
**Novice LD Debate**  
**Sharon Pocian (*7)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1133</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagan Ram Vaidyanathan</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Charles Zhang</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Aff:**
- Strong finish in ARI with link to definition of civil disobedience
- AR2 did a good job establishing impacts but a poor job responding to Neg rebuttal. (Show how you did not misunderstand Neg's case as he claimed)

**Neg:**
- Fantastic cross x questions covered most of aff's contentions, but could have gone further in rebuttal
- Strong point with permanent change through law (never rebutted by aff)

**RFD:** Neg did not sufficiently take out the links in the aff's case despite a strong negative constructive
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Brittany Stanchik (*'34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Flight 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 1126</td>
<td>Fri 10/25/19 05:00PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miranda Jarvis</td>
<td>Sasha Sai Gunta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Phoenix Country Day School</td>
<td>4 Hamilton 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:

**AFF**
- good pacing
- impact back to who/what it affects
- you let your opponent build a case, ask Q's differently
  - ex: does civil dis invite anarchy among people
  - because of violence only? or is violence necessary? etc.
  - you want yes/no answers.
- remember to not speak to your opponent during cross-x
- don't sum up so much of her arg.
- use all time (ex) to weigh, build your case, etc.

**Neg**
- good pace
- look at judge/not opponent during cross-x
- why is democracy a pre-req of justice?
- need impacts during speech
- try to use more sources in first contention

**RFD**
- gave 4 impacts
- weighed on a national level
**NLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Emily Marquez (*'30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Flight 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anushka Suneel Mitbander</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rania Warrayat</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Arizona College Prep</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:

- If you mess up, don't apologize. Just go on!
- Majority wins in Dem, so when the minority goes through legal channels they're simply overruled. Essentially ineffective.
- Wish you had brought up how CD brings more attention to changing policy.
- Good argument & clash
  - Morality is subjective & cannot be weighed
  - More impacts
    - humanity
    - guaranteed HRS
    - CD preserves
  - Flows FW through, forcing me to drop Neg STD of consequentialism
  - "not as valuable to protect Dem because CD in the long run strengthens Dem"
  - "untrue. Change of laws → ↑ dem"

- You already dropped their standard of conseq. because you flowed your FW through due to your "she concedes/agrees w/ my FW" argument.
- L no need to use new arg. of "I meet better anyways because APF strengthens arg.,".

- "can you provide your source?" vice direct Q
- Face Forward during CX
- Use all speach time please
- "no new evidence"
- "Not true. Minorities matter" is a very weak argument
- CD harms democracy restated

However, you do not address APF argument about how this is temporary. Ultimately, CD increases strengthens Dem

- Neg does not escape the APF & your own def says the same

- Turn her Bill of Rights!!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Emily Marquez (‘30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Flight 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 507</td>
<td>Fri 10/25/19 05:00PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affirmative**
- Isabella Keesler-Evans
- 34 Desert Vista High School
- Points (25-30) 2B

**Negative**
- Emma Goldstein
- 1 BASIS Flagstaff
- Points (25-30) 2Q

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

**Affirmative**

Is this a low point win? Yes

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**
- Either pronounce or slow down, please. You slur your case vs spreading "effectively"
- Ask more Q's
- Great clash, Extension of own case
- Really good arguments
  - Difference in Def is of CD
  - You uphold non-violence
  - Points out the P.O.'s are the violent ones
  - Points no clash that CD is a good Checks & Balances
  - CD aids in correcting injustice
  - Highlights of warrants CD does not help the dis/minorities from Neg
- Clash vs the Neg
  - Dropped CD definition bc. Inapplicable
  - P.O.'s are the violent ones
  - Points out Bacon Rebellion wasn't even in a Dem., was during Britain still ruling as a monarchy
  - Says P examples of anarchy occurring due to CD in a democracy
  - CD = alt.'s bc. grabs attention
  - Laws take years to be passed
  - Actions vs words points G Aly's Morrissey
  - More media/publicity
- Good to point out no new arg's in ZNR
- Turns the MLK example
- Asking opp. to summarize C.'s really helps to see if your opp. truly knows their cases
- Ask more Q's!! use all of your Co!!
- Very repetitive case
- You NEED to refute the AFF's case or they completely f*ck you over because later on you cannot make new arguments.
- AS Negative, you have to BOTH
  1. Read your case
  2. Rebute the AFF
  These is why you have 7 minutes!!
- P clash
- Spend like 4 minutes on case, 3 minutes rebutting
- ALL New Arguments
- go back on your FW
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1134</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong>&lt;br&gt;Frank Banister&lt;br&gt;5 Willow Canyon High School</td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong>&lt;br&gt;25</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong>&lt;br&gt;Queen Keza&lt;br&gt;7 Perry High School</td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong>&lt;br&gt;26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Aff** - "Democracy requires consent of governed, CD is people not giving consent" nicely phrased.
- Addressed Neg points ✓
- Loop back to your V + VC
- Use all of your time.
- Attack VC: why is it good to minimize lawbreaking?  

**Neg** - "legality" can be problematic. Emphasizing that lawbreaking is wrong? Even been in a car that's speeding? Speeding is illegal.
- Addressed Aff points ✓
- Sort of looped back to VC but not V

Neg won because did a better job of addressing contentions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 1134</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Mia Osmombekov</td>
<td>1 BASIS Flagstaff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Emma Jane Carns</td>
<td>11 BASIS Phoenix</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**
- interesting def of democracy
- contradiction: CD = democratic participation. Then in cross you said CD is a form of rebellion. I Neg didn't talk you on this discrepancy.
- stick to your def of CD and don't let Neg introduce violence.
- argue that violent examples isn't CD

**Neg**
- enunciate more clearly
- you are definitely prepared. Volume is part a valid point. though.
- you reached affirming a conclusion without supporting premise, in other words. If you had raised a point then you could respond by bringing them into perspective.
- did NASA serve lead to violence?
- you're arguing that CD = violence, and violence is bad.
- how would you counter argument that violence isn't CD?
- called Aff on non-democratic example
- voting can lead to violence (and has). So we shouldn't allow?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1135</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Savage</td>
<td>7 Perry High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aidan Zerafa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 BASIS Flagstaff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**  

(Circle Winner)  

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

**NLD**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Do not go on tangents e.g. Knox  
- Remember to signpost!  
- Use your final minute of your speech to summarize the debate and give key voters

**ASU YOU COACHES TO TEACH YOU FRAMEWORK PLEASE**

**RFD:** The negative did not provide a framework and had to evaluate offense on Aff framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 1135</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryam Khan</td>
<td>22 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anna Marie Sherwood</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>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Try not to use prep time before cross-ex. Prep is valuable.
- Use your time in the INC to attack your opponents case!!!
- Fill up your speaking time with more defense.
- Extend your contentions!!! This is the only way your arguments can remain relevant throughout the round.
- No responses to framework:

**RFD:** I voted affirmative because there were no responses to your case in INC and the case flaw was through the round.
**LANCASTER, MARK**

**NLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Mark Lancaster (*'22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillimon Yosafat</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 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:

- **Morally justified**
- **Generics (RULES)**
- **Political Disobedience**
- **Democratic Society (Violate the Law if Not Democratic)**
- Help to bring a light on problems
- **Good cites/energy & clarity**
- **Beneath to Democratic** (Violent)
- **CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE**
- **African American Example**
- **Strength of Character**
- **Protest/Extravagance**
- **Climate Change/Green Peace Example**

**Cross:**
- Human Right is Important?
- Why is Violence Good?
- Civil Disobedience = Democratic?
- Reason = MLK Day/Makin' Him Race!
- Black/White = Black (Interesting Discussion)
- Way to Think on Your Feet.

**Points:**
- **Maximum Utility**
- **Combating Structural Violence**
- **Civil Dis. Has Changed India (Gandhi)**
- **South Africa: Blacks/CA Has Been Effective**
- Black cowboy/Rosa Parks/Equality of Racer
- **Good Examples & Logic. Very Clear.**
- Advocating for War.

Best Benefit More Minimum

**Human Rights**
- **Change the Status Quo/Non Violence Protest?**
- **Faireness = Equality**
- **Chance of Belight**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge's Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACP-EFRI/ BUSINESS MANAGEMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School / Affiliation / Occupation

**CROSS:**
- **Strongman Status Quo**
- **Democratic Society**
- **Good Question & Answer**
- **Anti-Demo Char.**
- **Good Cross/ you almost get opponent to answer**
- **Good Energy & Clarity**

- **Definition**
- **Holding the**
- **Combating Structural Violence**
- **Structural Violence**
- **Endorses/Non 1**
- **Civil Dis. Is Not Structural Violence**
- **Good Cites - Interesting Spin**
- **Peaceful Protest/MLK Day Example**
- **Not Reality = Reagan**
- **No Human Rights w/o S.V.**
- **Status Quo Is Bad (Murders A Lot of People)**
- **Civil Dis. Harm People/Firing Clause**
- **Peaceful Protests (Not Moral Justification)**

- **Didn't Defend His Case**
- **Moral Minimum Basis of All Human**
- **Human Rights = First Have Structural Violence**
- **Violent Resistance/Black Panther Example**
- **Gandhi - Revolutionists**
- **Mandela - Burning Buildings**
- **MLK = Example**
- **Violence is Bad**
- **Outweighed by Utopian Society**
- **Reagan Opposed Civil Liberties**
**LANCASTER, MARK**

**NLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Mark Lancaster (*'22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hunter Travis Fenn</strong>&lt;br&gt;19 Mesquite High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The winner of this debate was</strong></td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong> (Circle Winner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is this a low point winner?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Judge’s Signature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASP-Erie / Business Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Judge’s Affiliation**

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **DEF. PUBLIC NOT VIOLENT/DEMOCRACY**
- **UTILITARIANISM / HUMAN RIGHTS**
- **GOOD DEFINITIONS / CITATIONS**
- **VERY GOOD PIECE OF CLARITY**
- **DEMONSTRATIONS / CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE**
- **GOOD EXAMPLES (AFRICAN-AMERICANS) / RACIAL PROBLEMS. NON-LAW ENFORCEMENT / CIVIL DISORDER WORKED (MORE IMPORTANCE OVER LEGAL).**
- **ESCAPED SLAVES**

**Cross:**

- **Standard criteria not viable.**
- I LIKE THE QUESTIONS (KEEPING ON TOPIC)
- IS CHANGE W/CIVIL DIS. QUICKER? GOOD QUESTION
- HOW CAN YOU DO THIS WITH LEGAL MEANS?
- **NICE CROSS AN CONCRETE.** SOME GOOD THINGS.
- THE SYSTEM IN AMERICA IS BROKEN. **STAY ON POINTS.**
- **ACCEPT LEGAL PUNISHMENT, NOT UNWILLING TO ACCEPT!**
- **LAW BENEFITTING THE PEOPLE.**
- **HUMAN RIGHTS**
- **JUSTICE DEFENDED IS JUSTICE DENIED.**
- **BREAKING UNJUST LAW / MARCHES COMPETE.**
- **QUICKER CHANGE (HAND IN HAND WITH LAW).**
- **RULE OF LAW (HUMAN RIGHTS FIRST).**
- **DEMOCRACY.**
- **NON-VIOLENT / NOT NEEDED TO BE VIOLENT.**
- **LEGAL MEANS!**
- **GOOD FLOW / DON'T HIT AWAY.**

**Affirmative:**

- **VIOLENT LAW**
- **VIOLATING THE LAW.**
- **SITUATION, POWERFUL, WHICH IS NOT LEGAL.**
- **LAW MAKING  ¼ WHY LEGAL PROTESTING?**
- **GOOD CROSS:**
- **GOOD QUESTIONS:**
- I LIKED THE ENERGY AND STAYING ON TOPIC.

**Overall Reasons:**

- **MAINTAIN THE RULE OF LAW (IN THE US).**
- **PROTECTION OF ALL PEOPLE UNDER THE LAW.**
- **OBEDIENCE TO THE LAW.**
- **MIGHT SHOW DOWN A BIT / GREAT ENERGY.**
- **LEGAL PATHWAYS.**
- **FORCE / COULD LEAD TO CONFLICTS / OUTBREAKS.**
- **FREEDOM UNDER THE LAW.**
- **BREAKING THE LAW (GETTING AROUND WITH IT).**
- **LEGAL MEANS AGAINST CIVIL DISORDER.**
- **EFFECT IN CHANGING CHANGE?**
- **GREAT POINTS ABOUT RACE/ETHNICITY.**

**To Have Change Must Have The Rule of Laws.**

- **KICK (Example) / RULE OF LAW.**
- **QUICKER IS NOT BETTER (UNEQUAL).**
- **LASTING CHANGE**
- **MORE MENTALITY / INBALANCE.**
- **CIVIL CO-EXIST**
- **NEED RULE OF LAW FIRST**
- **LEGAL PROTESTING.**
- **INCREASE INDEPENDENCE / DEATHS ETC...**
- FLOW WAS A BIT BETTER
- GREAT AT THINKING ON YOUR FEET.
Always time yourselves and keep track of prep.

Always take all CX time even if you're just silent and prepping, but always try to ask something.

PAR: Stick to the language in your Value/Criterion.

RFD: Aff controls the framing regarding the inclusion of "moral" in the resolution, also extends only impact w/ example of death's cause.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Brandon Favre (*4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 1122</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor Clark</td>
<td>Ethan Dean Nicoll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Tempe Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>16 Mountain View High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both debaters solid in terms of sticking to the language of the value/criterion.

Love the vibe! Hold onto that friendliness moving forward.

Clarity: fix prep — judge not listening usually, and you have no obligation to answer really.

Try not to apologize on stumbles, you're good!

"All other values derivative" is dangerous territory to be.

Aff controls that C/D is an inherent part of democracy (i.e.—voices publicized) and wins a risk that his specific criterion could achieve happiness.
### NLD

**Novice LD Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1123</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Affirmative | Points (25-30) | Kayla Lewis  
5 Willow Canyon High School | 27 |
| Negative | Points (25-30) | Daynah Andrews  
22 Arizona College Prep | 29 |

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

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

**Judge's Signature**: 

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

1. Evidences are more solid
2. Better attacks during cross exams
3. More organized
## NLD

**Novice LD Debate**

**Aster Measho (*32)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 1123</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Gordwin</td>
<td>36 Chandler High School</td>
<td>Konz Santos</td>
<td>5 Willow Canyon 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:

1. Answer crossfire questions confidently
2. Ask good questions on crossfire
3. Questioned major points from opponent during crossfire
4. Languages are more organized
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1202</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>Novice LD Debate</td>
<td>Carolyn Evans (*'35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Zhou</td>
<td>Sofia Sills-Freeman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 BASIS Phoenix</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:

Negotiators went home sick?

BYE
**NLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Carolyn Evans (’35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Flight 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 1202</td>
<td>Fri 10/25/19 05:00PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan B Gan</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Duong</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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? [ ]

**Judge’s Signature**

PCDS

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Good job to both debaters! This debate seems to come down non-violent v. violent protest, but no one is explaining it that way. Clin a big fan of the NC, but the NR doesn’t really persuade me to vote negative. Everyone can improve:

1) Organization; 2) Ballot directing language; 3) Civil Rights History

I believe Civil Disobedience at least does some good, so I vote aff.
## Novice LD Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 1121</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Katie Ann Jones</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Xie</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33 Desert Ridge High School</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:**

*Case is solidly constructed.*

Use prep time after cross not before.

Good turn on idea of power of democracy lying with the people.

Work on sign-posting, organize rebuttals better. Just go down the list.

Use 2AR to give voting issues.

Watch time in 1AR. You only left 40 seconds to attack Neg case.

RFD: Aff showed why Justice and Minimizing opposition should be weighed over safety. Under this framework, Neg has no offense. Aff's point that CD can spark social movements also goes unchallenged.
### Novice LD Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1121</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabe Huffman</td>
<td>22 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pranav Tangalpalli</td>
<td>29 BASIS Scottsdale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></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**

- Contention 1 has good examples of civil disobedience but doesn't actually offer proof of its effectiveness.
- Tie your contentions better to your framework.
- Use all of cross! It you run out of questions, cross them on sources and warrant.
- Use all your rebuttal time! You had 1:30 left that you could have used to further attack the **NEG**.
- Need more on the framework debate. You attacked his but never showed why Autonomy should be valued higher than Locke’s. Be sure to address Opponent’s specific examples of civil disobedience.
- Make sure to check that the room is ready.
- Ask was strong, but too many canceled args earlier. I didn’t really leave any ground to win. Make sure to use all your time.

**NEG**

- Questions in cross should set up future arguments. Like the question about how to win the round, but others were mostly clarification.
- Trying to use Kant and Util is philosophically inconsistent.
- Watch time in INC. You ran out of time attacking the **AFF** case and missed contentions 2 & 3 of the **AFF**.
- Love the “faster = better” response.
- Very strong voters.
- Rebuttal was solid but still messy; Syn-posing was off-and-on, so I wasn’t sure where you were on the flow at times.

Good catch on canceled args.

**RFD:** I’m voting under Util since Aff dropped autonomy in IAR. Aff also conceded point that CD must be universal to be moral.
The affirmative case was well-structured.

1st rebuttal
- Rebuttal was good at attacking the neg's evidence about SA, HK, not a democracy - Rebuttal felt rushed

2nd rebuttal
- CD = protest
- MLK = CD and went to jail
- Women's suffrage act = CD = change of law

The negative case of social harmony was well-thought out and had good logos.
- Good use of examples Brown vs. BOE
- Neg rebuttal
- Very effective delivery

Reason for Decision

At the end of the round, the neg stated that SD causes problems to all, even those who are unenrolled. The neg was very effective at defending their position while minimizing the aff's rebuttals, while the aff presented strong evidence, the delivery was lacking.
SH is a country

- Large changes at getting change
- Personal beliefs
- Protest lead to decrease in tourism
  - hotels that involved
  - Social harmony

2. SD = caused by
  1. SD = populated

Affirmative

Hong Kong not a democracy

Specific

South Africa failed to mention

Rebuttal

- Kaye hair pulls
  - MLK
  - Jim克林
  - Law isn't always just
  - Morally justified

Civil disobedience
### Novice LD Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 510</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Rayna Shaik, 22 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- [ ] Affirmative  
- [ ] Negative  

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? [ ] Yes [ ] No

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Aff**

- The aff case was supported by use of solid logic.
- Rebuttal 1st rebuttal - covered the key issues and was well structured.
  - "Democracy is for the people by the people."
- 2nd rebuttal - very strong and touched on all areas of cont.

**Neg**

- Cross exam was not effective.
- The neg case was presented, and applied to the aff the opponent read.
- Use of Brown versus BOE.
- Neg rebuttal - "Breaking laws with no consequences the rebuttal also failed to effectively refute the aff. it's statement of CD not creating violence. The rebuttal was rushed at times,"

**Reason for decision**

The affirmative did an outstanding job at focusing a deliberate and well-structured argument. In addition, the aff used the cross examinations as an opportunity to advance their position better than the neg.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Jack Heffernan (*'33)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Flight 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Thompson</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Tempe High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper Somora</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Perry 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 examples, *Time TV, Teachers, FCE Sept 2019*

Minities **xx**

Include more types **xx**

Good presentation

Skills: Don’t change!

Montana, President **xx**

Good pickup on Shanki

WEG

The real development

Maybe not civil disobedience

State of Liberty: good

Endangered others

Changing laws rather than disobeying

Violent roots protest

Violent or the constitution

Minities: Equal

Could have picked up

Not including anyone

Chandi: good

Eye contact – Judge

Standing up – Better

Charlotte’s Ville – etc. examples
### Novice LD Debate

**Affirmative**
- Joshua Marais
- 23 Tempe High School
- Points (25-30) 2.7

**Negative**
- Abhishek Jaiswal
- 37 Chaparral High School
- Points (25-30) 2.5

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

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

*Minimally Memorable*

- Good answer to Technology + Teniers' Strike + Familiarly with notes + Losing place - Marker 2
- Good presentation skills

**Both**

- Both eye contact
- Read 

**AFF**

- Technology - world under Communicatio

- George William example - good organization - need more

**NEG**

- Use thoughts - make a list

**Check Times on Affirmative"**
## NLD

### Novice LD Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1126</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:45PM</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>Isaiah Joiner</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Jared Maurice Perkins</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 BASIS Flagstaff</td>
<td></td>
<td>33 Desert Ridge 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:

\[\text{AFF}\]
- don't stand w/ knee on chair
- look at judge during cross-ex
- say author in examples ex: work 16 yr
- don't fiddle with pages
- use all your time

\[\text{NEG}\]
- ask do you have proper sources? (takes less time)
- use all your time
- give examples

\[\text{RFD}\]
- affirmative blocked and extended all arguments
- gave reasons to why impacts were important