Lincoln-Douglas Debate Ballot

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Type</th>
<th>Time Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Constructive</td>
<td>6 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Constructive</td>
<td>7 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Rebuttal</td>
<td>3 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Rebuttal</td>
<td>6 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Cross-Ex</td>
<td>3 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Cross-Ex</td>
<td>3 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Neg’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.

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.

1. 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.
2. The 1st rebuttal had an issue with covering the bottom portion of the Aff case.
3. Solid extensions!
4. The 2nd rebuttal covered the key issues. While rushed at times, it was well structured.
5. 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.
6. The coverage of the aff case was easy to follow, but was defensive oriented.
7. The second rebuttal was scattered and lacked a clear summary and comparison of key arguments.

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.