


VPD


Policy Debate		<del>Justin Fitz (#13)</del> CHETAN URUNKAR					
Round 2		Room 112		Fri 02/07/20 05:45PM			
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st 2nd	Anna Feifei Jiang	2	26	1st 2nd	Ava Rose Grosely	1	28
1st 2nd	Francesca Veronica Martin 5 Hamilton High School	4	21	1st 2nd	Lauren Hunter 22 Carlsbad High School	3	25
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature ADIS Pcorin School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative		Negative					
(Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

There is no doubt that there has been considerable effort put in by both teams. Well done! I also would like to wish both the teams the very best in future. I voted in favor of Neg since some of the arguments put forth were much more succinct & also backed by quantitative analysis. Another point that played a role in deciding is the fact that with the backing of China or some other super power will step in & seems like the Aff team lacked a counter to this narrative.

7

# VPD

Policy Debate		Raymond Hon (*5)			
Round 2		Room 115		Fri 02/07/20 05:45PM	
Speaker (circle) 1st 2nd Aditi Sathe	<b>Affirmative</b>	Rank (1-4) <u>4</u>	Points (20-30) <u>27</u>	Speaker (circle) 1st 2nd Catherine Allen	<b>Negative</b>
1st 2nd Tanvi Sathish 38 BASIS Peoria		<u>3</u>	<u>27.5</u>	1st 2nd Connor Lynaugh 22 Carlsbad High School	
The winner of this debate was					
<b>Affirmative</b> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <b>Negative</b> <input type="radio"/>					
(Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? _____		 Judge's Signature School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

2 days in contention = 1. venezuela reasoning for RU  
 2. will canada & PCR fill in?


venezuela - ~~off~~ makes analysis that venezuela action  
 or part of RU is due to insecurity; however, admit  
 in IAC that they have economic ties to venezuela  
 still. No specific evidence that venezuela is  
 not "just" expansionism.

for filling china is poised to fill in & canada is  
 all ready contributing, although the analysis is good  
 it wasn't strong enough to convince me that fill in  
 was definitely not going to happen

main voters hesitations - I thought Negs small arms =  
 no massive escalation, I thought other arms suppliers  
 or else C could have liked more historical precedent (one)  
 biggest vote was I thought that ukraine was  
 a bargaining chip for negotiations \$ (this should  
 have been emphasized more communication decrease  
 like blood of nuclear escalation)



VPD

Policy Debate				Deepak Sahoo (*38)			
Round 2				Room 113		Fri 02/07/20 05:45PM	
Speaker (circle)	<b>Affirmative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker (circle)	<b>Negative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st/2nd	Tyler Matome Busby	2	28	1st/2nd	Viveka Chinnasamy	3	28
1st/2nd	Jedidiah Jeffrey Barton 13 Desert Ridge High School	4	26	1st/2nd	Srishti Garg 5 Hamilton High School	1	28
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature <u>Boris Perera (Parent)</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/>		(Circle Winner)					
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative

- Tyler: - very articulate & creative.
- Jed: - outside of the box thinking. but lack of materials.
- Need to focus on the topic.
- More close teamwork required to present & challenge the opponent.


Negative

- (Srishti & Viveka)
- very well prepared
- Put structured argument
- Challenged the other team with valid argument.
- Good Team Balance.
- Team Co-ordination.

Both team better but deviated from the topic.



# VPD

Policy Debate				Michael Caplan (*34)			
Round 2				Room 116		Fri 02/07/20 05:45PM	
Speaker (circle)	<b>Affirmative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker (circle)	<b>Negative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st/2nd	Ishani Sahoo	4	26	1st/2nd	Andrew Zhuojie Chen	2	26
1st/2nd	Siddhant Urunkar 38 BASIS Peoria	1	28	1st/2nd	Abdullah Virk 5 Hamilton High School	3	26
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature  PCDJ School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative		Negative					
(Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>yes</u>							


Comments & Reason for Decision:

- IAC: make sure to enunciate when you read cards/evidence
- IAC: sign post when you (a) switch to a new off-case (OA, CP, etc.) and (b) say "next" or something when you make a new/distinct argument.
- IAR: you spend half (2:24) of the IAR on  $\text{\textcircled{T}}$  when I think you could have beaten this argument in about 0:30 to 0:45 tops. your coverage on the other positions was so much less because of this.
- neg: you don't seem to completely understand competitiveness on the counterplan, and the Iraq relations DA seems to link to the Executive Powers CP. Think through these aspects of your positions more carefully before choosing your ~~the~~ INC positions.
- Also completely dropping IAC framework was a tactical/strategic error.
- Also, you're trying to argue effects topicality is bad.
- look for some camp briefs on this and argue that in the INC.
- RFD: DA links and impacts are dropped in IAR so I vote for the status quo or the Aid CP without the perm due to the D.A.





# VPD

Policy Debate				Zach Bassoon (*5)			
Round 2				Room 114		Fri 02/07/20 05:45PM	
Speaker (circle)	<b>Affirmative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker (circle)	<b>Negative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st 2nd	Mohammad Ali Nik Ahd	<u>2</u>	<u>28.5</u>	1st 2nd	Kaushik Kandala	<u>4</u>	<u>28</u>
1st 2nd	Viviana Roman 42 Desert Vista High School	<u>1</u>	<u>29</u>	1st 2nd	Sansita Singh 38 BASIS Peoria	<u>3</u>	<u>28</u>
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Hamilton/McClintock School / Affiliation / Occupation			
(Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

IAC: Practice.

CX - explain your criticism of UTIL, in terms of Iran profit rhetoric - good, grounded ex. Also don't stop short of calling it colonialism, it is physical colonialism!

INC = \* Need terminal impacts on Relations (econ + terrorism)

\* Unsure of impact on liturgy argument, and the 2nd card seems to flow off...

ZAC = Gotta hit this Circumvention arg on the line-by-line.

ZNC CX well points to need for clear impact to Cognitive Denial impact - b/c ~~per~~ per INC it's defensive - i.e. - "status quo good." - to be a more convincing K argument - needs an ALT - Last ZNC arg touches on this ground a bit.

ZNC - Generally, No new off-case after INC  
but if so - right @ top, otherwise  
invites theory argument --

IAR - Probably crucial here to extend some  
⑤ stuff re: "circumnavigating fantasy"  
to push back on K

## FLOW YOUR OPPONENT

That performance ① can appear earlier,  
after CX of INC ---

RFD

I weigh "psychological violence" over  
terror or econ (not impacted w/ warrants  
also de-justified by UTIL BAD arguments)

K far too defensive, no impact to  
~~hang~~ hang my hat on --- Badillo gives  
me pause, yet I am unclear to  
the scenario of turning the aff --  
i.e. why that results in more violence

# VPD

Policy Debate				Rajesh Kumar Singh (*38)			
Round 2				Room 111		Fri 02/07/20 05:45PM	
Speaker (circle)	<b>Affirmative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker (circle)	<b>Negative</b>	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st (2nd)	Afreen Shah	1	27	1st (2nd)	Ethan Cohen	4	22
1st (2nd)	Xenia Zhao 5 Hamilton High School	2	24	1st (2nd)	Alexander Nistor 34 Phoenix Country Day School	3	24
The winner of this debate was				<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Rajesh Singh</u> Judge's Signature</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Basis Peoria</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation</p>			
<p style="text-align: center;"> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <b>Affirmative</b>    <input type="radio"/> <b>Negative</b>                  (Circle Winner)             </p> <p>Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u></p>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative

Xenia and Afreen had good eye contact during debate.

Afreen is well organized and confident during cross-ex.

Both teams were very respectful.

Affirmative team well organized, confident during cross-ex. I felt the Affirmative persuaded better. The arguments were effective and negative team didn't refute it well. Affirmative team was more balanced.

Negative

Alex didn't have eye contact with Judge and Affirmative team members.

Alex please work on your AL, umm, double clutter.

Ethan had good eye contact. Work on double clutter, don't repeat words couple of times. Please work on double clutter.

