



VPD

Policy Debate				Nicole Woodruff (*39)			
Semi-Finals				Room 901		Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM	
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st 2nd	Alex Fan	_____	_____	1st 2nd	Shikhar Srivastava	_____	_____
1st 2nd	Vignesh Viswanath 35 Hamilton High School	_____	_____	1st 2nd	Andrew Crusa 46 Brophy College Prep	_____	_____
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature CPA School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative		Negative					
(Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? _____							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

They who are the PDK side are, and the neg probably
 think but do the to do the. The PDK probably only
 sides because the Aff do not really engage with us,
 because it does not really make any sense.

VPD

Policy Debate				Amy Lin (*16)			
Semi-Finals				Room 901		Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM	
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st 2nd	Alex Fan	_____	_____	1st 2nd	Shikhar Srivastava	_____	_____
1st 2nd	Vignesh Viswanath 35 Hamilton High School	_____	_____	1st 2nd	Andrew Crusa 46 Brophy College Prep	_____	_____
The winner of this debate was				 _____ Judge's Signature Desert Vista _____ School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? _____							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

voted on the PK

IAZ super light on the K flow and therefore 2av answers were unpersuasive to me.



VPD

Policy Debate				Amy Minniear (*13)			
Semi-Finals				Room 901		Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM	
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st 2nd	Alex Fan	---	---	1st 2nd	Shikhar Srivastava	---	---
1st 2nd	Vignesh Viswanath 35 Hamilton High School	---	---	1st 2nd	Andrew Crusa 46 Brophy College Prep	---	---
The winner of this debate was				<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Joe Sannes</u> Judge's Signature</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>C. P. A.</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation</p>			
<p style="text-align: center;">Affirmative <input checked="" type="radio"/> Negative</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Circle Winner)</p>							
Is this a low point win? _____							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I'm not sure I have a great connection to the issue. I'm not positive after the debate what I am being asked to affirm. If the role of the ballot is to affirm "an uncompromising affirmation of play", I don't know what that gets me or anyone. ~~I'm not even there~~ isn't anything in the IAC to solve with imaginative play. So I'm struggling to find any reason to vote Aff: What does imagination solve and how does it solve it? I don't know. On the other hand I'm also perplexed by the Neg: seems like Neg was using Burbank's theory of "Cruel Optimism" to say that suggesting imagination solves creates a requirement that we use imagination to solve, and when it doesn't solve the psychological burdens are even greater. I also don't understand why the Aff is "empathic" imagination as opposed to un sentimental imagination. Aff didn't use refs of suffering as the reason to justify imagination. I don't give Neg a line to maps... Aff doesn't define China geographically. Although it's not Neg's position, I don't have any thing to vote for here (or against) so I go Neg. that I'm not making any judgment.

VPD

Policy Debate		Tanzil Chowdry (*35)					
Semi-Finals		Room 903		Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM			
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st 2nd	Ely Sannes	---	---	1st 2nd	Kaede Aoki	---	---
1st 2nd	Lauren Chen 39 Chandler Preparatory Academy	---	---	1st 2nd	Charley Hoang 16 Desert Vista High School	---	---
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature  School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative Negative							
(Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Oral RFD

tchowdr1@asu.edu

Ryan Magel (22) VPD

Policy Debate		Jacqui Anderson Ryan Magel (22)					
Semi-Finals		Room 903		Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM			
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st/2nd	Ely Sannes	3	25	1st/2nd	Kaede Aoki	2	26
1st/2nd	Lauren Chen 39 Chandler Preparatory Academy	1	27	1st/2nd	Charley Hoang 16 Desert Vista High School	4	24
The winner of this debate was				Ryan Magel Judge's Signature			
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative (Circle Winner)				Arizona College Prep - Oakland School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? NO							

Comments & Reason for Decision:


solid case, good flow on the
preference and good nuclear upper
so well, very easy to understand
great teamwork & drawing questions

good choice of affs words and
responses to case.

The round came down to case vs k, I disagree
ded the Fut stuff because AFF met according to
neg AFF won mostly on the whole pre requisite
of their case is life, stuff and education. both
teams had a solid debate when there was stuff
was alright I really liked the aff/ve stuff
but agreed with the flow and double bind even
though they almost dropped it, it was like a sentence
education is always good and definitely flawed a word

ATTRIDGE, PATTON

VPD

Policy Debate		Will Niebergall (#46) PATTON ATTRIDGE (34)	
Semi-Finals		Room 903	Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st 2nd	Ely Sannes	3	29
1st 2nd	Lauren Chen 39 Chandler Preparatory Academy	2	30
Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st 2nd	Kaede Aoki	1	30
1st 2nd	Charley Hoang 16 Desert Vista High School	4	29
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature	
Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)		TPAASU School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision: AFF

NEG

↳ SPEAKER ONE - THE FLASH HELPED, BUT THE UNDERLINING ISN'T TOTALLY ACCURATE TO WHAT YOU READ. WHEN THIS IS THE CASE, YOU MIGHT MAKE THAT CLEAR. ↳ LIKE THE ANTHRO DOUBLE-BIND, BUT IT DOES KIND OF INVALIDATE THE ATTEMPT TO ABIDE THE K - YOU CAN'T REALLY GO DEEP INTO ANTHRO AND ALSO LINK INTO THE ALT. YOU DO ATTACK THE ALT WITH THEORY AS WELL, BUT THE SAME PRINCIPLE APPLIES: FLOW INK ASIDE, THE ANTHRO LINKS MIGHT HAVE BEEN TIME BETTER SPENT ELSEWHERE. ↳ THE IAR WOULD HAVE BENEFITED FROM TELLING ME SPECIFICALLY WHERE YOU ANSWERED ABOUT TAIWAN. ↳ DROPPING THE DEHUMANIZATION LINKS MIGHT NOT HAVE BEEN TOTALLY STRATEGICALLY SOUND, BUT THE REFUTATION OF IN-ROUND ANTHRO BENEFITS WAS.

↳ THE ALT ON THE ZOFF WOULD BENEFIT FROM SOME DISCUSSION IN THE NC THAT EXPLICITLY EXCUSES YOU FROM BUYING INTO THE K, PRE-EMPTIVELY. ↳ GOOD ANSWER TO WATSON. DEEP FELD DIDN'T GET SUPER CLEARLY FLESHED OUT IN THE ZNC. ↳ THE IAR WOULD HAVE BENEFITTED FROM MORE EXPLICIT ANTHRO EXTENSION. THAT THE ZNC DIDN'T HAVE TIME FOR RATHER THAN THE CLIPPED LINE-BY-LINE. ↳ MORE DESCRIPTIVE COVERAGE LINES THAN "ARGUMENTATION WAS TERRIBLE" WOULD BE IDEAL. ↳ I'M NOT SURE THAT THE UTIL ANALYSIS IS ALWAYS DOING ENOUGH WORK AND IN THE ZNR THERE'S SOME OFF. COST FOCUSING ON IT RATHER THAN PEDAGOGICAL BENEFITS OF VOTING ON ANTHRO.

BFD!

BOTH AFF AND NEG BOIL DOWN PEDAGOGY TO UTIL. I BUY NEG'S KATE, MEANING ANTHRO IS A PROBABILITY CALC FOR EXTINCTION, AND SINCE I BUY ANTHRO CALLS OUT AT THE AC (THE DOUBLE-BIND BUYS IN), I NEGATE. AND INDUSTR. REV. ANALYTICS