Both debaters accept prag/ult structure. This implicates only our argument, the (un)likelihood of concurrent disarmament, but this is a strong arg for the neg. Aff asks for an vote on KVI 1, that nits to nuclear will not be adopted; but if neg is right that disarmament is unilateral, both worlds still have catastrophic risks, and I am not told how to weigh extinction against "merely" decimation. Neg wins conventional warfare deterrence decisively, and terror exists in both worlds.

Aff does not establish to me that the "irrational leaders" and "risk of error" factors have changed the calculus decisively, so she gets some reduced chow of her original extinction impact. Neither debater gives any particular time horizon by which their advocacy's expected value will be higher than the other.

Neg creates reasonable doubt that collective disarmament will occur and develops some significant quantity-of-lives through deterrence.

Neg wins a weighing battle.
### VLD

**FLIP: 35 Zoe Soderquist v. 47 Camila Hess-Neustadt**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Kurtis Nielsen ('27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 114</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoe Soderquist</td>
<td>Camila Hess-Neustadt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _______

Judge's Signature

Desert Vista

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- This C3 is entirely defense - you don't need an entire contention for it.
- Ocean, you need more warrants. Your FW bases a slide on a good card.
- You need to weigh on more than just probability in the LR.
- You need to diversify responses to determine weights. Just saying cannot climate is chic doesn't really affect either warrants.
- You need to argue on the impact of the LR. You feel better on the LR that there will be access to this impact.

- You need to do more weighing in the LR.
- You have a lot of repetition in the LR which was pretty messy.
- The door card doesn't reword at all. Claims first, but the LR doesn't matter.

RFD: I vote neg on deterring on the concern. Neg evidenced Neg's winning that deterring is effective and minimizes invadable under city. Aff's only reason is a circumspect re allocation of resource, doesn't need to make more sense.
**Varsity L-D Debate**

**Maniak-Ghotalla (50)**

**Derek Chown (1)**

**Finals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoe Soderquist</td>
<td>Camila Hess-Neustadt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Points (20-30)

28 | 29 |

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **✓** Negative

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**AP**

I don't really get the warrant for why nukes deter cyberattacks if cyber attacks are so difficult to track the perpetrators.

The cyber warfare point in general is weak since cyber attacks aren't really done using "weapons" that can be physically stolen by terrorists. I just don't see how terrorists are more likely to develop the program to use in cyberattacks with nukes gone.

Reinforcing the 90% reduction in deaths is a key point.

**Neg**

I need some kind of definite probability to compare it to the 90% reduction in conventional warfare deaths.

I bring up 0.001% ergs in the 2AR. If you're going to use that arg, set it up earlier.

I really since I told you the last time I judged you had I don't like this argument.

"I'm weighing the known reduction of conventional warfare deaths by 90% higher than the unknown (maybe 0.001%) probability of nuclear war."