<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 1125</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:00PM</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>
</tbody>
</table>
| Madison Harms  
5 Willow Canyon High School | 2-1 | Sarah Savage  
Perry High School | 2-8 |

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

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

1. Good Start with Setting the ground rules. Clear flow of information; finished with more than a min. left.
2. Unable to explain clearly on the Deontology Principle.
3. Aff 2nd Rebuttal came strong.
4. Structured Start to neg. constructed.
5. Clearly defined the contentions, but unable to explain Contention 2 when asked.
## Novice LD Debate vs Armando Montero (*'34)

### Round 3  
**Flight 1**  
**Room 1135**  
**Fri 10/25/19 07:00PM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Emma Goldstein  
1 BASIS Flagstaff | | Rayna Shaik  
22 Arizona College Prep |

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge's Signature**

Desert Vista

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Don't make a literal argument in the IAC.
- Make sure to use all of your time.
- Have more offensive questions in CT otherwise it helps your opponent.
- Give me an off-timeroadmap before you end your speech.
- You jump between offensive and go down the show.
- You respond to the negative in the round. (Don't make new points in the AF)

---

**RTA: F*ck neg. The CT on neg went un-responses which turns into a tipping element for the social context. Flaw is only one with offensive under society with violence against elderly people.**

Full round!
# NLD

**Novice LD Debate** | **Armando Montero ("34)**
---|---
**Round 3** | **Flight 2**
**Room 1135** | **Fri 10/25/19 07:45PM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hunter Travis Fenn</strong>&lt;br&gt;19 Mesquite High School</td>
<td><strong>Joey Antonelli</strong>&lt;br&gt;( \text{? Perry High School} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature: \( \text{[Signature]} \)

School / Affiliation / Occupation: **Desert Vista**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Don't read definitions on AC, read it in your notes.
- You need better sources...
- You need to spend wayyy more time researching the AC. Get some AC's and don't read the AC.
- You need to do more work on their FW.
- Don't make new argument in the JML... it's too late at that point.
- You need to tie the case back to your FW more.
- Please sign post fense me... tell me exactly what you are doing.

Extended!!

---

2F: I vote off. Almost all of the off criteria go on tech and all of the rest go to all negs offense. Aff win until debate so I vote off risk of relevance coming off the stand. Keep going!!
**FAVRE, BRANDON**

**Jim Fountain Classic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Brandon Favre (*4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Room 1121</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri 10/25/19 07:00PM</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daynah Andrews</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isabella Keesler-Evans</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Desert Vista 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**

Hamilton H.S. / Judge / PhD student

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **AC**

  - Don't ask clarification if you can avoid it, just go to see their case in CX and then prep.
  - Avoid looking at your opponent during CX; I look elsewhere or at the judge.
  - Be sure to leave time to rebuttal the aff in the NC comedy left 1 min
  - Don't forget roadmaps
  - Solid 1NR, good extension on case
  - ~1 min left in NR; don't forget key voters

---

**RFP:** Lots of stuff dropped that would have made this round much clearer - cut. Of what extended rebutted, no objections to need for moral consequentialism but "Cr" debate a wash. Ultimately, negs own evidence in FW turns extensions on neg into an aft victory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1121</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Jane Carns</td>
<td>11 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td>Avi Agarwal</td>
<td>32 BASIS Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The winner of this debate was</strong></td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Judge's Signature</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hamilton Hs. / Judge / PhD Student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>School / Affiliation / Occupation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- "Clarify your speech a bit. Speed is fine, but pronunciation needs work."
- "No new arguments in the LAR. NC's C3 was left unattacked in LAR & expanded."
- "Diversify your impacts & rebuttals more."
- "I'd run theory on a priori."

RFD: A Priori: independence argument combined w/ inherent structural opposition in govt forces an Aff win.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 1133</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Gagan Ram Vaidyanathan</td>
<td>Nisha Sumesh (*'32)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(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><strong>Negative</strong></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:

- Both of them had good points
- Alt had good research & supporting facts
- Neg had good points but lacked supporting facts sometimes in few cases
# NLD

## Novice LD Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1133</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan Dean Nicoll</td>
<td>16 Mountain View High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miranda Jarvis</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 points & supporting facts

**Bef** - more confident as you have to represent the facts as true.

**Neg** - Find more supporting facts more each task of your presented points.
**Novice LD Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 1124</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Affirmative** | Muntaha Islam  
4 Hamilton High School | **Points**  
(25-30) | **Negative**  
Kayla Lewis  
5 Willow Canyon High School |
| **The winner of this debate was** | | | |
| **Affirmative** | | | **Negative** |
| **(Circle Winner)** | | | |
| **Is this a low point win?** | No | | |

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Aff

- Spend less time in your case defining terms (you used 2/6 min on justifying)
- Good rebuttal of Neg’s rule of law  
  criterion and representation ideas, but your rebuttal on the rule of law has to go further. Don’t talk about being circumstantial, say it changes some groups over others. The rule of law is often biased on the basis of religion, race, class. Go further.

Neg

- I think your case somewhat undercuts your criterion. Your criterion is rule of law, but your case cites a lot of examples of police violence against me people
- “morality” is a really vague word. The whole thing with UD and “damage” is that you have to describe your moral framework. You can’t just say “my framework is morality” because what does that mean?
  - Say “utilitarianism” because that’s basically what you’re arguing.

Both teams

- Use your framework throughout. Don’t disregard it. Know the difference between a protest and a civil disobedient act. There is a difference. Protest is legal, but disobedience involves breaching laws.

- Why is violence not worth the claim? Also criticizing the protesters. undefined is, I raise a poor way of teaching why civil disobedience is not justified.

- Why is violence not worth the claim? Also criticizing the protesters. undefined is, I raise a poor way of teaching why civil disobedience is not justified.
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## NLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Cammie Soderquist (*'22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dens Sumesh</td>
<td>Queen Keza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td>7 Perry High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Always ask for judge paradigms at beginning so you know what type of judge you have and judging style.

Nice clear speech, good flow and pace, very easy to understand.

Always use her prep time to focus on speech, not look around room — even think about her CX questions and prepare. Excellent CX!!

You don't need to state recog just negate.

Get a definition for CD that says CD causes violence, per your Cl. Your own definition doesn't support.

You have great voice, I love the intonation and emphasis.

**R FD.** AFF should more clearly meet both criteria and turned point that opposed now are not in social harmony can use CD to gain that. Other points fairly equal. Great Debate!
### NLD

**Novice LD Debate** | **Cammie Soderquist (*'22)**
---|---
**Round 3** | **Flight 1** | **Room 507** | **Fri 10/25/19 07:00PM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah Joiner</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Tyler Thompson</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 BASIS Flagstaff</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 Tempe 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**

ACP

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1.30 left in 1AC. Very nice speaking voice. Great eye contact.
Always take prep before 1AR - the most critical speech.
Always go back to your case and pull arguments.
You have solid cases. Don't sell yourself short. You are better than you give credit.

RFD

AFF did drop his case in 1AR, so that is decision, but Affard & Ng both great.

Good flow, easy to understand. Very good CX. Nice salient arguments.
Don't need to waste time w/ opening example or thank you. 

Good flow, easy to understand. Very good CX. Nice salient arguments.
Don't need to waste time w/ opening example or thank you. 

## NLD

### Novice LD Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 510</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:45PM</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>Kinaed Jaxon Sabine</td>
<td>Cole Montei</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td>31 Tempe Preparatory Academy</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:

- Kinaed was more persuasive and convincing. He used cards and knowledge very effectively.
- Good eye contact, reading with confidence.
- Cross was good questions.
- Rattled by response of neg.
- Very knowledgeable.
- Convincing, Persuasive.
- Good gestures.
- Use of words.
- Enthusiastic.
- Use all time.

Cross very good. Skipped prep?

- Good use of references.
- Read in a convincing manner.
- Good responses to cross.
- Express more confidence.
- Voice, Body language.

Use all your time.
NLD

Novice LD Debate
Wayne Montes ('23)

Round 3
Flight 1
Room 510
Fri 10/25/19 07:00PM

Affirmative
Maryam Khan
22 Arizona College Prep

Points (25-30)
90 25

Negative
Philimon Yosafat
32 BASIS Peoria

Points (25-30)
27

The winner of this debate was
Affirmative
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:
Philimon was more experienced and used cards to his advantage.

5:30
Great eye contact
Very composed and confident. Good counter. (Right ok)
Be confident!
Convincing and clear.
Organized approach.

Good use of "cards"
MLK - others

Better Time (Too much)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Charyse Betts (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 1122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight 2</td>
<td>Fri 10/25/19 07:45PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affirmative**
- Emilio Ducomb
- 3 Arcadia High School
- Points (25-30): 27.5

**Negative**
- Joshua Marais
- 23 Tempe High School

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

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

**Judge's Signature**: Emile Qualls

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**: PCDS

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**
- Stand while speaking!
- Argument structure — need evidence to prove your point valid as opposed to broad examples
- 3:04 Ac — use all of your speech time! Could alter your description of Rawls' theory
- Flow on 2 pieces of paper
- Keep your pronunciation

**RFD**: Ultimately, I negate b/c the negative was able to most clearly explain how to get from the framework to the impact of their arguments better.
Both sides need more clash (only one contention attacked) though they did an awesome job responding to the framework debate. Negative case had less specifics so the flow through hurt her more. De Neg noticed 2C had flowed through (good!) but could have used her speech (she ended at 4 min on her 6 min) to spread the impact to the criterion. A good novice debate - both sides were well spoken and adept.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 1123</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared Maurice Perkins</td>
<td>Jackson Gordwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Desert Ridge High School</td>
<td>36 Chandler High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</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:

Debaters need to use all their time.

Neg. let off flow through & nice use.

Oss. in Neg led to a technical win.

Both did a great job explaining points when they were speaking. Improve clash if possible.

Great job!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Jessica Carter (*16,14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Flight 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 1126</td>
<td>Fri 10/25/19 07:00PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Marie Sherwood</td>
<td>William Zhou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Paradise Valley</td>
<td>11 BASIS Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</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**

Use your definitions strategically you just read them and don’t leverage.

So when you did your rebuttal you did good just deep breath you were making good ideas.

**Neg**

Throughout your neg you kinda just say things without a warrant e.g. Black Panthers violent or elections prove Vietnam war was just.

In your rebuttal you provide clear examples and do a good job extending your case.

 rdf: Neg did better weighing and provided clear impacts for one to vote on.
**NLD**

**Novice LD Debate**

**Jessica Carter (‘16, ’14)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1126</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:45PM</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>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ryan B Gan  
4 Hamilton High School | Katie Ann Jones  
33 Desert Ridge High School | | |

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ___________

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**AFF**

- Your case is 40 seconds too short.
- Strikes are not civil disobedience because they are not against the govt.
- You do good on responding to arg, make sure to stay organized.

**Neg**

- Don't read a def if it's the same as opponent.
- You don't need to read quotes.
- You still had 3 min on NC you can just stand there and think.
- Be sure to tell the judge why does each arg matter in the context of debate.

FitAff did better weighing and explained their impacts more.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Charyse Betts (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Room 1122</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri 10/25/19 07:00PM</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>Abhishek Jaiswal</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Jhaj Baaz</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Chaparral High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 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:

Abhishek, while he had trouble articulating, had more support and evidence than Jhaj.

Jhaj had a great counter, but couldn't validate why civil rights movement and suffrage was morally wrong.

Abhishek didn't rush, and did a streamline job of cross examining.
CROSS EX
- retroactive law could lead to non-parallel effects
- brought up civil rights movement
- "reason to live"

NEG CON (spoke quickly)
- conflict between civilized, "good"
- autonomy, for everyone!
- present fundamental human rights
- acts of rebellion + not civil disobedience
- must be universally applied

NEG REBUTAL
- anarchy because of C.D. re would lose fund. rights
- counter productive (has support evidence)
- 45b = small groups not just his thoughts
- more/main RIGH = "mutual benifits"

AFF 1ST RED
- great points, couldn't reach. Communicate
- struggle > pain
- women/AA. (u/argument)
- are we obligated to not abide? (locke brentnies)
- (both had good points but one had more points than the other)

AFF 2ND REBUT
- has not always been the case.
- these are cases when it worked
- 1. don't follow unjust laws
- 2. democratic channel not perf usable but gov is ineffective
Novice LD Debate | Tony Rosenberger (*6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 1202</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Affirmative**
- Connor Clark
- 31 Tempe Preparatory Academy
- Points (25-30) 27

**Negative**
- Aidan Zerafa
- 1 BASIS Flagstaff
- Points (25-30) 26

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff good, direct cx questions.
Neg you have a good case - sound ideas; however you need to explain how they refute, out-weigh, demonstrate your superior analysis and attacks on Aff. Just restating your case is not enough. Keep working and you will get better.

Aff wins the definition debate; thus the interpretation is civil disobedience.

Aff in def, Aff refuted negs case, extended his case and addressed negs counter arguments. Aff won the value debate.

Aff wins the round.
### Novice LD Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 1134</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 07:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Xie</td>
<td>Ryan Duong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hamilton High School</td>
<td>11 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge's Signature</th>
<th>School / Affiliation / Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain View High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**A:** When you were refuting, argument made by the aff, you mention brought up your opponent's point that you are addressing. This put the point made up in front of my face (front and center), which made it easier to see how your rebuttal overrides their argument. On your third speech, there seemed to be that you added an additional piece of information. I cannot include this to decide the winner of the round.

**N:** There were some pauses in your speech, which could have been more wisely used. To prevent this, practice more maybe of your speech. You also brought up your opponent's argument points, which made it easier to follow along with the argument.

**RFD:** The debate was fairly even in points made. But the neg made an argument that made more sense about his value and criterion.
A: With your first speech, not sure if it is your voice or tone, but it seems that you didn't have confidence in your speech. This I feel this way because your voice was soft and quiet. In addition, there weren't any stressed points made in your argument. During your second speech, you started out using the word "you". You were making points, but they were directed to your opponent. You were suppose to direct your speech towards me, the judge. This continued through your third rebuttal.

N: During your speeches you addressed how your counters rebuttals were unchallenged. This made it easy to follow along the argument to see which points have succeeded their goals. You once sign posted that you were moving onto your opponent's case.

Both: Speak with more confidence! Also, give a blueprint as to how your plan is going to run.

RFD: Both sides made unorganized arguments that made it more difficult to follow. Therefore, the decision was made on which argument was better organized to follow along. The Neg made an attempt at helping the judge with flowing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Ram Vaidyanathan (*'11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Flight 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabe Huffman</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner) **No**

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1. Good start constructing the case, but was uncertain towards the end, unable to close contention 3.
2. Lack of confidence on contention 1 explanation.
3. Cross examination weak.
5. Shown understanding of BP not part of Co; thus supporting his case.
7. Strong cross examination on ground rules.
8. Proved aff's arguments were not for des obedex.
10. Struggled a bit to correlate one theme of information during cross examination. Not confident on the.
11. Good finish on neg.