**Policy Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Rank (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Aoki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Agarwal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gupta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gupta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

RFD: Abjection clearly leads to real-world impacts, no probable link to Asian identity. Aff = Trump = re-election. Plus, evidence read against it (GOP inevituable). I satisfactorily rebutted, performance is educational. Rob of off leads cedence to this. Rob was not self-serving, and neg perpetuates model minority myth. Aff wins on performance, countered evidence, much of on-case.

8 off.
Ultimately, I think the question of structural fairness is fundamentally more important than the question of procedural fairness, 2nd. I find even the question of the procedural fairness of the AP to be reasonably within the limits of topicality. There is, it seems to me, reason to believe in the predictability of the AP, which leads me to wonder why we end up talking about abuse, instead of a methodological discussion of dealing with objected identities. Ultimately, I've got to come down in the affirmative.

Good round. Good show.

Best of luck to all of you.

Richard Glover
Say no line and it's not fair?
(And Lord. Stop. Being. 12.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finals</th>
<th>Momen Abdelkarim (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Aoki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gupta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ______

Comments & Reason for Decision:

One problem, esp w/ a panel like this, is that this neg strett (throwing it all on + there) makes the kind of reps that really relies on fellot knowing these args back+forward. I lish. It makes a mess. Ultimately, while many neg args compel me, and the weapons restrict the cards I wii that best enough to overcome:

1) In round impacts
2) neg responses on how we relate differently to the resolution.

By cx of the 2nd, I can't decide who is doing more petulant whining.

Honestly

Lo "No fair - you don't run a plan"
"You're known al year."
"And, nothing links but frwck because no plan"
"You aren't even go to try to debate us? We just say it and we win?"