<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 5213</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Arnold</td>
<td>Bennett Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Pinnacle High School</td>
<td>15 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was
- **Affirmative**
- **Negative**

(Is Circle Winner)

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Really great job in laying out contentions using subpts A B C etc.
You speak clearly with good diction even while speaking fast.
Nice You missed opioid epidemic - saying cohesion - what about legal prescribing
OK, you remember?

Neg makes good pt. regarding choosing treatment.
I agree w/ neg. - he had no name but not sure it makes his point irrelevant.

Great job reviewing concessions - except HIV contention.
Throughout you were clear & concise - laying out your pts. as a judge it is greatly appreciated.
pts to decide for the aff.

Pointed x questions - kept concise & kept on track - good use of time
Lots of valid points but if you are going to speak fast you should work on your diction & be careful you are not running your words together.

Nice job of refuting aff's contentions with the exception of C4
You were a bit hedges on speeding to get through all your pts.

The missing about was a bit distracting. I think a bit more thought should go into your organization.

aff did an incredible job of pointing out concessions.

You do make some good pts regarding mandatory treatment.

I appreciated the respect that you both showed to each other.

Use of the word "like" - a real put Reuse for me. I took speaking pts but not reason for siding w aff.
### Lincoln Douglas Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 2232</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Tran Nguyen  
12 Mountain View High School | Ria Manathkar  
7 Hamilton High School |

**Points**  
(25-30)  
24  
28

The winner of this debate was **Negative**

(Affirmative  
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  

[Judge's Signature]  
Desert Ridge  
School / Affiliation / Occupation

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Ria presented & defended her contentions very well & asked pertinent questions about Tran's contentions. Suggest Ria try to eliminate the "omission" that occur more frequently. Tran had extremely good points on any limits & public health.
## Lincoln Douglas Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 2235</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Affirmative
- **Points (25-30)**: 29
  - Dev Singhania
  - 7 Hamilton High School

### Negative
- **Points (25-30)**: 28.5
  - Maya Conroy
  - 12 Mountain View High School

The winner of this debate was
- **Affirmative**
- **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:
I was ultimately forced into deciding which one has more of a stigma? Jail or Rehab? Jail on the **Aff** side won out for me for reasons I explained to both sides.

Both sides did excellent.
NGUYEN, KHOA

AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

LD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Khoa Nguyen (*'12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 5208</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Von Tobel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sunrise Mountain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natsuki Saballos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Tempe Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>28</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:

RFD: The neg through threw out the stats from the argument and which sort of weakened the his argument. The aff provided points that both attacked and the neg's argument and supported her own argument in a clear and understandable way.

Aff: The speech made it really understandable and follow. You attacked all if not most of his point to support your own. I suggest that you should attempt to refute the neg's second rebuttal more. It seemed that you sort of glossed over it, such as his attempt to throw out the stats because of the different time frames that stats came from. But overall, it was good.

Neg: The examples used to relate the issue with something more relatable is a good strategy to help judges understand the importance of the issue. But even with giving more significance of the points. The example didn't. The argument made was well
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Brandon Favre (*7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 2238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe Legay</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Horizon High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhegan Crabtree</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Good defense in CX, but definitely work to give fewer concessions.
- Work on making more concise questions.
- Took ~1:30 to ask your first main Q.
- Solid line of questioning in 2nd half of CX, just didn't have time to pursue it.
- No new arguments in 2nd speech.

XFO: Neg wins under off. (LH through ending drug abuse/domestic abuse cycle & especially helping women & minorities better than the off.)
Lincoln Douglas Debate

Noe Saballos (*18)

Round 3
Room 2229
Fri 03/15/19 05:30PM

Affirmative
Hanna Griffin
10 Horizon High School
Points (25-30) 28

Negative
Saif Agha
15 Brophy College Prep
Points (25-30) 29

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

Is this a low point win? Yes

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Utilitarianism
C1 - Cartels,
C2- Terrorism,
C3 - Accessibility

Evidence-based results & programs
Mass incarceration decreased effective nears

The affirmative had some good points, though weak in the delivery.
Was close but decided on Negative for the argument of C1 & C2.
The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health not criminal justice.

"Good Luck!!!"

Reason for Win:
All had good points, able to argue contribution & impact on society.

Keep up the Good Work!
Good Luck!
## LD

### Lincoln Douglas Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Liam Huggins (*'19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Zhang 12 Mountain View High School</td>
<td>Mariah Hays 16 Perry High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**1AC:** Really cool case, the poetry is really good too. I thought it was quoted at first. Good flow with spreading as well.

**1AR:** You very fluently call out the cynicism of the neg and perm which was very smart. It seems the aff already slavots academia. Try to refrain from aggressive gestures and gendered pronouns, I know it's not on purpose and more so a byproduct of the speed of the speech.

**2AR:**

**1NC:** Intriguing case, I understand & don't understand parts of it. Part of it is due to rough spreading. Lack of solvency of clean alt also adds to confusion.

**2NR:** This was a rough speech that blew all over and was a bit hard to follow.

**RFD:** The neg says vote for the better debater, so I am. The aff clearly showed many contradictions in the neg, delievered a logical perm and gave a much more digestible voice throughout the debate.
PERKINS, ABBY

AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

LD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Abby Perkins (*'19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 2239</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>Danny Seep</td>
<td>Claire Mullings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Horizon High School</td>
<td>7 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</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>McClintock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Aff:** I need a strong link between rage/anger and discourse/edu. When someone rages at me I disengage so how are you bettering the debate space? Or even the perception of trans people? Offer counter R.O.B. if you dont have time and they offer R.O.B.

**Neg:** There couldve been way more clash on the first rebuttal. You talk about minority groups but forgot to link into Danny's case all about minority identities! Work on clarity also, your words got muddled during the constructive.

NFD: I had to buy Negs Role of the Ballot since no counter was proposed. Also NC was dropped.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Maanik Chotalla (*'15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 2228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezri Tyler</td>
<td>Savannah Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Sunnyslope High School</td>
<td>17 Desert Ridge High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</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>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

"FYI, the resolution isn't only about the U.S.

- Nice 1AR but try to get more of the line by line on the neg
- The 2AR was pretty inefficient, you gotta go back and extend your own case"

RPD: I end up negotiating on the emnities of the parole program. Aff seems to offer some reform but doesn't really explain what that is, also aff doesn't extend any offense."
MOREY, BRENDAN  

AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament  

LD  

Lincoln Douglas Debate  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 5202</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dylan Lifshitz  
14 Sunnyslope High School | 27 | Benjamin Phillips  
12 Mountain View High School | 28 |

The winner of this debate was  

**Affirmative** **Circle Winner**  

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:  

**RFD**  

I voted negative on cartels/failed Mexican state. I think public health debate is somewhat a wash when ac lacks warrants/plan and the neg proposes prison rehab (altho that’s dropped in the NR → make sure to extend).  

Aff need more specifics/empirics on why/how drug rehab works separate from criminal justice.  

Neg → make sure to extend arguments → 1st coat was good although nuclear war impact is fercous
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Robb Tyler (*'14)</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 05:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 5206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Sun</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin Tyler</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff: Strong structure & constructive (well presented). Don't let your opponent get an emotional reaction out of you in cross-X! Also, don't argue your case in your cross-X. Give your opponent a platform they wouldn't have otherwise.

Neg: You're attack on his framework didn't stick (slavery?) and you didn't convince me consequentialism stood in your 2nd rebuttal.
## LD

**Lincoln Douglas Debate** | **Bryton Bryner (*8)**
---|---
Round 3 | Room 2233 | Fri 03/15/19 05:30PM

### Affirmative
- Meghan Munoz
- 17 Desert Ridge High School
- Points (25-30) **26**

### Negative
- Katherine Howell
- 20 Pinnacle High School
- Points (25-30) **26**

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

(Circle Winner: either **Affirmative** or **Negative**)

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

**Judge’s Signature:**

Mesquite HS
School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**Aff:** Need to work on time management. Work on affirm w/ until your argument could be in danger so make sure to get cards that could counter that. Nice job w/ the V/NL framework. I decided to choose the Affirmative because most of your case flowed through however, make sure to do it earlier on.

**Neg:** Need to work on time management. When it comes to your opponent’s argument of that addiction is a sickness, you could state w/ a card to back up your claim, that there is a majority of people that are addicted chose to take the drug w/o the influence of drugs which can tie in w/ Aff’s

**Work on Flowing:**

Notes: Neg. you need to work on time management so that you can have more time to argue your opponent’s use. Some of your case needs to be trimmed off. Great uses of cross-ex for the both of you. Both need to work on time management. When both cards from each side clash, you should explain why it is correct on your side w/ V/NL. A lot of arguments were dropped as well.
### Lincoln Douglas Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Nick Stump ('10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 5209</td>
<td>Fri 03/15/19 05:30PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyler Nickel 6 Sunrise Mountain</td>
<td>Carter Miller 19 McClintock High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The winner of this debate was**

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Overall good IAR make sure to have
clerwer citations of evidence

You should take some prep time to
structure your IAR, but
overall decent speech for mostly
ad libbing. And IAR

Explain why drug courts fall under person of your aff interpretation of the resolution.

I'm confused does the US govt make drugs for people now?

**Better needed** explanation of why you can do both Pub health and Drug courts

I vote negative that drug courts are a better way to help people who are addicted
to drugs have decrease usage. Also allows for prosecution of possession which
deters cartels and terrorism to profit off of use. Also when looking
at the current system of Healthcare Public Health may have classist
elements.

You seem very frustrated during CX of IAR

If missing lots of IAR can't see case for cards

INR loses all detail of the 3 disadvantages

You need to have nuance in explaining your arguments not just headline extensions

Horizon

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logan Kraver</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Alicia M Hall</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 McClintock High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 Mesquite 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**

**SUMMA SLOPE** (14)

School / Affiliation / Occupation

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Good introduction and articulation of the value structure - clear presentation of argument
- Public health as a moral imperative was your strongest argument - great use of cards, as well as logic, to illustrate
- Good job refuting case during first rebuttal - could have used more of that time to bolster your case
- Attack on opponents' rebuttal to the "race" argument could have been stronger
- Great closing attack on the sample size of the study card
- Great cards - good use of statistics to illustrate issues
- Good articulation of value structure - your argument was unique
- Excellent use of "consequentialism" to turn your opponent's "greater good" argument on its head
- Good use of your cards to rebut opponents' cards/points
- Great clash
- Good defense of card and refutation of opponents
- Rebuttal - valuing victims as well as offenders was a great counterpoint to the case for moral imperative

You both had good poise and delivery of your arguments. Ultimately, I awarded to A4 because the relationship between argument and value structure was stronger and more clearly addressed the central question.
### Lincoln Douglas Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 2237</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armando Montero 5 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td>Aatmik Mallya 7 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**EXCLUSION VS VIOLENCE**

**OPPRESSION VS RESOLVE VIOLENCE**

**PUBLIC HEALTH STAND.**

**X2 X4 2014 DEATH R8**

**# PRESCRIPTIONS**

**CONT 2**

**MASS INCARC.**

**1000 DIE EACH WK**

**PRO. MARIS.**

**NATIVE AM X2**

**BLACK HTS 2014-2015**

**NO HELP W/ INCARC.**

**COUNT DAMAGE**

**CONT 3**

**HUMAN TRAFFICKING VS SEXUAL**

**SUN. MENTAL**

**AIDS/HIV LOWER PRISON**

**CONTS:**

- LOW R8 PRISON (DROPPED)
- WAR ON DRUGS
- PRISON DOWNTOWN
- EVIDENCE FOR CURRENTLY

**UC**

- **CRIMINAL JUSTICE**
  - CRIME = COURT
  - PRISON
  - 2410 DC IN
  - DRUG COURTS
  - PROGRAM
  - CONV.
  - Active in TX
NEED TO DETECT MENTAL HEALTH IN DRUG USE
REHAB VS PRISON

DATE RAPE
WILFUL
NAZZ IS USED
SEXUAL ASSAULT
BLAMED & QUESTIONED

AFF CASE (NEG)
PER

STAY IN TX & DRUG COURTS VS PRISON
PROS: DRUGS NOT IN FOR DRUGS BUT FOR CRIME
DRUG OFFENSES DON'T GO TO PRISON
DRUG RACES

PUBLIC HEALTH & PEOPLE OF COLOUR LESS WILL TO GET HELP
RACIST
HUMAN TRAFFICKING? (DOES NOT APPLY)

NEG WAS ABLE TO ANSWER MY SOURCES & FACTS
NEG WAS ABLE TO SOURCE THEIR FACTS, NEG
WAS ABLE TO DO SO WITH MORE THAN AFF, NEG
WAS ABLE TO CY WITH BETTER FACTS & SOURCES.
AFF COULDN'T SOURCE A FEW OF HIS
CONT. NEG WINS.
Affirmative does a good job of turning the moral independence value on its head. Negative speculates too much on why or why not drug users continue to use drugs. Negative needs to be more convincing/explain why criminal sentencing is the best way to stop cartels. Negative's economic arguments against lowering sanctions were strong.

Both affirmative and negative were energetic, powerful speakers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Sam Spiller (*'20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 5203</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Kan</td>
<td>Nivea Mahesh Krishnan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td>7 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</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:

AC was excellent. Solid case. Good spread. (morality/str.v)
CX was good by both.
NC was also very good. Restorative justice and drug courts.
CX was combative and misguided by AFF.
AR covered all ground extremely fast and occasionally unclear in the analysis.
NR was effective. Arguments extended and refuted. Brought it all back to whether restorative solves for P.I.C. and mass incarceration.

AR was outstanding, won the round.
Lincoln Douglas Debate | Mathew Cusson (*'12)  
Round 3 | Room 2230 | Fri 03/15/19 05:30PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Savannah Elizabeth McNamara  
10 Horizon High School | Luther Wasbotten  
14 Sunnyslope High School |
| Points (25-30) | Points (25-30) |
| 27 | 25 |

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(circle winner)  

Is this a low point win?  

No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - You handled the situation very well considering the circumstances. I appreciate the fact that you treated it seriously and yet still did not go off on craziness or join in the absurdity.

Neg - So at the beginning I thought it was the most meta performance k ever but I realized it was not that. Read the case next time.

RFD - Lack of neg case

Aff wins
**Lincoln Douglas Debate**

**Round 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie Spencer</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Desert Ridge High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Rae Mittelstedt</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Horizon 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:**

- Your case needs to be specific—choose a specific meta-ethnic. I'm sure different people/philosophers have differing thoughts w/ meta-ethics.

- Way more line by line in the case, especially when defending your case.

- I'm not sure how prisons don't replicate the logic of dominance.

- I would want appeal to "objective reason".

- Is this a PIC?

- Also might not value util.

Maybe you can look for more specific evidence on why prison/whatever is key in cases of date rape drugs.

- I need more explanation on this PIC.

- Net benefit? solvency?

---

RFD. I think I can vote on the case turns that were conceded, because I don't feel comfortable voting on the PIC—it's not explained well enough.
# VANDERVEEN, LEXIE

## AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

### LD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Lexie Vanderveen (*7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2227</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Affirmative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Negative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allison Okonoski</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pratik Shah</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sunrise Mountain</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Mountain View 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**

---

**Aff**

- Very clear organization of points
- Convincing evidence and reasoning!
- More explanation for framework would strengthen it, as well as how your claims better ensure that value than the opposition's
- More evidence and rebuttal points would help as well

---

**Neg**

- Plenty of strong statistics and evidence used!
- More connections and explanation of their importance would help showcase your point even more
- Strong adherence to your standard
- Good job promoting impacts, but Nuclear weapon threat needs more connection

RFD: Neg had some key points that proved the greater impact of their stance that went unrefuted along with clear evidence supporting them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Niti Singhania (*7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 5207</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella Lovelady</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Tempe Preparatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Peters</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Desert Vista High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Affirmative Reason for Win:** Aff had good evidence & able to argue contention 1 - impact on society.

**Affirmative Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Able to defend her contention 1 with good evidence & reinforce its impact on society.
- Good attack on Negs contention 1 & its weak link to resolution.
- Negs contention 1 is "non-unique" was good argument.

Keep up the Good Work!

Good Luck!