**Varsity LD Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sajni Nimesh Patel</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Zachary Jones</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? 100

Comment & Reason for Decision:

- No responses to Neg links really hurt you.
- Can't Perm if you still link to be.
- If your advocacy is to use CPA to disrupt set col structures then you don't meet the threshold to solve or minimize your impacts.
- The way you could have won is going hard on State Inevitable, because then Zach cannot defend Politics of School.

RFD: Based on the ROB, I have to choose the debater that best disrupts set col structures and solves for the impacts of both les. Since the AFF links into the impacts of their and their own le, I vote Neg.
### VLD

**FLIP: 11 Zachary Jones v. 4 Sajni Nimesh Patel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Logan Guthrie (*'16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 601</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sajni Nimesh Patel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**AFF**

1. CX could be clearer concerning the advocacy. "Post-tint" and "pre-tint" doesn't explain whether you would defend the plan.
2. Signpost response to the act and in solvency derived on the act, not as answer to case.
3. Diversity offense to the act in the case turns no lens independent to the act, etc.
4. Cheek neg when they assume identity.
5. BAF is not extreme heavy, but instead look at line-by-line arguments; organize speech by offense or case and not.
6. Choose arguments to spend time on in the BAF: perm, disrupt space, try-or-die vid. or at least, why you don't have to.

---

**NEG**

1. Care offense is largely repetitive cross-applications of the kritik.
2. Description of settler-colonialism as structure is repeated unevenness in WIC.
3. Link aggregations are not connected to a terminus impact in 04: move 2 innocence, recognition, etc., university.
4. Flag the care two aspect grade shifts more explicit and impact it out.
5. Spend time winning that settler-colonialism is totalizing and universities are irrefutable as power apparatuses.
6. More offense on the perm besides cross-applications of line args.
7. Explain how the act substances native.
• You need to do some work against the links on the K in the AFF.

• Do more impact analysis with the aff, I'm unsure what exactly is the benefit of affirming exactly.

AFF: I negate on the K, the links flow through as dividends to the aff and I'm unsure of the unique impact from the aff and the benefit of the aff.
**VLD**

**FLIP: 4 Claire Mae Mullings v. 27 Calvin Tyler**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Luke Calhoun (44)</th>
<th>Armande Members (34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25-30)</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Claire Mullings</td>
<td>27 Calvin Tyler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative** [Circle Winner]

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- You need a clear Ro & Station for me to win.
- You don't tell me how you gained offense under this Ro.
- Is it part of the reading section?
- Good objections
- I have no idea to which rounds debate?
- Good time allocation in the 1AR!
- There is nothing in the case that says
- Problem can't be taught - you can evidence
- Scary texts inhibit teaching.

**RFD:** I vote neg. They FUD collapse (even though neg has often won both). I buy that 3 held I really NPK & anti-top. Simply extra rid & tests on
- intro poetry, too! I buy access to high ed & grade DA means I can analyze tones.
VLD
FLIP: 4 Claire Mae Mullings v. 27 Calvin Tyler

Varsity LD Debate
Nickpreet Singh (*36)

Semi-Finals
Room 603
Sat 10/26/19 03:00PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative  Negative
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF
- avoid giving direct reasons neg can win - i.e. up to judges
- try not to pull at your shirt, I think it distracts you more than judges but it can mess with your flow
- good extensions

Neg
- say 1 off/2off/3off a little louder w/ a pause so I can distinguish when to move on flow. (you did in 2nd R) 
- don't fiddle with water bottle, clicking can be distracting
- tell me why poetry is non-unique - just said at the end

REF
AFF won because they proved CP wasn't going to work, active learning and change should be valued, and SAT/ACT inherently inflate GPA
**VLD**

**FLIP:** 4 Claire Mae Mullings v. 27 Calvin Tyler

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Eli Botham (*'17)</th>
<th>Derek Chisum ('11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 603</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sat 10/26/19 03:00PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Mae Mullings</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Calvin Tyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was <strong>Affirmative</strong> (Circle Winner)</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:**

**Aff:**

- Great questions on framework.
- Excellent evidence usage in answering cross.
- Good turns in 2NR.
- Dropping atheism was the right move.
- Seamen evidence does need a stronger causation warrant.

**Neg:**

- That's really missing from the Aff is a lack of a clear framework for weighing post-fact impacts as well, since you admit post-fact impacts are the more important.
- You impact out the identity point much better than the New Paths point.
- I did not catch the warrant for your arg that GPA was the best predictor.

FD: Aff never proves getting rid of standardized tests necessarily results in proliferation of poetry. Since CP turns poetry, this wins under either framework.