<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Affirmative Rank</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative Rank</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Hsu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Zhuoijie Chen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Wang</td>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abdullah Virk</td>
<td>5 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Like was a cuttrass aff. Aff. link to the resolution as that resolutions on arms are hot is based on decisions of whether countries in Asia are deserving of arms, the framing of arms sales policy leads to either assimilation as a model minority or treatment as foreign. Alt. is Asian fiction, Neg. van T/H framework, long cards, could have been shown by better cutting or could have added more arguments. Neg. also ran a line to a Neo-Liberalism but didn't get to the k... just a long line card. Neg. also had a hard time explaining the framework argument in citer. 2rd

sort of added more on framework, but not line by line. Then, Neg. was only more cards, no line by line + no explanation of what issue the new evidence related to is no signpost for where to flow the new evidence. After line, it was 12 doing like Aff. would need to make his mistakes to lose.

InR covered the case arguments, the Taiwan TVA framework, extending the Neg. to debate counter in order and also extends the innate desires to Neg. framework. Neg. did a good job explaining neg. argument, but again without line by line (no example, no answer to the response to Taiwan TVA threat a Taiwan case perpetuates stereotypes that justify anti-Chinese attitudes). RFD: All advocacy is to relieve teams of the obligation to defend the resolution because arms sales policy often involves perpetuation of stereotypes about people from Asia, Aff. all was to mislead us debate as a space for Asian American liberation to disrupt the dominant stereotypes about people in the U.S. who are from Asian heritage. Aff. says you're ballot is who best disrupts orientalism. Neg. didn't respond to alt. devices on neg. framework and aff. also says it meets Neg's own a fore bullet. Neg. also dropped affinity move that the resolution
Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020

Policy Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>Justin Fitz (*'18)</th>
<th>Sat 02/08/20 06:30PM</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>(1-4)</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Jeffrey Hsu</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Shirley Wang</td>
<td>42 Desert Vista High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Aff**

- Slow down CAP or
- Signpost care answers rather than proving different cases
- Order CAP on T by argument. Organization is jumpy and extensions are shallow
- Extend the disads, don’t just say the word
- Start with Cs and Ds, then deliver

**Neg**

- T is way too long, strange standards
- Dnc needs to answer due-bi-lie on homework - A715, CI, uniqueness questions
- Better answer to invisibilization pre-req any, take-out redundant policy-making good ago in care
- Capitalize on CAP homogeneity in 204
- Extend interp and deck to prove start point
- Discuss how the scores are rather than correcting, also 550

RFQ:

I vote affirmative to create a space for asian-americans to access the political. The case says about proto-institutionalism etc. are located behind the exclusion rhetoric or orientalism. Procedural fairness not impacted as an independent voter.
### VPD

**Policy Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>010</th>
<th>Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Jeffrey Hsu</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shirley Wang</td>
<td>42 Desert Vista High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

&copy; -

- 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 **wry TUA** was bad.

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

- ROB work was messy in the 2A being non-topical is not why you fit into the TUA it's because of the fiction

The **Taiwan arg** should have been earlier

---

FO: The neg was non-responsive to most of the aff's case. Felt like the aff did enough on T.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Rank (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Rank (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Lyaghla</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Zhao</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Shah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**
(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 limited Terrorism in the area.

2. The assertion of increased price for Russian arms was not validated given sufficient proof.

3. Reason for decision flaw of impact, and stability in Qatar by US forces at airbase.
VPD
FLIP: 22 Allen - Lynaugh v. 5 Shah - Zhao

Semi-Finals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Lynaugh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Zhao</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shah</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- congrats to both teams on semifinals
- IC - strat needs work - it probably avoids Saudi & Russia, but it doesn't avoid the policy CP. Also think about language critique - not spec to off & your lining re: al qaeda is as your characterization of Saudi Arabia. Develop an internally consistent strat.

- WA - C time allocation; too much time on Russia
  - it's not competitive
  - Answer the policy militarization CP
  - Coverage + offense = good
  - offense on CP says Saudi Arabia

- I think you're conflating mili presence & arms sales
  - but the same thing. Also, work on framing of 1033 CP -
  - it's not 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?

- one trick the Anderson card was needed. You only have #1 1/2 on the Russia CP - by my count 2AC has 0

- the framing of 1033 CP - US or terrorists have arms
  - usage is better. Nice term but now in #1A. Also, looks like Saudi Arabia CP.
NR probably goes for too much. Weigh imp of Saudi assurance UA. Need a clearer story of cp/DA.

SAE - lots of new args - probably need to be in the IA.

Also, they capture lots of your SAE framing (conditions, econ, morality) w/ cp. You need to be clearer about roadmaps & signposting.

PPL:

- cp 5 the Aff & avoids the Saudi assurances DA. I vote neg.
### VPD

**FLIP: 22 Allen - Lynbaugh v. 5 Shah - Zhao**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Lynbaugh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Zhao</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Shah</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Affirmative (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? __________

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

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

---

**Lynbaugh**

when numbering points, you want to keep.

Numbering b2b, else harder to follow even w/ flow, say first/second: vs 1, 2
Watch pre-game stumbling, our words. Points all scored.

Aff 4 Resp

Nice B Cx2, strong.

Good Cx3 to help partner defend.

Rebuttal is clear, strong, strong to point.

Very sad close.

---

**Allen**

Nice Resp (Cx1)

Watch "hmm"

Good Aff 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 contain.

Good close; rebuttal clarification.

Very strong way to attack Neg.

---

**Zhao**

said Cx1 - lets push more.

Watch stumbling of words.

Keep talking back; points mostly stated.

Watch "hmm" good Resp on Aff points.

Nice Resp Cx2 - very good rebuttal

Strong rebuttal.

Watch "I don't know" when making point.

Good close; Shah interpret.

---

**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 "hmm".

Good cross of Aff points

Watch point count. A, 2, stay A, B or 1, 2.

Careful w/ flow or change/transition by accident.

Good job strengthening Arg.

Cx4; nice defense.

Nice strong points in rebuttal.

Need to explain poor points.