


VPD

FLIP: 38 Kandala - Singh v. 22 Grosely - Hunter

Policy Debate		Charley Hoang (*42)			
Round 3		Room 114		Fri 02/07/20 07:45PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points	Speaker	Negative
1st	<u>Kaushik Kandala</u>	⁽¹⁻⁴⁾ 2	⁽²⁰⁻³⁰⁾ 27.5	1st	<u>Ava Rose Grosely</u>
2nd	<u>Sansita Singh</u>	1	28	2nd	<u>Lauren Hunter</u>
The winner of this debate was					
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative (Circle Winner)			 Judge's Signature		
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			<u>Desert Vista High School</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		


Comments & Reason for Decision:

DA had no UQ in INC

Aff has risk of solving nuke war
by reducing arms to Ukraine

VPD

FLIP: 22 Allen - Lynaugh v. 13 Busby - Barton

Policy Debate				Chetan Urunkar (*38)			
Round 3				Room 117		Fri 02/07/20 07:45PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	CONNOR L.	1	28	1st	BARTON	2	27.5
2nd	KATHERINE A	3	27	2nd	BUSBY	4	26.5
The winner of this debate was <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>				 Judge's Signature BRUCE REORIA School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Its evident that both teams put in a lot of effort & had a long day debating. Well done ! I wish both teams the very best.


While I thought the neg was creative it did lack the depth. For me the aff team was very well prepared & did a wonderful job with there arguments.

1000
1000

1000
1000

VPD

FLIP: 38 Sathe - Sathish v. 42 Ahd - Roman

Policy Debate				Zach Bassoon (*5)			
Round 3				Room 113		Fri 02/07/20 07:45PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Ahd	1	29	1st	Sathe	4	28
2nd	Roman	2	28	2nd	Sathish	3	28
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Hamilton/McCintock School / Affiliation / Occupation			
(Circle Winner) Affirmative Negative Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- IAC - Tabar/Desai Citation incomplete... Also Amnesty...
- INC - * on Terror + Econ impacts (miscalc is all good)
 need terminal spill over claims - i.e. -
 "U.S. collapse → global downturn" or "Terror → miscalc"
 or "This turns psychological violence..."
- * T - Discourse helps w/ atps like this...
- ZAC - ~~1~~ ① Case line by line
 ② Case outweighs analysis on top of DA page
- ZNC - Democracy argument is ① New, ② Wholly defensive
- INR - Cleaner block split = less repetition
- IAR - Gotta extend this dropped ① turn. These ethics args also key to get ahead..
- ZNR - * Many deaths ≠ "genocide"
 * Choose one disad, your *ZNR "world"

RFD


Left to weigh Psychological Violence
to the terrorism impact (only full scenario
extended, as economy arg is incomplete)...

① independently, framework makes the way
I weigh this difficult for NEG - I am
left without a response that this is another
large conflict to dissuade from genocide...

② I do not buy the "turns genocide"
argument - first, it's new per ZNR,
Second, does not correctly identify ~~the~~
what facet of ~~the~~ "genocide" occurs.

VPD

FLIP: 38 Kim - Yousuf v. 5 Shah - Zhao

Policy Debate				Michael Caplan (*34)			
Round 3				Room 115		Fri 02/07/20 07:45PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points	Speaker	Negative	Rank	Points
1st	Faizan Yousuf	(1-4) 3	(20-30) 28	1st	Afreen Shah	(1-4) 1	(20-30) 30
2nd	James Kim	4	27	2nd	Xenia Zhao	2	30
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature RCD5 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:

Aff leaves themselves in a deep hole by only making 2 or 3 responses to each off-case position in the 2AC. Neg does a good job making multiple responses to each of these in the negative block (I would recommend doing even more in the future - ~5 responses to each and every point the aff makes).

Neg makes good case responses on the first contention. Could have used some more time in 2NC to do more on the Venezuela contention.

Just doing (T) in 2NR was a fine choice. Personally I wouldn't have put all of my eggs in one basket so I would have kept a DA and on-case args going (I think you were convincing enough if those). You had about 1:30 left in your 2NR to do that with. But only going for (T) definitely makes the judge treat it as an a priori issue, so I see your strategy too.

RFD: (T)

there was only 1 2AC response "we meet" that didn't say much. all other arguments were new in 2AC - I hope to see till me to ignore them.

VPD

FLIP: 42 Hsu - Wang v. 5 Chen - Virk

Policy Debate				Rajesh Kumar Singh (*38)			
Round 3				Room 112		Fri 02/07/20 07:45PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Virk	2	25	1st	Hsu	3	24
2nd	Chen	4	21	2nd	Wang	1	26
The winner of this debate was				Rajesh Singh Judge's Signature BASIS Peoria 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

Chen make sure more confident during cross exam. work on hand movement purposefully. Virk had good eye contact. well organized and confident. work on Team work.

Negative


Hsu - make sure speaking clearly and effectively. Wang was more confident and well organized.

Both Team make sure have good eye contact with judge and opposite team. Both team were very respectful.

I felt the Negative team persuaded better. very clear and articulate. Nice job summarizing your evidence. The argument was effective and other team didn't refute it well.

VPD

FLIP: 5 Chinnasamy - Garg v. 38 Sahoo - Urunkar

Policy Debate				Christine Gallup (*22)			
Round 3				Room 116		Fri 02/07/20 07:45PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank	Points	Speaker	Negative	Rank	Points
1st	Skishiti Garg	(14) 2	(20-30) 27	(1st) Ishani Sahoo	(14) 4	(20-30) 25	
2nd	Viveka Chinnasamy	3	26	(2nd) Siddhant Vr	1	28	
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Carlspad high school School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Circle Winner)							
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff: demonstrated solid knowledge of case and ability to defend your positions. Also, the commitment to your aff stance was evidence. Your case was well-researched to speak to fact to understand.

Neg: first speaker: well-done. your arguments including the economics well-presented.


2nd speaker: you demonstrate an excellent understanding of AFF case. you know the casual linkage and big-picture comprehension know what "DPEC" is!!

Reason Both sides did an excellent job - both were well-researched, both showed a commitment to their position & an awareness of opponent's argument.

It was a tough decision but I feel like neg demonstrates more causality. Also it was at times hard to follow nuances of aff argument due to "spreading".

VPD

FLIP: 34 Cohen - Nistor v. 38 Chintham - Mahant

Policy Debate				Justin Fitz (*13)			
Round 3				Room 111		Fri 02/07/20 07:45PM	
Speaker	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)	Speaker	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (20-30)
1st	Alex	2	28	1st	Jai majat	3	27
2nd	Return Ethan phoenix country day	1	28	2nd	Rohan Basis Becker	4	27
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature Hamilton School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- basically goes down to do / buy 3C minute T and as a 1st the policy judges identify (do dropped?)

W/C Nietzsche (I didn't understand and neither did Neg over head in cross that they were trying to go for social Darwinism / mathismism good which was not what he read. (for future off the description interpretation of suffering misreads what neg is trying to say) but could have been intentional (DRC)

- I like aff's K... mode U"

of course I don't even have to mention Neg's k wasn't coherent

for neg / enjoyed #TDH but most of my policy friends hate this stuff (the jokes) so beware.

