## Lincoln Douglas Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 5200</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aatmik Mallya 7 Hamilton High School</td>
<td>Isaac Kan 5 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The winner of this debate was</strong></td>
<td><strong>School / Affiliation / Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>SUNNYSLOPE (14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Circle Winner)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win? <strong>NO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

Great introduction. Definitions were used to illustrate framework really well.
- "Human capital" argument was a good one, but not as strong as the "involuntary treatment more likely to succeed" point. Excellent point re: stigma as an obstacle to voluntary treatment.
- The "hybrid" model is a good creative argument.
- Great job on answers or cross - you were able to build a case rather than scramble to defend.
- Excellent final rebuttal: you were able to elicit the answers you wanted by the way you phrased the questions.
- Great job.

Both of you did really well - great poise and presence. You each did an excellent job addressing the central question directly. Ultimately, it was awarded to Aff because of the strength and depth of the points used to advance the argument & defeat the counter arguments.
# LD

## Lincoln Douglas Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 2229</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Carter Miller  
19 McClintock High School | Anderson Zhang  
12 Mountain View High School |  |
| The winner of this debate was: **Affirmative**  
(Circle Winner) |  |  |
| Is this a low point win? **No** |  |  |

**Points**

- **Affirmative**: 25-30
- **Negative**: 24

**Judge's Signature**

Mesquite HS

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Aff:** It was a little difficult to follow your 1st rebuttal (most likely due to the first time). Watch out for using universal due to the minority argument.

Dist to that after the Neg's rebuttal flowered.

**Neg:** Good argument when it comes to that there will still police that will still do what they do even in the Aff world.

The Aff stated that this would involve minority as well; however, you were slightly able to refute with the util argument. Aff did have solvency. Watch out for inappropriate

I chose Negative for the rebuttals and arguments that volunteer won't work.

**Notes:** The whole debate depended on what solvency worked the most. If the Neg's argument on how people won't want to be voluntary was refuted better then it might of went to the Aff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Maria Mucino (*'18)</th>
<th>AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 5208</td>
<td>Fri 03/15/19 06:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nivea Mahesh Krishnan</td>
<td>Armando Montero</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Armando Montero</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>M. Mucino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judge's Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School / Affiliation / Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- C1. Women
- C2. Policing
- C3. Deportation

- Cross - drug decriminalization not as mandatory treatment over policing
- Misssy the Yes/No questions about evidence based.
- Good cross on questions, especially the Colorado legalization as decriminalization
- Good attack on neg valenced contentions.

Affirmative wins as rebuttals on medical industrial/campbell hybrid system is somewhat part of public health.

The illegal use of drugs ought to be treated as a matter of public health, not criminal justice.

C1 Medical Industrial complex
C2 Citizen's safety
C3 Drug Abuse

Slow down a bit, good job summarizing your evidence!

You needed to address the affirmative contentions with a bit more thoroughness. The fact that you propose a hybrid system, you are giving the aff 50% win.
Lincoln Douglas Debate

Affirmative
Katherine Howell
20 Pinnacle High School

Negative
Danny Seep
10 Horizon High School

The winner of this debate was
Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?
No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

You kinda just gotta
attack the different
parts of the K. Generally
priority order goes
All > Link > Framing > Impact

RPO: I negate with the neg ROTB
of including marginalized groups. Neg's all flow through
and has a larger impact compared to the off
advocacy.
**Lincoln Douglas Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 2237</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Affirmative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Negative</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ria Manathkar</td>
<td>Mackenzie Spencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Hamilton High School</td>
<td>17 Desert Ridge High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**INR:** Fairly good stock case, could be slower reading太快

**INR:** Great frontlining, well thought out and said but not well organized as to get through all of the vug case

**INR:** This speech was rough, many “arguments” are just cards or statistics without context, warrant or impacts. Prison rehabilitation effectiveness card isn’t even relevant to U.S. it’s the UK why bring up Phillipines they kill drug users on sight.

In your response to the aff why is the evidence skewed in 1. and why is illegal smuggling in us not matter, issue fails certain they do. Also why is rehab outside of prisons not solving for violence like they do in prison.

**INR:** Pretty much same problems as from the constructive. Nothing is really resolved in this speech.
DOMINGUEZ, AURA

Lincoln Douglas Debate
Aura Dominguez (*'17)
Round 4
Room 2235
Fri 03/15/19 06:30PM

Affirmative
Alicia M Hall
8 Mesquite High School
Points (25-30)
28

Negative
Tran Nguyen
12 Mountain View High School
Points (25-30)
28

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative  Negative
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:
Presentation
Appearance
Alicia → formal

1. cross: Tran → clarification on points.
   Hall → gave clear answers / supported by info (general).
   Le unable to answer if cure treatment question (Legal provide

Prep (Tran): Treatment should be assisted by Criminal Justice
   legalize drug use will only increase
   misuse and increase of them incarcerated.
   Criminal law is more impactful on rehabilitation
   more affective than rehabilitation.
2. cross: Hall → explain concept "law decreases use of drug"
   when districting people with use of dependency for people to
   (Hall): Public health systems fight for everyone, while utahanism
   only fights for majority
   Criminal Justice lacks the ability to proven necessary
   treatment, not just provide for treatment.
   community help & support
   (Trans): Claims ward rehabilitation doesn't come
   only majority & just luck
   When drugs are not illegalized / use is increased &
   2 of usage increase.
   If treatment is voluntary (how do we get people to actually
   partake in the rehab). 4. That public health system was built for drug users.

AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament
LD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Ryan Kibby (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2238</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lili Chambers</td>
<td>Stella Lovelady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mountain View High School</td>
<td>18 Tempe Preparatory Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Don't forget to ext pre-tint satisfaction for your FwK and explain why aff outweighs neg
- Don't read the topic as the neg
- Be strategic with your definitions
- You need to explain how your case ties into your FwK because I don't see deontological impacts in your case
- You need to explain why
- When making extensions you need to explain how it is helping you win the round
- You only attacked your opponents strict violations FwK you never defended your deont FwK
Both: Be explicit about where you get offense. Play it like chess. How do the pieces function? Why does this argument mean you win? General, social impacts are great but how do you want me to evaluate it on my flow today?

You are both amazing debaters! Now just go the last step of telling the judge exactly how to evaluate your amazing arguments.

RFD: I buy the Aff argument about stigma on the framework debate. Restorative Justice through CSS still carries stigma that inhibits autonomy.

Great round! Good luck!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Brendan Morey (115)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 5202</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svannah Marshall</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Desert Ridge High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? 

Judge's Signature

15

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote **Affirmative** because I think the main clash is over whether it's better to treat drug abusers in prison or out of prison. Ultimately, I side with **Affirmative** because prisons increase poverty by eliminating a family's breadwinner and prevent future employment via a felony record.
ROBBINS, CRISTI

AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

LD

Lincoln Douglas Debate

Cristi Robbins ('6)

Round 4

Room 5204

Fri 03/15/19 06:30PM

Affirmative

Calvin Tyler
15 Brophy College Prep

Points
(25-30)
29

Negative

Kristen Arnold
20 Pinnacle High School

Points
(25-30)
27

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative     Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  NO

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Accept race universe

MASS INCAN

Violent hips apart

than new 1/3 black men

MEN VS SOUTH AFRICA

10% 20-22%

MODERN GENOCIDE

6X more than

PTSD in children who

see parents arrested

CENT 2 (Chandler) 09

Rehab Cycle

Police Hand

CENT 3

Racial Consumption

Drug Use that Overdose

Mand. TX

Drug Court

Solve Race

CENT 2

Don't focus on race

Don't

Amnest Police

Rehab

Public Police

Relate to

People

Inner Racism

CULTURAC

Solving

MMAE cut

TUNES

Include everyone

Don't get rid of Rehab

Rehab Pay

An? Private

Rule Pay

in prison?

Amnest Police
The negative wins the round on the impact of private prisons and for-profit rehab/pha. After the round was agreed to be evaluated on the basis of minimizing oppression, the negative won the largely uncontested impact of achieving this through reform of for-profit prisons. (Although established that the negative could only allocate half of the justice system’s role in doing so.) Ultimately, this round litigated most the issue of the cost of care. The neg wins pharma’s role in creating/poisoning from the crisis is mitigated by a neg world and (2) the impact of the structural exclusion from care experienced by low income communities and communities of color.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Lauren Barney (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2227</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luther Wasbotten</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Sunnyslope High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Von Tobel</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sunrise Mountain</td>
<td></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is this a low point win?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:
- Start with case in 1AR
- More line by line
- How did you answer the question better?
- Felt like your framework disappeared after 1AR.

Seems like there's a risk of the aff solving the crime the Neg talks about. Neg seems to rely on fear mongering.

- You need a criterion/standard
- I would also try to prove why rehabs don't work isn't effective
- You said something new preventing drug use but explain now you prevent drugs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Robb Tyler (*'14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariah Hays</td>
<td>Kyler Nickel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Perry High School</td>
<td>6 Sunrise Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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:

**AFF**: Adaptable and nuanced understanding of debate structure/procedure gives you a calm, authoritative control of the debate. If you're going to use speed (like @ and @ 1st AR) breath control is key – shop inhales only make it sound bordering on out of control and detract from your actual words. Great use of rhetoric & narrative in 2nd AR.

**Neg**: Literally, without exaggeration, you offered not a single source/cable/quote/number in support of your case. You are obviously intelligent and well spoken, but woefully unprepared for structured debate in this format.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Abby Perkins (*'19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2230</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Phillips</td>
<td>Ezri Tyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mountain View High School</td>
<td>14 Sunnyslope High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner) 

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Good NC. I don't fully understand the counter value in this instance.

Really strong NR! You are missing a little bit of the technical wording that comes with experience but good coverage and weighing.

In terms of framework and permutations

I vote for ending war on drugs to be a priority to ending structural violence and ought to be preferred to smaller st. changes by the WAP is racist and genocidal.

Public health needle exchange vs Kohala is a wash.

Aff also wins higher chance of Aff and neg actions being able to work in conjunction vs the permutations.
VANDERVEEN, LEXIE

AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

LD

Lincoln Douglas Debate | Lexie Vanderveen ('17)
Round 4 | Room 5213 | Fri 03/15/19 06:30PM

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

Negative
Rhegan Crabtree
5 Desert Vista High School
Points (29)

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? no

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

• Good strategy of pre-emptively anticipating and attacking Neg arguments in AC!
• Evidence used to show impact of 1/3 of black men incarcerated was effective
• Needed to more thoroughly address how people would follow through with treatment without prison's influence
• Rebuttal to Neg's point on how jailing drug abusers would prevent further harm such as trafficking and date rape needed more thorough response. Didn't address root argument.

Neg

• Strong explanation/defense of value
• Good attack on non-uniqueness of impact by using card
• Effective strategy to go with if Neg proves that both treatment and criminal justice system possible Neg wins. Would have been even more effective if convinced Aff to agree to that arrangement in cross-ex.
• Good variety of evidence of how public health fails on its own and the further results of drug abuse that stopping it there would solve.

RFD: This was a hard decision, but I believe Aff better showed the problems that the criminal justice system causes for a larger population than the "do both" solution from the Neg would necessitate keeping.
Affirmative presented excellent points, but let negative control his arguments too much. The date rape argument was the weakest, but it disarmed affirmative and was successful. Negative's argument about decriminalizing fueling drug crimes was one I heard many times, but then he said, if we don't decriminalize, then people want get help - this was a great strategic move.

Both sides argued with agility and grace - a pleasure to watch.
AFFIRMATIVE

Bennett Fees
15 Brophy College Prep

29.5

NEGATIVE

Dylan Lifshitz
14 Sunnyslope High School

26

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?

Comments & Reason for Decision:

A priori illegal = crime is insufficient, & as off-point out, would totally take all ground away from affirmative. Pitts is not the whole squad, as both sides point out, and Matthews & Chandler et al. show solvency. Branch & Attas & Thompson turn neg, they off-the-record due to memorex & attacks on using locum being largely mistranslated. They because aff solv & against turns neg, off victory.
Great round!

This is the first time I've seen neg take a hard-line rule of law approach and I really liked the concept. However, I felt the points of focus were not the most effective points. I would have been more swayed by focusing on how the criminal justice system is working to reduce drug use, coupled with how the community feels safer, the guilt is more legitimate (although I had a hard time understanding underwriting), etc.

I did find it ironic that neg argued that public health system is unjust while proposing the inequities of the criminal justice system.

I wish neg would have had better rebuttals to aff's numbers. Agreed with aff that $1.1 trillion in health costs must the right stat. to use with this argument. And felt that 45% those in prison there for minor drug infractions valid. Needed an opposing jury number to counter.

Also, if going to claim addiction not a disease, but a choice, need something to back that up.
### Lincoln Douglas Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 2232</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Claire Mullings  
7 Hamilton High School | Logan Kraver  
19 McClintock High School |                      |
| Points (25-30) 29 | Points (25-30) 29 |                      |

The winner of this debate was **Negative**

Affirmative (Circle Winner)  
Is this a low point win? No

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

RFD: The Aff was unable and did not provide counter-argument to the neg's first and second contention that were sufficient enough to be persuasive that the claims were incorrect. The remaining part of the argument was about equivalent equal in significance.

---

**Aff:** In your first rebuttal, you ran out of time to refute the neg's first and second contentions directly, if there was something. In addition, you ran out of time during your last speech to explain the key voter issues. Next time, try to address all the points made and the ones that are necessary to further raise the value of your arguments. But the points that you did address blended well into your argument, well done.

**Neg:** From the entire debate, you were able to address most if not all of the aff's points, good job. But maybe more substantial evidence for your tenor contention would better improve your argument. But overall, well done.

**Both:** I liked how both of you went back and refreshed the about the points you guys were addressing. It really helped to see how the new points being made related to each other.
Lincoln Douglas Debate | Kelly Munoz ('17)  
---|---|---
Round 4 | Room 5203 | Fri 03/15/19 06:30PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pratik Shah</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Jason Mittelman</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mountain View High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **(Circle Winner)**

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Low point win for Jason. Did a better job of analyzing and picking up on points made by Pratik + then pointing out what was wrong. Excellent debate by both! A pleasure to judge.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lincoln Douglas Debate</th>
<th>Hillary Hays (*'16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>Room 5209</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>Valerie Peters</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Joel Joseph</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 Mesquite 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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I bought into the neg's counter plan of a combo of drug courts - a mix of compulsory treatment and criminal justice. I felt like the aff couldn't really respond to the legal coercion contention.