<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>(circle)</td>
<td>(1-4) (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>(circle)</td>
<td>(1-4) (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>Rohan Chintham</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>Tyler Matome Busby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>Jai Mahant</td>
<td>38 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>Jedidiah Jeffrey Barton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Ty**1er: squeeze ball or something to keep your hands still*

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

*Aff: Extinction scenario. Do your case is the most important thing you've got. But you spend 0.15 of EIN telling me it outweighs.*

*Neg: you need to get some on-case responses out in INC or 2NC*
### Policy Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viveka Chinnasamy</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srishti Garg</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aditi Sathe</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanvi Sathish</td>
<td>2N</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Case Outweighs on Time Frame**

**Human Rights advantage vs Houthis Victory**

RFD spoken
VPD
Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020

Policy Debate
Abby Karlin ('7)

Round 1
Room 112
Fri 02/07/20 03:45PM

Speaker (circle)  
Affirmative  
Rank  
Points

Kaushik Kandala  
1st 2nd
38 BASIS Peoria

Speaker (circle)  
Negative  
Rank  
Points

Afreen Shah  
1st 2nd
Xenia Zhao  
5 Hamilton High School

The winner of this debate was  
Affirmative (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  NO

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1st - manual gestures are distracting
2nd - I'm not sure how you access the Vis to your Adv - seems to assume lifting sanctions, debt restructuring as an Venezuela crisis - that's your own O'Neill to
3rd - you're asking the right questions, neg
1st - don't ex the IA prep, better signposting pls.
2nd - need more offense on the DTS & cp
2nd - line by line on case - don't get sucked into the suck.
more impact analysis on the DTS - why do you o/w?
1st - your US leadership & NATO seems like a weak arg...I really think it's a bad time to be running NATO
1st - the name of the game is coverage. This is a problem in the 2nd as well. You need to answer (1), the cp
2nd - 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, entryway/exit - then, proceduralism
3rd - smart analysis - but coverage: you have never answered

(3) is conceded; invoke neg.
**Policy Debate**

**Speaker**
- Affirmative: Ava Rose Grosley, 22 Carlsbad High School
- Negative: Jeffrey Hsu, 42 Desert Vista High School

**Points**
- Affirmative: 37.2
- Negative: 28.0

**Round 1**

**Room 117**

**Fri 02/07/20 03:45PM**

**The winner of this debate was**

**Affirmative**

**Negative**

(Circle Winner)

**Is this a low point win?**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

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

1NC - Flash CP text, for judges' sake ...

2AC - K Page: (1) Case outweighs [Draw key for answering]

(2) Framework - USFG good

(3) "Link of omission" (plus debate good) K

RFD = a priori violation dropped

*Write a Pearson block

* Begin w/ case overview! (Put Hudson in 2AR)

"We are more accepting now" is the 2.

Key to defend those reforms - Hudson on right track here

Take all prep P12, from 2AR - hustle.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 113</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 03:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Points (1-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Andrew Zhuojie Chen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Abdullah Virk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Mohammad Ali Nik Ahd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Viviana Roman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The quiet 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 the Affirmative since I felt they had compelling arguments on multiple fronts like apparel & dem cog.
**GALLUP, CHRISTINE**

**VPD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Christine Gallup ('22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Room 115</strong></td>
<td>Fri 02/07/20 03:45PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st (c) James Kim</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Faizan Yousuf 36 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Aff**: difficult to understand. words flowed together. glibly for air. support and explanation of evidence firm together. difficult to articulate point of view. argument.

**Neg**: bad built on empty evidence and example.

Aff: arm sales: did specific response increase
reduced crime. able to answer question clearly.

Neg: unclear cause and effect responses.

Aff: not prepared with documents. be prepared.

Neg: argument reads from paper. from various cards.

Aff: could not agree with judge what the issue is when there is a technical issue.

Neg: like yourself: reading information for the first time. partner was feeding information.

Aff: line of one country to another example of instability.

Neg: 

Aff: production: high rise of price effects.

Neg: retaliation: Russia, UK. lack of lead impact. ties and evidence. Saudi/UK.

Aff: paying attention plans to opponents cause clarity of plan.

Reason: Aff presented a more coherent case and were much better prepared for the debate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Policy Debate</th>
<th>Raymond Hon (*5)</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 03:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Rank (1-4)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(circle)</td>
<td>1st 2nd Ethan Cohen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd Alexander Nistor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1st 2nd Siddhant Urunkar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Phoenix Country Day School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38 BASIS Peoria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- I couldn't follow 2.74, dropped it
- Framework: bought the education, bought No-tresuerer (Neg) adopt framework, no time show not entirely sure I want to buy framework because Neg = "we don't have the skills," I'm going to think about this, needing no key and come back to be of deadlock on rejoin.
- Main issues were [error vs human rights]
- I bought whatever WOT is human rights above dressed up as a legitimate cause.
- Fill in. Aff doesn't provide a concrete answer as to either why Fill in = not as bad. Didn't buy Neg. Neg wasn't big enough either.
- I'll buy the K. Blockade is a valid possibility.