<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Rank (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Rank (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Singh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Virk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sahoo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Chen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is this a low point win? __________

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: Risk of Russia turn means no solvency; Houth is worse than Saudis.
# NCX

**Jim Fountain Classic**

**FLIP: 32 Sahoo - Singh v. 4 Chen - Virk**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Policy Debate</th>
<th>Eli Botham (*'17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 512</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sansita Singh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ishani Sahoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Abdullah Virk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Andrew Chen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **No**

| Comments & Reason for Decision: |

On Aff, as well as Neg, know your cases better. Neg asks a question in the 1st CX about intentional killings of civilians but the Aff read a card about bombings of hospitals schools etc in Yemen. Pretty sure that sounds intentional.

I need a more concrete humanitarian morality argument when weighed against the Bostan 12 card. When deciding on FW, I need to make this decision and its hard.

Both teams collapsed to this sort of humanitarian FW that is the only other FW besides Bostan 12 which was pretty much dropped. This is bc Neg ends up going for some arguments that Neg 63 undercuts humanitarianism and there is no way done w/ the Bostan card.

Note on both debate teams: some trouble summarising weakly when where to flow arguments.

To be more efficient, I think FW card have just used double comparisons on the cards.

2016 vs. 2019 on (people) I accept the condemn

Also, if you listen closely to the wording of the children (and continuous shot by snipers and of the 28 million people & the mercy of this) does not mean that Hope outweighs...
RFD: I vote neg. The aff claims we have a moral obligation to stop sales of arms, but neg wins that Hurris will win in the aff world and make this worse (and that they do it intentionally). Neg also shows that Russia will fill in, which means the aff makes things worse because their weapons are less accurate and kill more civilians. The aff doesn’t really extend any compelling reasons for why they stop war/casualties, although they show that the status quo is bad, the neg proves that they don’t do anything to help the situation.
### NCX

**Novice Policy Debate**

**Michael Caplan ('35)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Room 504</th>
<th>Sat 10/26/19 10:00AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>Rohan Chintham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>James Kim</td>
<td>32 BASIS Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>Jane Shujuan Li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>Iris Lai</td>
<td>4 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The winner of this debate was**

- **Affirmative**
- **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

**Is this a low point win?** NO

**Judge's Signature**: [Signature]

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**: NAHS

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**1st Round**

- Aff: your organization is not evident - you make your judge have to sort out the relationship between the cards you read. You should do the job of advancing the overall concepts of policy debate.

**2nd Round**

- Ne: your speech was more coherent, became more transitional, showing the relationship between ideas. Used sign posts.

**2nd A2**

- Aff: you should just read evidence - use your analysis to show what you are doing - you are finding me to figure out why you are reading the evidence. You need to address the DA's and CP before you can, which took a long time to present. You will do better when you are more organized. You have given NEG a gift by not advancing off core arguments.

**2nd NC**

- You stated that your DA was not addressed, you just need to tell me to flow it through, not read the DA again, you could just go over the impeds and weigh from Affirmative. Best analysis of the round.

**1st NR**

- Good job - you stated be ready to go instead of taking prep. Good analysis of the round's on case.

**1st AR**

- Are you going for a moral (k) now? Questions on main arguments. You may be clean in your head but you are not clear on the flow. What am I to do with moral arguments?

**2nd XR**

- Go for impacts - weigh out the impeds more - okay.

**2nd AR**

- Weigh your arguments. A head was but why is this significant? You best speech.
Both teams stopped cross-ex early. It used well, cx is a great way to get information. It's also 3 minutes of free prep time that both teams gave away some of. Use all of the cx time. It works best if only 1 person (not the next speaker) asks the questions, so the next speaker can get 2 min of free prep time.

Take all of your rebuttal time!! If nothing more in 2NR & 2AR, repeat their argument and then make the first response that pops into your head. If that fails, re-state your partner's previous arguments or even your own initial position from 1AC & 1NC.

2NR & 2AR can spend some time doing that line-by-line (see above about 1NR & 1AR) and some time weighing the round.

RFD: M. A. D. O is inconsistent w/ D. A. Impacts, so no nuke war from Cas & no nuke war from D. A. S. Case argues conventional war, but neg says that China won't do that because they know they can't win. Neg says AR will hurt the economy and AR doesn't agree that in 1AR.
### Novice Policy Debate

- **Affirmative**
  - Speaker 1st 2nd: Manasvi Vrushal Jagtap
  - Rank: 1
  - Points: 29

- **Negative**
  - Speaker 1st 2nd: Aditi Sathe
  - Rank: 9
  - Points: 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manasvi Vrushal Jagtap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aditi Sathe</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(circle winner)

**Affirmative**  **Negative**

Is this a low point win? **NO**

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **Practice your AAC/2AC/1NC/2NC All the time, you all had fluency/"um" issues. Practice will help!**

---

**RFD**

**Aff won due to impact weighing + deterrence evidence.**
CONVEY, MIKE

NCX

Novice Policy Debate
Mike Convey (*33)

Round 4
Room 520
Sat 10/26/19 10:00AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st/1st</td>
<td>Allen William Peng</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Nathan Jiabao Zhang</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>Mohammad Ali Nik Ahd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Viviana Roman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative  Negative
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Zhang: You did the best job adapting to the time reduction. Your rebuttal was effective but this speech was too late in the debate. The rebuttal should have been started in the constructive.

Peng: Your 2AC you failed to provide a roadmap & sign post appropriately. This leaves the judge lost. You also read at me, explain what these cards are & how they affect the round. The aff is given its first & the neg has mutually exclusive arguments so they can contradict.

Roman: Your INC was fine but has something to be desired. When you're on case you need to explain what the cards mean to your turn. The neg is going through your rebuttal you should reference & extend your cards through the flow. You also should have taken some prep prior to your INC.

Ahd: As for the Aff for what the neg burden is, is a great tool when used effectively. This round wasn't complex enough to ask though, your neg so your burden to negate. Your 2AC was kind of abusive by running new DRS. You also just read cards at me without showing how they apply to the round.

RED: The tie transfer was a 15 minute circus. Your 1/15 prep time reduction was gracious. You both could have solved the issue sooner by connecting to the internet. Fix this issue. Both teams simply read new cards without clear retoftation showing how cards apply to the round. This made the decision entirely based on the judge's interpretation of the flow. Great debaters guide the judge through the flow. Based on just the flow Neg won. 8 min of prep is crazy long. You all had more than enough prep regardless of the penalty. Normal rounds have limits, even w/ deduction you had 816 min.
**RFD: I vote neg. The aff doesn't explain why they solve any of their impacts in the TAR, which means that they don't really have any offense anymore. The only reason they give to vote aff is the the US needs to follow the Geneva Convention, and the reason for why this impact is important or could outweigh any of the neg impacts is never really explained. The neg also wins that Russia will fill in and that Houthis will get an advantage and use it to kill a bunch of people, which is plenty of reason for me to vote neg at that point.**
CONVEY, MIKE

NCX

Novice Policy Debate

Mike Convey (*33)

Round 3

Room 520

Sat 10/26/19 08:00AM

Speaker (circle)  Affirmative  Rank  Points
2nd  Kaushik Kandala  2  27

Speaker (circle)  Negative  Rank  Points
2nd  Jane Shujuan Li  3  26

1st  Jai Mahant  32 BASIS Peoria

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative  Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  NO

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Kandala: First speakers usually get over looked because they are just doing the case. It was a pleasant surprise that you were able to read at some speed and confidence, and emphasis when it mattered. Your LR is too late to do all of this. You have some damage control. The neg arguments are mutually exclusive so there is no interplay so they don't contradict. The neg gets that grant + the aff gets plt. The aff however cannot contradict which you did get called on in the LR.

Mahant: For your 2AC don't read "A2," just explain where you are on the flow, just read the card, explain how it affects the round. The neg also isn't running a competing plan so you are not comparing solvency rather just proving the aff loses. Be in my last there was a CP... CPs are different than simple DAs. CB + IS you need to show no link, no solvency + play on some perms. Your priority list for offcase stuff you should address is:

Theory, Importance, K, CP, DA, then ans case. You could have been effective by cross applying DA answers to case arguments.

Lia: Your reading today was better but I would ask you to work on some emphasis on the portions of your card that matter the most. The LR was small enough that you should be able to read a card or two and then explain how they play in the round today. When answering questions learn to refer to your cards, the black + white is your friend.

Lia: When you're extending arguments you don't need to re-read the cards, simply reference them "Author, year" or they reference your story. Especially at the novice level if you can show a real understanding of the material you will win significant round today. Your organization was better today but you still jumped around on the flow, but one thing at a time, finish. Then move on.

RFD: Both of you did a good job. If they were power watching it showed in this round. The neg's non-unique argument that piece talks happening now fell short. However, so did the aff answers to the CP and the offcase DA. This is what lead to a neg ballot. AFF lacks Mahant's secion for how to answer these more effectively. NEA look at Lia's section for how to be more effective in rebuttals. I highly recommend practicing with less prep time so you can be more effective with your time. Brain is insane for the amount of prep.
Novice Policy Debate

Abby Karlin ('17)

Round 3

Speaker (circle)
1st 2nd

Affirmative
Rank Points

Speaker (circle)
1st 2nd

Negative
Rank Points

Ishani Sahoo
2 28

Manasvi Vrushal Jagtap
1 30

Sansita Singh
32 BASIS Peoria
1 28

Melissa Lin
4 Hamilton High School
1 29

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?

NO

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- I wish y'all impact weighed more
- ATTACK THE SOLUENCY/CP SOONER!! Don't just attack the DA
-Color
- I like the disad, but I think the CP needs more meat
- What does the world of the CP look like?
- Melissa: a lot of "Wh's and "Uni"

RFD

I voted for neg. CP flowed through the round and evidence of Russia stepped in outweighed
RFD: I vote neg b/c the conditions CP solves better than the aff while preserving US influence in the Middle East. The analysis on the incentive vs. directive deal was much more deep and well warranted from the neg, whereas the aff ends up just saying that forcing them is better "because they have no choice," which is kinda underdeveloped. At this point, the aff can't really access any of their impacts of saving lives because the neg does that too, but better. I also think the weighing of the DA in the dNR was sufficient to show that the WWII impact outweighed the aff, which has a less magnitude and is longer term.
Good cross ex of SAC and 1NC - used by both to understand the other team's key arguments. (all around good, see 2 ex)
Signposting in 1NC on case was excellent - keep doing that!

In single person (not team) cross-ex, that allows the best speaker 3 minutes of free prep time. That speaker should listen while prepping, but can get a lot of prep done, taking only prep time.

Try making analytical responses (without evidence) in 1NC on case, 2AC in general, and 2NC in general. You can do a lot with these types of responses. You can even have waste room time that are unvindicated (for example countermoves).

Use all of your 1INR time (see above about making analytical arguments). You left 3 line arguments unanswered on the DIA.

Even more so for 1AR. Always take all 5 min. If nothing more, read one of their statements and say whatever comes to your mind in response. Keep doing that until time runs out.

1AR: good attempt at weighing round - you tell me there is no benefit to humanitarian crisis if I vote that. You also should have then added that the DIA means that there are worse future problems due to the oil shock = global recession and unrest.

2AR: weigh the round for me. You are winning the 2nd scenario on case. Tell me about that. You're also winning the 1st debate on the DIA. Tell me about that. Explain to me that a likely draw-in of major powers on scenario 2 is really bad and the DIA is unlikely to happen.

RFD: Humanitarian crisis is bad either way. Aff beats DIA. Links case scenario 2 to regional war, maybe diverse...
NCX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Policy Debate</th>
<th>Ryan Ferdowsian (*'34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 504</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong>&lt;br&gt;1st and 2nd&lt;br&gt;Andrew Zhuojie Chen&lt;br&gt;4 Hamilton High School</td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong>&lt;br&gt;Rank (1-4)&lt;br&gt;3&lt;br&gt;Points (25-30)&lt;br&gt;28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st and 2nd&lt;br&gt;Abdullah Virk&lt;br&gt;4 Hamilton High School</td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong>&lt;br&gt;Rank (1-4)&lt;br&gt;1&lt;br&gt;Points (25-30)&lt;br&gt;29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **Yes**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**General:**
- Neg - read the DA/T in Inc, not 2nc
- split neg block more cleanly

**Aff**
- More cohesive 2ar story
- extend impact calc all the way through

**RFD:** Neg on Taiwan Link Turn;
2ar did not explain what the plan strives to prevent war
**Novice Policy Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th><strong>Affirmative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Negative</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td>Mohammad Ali Nik Ahd</td>
<td>Allen William Peng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td>Viviana Roman</td>
<td>Nathan Jiabao Zhang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34 Desert Vista High School
4 Hamilton High School

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **No**

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Good argument with respect to Iran wanting to negotiate.
- It is true that S.A. has broken international law, but, as the negative side said, they are the lesser of two evils. So your argument kind of supports their position.
- Claim is that the affirmative plan would save lives, but that has not been demonstrated. There is evidence that the Houthi's are brutal.
- Don't put your hand in front of your mouth when you repeat.
- Good argument that currently Saudi Arabia is the lesser of two evils.
- Good argument with respect to keeping Russia in check by selling weapons to S.A. with conditions.
- WW III argument is pretty speculative.
- Both Nathan and Allen spoke clearly and I could follow their points.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Policy Debate</th>
<th>Ryan Ferdowsian (*'34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Rank (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Kaushik Kandala</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Jai Mahant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Rank (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Manasvi Vrushal jagtap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Melissa Lin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative** (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ___________________________

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**General:**

**AFF:** answer the DA + CP!
   extend Mid East stability scenario

**NEG:** block split +
   extend dropped DA

**RFD:** CP solves case, and
   risk that plan empowers the Houthis, who are still
### Novice Policy Debate

#### Michael Caplan (*'35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 520</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd TJ Chang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd Zariya Shams</td>
<td>4 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **affirmative**
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

---

Very good debate! Good clash on the arguments.

Topically isn’t extended well in 2nd/1st. clipped some 2AC responses and didn’t really explain the violation.

Round comes down to conventional war scenario by aff vs recession on-case closed by neg.

M.A.D. takes out that case impact and 2AC Impact.

**Aff beats recession argument, but neg doesn’t beat aff’s conventional war arguments.**

Sputnik ’19 says china will see F16 sale as necessitating pre-emptive strike. Won’t escalate but that makes aff a good idea.
### Novice Policy Debate

| Speaker | Affirmative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(circle)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd Jane Shu Juan Li</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd Iris Lai</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Speaker | Negative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(circle)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd Ishani Sahoo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd Sansita Singh</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Li:** You need to be a bigger presence in the round. Focus on building an effective delivery. Have a plan and a roadmap prior to starting your speech. You dropped the T shell...

**Sahoo:** Your very wavy with your hands while you talk. It's fine but you should hone it to be relevant to things you want to emphasize rather than keeping rhythm.

**Lai:** Asking for open CK can show that one of you is a weak question answerer. If that's something you want you should figure it out in your opponents' preparation.

**Singh:** You're very monotone and doesn't allow for a lot of emphasis.

**RFD:** This was a big mess, you all need to work on organization. The NEAs T shell didn't get answered yet this is enough to vote neg. However the neg dropped it too so it's semi-up in the air... AFF if your 2HC was a bit more organic with a concise counter measure this round would have gone differently.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 503</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 05:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Rohan Chintham</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>James Kim</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td>4 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative  Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No  Yes

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD

PP-JW and turn case. All in no support of JK or my whr or less some withdrawal of case.

Feed back

In specific, was literally reciting several cases in their answers.