<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lincoln Douglas Debate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Kristen Arnold</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td><strong>Nivea Mahesh Krishnan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octo-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2215</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The winner of this debate was</strong></td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is this a low point win?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Aff:** All 5 contentions were clear, would have liked a few more impactful facts to back th

**Neg:** Definitions to clear. I got lost on 2nd contention. I found the drug court contention persuasive. Primarily due to the multiple impactful facts supporting the contention.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Will Mitchell (*’12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Octo-Finals</td>
<td>Room 2209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Isaac Kan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Calvin Tyler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**  
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? __________

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff feels like moving target. If you make drugs illegal then neg can make certain arguments. Aff doesn't make drugs legal in a case but then in ex you try to get out of link by saying gravitate to illegal activity. Not sure if it's gonna come up in speeches, but it's a danger zone. Be specific in your advocacy.

Carlkins + Ruder’16 - DE -> P prices + strength

California card is weakreally only deals w/ weed in Netherlands, and doesn't compare it to marijuana use in other countries at the same time period. The top of card provides no specific analysis, it just says likely has a heroin problem and assumes a link to decline.

Second Carlkins card = I don't understand how mandatory civil vs mandatory criminal drug treatment makes a difference. After mandatory drug testing ends does it still work?
Chandler 9 is best card for both advocacies. The one that stats 55 can provide leverage but if you claim

RFD: I think drug courts provide mechanism for 0 better 1 is still a risk with decrim because it makes it easier. Cartels are stronger not weaker in Aff world, also more death in Aff world because of plants & without enforced

Great shot
- Strong arguments for why the current criminal justice system has been ineffective in reducing the use of illegal drugs.

- Some questions I had:
  1) You mention increased violence and power of drug cartels - did you have evidence of this?
  2) I would have liked to hear more about Holland+Portugal’s public health program.

- Good use of Nixon card re: war on drugs targeting “black+hippies.”

- Great point that action matters more than rhetoric.

- While you made strong points about how the health care system is sexist+racist, you assumed or tried to draw a causation that it’s worse than the criminal justice system, in part because the very players who are involved in drug abuse are also involved in rehab and therefore profiting from both. While that may be morally reprehensible, you didn’t show evidence that it is therefore worse than prison. You made that leap without proof of patient clinical outcomes. Are patients really worse off than prisoners? Regardless of whom profits off whom - are patients helped in greater proportion than not helped through public health.
than through the criminal justice system?

- You claimed that the cost is prohibitive, especially for small towns. Yet if $6 for the War on Drugs is transferred to public health, that is in part mitigated.

- I like your term "treatment industrial complex." But honestly all healthcare is like that. It's rife with subcontracted relationships between for-profit non-profit entities. The great equalizer is patient outcomes. Maybe you can find evidence to support clinically why patients are worse off than prisoners.
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Maanik Chotalla (*'15)
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Dev Singhania
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Points (25-30)

Negative

Hanna Griffin
10 Horizon High School

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?

Judge's Signature

Wagner

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

Neg

* You need to address the
observation and their
solvency any in the LAR.

* It's a weird neg so it's
important to know what they're
defending

* Solid 2AR weighing analysis, you
make a lot of good arms
to the framework

Admittedly your arguments on case
aren't that great, try to do more
line by line

* The big issue for me is that it
isn't made clear what exactly you
defend in your case. I have no clue
what the neg advocacy looks like

RFD: This is a close round, but I end up

Affirming

On the stigma argument, there comes down to the reality

barring some people getting cases with stigma.

Scratch that. I want to negate but carefully since I don't know what

exactly the neg solvency is. I don't know how to evaluate it. It

has at least some tangible impacts explained to me so I aff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Khoa Nguyen ('12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Octo-Finals</td>
<td>Room 2214</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>Sair Agha</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerry Sun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **No Flip**

Affirmative: **No Debate**

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

Jerry Sun did not show and thus disqualified

Comments & Reason for Decision:
# AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

## LD

**FLIP: 5 Rhegan Crabtree v. 19 Carter Miller**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Hillary Hays (18)</th>
<th>Teresa Smith (20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octo-Finals</strong></td>
<td>Room 2213</td>
<td>Sat 03/16/19 12:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30): 28</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhegan Crabtree (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carter Miller (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The winner of this debate was**

- **Affirmative**
  - (Circle Winner)  
- **Negative**

**Is this a low point win?**  

- **No**

**Judge’s Signature**  

- Teresa Smith

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

- Pinnacle H.S.

## Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Neg** - I would recommend you keep your head while being cross-examined. "If you'd let me actually answer" and you got really flustered at the end, mumbling "you said it" after time ended. It's your opponent's cross-ex-her time to try to get from you what she needs. You had your time. Don't worry, your judge is hearing it all. I will understand what "induces" the black market means for your case. I knew what she admitted and not.

Both debaters are very good - I enjoyed the round w/ some new argumentation. Good job to you both.

**RED** - This was tough! But AFF truly outweighed and more effectively extended original content while dropping Neg. Key Voters:

- on Flow: AFF cross applied cor: 3 subA + NEG attempt
- Neg held no real answer to AFF moving $1 trillion to PT to open up access
- Neg claimed he 6/15's a timeframe but AFF showed 1 year torn around in Portugal.
- Neg dropped racism claim w/ very little progress.

Both debaters are very good - I enjoyed the round w/ some new argumentation. Good job to you both.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Jack Heffernen (*'17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Octo-Finals</td>
<td>Room 2212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Rae Mittelstedt 28</td>
<td>Aatmik Mallya 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Aatmik:** Excellent line of questioning in 1st CrossX, watch the interruptions, a couple of times you cut off Taylor.

**Taylor:** I think you misunderstood the date rape response from your partner. I heard it as date-rape—drugged people exhibit measurable patterns of behavior that allow for diagnosis, which doesn’t have an explanation like the drug itself does. You tell me numbers don’t lie, then don’t refer any actual #s immediately following that statement.

**Aatmik:** Nice job on your 2nd speech. Did what you needed to do to win.

I vote neg because aff did not adequately address the 85% more likely to relapse evidence that neg reads about public health programs. That did provide enough terminal defense in my mind to think that the neg would be slightly less crappy than aff.

---

Judge’s Signature: **Brophy**

School / Affiliation / Occupation:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Brandon Favre (*7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octo-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2208</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swannah Marshall</td>
<td>Anderson Zhang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Zhang</td>
<td>Swannah Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The winner of this debate was</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REED: Lack of engagement on neg's part and pre-first off inflicts a # and in general ultimately takes neg out of a victory. Several key extensions on alt (e.g., osa, mom, pass, etc.) establish need for conscientization, something only off achieves, fully off victory.