<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 140</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 05:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice L-D Debate</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Pham</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sasha Sai Guntu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45 Horizon High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative** (Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature

Catalina Foothills

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I voted negative because affirmation didn't refute their points about arsenals deterring conv. and nuclear war, and I weighed lives over environmental impacts.
Value: quality of life → Safety is primary to all.

Nuclear weapons should not exist.

C1: Consequentialism

R/W: judged by consequences

C1: Life of damage

A: HITS SOLID / HIT INDUSTRIES → No more nuclear war since

1/4 mil civs killed in sad? before WWI in WWI

B: Disability from radiation → millions more died

Nuclear war = Extinction → Getting rid of

R/W: 1/9 = nuclear war = illness of radiation, waste

Nuclear weppers harm go.

C2: Econ → getting rid of nuclear can →

Nuclear budget always up

CBV = US spends 25 billion per year

Invest in food instead = 76 bill meals

C3: Env → CBW waste for env

Reusing requires detonation → Getting rid of arsenal leaves waste

IMPACT?

Nuclear war = causes host of harm → prove war will happen

Spending too much $ on nukes, will happen

Spend on infra instead

Detonation creates radiation

C2: No CBW

PP doesn't mention waste

NPG could have talked about CBW harming environment

C4: Deterrence

MAP limits scale / scale of cap

No arsenals = no deterrence

CBW = war = no deterrence

States can have secret det.

C2: No nukes = ↑ CBW

↑ in CBW proliferation

Bio weapons can be more lethal

CBW kill 1.5 million people

No nukes = ↑ use of CBW
Null
Value: morality
Crit: v pain
C1: Uranium mining = harm →
Det step in nuke
Affects health → over time health better
Omits harm but don’t profit → dies don’t happen
Hurts indigenous ppl
C2: Pakistan: → both heads listen to tension
In dia, Pakistan Conf. →
Terrorism creates peace terms
In dia, Pakistan Conf.
No arrest = No conf.
So no mi cas in pot. conf. → loose sites
And harm to ecosystem
C3: Pure war is immoral
We reduce cas. to instrument extinction

Value: security
Crit: u.m
C1: deter nuke war
Sa: only way to get sec ex cold war
No incentive to contact
Us can retaliate against nukes

C2: Terror
Sa: doesn’t prevent terror groups
Al qaeda willing to use them
Terrorist steal weapons

C3: Phys removal doesn’t remove terror groups can make weapons

C4: n’t talk about Sb
Rem. arsensel = extinction
Flow thru Sb
9/11
No evidence terror groups steal from govt.
Rem. arsensal = $ / death
Mortality politicians W/O security

Nice use of constituents
Morality vague
ege contact

Neither of yall defined morality
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Chen</td>
<td>5 Hamilton High School</td>
<td>Zoe Rossi</td>
<td>4 Gilbert Classical Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McClinton Tech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Contentions on the Aff and FW of the Aff sort of gues unresponded to.
- Eliminately later generations is a bad thing and we just cross bad ad
- I'd shift C3 into a block file.
- I don't need to restate def's
- Make sure you read one toplines for sympathy
- The Neg FW doesn't make sense to me.
- Neg time split in response
- I don't think a
- Political Realism FW makes a whole lot of sense wrt warranty at the least.
- Maybe read some Hobbes.
Aff will win on Bostons. 4th will win until FLU

I think your need to realize that I think your need to realize that this strategy is to just put under your

I think your need to realize that this strategy is to just put under your

Aff will win on Bostons. 4th will win until FLU

I think your need to realize that I think your need to realize that this strategy is to just put under your

impossible to quantify an unknown

impossible to quantify an unknown

lying about some frame is good

lying about some frame is good

imagine if you could prove the臥底

imagine if you could prove the臥底

you need to argue that you need to argue that

you need to argue that you need to argue that

I think the key FLU is very hard to

I think the key FLU is very hard to

nullify act on useful FLU dont

nullify act on useful FLU dont

trickery actions so I dont

trickery actions so I dont

understand. The theoretical jockey

understand. The theoretical jockey

for the FLU.
The aff and the neg presented clear cases with definitions, criteria, value criteria, and contentions. The basics were covered.

The neg did a great job screening her opponent's case, allowing her to address questions to her opponent.

The Neg presented a case highlighting consequentialism if the states eliminate nuclear weapons, summarizing the pros of keeping the nuclear arsenal, also to deter war.

The Aff presented arguments against the contentions from the Neg, but the Neg was able to link her case from definitions to final rebuttal, making her case easy to follow. For this reason I gave the win to the Neg.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>Oscar Gonzalez (*9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adallis Pantry</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Positive**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

During the constructive presentations, both debaters presented references and illustrations. The data presented were important facts very well related to their cases. Good research.

Both debaters presented clear frame work, definitions, value and value criteria.

During cross examination the Neg did a great job obtaining clarifications from the Aff, also asking for cards about contentions from the Aff highlighting no evidence about weapons launched by accident in the past.

The Neg presented a case very easy to follow supported with cards and arguments. Good job.

I gave the win to the Neg because her case was very fluid and easy to follow.
Novice L-D Debate | Kayla Green (*5)
---|---
Round 2 | Flight 1 | Room 125 | Fri 02/07/20 05:45PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hugo Osuna Garcia</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Alex Hall</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Willow Canyon High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 Gilbert 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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote neg b/c they win that keeping nuclear weapons is better on a cost benefit analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>Kayla Green (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 125</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Robert Massoud</td>
<td>7 McClintock High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri 02/07/20 06:30PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branden Currie</td>
<td>3 Willow Canyon High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **00**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote neg on presumption. AFF dropped their whole case in IAR.
**NLD**

**Novice L-D Debate**

**Evan Martin-Casler ('47)**

**Round 2**

**Flight 1**

**Room 128**

**Fri 02/07/20 05:45PM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ani Hartman</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Cooper Somora</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Horizon High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 Perry High School</td>
<td></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:** Clever speech & constituent tone. Use of cards.  
Good anticipation of Neg arguments.

**Neg:** Great, apparent familiarity with many facets of issue, including anticipating opponents arguments and preparing blocks & rebuttals ahead of time.

**AFF:** Your rebuttal would be strengthened by some extra preparation/research into potential AFF arguments, so that you are more ready to argue those points.

**Neg:** Very consistent in keeping your argument connected to AFF for rebuttal (i.e. point-by-point rebuttal).  

developed more familiarity with both sides of argument including causes & effects of potential argument on both sides. Both debaters performed almost equal should keep up the great work.
ADF: Please keep in mind that Nrg demonstrated unusual readiness for a novice round. You should feel good about your debate.

Nrg: Great preparedness and practice. These create confidence, and that matters.

Well done, both of you.
**NLD**

**Novice L-D Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 128</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia Browder</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Karim Jayyusi</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Sunnyslope High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Willow Canyon High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Affirmative:** Clear, fluid speech. Clearly well-prepared including knowledge of ramifications of nuclear arms. Good, consistent, effective use of cards.

**Negative:** Effective start by defining key terms in a way that also serves as an outline for your argument. You moved into rebuttal earlier, so you could sacrifice more time to explain and expand on your side of the argument.

**Affirmative:** Interesting, potentially effective questioning strategy in cross, though there was some possible streamlining. You clearly paid very close attention to Neg, and were prepared for cross & rebuttal. Great strategy for attacking foundation of Neg (i.e., utilitarianism) before moving on to specific points using specific examples.
Neg.: Your argument would benefit from some extra research into potential AFF arguments so that you're ready to tackle & rebut. You had to expend some extra time defending your case instead in attacks on AFF because AFF had anticipated some of your arguments.

RFD: AFF was extremely well-prepared for most potentialities of the arguments.

Neg.: You performed admirably. You should feel good about your debate. AFF demonstrated unusual readiness for a novice round.

AFF: Great preparedness & practice. These create confidence, and that matters.

Well done, both!
**Novice L-D Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas Jenelle Truax York</td>
<td>30 Mullen High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Negative | Points (20-30) | 28 |
| Emma Goldstein | 47 BASIS Flagstaff |

**The winner of this debate was**

**Affirmative**

**(Circle Winner)**

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Very strong speaker!

Watch time in 1NR. You had a bit of time left and I didn't catch explicit defenses of the attacks on your contentions.

Rebuttal gets a bit messy. Make sure to synapses and go straight down the floor.

I really wanted to hear an analysis of the probability of nuclear war in the future. You say deterrence has worked until now, but why will it stop working? Why will it stop working?

**R3D:** The debate came down to the impacts of current radiation compared to the wars stopped due to deterrence. Based on this, the Neg seems to be saving more lives in the present, while the probability of nuclear war in the future is unknown. I'm taking a known present impact over an unknown future one.

Try to go beyond simple clarifications in cross. Use the time to set up your future arguments, point out contradictions or weaknesses in their case etc.

Careful about narrowing down your attacks too much. All your attacks on the AF came down to two points, and they have been used in many ways and 2D deterrence. Anding more diverse attacks would make the AFs redundant.

Don't make US centric arguments on a resolution that is not US specific.

You had a lot of time left in the 2NR. If you're done with the low-by-low, use that time to weigh and give explicit votes.
The kind of leading question you used is not allowed. You should follow up with them with a real question.  This aff. move is not a part of your prep time.

We should use all your prep time.  The aff. move is on lead poisoning after the black and as a result of not being vaccinated.  It has an impact on our communities.  Some some time in 2ME to give explicit reasons.  We need to give explicit reasons.

Exposure contamination is fairly weak, when dealing with the nuclear waste, jobs need a lot more.  I don't need a lot more.  I want to take a good look.

The kind of leading question you used is not allowed. You should follow up with them with a real question.  This aff. move is not a part of your prep time.

We should use all your prep time.  The aff. move is on lead poisoning after the black and as a result of not being vaccinated.  It has an impact on our communities.  Some some time in 2ME to give explicit reasons.  We need to give explicit reasons.

Exposure contamination is fairly weak, when dealing with the nuclear waste, jobs need a lot more.  I don't need a lot more.  I want to take a good look.

The kind of leading question you used is not allowed. You should follow up with them with a real question.  This aff. move is not a part of your prep time.

We should use all your prep time.  The aff. move is on lead poisoning after the black and as a result of not being vaccinated.  It has an impact on our communities.  Some some time in 2ME to give explicit reasons.  We need to give explicit reasons.

Exposure contamination is fairly weak, when dealing with the nuclear waste, jobs need a lot more.  I don't need a lot more.  I want to take a good look.
**NLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>Logan Guthrie (*10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Flight 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Emma Jane Carns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Benson</td>
<td>1 BASIS Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was: **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Aff:**
- Use numbers and metrics to make your case convincingly.
- Offer more reasons for your assertion, not less.
- Start 240 in one direction, then pivot to support comparison.
- Commit to one contention in L2R, win mining.
- Explain the legal, not a wash.

---

**Neg:**
- Peace needs a more clear terminal impact that compares to missile.
- Concede to a single impact, time is wasted losing entire flow.
- Explain why CBW ad more probabilistic & larger in scope, rather than asserting.
- Extend terminal impact to CBW, won't wash, unclear.

---

I vote affirmative to curb the risk of continued escalation that scales to nuclear winter. CBW's are not explained to have higher probability and terminal impact worse is minimal. Now and mining irrelevant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 129</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Dudebout</td>
<td>42 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td>Jaylin Wilson</td>
<td>48 Horizon 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.**
- Start off w/ care extensions, the risk decreases
- Signpost and introduce the case
  rather than generally discussing
  &^g; or the flow
- Extend care in LAR
- These can be terminal impacts articulated
  along or pessimistic - what are
  chances of rogue action?

**Neg.**
- Number signs of care for
  organization in resultant
- Extend w/ purpose and structure
  in 2ND to extend contention,
  care decrease
- Collapse to a singularlewel
  issue(s) and do impact calculus
- Extend a terminal impact
  toward the determinacy of
  numbers per unit.

I vote negative to maintain nuclear deterrence
w/ lower the probability of conflict escalation
w/ conventional weaponry.
CHOTALLA, MANIAK

NLD

Novice L-D Debate

Round 2

Flight 1

Maniak Chotalla (*50)

Room 139

Fri 02/07/20 05:45PM

Affirmative
Austin Keith
3 Willow Canyon High School

23

Points
(20-30)

Negative
Madeleine Joslin
7 McClintock High School

30

Points
(20-30)

The winner of this debate was
Affirmative
(Circle Winner)

No

Is this a low point win?

Judge’s Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

• You spent way too much
time talking framework in your
1AR, time allocation could
have been better.
• Confidence is the main issue,
you stumble a lot on your
words which kills your efficiency.

RFD: I negate on environmental impacts that
come with damming rivers. There is enough defense on
the Aff to the point where Neg is more probable.

Neg
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liam Reynolds &amp; Gilbert High School</td>
<td>Britney Brooks ('13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Judge's Signature**

Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020

NLD

**Comments & Reason for Decision**

Affirmative - No

Replies: More historically cases of nuclear war - nuclear war = more nuclear war

Affirmative - More efforts to prevent war are needed - more nuclear war = more nuclear war

**Is this a low point win?**

No
**Round 2**

**Flight 2, Room 141**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reasons for Decision**

- Affirmative: We assert that the use of nuclear weapons must be prohibited.
  - **Evidence:**
    - Nuclear proliferation has been a major concern for decades.
    - The risk of nuclear war is unacceptable.
  - **Analysis:**
    - Nuclear weapons are inherently destructive and pose a threat to global security.
    - The existence of nuclear weapons leads to a state of constant danger.

- Negative: We believe that nuclear weapons can be used responsibly.
  - **Evidence:**
    - Some countries have successfully used nuclear weapons to achieve their strategic goals.
    - Nuclear deterrence is effective in preventing aggression.
  - **Analysis:**
    - The risk of nuclear war can be mitigated through international agreements and arms control.
    - Nuclear weapons can be controlled and monitored to prevent their misuse.

---

**Judge's Signature**

---

**NLD**

---

**Jackrabbit Jambooree 2020**

---

**Brooks, Britney**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>Djino-Gomez (42)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rd 2 Fl 1 Room 124</td>
<td>Fri 02/07/20 05:45PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Richard Napolitano</td>
<td>Hunter Travis Fenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hamilton High School</td>
<td>31 Mesquite High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was:

Affirmative (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ☑

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Good attack on contention 2.
- Contention 1 opponent had minimal evidence of terrorist attack.
- Definition well stated.
- Stated well.
- Roadmap stated.
- Stated magnitude/propensity feels more examples to prove point of magnitude can substantiate argument was lacking for me.
- Stated happiness important for human life or similar.
- Well done!
- Keep up the good work!

- Good delivery of facts in rebuttal.
- Well done.
- Keep up the good work.
Keep up the good work!

Rob's view on the debate:

- Good arguments
- Confident
- Explained
- Framework established
- Followed easily
- Provided references

Affirmative: crowded delivery in intro,Anchors were clear, refutation was strong

Negative: good delivery in intro, Anchors were clearly explained, refutation was stronger

Other notes:

- Few moments of silence
- Improved presenting
- Consistently distinguished
- Good questions during cross
- Good answers during cross
- Some hesitations in asking questions

Amanda McAlpin

7th McCallum High School

Lincoln Andrews

4th Manor High School

Tyler Carter

8th Bonita Vista High School

NLD

Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020
Affirmative
Negative

Is this a low point win? 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

A.F. you should up your...
### NLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>Mike Convey (*'13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Hofstetter</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 BASIS Flagstaff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sneha Lakamsani</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is this a low point win?</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**AFF:** You're running a plan. This is LD. Most judges on the Phoenix metro circuit won't like it. When reading slow is smoother. Remember this is LD, more clearly. You're advocating for the existence of a world. You have to sell me on a world without rules, not implementation of how to get rid of them.

**NEG:** You're getting caught in the weeds for a body count to prove utility. You can stay overview and prove a point.

Ask if everyone is ready before you start. Your rebuttal felt disjointed. You need to signpost and continue to move through your thoughts smoothly.

**RFD:** Both of you ask for paradigms, it'll guide you in making your strategies. The AEF focused on implementation of the AFF world & didn't provide clear issues for why the AFF world is preferable to the NEG. NEG was able to solve utility greater. AFF didn't pick utility as a value of justice for the individual, the few.