The page contains a debate format with statements and reasons for decision. It also includes a table with points scored for each round. The table details the arguments presented and the scores assigned by the judges. The debate format is typical of high school or college-level debate tournaments, where participants present arguments on a specific topic, and judges score them based on various criteria such as clarity, coherence, and rebuttal. The image also contains some handwritten notes and annotations, suggesting that it might be a practice round or a study tool for a debate competition. The date mentioned at the bottom is "VLD SWDTR 2018."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VLD</th>
<th>PAODE, POOJA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varsity Lincoln-Douglas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Xander Agnello</strong></td>
<td>10 Paradise Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pooja Paode</strong></td>
<td>[<em>30</em>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Judge's Signature** |              |
| **School/Affiliation/Occupation** |              |
| **School** |              |
| **Affiliation** |              |
| **Occupation** |              |

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

*To build a strong case that focused on why US was right, VLD should have concentrated on showcasing that US had a better rebuttal. For their rebuttal, VLD could have debated why US was the winner. VLD's debate was not able to relate outside the topic.*

*This was a well-structured debate and both speakers were skilled. Both teams had strong arguments and provided clear, concise responses.*

*The debate was well-structured, but the main issue was the timing. Both teams were able to keep the floor for a significant amount of time, but the debate was cut off at the end.*

*Overall, it was an intense and engaging debate.*
Have a concrete plan. Should be smart, specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-bound. If you don't write, you can't write. So write. Then act. Get moving, even if it's not perfect. One step at a time. Keep moving forward.卮AILY, WHATEVER!
I like the idea itself of your K, but we need more evidence about how it has no tangible benefit or action plan. And like you said, if I believe Aff saves better than Neg I should vote for them, which I do, because as mentioned in your summary, Aff hawks at behind the scenes, solving for welfare state by having an IPR receive money, or even worse, those at the bare life. Better solves the welfare system. It does create Bare Life, but is worse than poor-resource management or wealth inequality?

Aff: I don't think you understood what bare life is. The 2 good points you made: ex: the H2O regulation is better than poor-quality control and no one gets water. Meeting your VC is solving welfare poverty, well directly solves welfare. For some situations, we found places where the negative will need to do though the debate space
VLD

ONG, KIM

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

Round 2

Affirmative

Clayton John Marfori
25 Perry High School

The winner of this debate was
Affirmative
(Circle Winner)

28

Negative

Kristen Arnold
16 Pinnacle High School

Judge’s Signature

Nesquita

Points
(20-30)

29

Affirmative

Kim Ong (*144)
A109

Negative

VLD

Is this a low point win?

Comments & Reason for Decision:

You need to address the turns and CP more. Just touching on it doesn’t mean it’s a win. You need to expand on it. You have a lot of impacts but it’s very weak. As far as how it links back to the Alaska plan, impact. magnitude and calculus would really help your case. You need to do your drills. Enunciate more. Your voice is still too soft for me.

Affirmative: Look up. Emilie Dunkham as a source against tech automation. Sexism and minority impact is very weak. As far as your reads go, your reads UBI very well. Yet, Aff did not properly address the turns key because Aff did not address and refute the pre-reg of UBI. Aff still made a claim it, I don’t give any tins point.
COHON, GABE

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

Gabe Cohon (18)

Round 2

Affirmative

Chur Tam
28 BASIS Ahwahkee

Negative

Michael Liu
26 Desert Vista High School

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative

(circle winner)

Comments & Reason for Decision

- Great flow, still need to flow.

- Runs all three issues.

- Great AR, great evidence.

- Grok’s lack of warrants.

- Great offense, messes.

- AC outweighs all potential.

- AC’s offense.

- Great response, warrants.

- AC wins.

- Great flow, still need to flow.

- AC’s offense.

- Great response, warrants.
Aff: Work on time management esp in last speech. Spend more time on impact. Good job on line-by-line. Your responses in cross-ex. try to stay in control of your cross. If you want to move to your next question, on impact analysis.

Neg: Try to group arguments. When you can especially in the 2NR, you will be able to spend more time on impact analysis. Liked the K, but wanted to hear more real-world.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VLD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varsity Lincoln-Douglas</td>
<td>Teresa Smith (*'16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Fri 03/02/18 04:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affirmative**

| Carter Miller                          |         |
| 19 McClintock High School              | 24      |

**Negative**

| Samantha Swayze                        |         |
| 18 Catalina Foothills High School      | 25      |

The winner of this debate was **Negative**

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Affirmative:

- "fulfillment of utopianism" does not really make sense. Link back to your homework. Question your impacts through utopianism. "Violence kills," try not to do so much during CX. Please do not even think to run theory. Please you need to de-link.
- If you run re theory, you need cards & a shell.

Negative:

- "fitting the round does not make sense. There was no plan. Good questions concerning VLD. It would be better to question his links though. You can't solve w/o a plan. Your Chris weak. Sign-post: "presumption of the assumption" ?? Do you know what K is?

RFD: Neg. K front & center stands.
### VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln-Douglas</th>
<th>A117</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Judge's Signature:**

**Notes:**

- **Affirmative Points:** 26
- **Negative Points:** 25

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Affirmative started very fast. Topic and points didn't become immediately clear. However, did wrap it up neatly by the end of the construct.
- Negress brought up some good questions. Also interesting perspective on glide, not a moral actor.
- Neg's construct was also fast but became clearer especially in the end.
- Negress rebuttal was well spoken.
- Negress response to a need back and forth debate.
- Negress could be implemented and the definition of UBI.
- Negress didn't address all of Aff's arguments throughout.
- Negress only spoke with more clarity but in the end, Negress won.
- Some excellent points that flowed through Negress thinking.}

**School Affiliation:**

- VLD

**Judge's Affiliation:**

- Judgment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varsity Lincoln-Douglas</td>
<td>Zane Encinas</td>
<td>30 (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td>Affirmative (Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision:</td>
<td>AFF had too much offense and was unanswered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varsity Lincoln-Douglas</td>
<td>Margaret Krenke 20 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge’s Signature

Perry High School

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Aff** - Well-spoken, good points, contentions. Even if you don't need to prove how to pay, still should back up the idea...

**Neg** - Immigration and influx of people, fear - violence - while it is a logical argument, would've liked more proof, polls etc.

**Aff** - Indigenous flows through $1,000/mo? America is still capitalism, so employers will keep negotiating powers. What will people do with their $? How will we pay for this? It's dabbling in government policy, so you have to back up ideas somewhat better.

**Neg** - Increasing wages, not jobs. More xenophobia. No response to 3rd contention.
VLD

STANAGE, JAMES

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

Round 2

Affirmative

Armando Montero
26 Desert Vista High School

Is this a low point win?
(Circle Winner)

Affirmative

Negative

Points
(20-30)

Finley Dutton Reid
15 BASIS Flagstaff

Judge’s Signature

Finley calm to the point

- Slow down
- Handled questions
- Don’t let the opponent up
- More logical argument thus far.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- No hesitation on responses for successful responses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Gomez</td>
<td>Desert Vista High School</td>
<td>Jairo Giraldo ('20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Miller</td>
<td>32 Hamilton High School</td>
<td>A119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Neg provided more evidence of the potential negative impact of UBI than Aff was able to. The core of the argument, from a cost perspective, centered on the cost of social security plus welfare vs. UBI, and their effect on the economy. Aff did a good job on his initial comments on cost but did not refute Neg's inflation and cost claims.
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas
Round 2

James Driscoll
6 Mountain View High School

Is this a low point win?

Affirmative

Negatives

Points

20-30

Judge's Signature

Emily Marquez
10 Paradise Valley

The winner of this debate was

Policy Winner

Affirmative

(€)

Negative

AFL: I end up affirming because the only somewhat impactful analysis to agree with is the only thing I end up writing on. However, I will not write it in the main resolution impact. Therefore, I will go with the minor resolution impact.
The order of the round was not well communicated.

Statement 1: 3D - 2D. I would have points for that, but I don't think they would have crossed lines very distinctly.

Statement 2: His discourse was in 1s sound. Despite attempts from the audience to value his demands, his discourse was not as well received as his argumentation. His argument was not as well delivered. But in and because summarizing or both sides well.

The winner is明确 because the opponents presented an argumentative answer. But this lunch was weak. She was unable to answer.

The reason for decision was the ligation of the title. Any amount or time was spent analyzing this to the proposition, unfortunately a large turn. And assigning these values in returning.

My Alcove started carrying outlining the program.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Is this a low point with?

(32 points)

Affirmative: Regretful

The winner of this debate was

25

Harma Shadmany 29 Basis Mesa

Affirmative

24

Mariana Acevedo 42 Group College Prep

Affirmative

Points

Fri 03/02/18 04:30 PM

A111

Round 2

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

VLD

ESSEC, LINDA

SWDIT 2018
Aff

Victoria T.

2nd Place

The winner of this debate was

Aff
Gabrielle Patterson

- 30

3:00 PM

19 McGilvra High School

EI! Bottom

- 28

Varisty Lincoln-Douglas

- 2:30 PM

FL 03/02/18

C108

Round 2

Points

Negative

Affirmative

Negative

Affirmative

27 Desert Ridge High School

Sam Spiller

04/30PM

Judge's Signature

Principal/AD Coach

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Is this a low point win? (Circle Winner)

Affirmative

Negative

Points

FL 03/02/18

04:30PM

Sam Spiller (1st)

Spiller, Sam

VLD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VLD</th>
<th>Varsity Lincoln-Douglas</th>
<th>Sreeshaa Puramam (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Lambert</td>
<td>A112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 River Valley High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Points (20-30) 28

Judge's Signature: Baha Phoenix

Canada Inc Card to look up

Children Pragmatism

Very articulate and effective delivery. Included reasoning and conclusions.

Affirmative (Circle Winner)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Judge's Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>C119</td>
<td>Armita Chaklader</td>
<td>29 Basia Nesa</td>
<td>Catherine Curry</td>
<td>SFG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affirmative**
- **Unemployment**
- **Robots**
- **Income Inequality**

**Negative**
- **Justice**
- **Universal Basic Income**

**Points (20-30)**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Justice/Utilitarianism**

**Equality/Redistribution**

**Cross: Social welfare is bigger than justice**

**Evidence:**

- We still have poverty, welfare programs.
- Robots - argue budget reallocation.

**Robots:**

- UBI cost $3 trillion.
- We need technology to prevent mental health issues.

**Conclusion:**

- Robots solve poverty.
and production cost due to new taxation.

2. According to the NBER, the price of increase in wages, even if they cause no reduction in demand, will still go up. The recent principles get a little muddled, but I still agree to rise.

(For VC)

In the VC, wasn't mutually exclusive company bought up by a lot more than Pepsil. Pick carbon consumerism, which is a lot more than Pepsil. Any carbon consumerism, which is a lot more than Pepsil. Next, cards bought up by the Affirmative application. 1 a lot more than Pepsil. 1 a lot more than Pepsil.

On environment, 3 a lot more than Pepsil. 3 a lot more than Pepsil. 3 a lot more than Pepsil.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judge's Signature:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>School / Affiliation / Occupation:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Judge's Signature:**                                   |  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>School / Affiliation / Occupation:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Round 1</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benjamin Phillis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phillips Mountain View High School</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Round 2</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shawn Yousefian</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26 Desert View High School</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Round 3</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jack Shafestall (3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varsity Lincoln-Douglas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

SWDIT 2018

SHAFESTALL, JACK
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Lincoln-Douglas</th>
<th>Scott Schuemman (-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mariah Hayes  
23 Perry High School  
Affirmative  
(Circle Winner)  
The winner of the debate was:  
Affirmative  
(NC)

Comments & Reason for Decision:  
I think the answer you were looking for to the ex question of why rich people should receive UB is that being universal makes UB more politically palatable long term.

The discussion of UB trace by pointlessness and being muddled to be honest.

QFD:  
The aff's framework stands. The neg provides no real discussion of how the status quo. The neg says is preferable because it's sufficient enough, marginalized groups. The aff's framework, because the neg is the main argument, was ultimately an efficient way that reframe the way we think in AC. ['s] ways a bit unconvincing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bill Kimsey</strong> (Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A115</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maya Conroy</strong> 6 Mountain View High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stella Loveley</strong> 40 Tempe Preparatory Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judge's Signature</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.I.V. Parent Occupation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points**
- A: 0
- N: 1
- P: 0
- D: 0
- **0/30**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**
- *VALUE CRITIC: give oxygen first. One*
- "Words taken every day, on every day, on every day. Take time to think about your words."

**Affirmative**
- More businesses opening
- More jobs being created
- More competition in labor market
- More money in people's pockets

**Negative**
- More people unemployed
- Inflation, price rise, less money
- More poverty, less security
- More crime, less peace

For taking every word, every word, every word, every word, every word taken every day. Check your language.
ROGERS, HUNTER

Round 2

Affirmative

Jayda Aparicio
18 Primacol High School

NEx

Affirmative Negative

The winner of this debate was

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I felt the AFF highlighted very significant points in terms of the value discussion.

It is a moral imperative that governments ensure economic stability. Had you made this argument, NEG would have won.

VLD

Score! Well done! Well done to both sides! Ultimately

I felt the AFF edged the NEG on her value of morality. NEG failed to make this argument.

Your constructive was very solid. Well done.

- Not sure (Cont'd Benefits to U.S.)
- Really strong AFF material!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Excellent response to YES CX - well thought out/pleas to let neg off (equal, not just appealing)

For the CX, I think they need to show some reason to let neg off. We need to know why it is equal, not just appealing.

Affirmative

**Affirmative (Neg Winner)**

**Round 2**

**Varsity Lincoln-Douglas**

Lindsay Newfield
Tempe Preparatory Academy

**Affirmative**

**Points 20**

**Affirmative**

**Negative**

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**

**Points 20**

**Affirmative**

**Negative**

**Judge Signature**

**School Affiliation: Occupation**

**Note:** Tension and conflict in the debate, especially in the early rounds.

**Bullet Points:**

- Thank you for organizing, well attended, and well executed.
- Some points were made that will help in future debates.
- Keep up the good work!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathew Cusson (6)</td>
<td>VLD</td>
<td>C115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

AC: AG was well developed. I would suggest only because of performance.

You should try and be more argument about what you are saying.

The 2AR was really weak and I understand what you were trying to do but don't think it came across that well.

**Neg:** AG gave only reasons to 2AR.

Long term wins and AG could not keep on top of the 2AR.

**R-F:** AG did not fall into what this is the case.

At last we have heard of these. This was a good NR you all sold.

I appreciate the weighing and

Neg. I like the 2AR by itself interesting. I think there are some weaknesses you allow yourself to fall into but this is the end.