NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

Lincoln-Douglas Debate Ballot

Tournament Date:	11/07 - 11/08		*Tournament Location:*	West High School	
Round/ Flight: 1A	Room: 322	Division: V	Judge Name: Jameela Judge		Judge School: West High School
Affirmative:	Pink AB		**Name or ← Code →**	Negative:	Yellow CD
Aff. Points: 29	**← Award speaker points to each debater (based on the range below) →** 20-21 Below Average 22-23 Average 24-26 Good 27-28 Excellent 29-30 Outstanding				Neg. Points: 28
Decision: ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative			Winning Team/Code: Pink AB		

1. The resolution evaluated is a proposition of value, which concerns itself with what ought to be instead of what is. Values are ideals held by individuals, societies, governments, etc., which serve as the highest goals to be considered or achieved within the context of the resolution in question.
2. Each debater has the burden to prove their side of the resolution more valid as a general principle. It is unrealistic to expect a debater to prove complete validity or invalidity of the resolution. The better debater is the one who, on the whole, proves their side of the resolution more valid as a general principle.
3. Students are encouraged to research topic-specific literature and applicable works of philosophy. The nature of proof should be in the logic and the ethos of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion.
4. Communication should emphasize clarity. Accordingly, a judge should only evaluate those arguments that were presented in a manner that was clear and understandable to them as a judge. Throughout the debate, the competitors should display civility as well as a professional demeanor and style of delivery.
5. After a case is presented, neither debater should be rewarded for presenting a speech completely unrelated to the arguments of their opponent; there must be clash concerning the major arguments in the debate. Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments.
6. The judge shall disregard new arguments introduced in rebuttal. This does not include the introduction of new evidence in support of points already advanced or the refutation of arguments introduced by opponents.
7. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.

Comments: provide detailed comments (both positive feedback and constructive criticism) designed to help both the debater and the coach; for example, suggestions on improving case construction, refutation, logic, delivery, etc.

- The affirmative case was well structured. While the links to the criterion are mostly present within the case, there are some specific arguments without direct links to the criterion. An example of this was the Smith evidence in your second contention.
- The 1st rebuttal had an issue with covering the bottom portion of the Aff case.
- Solid extensions!
- The 2nd rebuttal covered the key issues. While rushed at times, it was well structured.
- The negative case offense was solid, but the preemptive arguments to the affirmative were not necessary, especially since most of them didn't apply to the aff your opponent read.
- The coverage of the aff case was easy to follow, but was defensive oriented.
- The second rebuttal was scattered and lacked a clear summary and comparison of key arguments.

Reasons for Decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Aff + Neg: both had very clear statement of value & criteria.

Each sides flows had nice opportunity for clash and opposition. Overall, this was a good debate.

Aff's constructive argument was organized and cleanly delivered with evidentiary warrants supporting.

Neg's Cx only used about half allotted time and did not set up strong ammunition for rebuttals that followed.

Neg's constructive argument had two strong main points. The delivery came across more strained and not as polished.

Aff's Cx asked solid questions, particularly strong probing/undermining question about opponent's Egypt example.

Aff Rebuttal directly answered Neg's attacks and constructive arguments head on

Neg Rebuttal did an admirable job attempting to point out where opponent had dropped or failed to answer Japan example, though in reiterating Japan example, it was unclear exactly how it pertained to military aid rather than warfare per se.

Aff Rebuttal 2 did a good job countering Neg Rebuttal and reaffirming Aff positions.

Overall close with a slight edge to Aff debater.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

Affirmative Constructive	6 min.
Neg. Cross-Ex of Aff	3 min.
Negative Constructive	7 min.
Aff. Cross-Ex of Neg.	3 min.
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min.
Negative Rebuttal	6 min.
Affirmative Rebuttal	3 min.

Each debater has 4 min. prep used before their own speaking times, at their discretion.

SAMPLE