

VPD

FLIP: 16 Aoki - Hoang v. 39 Dempsey - Sodhi

Policy Debate				Will Niebergall (*46)			
Round 3				Room 908		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Hoang	2	28.5	1st	Dempsey	3	28.5
2nd	Aoki	1	29.5	2nd	Sodhi	4	28
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				_____ Judge's Signature Brophy _____ School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? _____							



Comments & Reason for Decision:

- neg drop the whole aff ^{meta-} ~~theory~~ framework (drop the arg) & reasonability
- neg drop Berlant / Osajima comparison
- looking for impacts on care I find basically only Osajima
- + I agree that the neg are trying to win on a risk of a solvency deficit

both teams need to do more w/ the rich clash b/t identity pol. + orthodox Marxism

VPD

FLIP: 35 Fan - Viswanath v. 46 Srivastava - Crusa


Policy Debate				Nicole Woodruff (*39)			
Round 3				Room 901		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Crusa	4	28	1st	Viswanath	3	28.5
2nd	Srivastava	1	29.5	2nd	Crusa Fan	2	29.5
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature  School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative		Negative					
(Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>Yes</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I think both sides were strong and both argued the case for their side well. The case for me is always the better as clearly I agree with the negative side. But the positive is stronger. Although the case of the Haberman is very strong on one side today we

VPD

FLIP: 39 Sannes - Chen v. 16 Quah - Gupta

Policy Debate				Tanzil Chowdry (*35)			
Round 3				Room 902		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Isaac Quah	1	27	1st	Lauren Chen	1	28
2nd	Animesh Gupta	3	27	2nd	Ely Sannes	2	28
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Hamilton School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative <u>Negative</u>							
(Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD Given Orally


E-mail: tachowd1@asu.edu

ANDERSON, JACQUI
SANNES, JOEL (39)

Bobcat Bonanza 2017

VPD

FLIP: 16 Laibe - Grossberg v. 46 Baltman - Shah


Policy Debate				Jacqui Anderson (*63)			
Round 3				Room 907		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Shah	4	25	1st	Laibe	1	28
2nd	Baltman	3	26	2nd	Grossberg	2	27
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Chandler Prep School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

IAC was bilateral investment treaty with economy advantage and climate change advantage. Neg ran solvency on case, also good case evidence on econ & climate change. Neg off-case was Diplomatic Capital with an African War and impact (Ethiopia/Eritrea war), and a human rights conditions counterplan. Aff in 2AC did a good job responding to case BUT dropped the D.A. & counterplan -- No responses at all. 2NC expanded the Dip Cap D.A. & added as a Bio-Diversity impact; on the C.P, 2NC added a morality Decision Rule. 1NR did a good line-by-line on case, lots of solvency take-outs. If solvency diminishes, the impact of the Africa DA begins to outweigh, especially w/ Bio-Diversity Impact. 1AR addressed/argued the Africa D.A. but and the H.R. conditions C.P but dropped case -- good debate team making novice mistakes ...

VPD

FLIP: 16 Watkins - Ito v. 35 Dwiyono - Lakamsani

Policy Debate				Philip Birgenheir (*46)			
Round 3				Room 903		Fri 02/10/17 07:45PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	WATKINS	1	30	1st	DWIYONO	4	28.5
2nd	ITO	2	29	2nd	LAKAMSANI	3	29
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature BROPHY School / Affiliation / Occupation			
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative (Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>N</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD:

Neg doesn't do enough work on Russia DA.

Aff adv outweigh HR abuses which may not even increase that much if BIT passes.