






# VPD

|   |   |                                       |                   |  |   |                      |                   |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--|---|----------------------|-------------------|
| Policy Debate                                       |   |                                       |                   | Justin Fitz (*13)  |   |                      |                   |
| Semi-Finals   |   |                                       |                   | 010  |   | Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM |                   |
| Speaker<br>(circle)                                 | <b>Affirmative</b>                          | Rank<br>(1-4)                         | Points<br>(20-30) | Speaker<br>(circle)  | <b>Negative</b>                         | Rank<br>(1-4)        | Points<br>(20-30) |
| 1st 2nd   | Jeffrey Hsu                                 | ---                                   | ---               | 1st 2nd  | Andrew Zhuojie Chen                     | ---                  | ---               |
| 1st 2nd   | Shirley Wang<br>42 Desert Vista High School | ---                                   | ---               | 1st 2nd  | Abdullah Virk<br>5 Hamilton High School | ---                  | ---               |
| The winner of this debate was                       |   |                                       |                   | <br>Judge's Signature<br>MVHS<br>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:

Aff -


- Slow down IAR on T by argument. Organization is jumping and extensions are shallow
- Extend the disads, don't just say the word.
- Start w/ CI and DA's, then delve

neg -

- OT is way too long, stretch standards
- DA's need to answer line-by-line on framework - DA's, CI, uniqueness questions
- Better answer to invisibilization pre-req arg, take out redundant policy-making good arg. on care
- Capitalize on IAR homogeneity in 2nd
- Extend interp and dis. to prove status point.
- Discuss how TWA silver act rather than writing, also 550

FFD:

I vote affirmative to create a space for asian-americans to access the political. The care arg about proto-institutionalism etc. are locked behind the exclusive rhetoric of orientalism. Procedural fairness not impacted as an independent voter.



# VPD

|                                    |   |                     |   |                                  |   |
|------------------------------------|---|---------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|
| Policy Debate                      |   | Jason Sturgis (*38) |   |                                  |   |
| Semi-Finals                        |   | 010                 |   | Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM <i>ASAP</i> |   |
| Speaker (circle)                   | <b>Affirmative</b>                          | Rank (1-4)          | Points (20-30)  | Speaker (circle)                 | <b>Negative</b>                         |
| 1st <u>2nd</u>                     | Jeffrey Hsu                                 | _____               | _____   | 1st <u>2nd</u>                   | Andrew Zhuojie Chen                     |
| <u>1st</u> 2nd                     | Shirley Wang<br>42 Desert Vista High School | _____               | _____   | <u>1st</u> 2nd                   | Abdullah Virk<br>5 Hamilton High School |
| The winner of this debate was      |   |                     |   |                                  |   |
| <u>Affirmative</u> Negative        |   |                     |   |                                  |   |
| (Circle Winner)                    |   |                     |   |                                  |   |
| Is this a low point win? <u>No</u> |   |                     |   |                                  |   |
|                                    |   |                     | <i>Jessica Carter</i><br>Judge's Signature                |                                  |   |
|                                    |   |                     | <u>Mountain View</u><br>School / Affiliation / Occupation |                                  |   |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

- The 1AR was messy in a couple areas just because they drop something it doesn't just nebulously flow through, should have focused more on why TVA was bad

- The "they don't even notice their oppression arg was a great one"

- ROB work was messy in the 2A being nontopical is not why you fit into the TVA its because of the fiction

The taiwan arg should have been earlier


Neg

- When the aff is about Koreans taiwan is not a good TVA.

- On fwk it doesn't matter if movements exist if storytelling is a prereq


- The neg is largely unresponsive to most parts of the aff beyond ~~the~~ claims that storytelling does nothing

FD: The neg was nonresponsive to most of the aff's case. = felt like the aff did enough on T.



AF VPD

FLIP: 22 Allen - Lynaugh v. 5 Shah - Zhao

|   |                    |                                       |                   |  |                 |               |                   |
|---|--------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Policy Debate                                       |                    | Charlie Mack (*4)                     |                   | ASAB   |                 |               |                   |
| Semi-Finals   |                    | 011                                   |                   | Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM   |                 |               |                   |
| Speaker   | <b>Affirmative</b> | Rank<br>(1-4)                         | Points<br>(20-30) | Speaker  | <b>Negative</b> | Rank<br>(1-4) | Points<br>(20-30) |
| 1st   | Lynaugh            | 2                                     | 24                | 1st  | Zhao            | 4             | 25                |
| 2nd   | Allen              | 3                                     | 27                | 2nd  | Shah            | 1             | 25                |
| The winner of this debate was                       |                    |                                       |                   | <br>Judge's Signature<br>*GCA / Parent / Engineer<br>School / Affiliation / Occupation |                 |               |                   |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> <b>Affirmative</b> |                    | <input type="radio"/> <b>Negative</b> |                   |  |                 |               |                   |
| (Circle Winner)                                     |                    |                                       |                   |  |                 |               |                   |
| Is this a low point win? _____                      |                    |                                       |                   |  |                 |               |                   |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1. Did not see full flow from Neg for African stability. As this region is unstable, the US presence has not really curbed tension in the area.
2. The assertion of increased prices for Russian arms was not validated a given sufficient proof.
3. Reason for decision: flaw of Impact, and stability in OATAR by US forces at airbase.





VPD

FLIP: 22 Allen - Lynaugh v. 5 Shah - Zhao

|  |             |            |                |  |          |                      |                |
|--|-------------|------------|----------------|--|----------|----------------------|----------------|
| Policy Debate  |             |            |                | Charley Hoang (*42)  |          |                      |                |
| Semi-Finals  |             |            |                | 011  |          | Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM |                |
| Speaker  | Affirmative | Rank (1-4) | Points (20-30) | Speaker  | Negative | Rank (1-4)           | Points (20-30) |
| 1st  | Lynaugh     |            |                | 1st  | Zhao     |                      |                |
| 2nd  | Allen       |            |                | 2nd  | Shah     |                      |                |
| The winner of this debate was  |             |            |                | Russell nsj<br>Judge's Signature<br>Brophy College Prep<br>School / Affiliation / Occupation |          |                      |                |
| Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/><br>(Circle Winner) |             |            |                |  |          |                      |                |
| Is this a low point win? _____   |             |            |                |  |          |                      |                |

3:30  
2:45

5:55  
5:15

Comments & Reason for Decision: Congrats to both teams on semifinals  
 INC - strat needs work - cp probably avoids Saudi & Russia, but it doesn't avoid the police DA. Also think ~~the~~ you to the Abdi language critique - not spec to aff & your lang re. al Qaeda is as your characterization of Saudi Arabia. Develop an internally consistent strat.

2AC - (1) time allocation; too much time on Russia (2) perm the cp - it's not competitive (3) Answer the police militarization DA. coverage + offense = good 2AC. (4) offense on cp/saudi Arabia DA.

2NC - I think you're conflating ~~the~~ mili presence & arms sales - not the same thing. Also, work on framing of 1033 DA - the (1) isn't that the \$ would be used to fund US mili but, rather, there's a surplus of mili equip - in a world it isn't sold to Qatar, then it's sold to local police forces which → militarization. Make sense?

1NR - nice. the Anderson card was needed. you only Ans #1/2 on the Russia DA - by my count 2AC has 9 args

1NR like the framing on 1033 DA - US or terrorists have arms & using is better. nice perm but new in 1AR. Also, Ans the Saudi Arabia DA

ENR probably goes for too much. weigh impct of sandi assurance DA. Need a clearer story of CP / ~~DA~~ DA.


ZAP - lots of new args - probably need to be in the IAR.  
Also, they capture lots of your ZAP framing (conditions, econ, morality) w/ CP. you need to be clearer about roadmaps & signposting

**PTD:** \_\_\_\_\_

CP (S) the Aff & avoids the sandi assurances DA. I vote neg.

VPD

FLIP: 22 Allen - Lynaugh v. 5 Shah - Zhao

| Policy Debate                  |             |                 |                | Stephen Miller (*32) |   |                      |                | <i>ASAP</i> |  |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|---|----------------------|----------------|-------------|--|
| Semi-Finals                    |             |                 |                | 011                  |   | Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM |                |             |  |
| Speaker                        | Affirmative | Rank (1-4)      | Points (20-30) | Speaker              | Negative  | Rank (1-4)           | Points (20-30) |             |  |
| 1st                            | Lynaugh     | 2               | 29             | 1st                  | Zhao  | 4                    | 27             |             |  |
| 2nd                            | Allen       | 1               | 30             | 2nd                  | Shah.   | 3                    | 28             |             |  |
| The winner of this debate was  |             |                 |                |                      | <br>Judge's Signature<br><br>GCA<br>School / Affiliation / Occupation |                      |                |             |  |
| <b>Affirmative</b>             |             | <b>Negative</b> |                |                      |   |                      |                |             |  |
| (Circle Winner)                |             |                 |                |                      |   |                      |                |             |  |
| Is this a low point win? _____ |             |                 |                |                      |   |                      |                |             |  |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very solid debate. All made strong points and arguments. The decision is based on rebuttal and taking each point that were countered. The Neg has strong points, but AFF's arg and rebuttal were stronger. The AFF's points were stronger and Neg did not counter ~~the~~ all the points. Some points were negated, but overall by count AFF has more stronger points.

Lynaugh

When numbering points, you want to keep numbering. b2b, else harder to follow even w/ flow say first, second, vs 1, 2  
 watch pace some stumbling over words  
 points all stated.  
 Good CX resp.  
 Nice Q CX2, strong.  
 Good CX3 to help partner defend.  
 Rebuttal is clear & strong. straight to point.  
 very solid close.

Zhao

solid cx1 - lets push more.  
 watch stumbling of words.  
 keep looking back; points mostly stated.  
 watch "uhm"; good ARG on AFF points.  
 Nice resp CX2 - very good. restate!  
 strong rebuttal.  
 watch "I don't know" when making point.  
 good close, Shah interrupted.

Allen

Nice resp CX1  
 watch "uhm"  
 Good ARG on Neg. points, strong points  
 solid AFF points, strong.  
 Nice control of CX3, very good defense. need stay strong.  
 CX4 - solid. push and force of. Neg pts. solid control  
 good close. Rebuttal clarification.  
 very strong. way to attack Neg.

Shah

good cx1  
 good resp CX2 - very good.  
 good CX3 - solid push to force answers.  
 Nice way to force flow  
 watch stumbling of words; watch "uhm"  
 good. cross of the AFF points  
 watch point count. A, 2. stay A, B ver 1, 2.  
 careful w/ flow or change/transition by accid.  
 good job strengthening arg.  
 CX4 - Nice defense.  
 strong points in rebuttal  
 need to explain some points

ZAR.  
|||

ZNR  
+ 6 0 3 4 1

IAR  
|||

INR  
|||

ZNC  
|||

ZAC  
|||

INC.  
|||

IAC  
+ -  
Plan  
S  
Adv  
2  
3