Novice Policy Debate

Abby Karlin (*'7)

Round 1

Speaker
(circle)

Affirmative

Rank
1st

Points
27

Negative

Rank
4th

Points
21.2

2nd Aditi Sathe

1st Tanvi Sathish
2 BASIS Peoria

1st Shashmeen N Hoque
10 Hamilton High School

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Negative

Is this a low point win?

No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

-During CX it might be helpful
   to restate cards in your own
   words. esp. when debaters don't
   emphasize your points.

-Slow down & deal w/ numbers.
   esp. when asking my judge to
   slow down & deal w/ numbers.

-Good clash & acknowledging of
   targeting civilian.

-What does it mean that the
   US is second to supply oil in the
   middle east. What countries?
   How much do we provide?

-Why wait until IAK to make
   the Saudis are not the lesser evils
   again. I've been waiting to hear
   what you all should have talked about differences in earlier

-I like the way your argument
   is structured.

-Debate etiquette (ask judge if
   they're ready for CX before you
   start for the time)

-Bad news for civilians in Yemen
   and American interests

-I want to see impacts
   about what it looks like when
   the economy is demoralized
   ! Don't buy your response to targeting civilians

-Need to talk about differences between
   your plan & mine. I want to see the
   differences between your plan & mine.

-Tell me more about the
   education is what debate is all about.

-Please make sure next time to feed all cases before the round.

-in the future refrain from repeating CX question.

-1st CX seemed disorganized

-Ask the judge if it is okay to answer the question/finish at 9:59. I would

-NEG wins because arms are already being sold to Russia.

Each other.

-Neg wins because arms are already being sold to Russia.

-more etiquette ;)

-make sure that you guys are looking forward during CX

-good job!
**2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy**

### Novice Policy Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>ED 130</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Rank (1-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Jane Shujuan Li</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Iris Lai</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Rank (1-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Rohan Chintham</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Jai Mahant</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative** (Circle Winner)

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

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The req uncued the discarn and terrorism impact on case.

This count as "new args" as the 2NK attempts to state.

No extension of defense in Industry DA in the block but it's mentioned in the 2NK, so I don't weigh it.

Thus, a concludes no link any on the allied profit DA (Thompson 17)

All outweighs and prevents extinction caused by disease and terrorism. Outweighs on timeframe as well even if I don't buy the no link.

For the aff team: not having/reading a counterplan isn't a reason to vote aff without any additional reason.
# NPD

## 2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice Policy Debate</td>
<td>Ryan Fardowsign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(circle)</td>
<td>(1-4) (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Ishani Sahoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Siddhant Urunkar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2 BASIS Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(circle)</td>
<td>(1-4) (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Aditi Daga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sabah Ashfeen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>10 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ___

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **AF**
  - 2ac - start on-case, THEN go to off-case (your offense first)
  - Ishani - still not doing the case
  - 2ac line-by-line like we've talked about twice now.
  - I'd highly suggest forcing yourself to read no cards in 2ac on case flows.

- 2ar - overall, pretty solid - good extension of dropped arguments on the 2 disads
  - but got to your own case w/ very little time...
  - (put case first?)

- 2ar: Local critique (post-round)

---

**NEG**

- Inc - put off-case (i.e. the 2 Disads) FIRST, THEN on-case (your offense first)
  - 2ac: even if you struggled through some parts of this speech, you did good analysis on Assurances DA...
  - Could have developed Defense DA some more

- 1ar: really really solid analysis and easy to follow. Biggest advice would be more impact on the Taiwan deterrence horn - if you win that, why do you win the round? Why does that outweigh their advantages?

- 2ar: Local critique (post-round)

---

**RFD: Neg on Allied PolifDA**

2AR doesn't really extend an impact that outweighs...
# NPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Policy Debate</th>
<th>Sathish Muthukrishnan ('2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(circle)</td>
<td><strong>Rank</strong> (1-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinayak Atul Athavale</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan B Gan</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td><strong>Rank</strong> (1-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd</td>
<td>1st &amp; 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammad Ali Nik Ahd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Only 2INK so messy - follow the flow
- #D1B - n-u (neg needs to respond line by line or crossapply) (dir. TAR)
- #Protesting - aff needs to respond in 1AR to the warrants re: risk ("any risk too high")
- US reliance/assurance about reg. violations of 1Chime are incredibly narrow.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Policy Debate</th>
<th>Akhil Mahant (*2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>ED 216</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(circle)</td>
<td>(1-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frances Coleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olivia Markos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(circle)</td>
<td>(1-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>TJ Chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>Ammaar Faisal Zindani</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The winner of this debate was:**
- **Affirmative**
- **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Aff**

**Strengths:**
- Good initial cross-ex.
- Better do your
  - Good initial cards
- Consistency of main
  - Ideas for your resolution

**Areas of Improvement:**
- More numbers showing direct correlation
- Define impact of your cards
- More clearly
- Define moral obligation
  - Good argument, but needs quantifiable precedent for what this is
- Define why abashing from sales

**Neg**

**Strengths:**
- Good job defining impact
- More consistently
- More SATES, better ME by ITALY
- Better latching on to opponent’s holes/flows
- Good cards to open contact Aff cards

**Areas of Improvement:**
- Be a little more consistent with impact
- Work on preparation of your thoughts
- Work on AMMAAR
- Stronger initial cross-examination
- Be more specific in rebuttal
  - By defining quick counter at card, rather
  - Than just dropping card name.
Novice Policy Debate

Round 1

Speaker
(circle)

Affirmative

Rank
(1-4)

Points
(20-30)

Kaushik Kandala
1st 2nd

2
9

Hailey DeWolf
1st 2nd

Negative

Rank
(1-4)

Points
(20-30)

Sarah Hamm
7 McClintock High School
1st 2nd

3
27

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ND

Aff (5) terrorists taking advantage of

in Yemeni Civil War.
Chowdhury

Jordyn Walhof

ED 218