


# VPD

Policy Debate				Michael Caplan (*34)			
Round 1				Room 111		Fri 02/07/20 03:45PM	
Speaker (circle)	<b>Affirmative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker (circle)	<b>Negative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st/2nd	Rohan Chintham	<u>3</u>	<u>26</u>	1st/2nd	Tyler Matome Busby	<u>2</u>	<u>26</u>
1st/2nd	Jai Mahant 38 BASIS Peoria	<u>1</u>	<u>27</u>	1st/2nd	Jedidiah Jeffrey Barton 13 Desert Ridge High School	<u>4</u>	<u>24</u>
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)				PCDS School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>yes</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Tyler: squeeze ball or something to keep your hands still

Both teams: clash with the other team's most important arguments. Neg - you need to beat their nuclear war scenario that leads to extinction. Aff, you need to beat the solvency of the K (i.e. that suffering leads to utopia)


Aff: Extinction scenario?? your case is the most important thing you've got. But you spend 0:15 of 2AR telling me it outweighs.

Neg: you need to get some on-case responses out in 1NC or 2NC

fun round.



# VPD

Policy Debate				Charley Hoang (*42)			
Round 1				Room 114		Fri 02/07/20 03:45PM	
Speaker (circle)	<b>Affirmative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker (circle)	<b>Negative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st 2nd	Viveka Chinnasamy 2A	2	<del>27.8</del> 27.9	1st 2nd	Aditi Sathe 1N	3	27.8
1st 2nd	Srishti Garg 1A 5 Hamilton High School	1	<del>28</del> 28	1st 2nd	Tanvi Sathish 2N 38 BASIS Peoria	4	27.7
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Desert Vista High School School / Affiliation / Occupation			
<input checked="" type="radio"/> <b>Affirmative</b> <input type="radio"/> <b>Negative</b> (Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Case Outweighs on Time frame


Human Rights advantage vs Houthi Victory DA

RFD spoken



Nick Russell

VPD

Policy Debate				Abby Karlin (*7)			
Round 1				Room 112		Fri 02/07/20 03:45PM	
Speaker (circle)	<b>Affirmative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker (circle)	<b>Negative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st/2nd	Kaushik Kandala	4	26.5	1st/2nd	Afreen Shah	2	27
1st/2nd	Sansita Singh 38 BASIS Peoria	3	27	1st/2nd	Xenia Zhao 5 Hamilton High School	1	27.5
The winner of this debate was				<p style="text-align: center;">             Judge's Signature            Murphy College Prep            School / Affiliation / Occupation         </p>			
<b>Affirmative</b> <b>Negative</b> (Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>							

75


Comments & Reason for Decision:

- 1AC - ① hand gestures are distracting
- ② I'm not sure how you access the 1/4 to your Adv 2 - seems to assume lifting sanctions, debt restructuring as ~~the~~ Venezuela crisis - that's your own o'willer
- CX - you're asking the right questions, neg
- 1NC - don't cx the 1A, prep. better signposting pls.
- 2AC - need more offense on the DPO & cp
- 2NC - line by line on case - don't get sucked into the suck. More impact analysis on the DA. why do you o/w?
- 1NR - your ~~NAPO~~ "US leadership & NATO" seems like a weak arg. I really think it's a bad time to be running NATO
- 1AR - the name of the game is coverage. This is a problem in the 2AC as well. you need to ans ①, the cp
- 2NR - need a better explanation of why ① is evaluated first. not an issue in this round, but you need the insurance E.g. A PRIORI, GATEWAY / if-then, proceduralism
- 2AR - smart analysis - but coverage: you have never answered ①

PRD - ① is conceded; i vote neg.



# VPD

Policy Debate				Justin Fitz (*13)			
Round 1				Room 117		Fri 02/07/20 03:45PM	
Speaker (circle)	<b>Affirmative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker (circle)	<b>Negative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st 2nd	Ava Rose Grosely	<u>3</u>	<u>27</u>	1st 2nd	Jeffrey Hsu	<u>2</u>	<u>28</u>
1st 2nd	Lauren Hunter 22 Carlsbad High School	<u>4</u>	<u>26.5</u>	1st 2nd	Shirley Wang 42 Desert Vista High School	<u>1</u>	<u>28.5</u>
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Hamilton/McClintock School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative		Negative					
(Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? _____							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

IAC - Places to strengthen case: ① Add terminal impacts (ex. - terror = war/escalation, or Yemen = structural violence, that comes 1st.) ALSO ② ceasefire evidence + internal links.

INC - Flash CP text, for judges' sake...  
Clash/cority > tricks...

ZAC - K Page: ① "Case outweighs" ② Framework - USFG good ③ "Link of omission" (plus "debate good") } Key for answering K

RFD  
Ⓡ = a priori violation dropped


\* write ~~planned~~ a Pearson block  
\* Begin w/ case overview! (put Hudson in ZAC)  
"we are more accepting now" is the ②  
Key to defend those ~~reforms~~  
Reforms - Hudson on right track here

Take all prep PIZ, from ZAR - hustle.






# VPD

Policy Debate				Chetan Urunkar (*38)			
Round 1				Room 113		Fri 02/07/20 03:45PM	
Speaker (circle)	<b>Affirmative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker (circle)	<b>Negative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st 2nd	Andrew Zhuojie Chen	<u>3</u>	<u>26</u>	1st 2nd	Mohammad Ali Nik Ahd	<u>2</u>	<u>26</u>
1st 2nd	Abdullah Virk 5 Hamilton High School	<u>1</u>	<u>27</u>	1st 2nd	Viviana Roman 42 Desert Vista High School	<u>4</u>	<u>24</u>
The winner of this debate was				 _____ Judge's Signature  BASIS PEORIA _____ School / Affiliation / Occupation			
<input checked="" type="radio"/> <b>Affirmative</b> <input type="radio"/> <b>Negative</b> (Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>							


Comments & Reason for Decision:

Its quite evident both teams have put in a lot of effort in the prep. Before going any further wishing them the very best in all future tournaments.

I have ruled in favor of affirmative since I felt they had compelling arguments on multiple fronts like appearance & democracy.



# VPD

Policy Debate				Christine Gallup (*22)			
Round 1				Room 115		Fri 02/07/20 03:45PM	
Speaker (circle)	<b>Affirmative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker (circle)	<b>Negative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st 2nd	James Kim	2	27	1st 2nd	Anna Feifei Jiang	3	24
1st 2nd	Faizan Yousuf 38 BASIS Peoria	1	28	1st 2nd	Francesca Veronica Martin 5 Hamilton High School	4	20
The winner of this debate was							
<input checked="" type="radio"/> <b>Affirmative</b> <input type="radio"/> <b>Negative</b> (Circle Winner)				 Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				<u>Carlsbad High School</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Comments

**AFF:**  
 1st: difficult to understand. Words flowed together. Gulping for air. Support and explanation of evidence from together, difficult to delineate point of your argument.  
 The Venice: pl: had an array of evidence and examples.  
 Y: arms sales: the specific response unclear. refugee crisis. Not able to answer question clearly.  
 Link cho ~: musical → war - cloudy causation - responses.


**NEG:**  
 not prepared with documents / drop box issues. be prepared.  
 1st: argument skips around from various cards.  
 suggestion: communicate w judge what the issue is when there is a problem w. laptop, retrieving evidence.  
 seems like you were reading information for the first time. Partner was feeding information.  
 X: show relation of one country to another as example of instability. arms sales.

**AFF:**  
 oil production: Venice rising prices effects.  
 rebuttals: Russia vs UK. lack of link & impact. Taiwan vs UK. falsify evidence. Saudi/UK.  
 paying attention to flaws in opponents cause  
 clarity of plan

**Reason** AFF presented a more coherent case and were Much better prepared for the debate.



VPD

Policy Debate				Raymond Hon (*5)			
Round 1				Room 116		Fri 02/07/20 03:45PM	
Speaker (circle)	<b>Affirmative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker (circle)	<b>Negative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st 2nd	Ethan Cohen	<u>1</u>	<u>28</u>	1st 2nd	Ishani Sahoo	<u>4</u>	<u>26.5</u>
1st 2nd	Alexander Nistor 34 Phoenix Country Day School	<u>2</u>	<u>27</u>	1st 2nd	Siddhant Urunkar 38 BASIS Peoria	<u>3</u>	<u>27</u>
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Hamilton School / Affiliation / Occupation			
<input checked="" type="radio"/> <b>Affirmative</b> <input type="radio"/> <b>Negative</b> (Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- couldn't follow 2.7+, dropped it
- Framework: bought the education, bought NO+resister (if you adopt framework, no +resister) not entirely sure  
 I want to buy Framework only because they = "we don't have the skills" I'm going to think about also assuming no K and come back to K if deadlock or neg win.
- main issues are terror vs Human rights, I bought ~~WOT~~ WOT is human rights abuse dressed up as a legitimate cause.
- Fill in Aff doesn't provide a concrete answer as to either why Fill in = not us bad, (didn't buy morally) or Fill in wasn't happen (would have covered us) they wasn't buy covering either.
- I'll buy the K. Blockade is a valid possibility

