


VPD

852 83

FLIP: 5 Shah - Zhao v. 42 Ahd - Roman

Policy Debate		Jason Sturgis (*38)					
Quarter-Finals		Room 613		Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM			
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points	Speaker	Negative	Rank	Points
1st	Nike Ahd ^{Mohammad Ahd} Nike Ahd.	(1-4)	(20-30)	1st	Xenia Zhan	(1-4)	(20-30)
2nd	Vivian Roman		25	2nd	to Afeen Shah		28
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Carlsbad High School School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative		Negative					
(Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:


Both sides developed their cases and put in obvious effort to prepare.

That said, Neg won because they had a ^{more} cohesive argument and a causal linkage demonstration. In Aff's defense of their point, there was plenty of confusion. However strong debate..

VPD

ZACH BRISSON

FLIP: 22 Allen - Lynaugh v. 34 Cohen - Nistor

Policy Debate		Zach Bassoon (*5)		Chastie Mack *4	
Quarter-Finals		Room 606		Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Negative
1st	22			1st	34
2nd				2nd	
The winner of this debate was			 Judge's Signature Hamilton / McClinton School / Affiliation / Occupation		
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative (Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? _____					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

IAC - terror + interests advantages need more terminal impacts (ex. - "terror → war" or "Muslim Brotherhood spills over to wider conflict.") as claims to weigh against many common DA's - Key offense.

~~Answer~~ ↑ IAC CX can/should look to ? these link chains...

INC - Sandi argument on case, needs a claim to grapple w/ uniqueness - why plan would uniquely allow Yemen, etc. to continue/get worse...

Edelman in 2AC → move to IAC!

* A + explanation of internal (D) story -- just gotta make sure you get your self up to outweigh common DA's -- either thru this ev or a framing/structural violence argument --


* CP is helpful, increase CP, etc... easier to weigh these (S) deficits -- try or die... etc.
* split block - avoid hitting on same arguments

AFD

1. First look to Saudi/Iran sovereignty argument —
I find aff is greatly ahead in leveraging their
evidence about sheer magnitude of ~~the~~ counter terror
in Qatar ~ response to this is super defensive
i.e. — "Terror will still happen" without grappling w/
core of their sovereignty claim — ∴ 100% risk!
2. Then weigh risk of NATO Disadv (fill-in
lacks a real extension of the Link chain —
super bippy) — I think the Neg does little/none
to grapple w/ claim that U.S. still maintaining
heavy presence —
Thus risk of ② too small to
outweigh Aff.

VPD

FLIP: 38 Kim - Yousuf v. 5 Chen - Virk

Policy Debate		Stephen Miller (*32)					
Quarter-Finals		Room 605		Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM			
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points	Speaker	Negative	Rank	Points
1st	Yousuf	2	(1-4) (20-30)	1st	Virk	3	(1-4) (20-30)
2nd	Kim	4	(1-4) (20-30)	2nd	Chen	1	(1-4) (20-30)
SM				SM			
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Sahuarro School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative		Negative					
(Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

26
29

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- good cross after 1AC, asked tough questions.
- In the 2AC, keep presenting evidence, too much rebuttal too soon.
- Both sides drop evidence and then brought back up points. Be sure to carry your important cards all the way. Especially the impact/harm for both teams.
- Just because the other side drops some evidence, does not mean you can't keep extending it.

Reason for decision

- Harms and how the perm does not work.
- & argue that the DA Harms are impossible and then try and perm it. Be all in. Thank you both teams!

VPD

FLIP: 42 Hsu - Wang v. 5 Chinnasamy - Garg

Charlie Mack #4

Policy Debate		Justin Fitz (#13) - Charlie Mack #4					
Quarter-Finals		Room 604		Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM			
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	GAPE	3	27	1st	HSU	2	26
2nd	Chinnasamy	1	21	2nd	WANG	4	24
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)				Charlie Mack Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? <input type="checkbox"/>				GEA / Parent / Engineer School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Elements that weighted decision -

1. Russian arms sales - flawed +
2. Human Rights (AP) flawed, but the secondary source of arms would negate this

