<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Debate</th>
<th>Tyler Lyons (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2205</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(circle)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Aman Agarwal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Andrew Crusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(circle)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Viveka Chinnesamy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Anna Jiang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Quotes of Necessity:**

- Cars 2 — 2ARV
- Wall-E — 2ACV
- Toy Story 2 — 2ACV

INC status a double turn

I don’t like being told I have an “ethical obligation” to vote for a team, I’m not breaking the law by circling my ballot for another team.

2 NR goes for T, CP, and K, drops perm on the K, drops no net benefit on CP, no offense on the T extension (no into), conceded reasonability
AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

CX

Policy Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 2203</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 02:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Amanda Gong</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Xenia Zhao</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speaker | Negative | Rank | Points |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Ethan Cohen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Erik Dahl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Aff

Great Job on the 2AC love the frame with arg.

The EAAR was awesome did tons of impact debate
Always go Case #5.

I voted Neg because on the flow the
exclusion @1 outweigh the Aff impacts.
Neg did a great job explaining that Aff
plan pass the arrow and counter plan
Impact with tangible down.

Judge's Signature

neg

- exclusion @1 + counter plan nice arg

- spend more time on arg that
was dropped → = win

I would have love more
impact on-the cp and excel.
### AIA 2019 Division 1 State Tournament

#### CX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Debate</th>
<th>Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>Room 2204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Rank Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td>(1-4) (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd Juhi Khandelwal</td>
<td>3 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd Afreen Shah</td>
<td>2 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd Kenneth Wang</td>
<td>1 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd Shirley Wang</td>
<td>4 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Aff** - Went in hard on changing the debate space and making it acceptable for Muslim voices. I like the K aff. Started out very hard to understand but became fire.

**Neg** - Good rebuttal to the AFF. The psycho K was interesting. I would not have spent as much time on the Orientalism point but not inherently bad.

**RFD** - Neg wins on the psycho K. The entire AFF strat is balanced on making change. If that wasn’t enough Neg wins presumption.
### Policy Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 2200</th>
<th>Fri 03/15/19 02:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Ria Bhatti</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ruby Gao</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Hamilton High School
5 Desert Vista High School

The winner of this debate was **Negative**

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

**Is this a low point win?**

No

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Africa:** Read a disad? If they defend topical implementation of the plan.

**Hac:** Should have a push or own against the Kritik, their K isn't really a cap k either, it's a K of your affects, it's important to talk about identity.

**Hac:** Start with Link after Overview, you say a sentence 3 or 4 times. Flow is very muddled.

**Hac:** Takes too much, but good work on case.

**Link:** You spend too much time on your overview and don't respond to the case line by line. You spend too much time telling me what their argument are instead of explaining your own. You spent too much time telling me what their argument are instead of explaining your own. Which makes you run out of time before making any real argument on T.

**Link:** Goes for too much - don't need to. The Burden of woman impact staff at the end, we the time to explain your link story better.

**Link:** The overview doesn't really address any of the arguments they are making in the HNR.

**RFD:** vote neg on the K - it offs engagement in identity discourse is harmful to the debate space.
### Policy Debate

**Round 1**

**Affirmative**  
Speaker (circle)  
1st 2nd: Cole Brown  
5 Desert Vista High School  
Rank: 1  
Points: 27.5

**Negative**  
Speaker (circle)  
1st 2nd: Colin Guan  
1st 2nd: Anusha Rahman  
7 Hamilton High School  
Rank: 3  
Points: 26.5

---

**The winner of this debate was**  
**Affirmative**  
(Circle Winner)  
Is this a low point win? **No**

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Neg fails to weigh case impacts against the Aff solvency. No key link to K so **Aff wins.**

---