


VLD

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

Varsity L-D Debate		Logan Outline #10 Nick Billings (N/A)	
Finals		Room 114	Sat 02/08/20 05:30PM
Affirmative Zoe Soderquist Points (20-30)		Negative Camila Hess-Neustadt Points (20-30)	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____		 Judge's Signature N/A - volunteer School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both debaters accept prag/util structure. This implicates only one argument, the (un)likelihood of concurrent disarmament, but this is a strong arg for the neg. Aff asks for a vote on KVI 1. that affs 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 chance 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

Varsity L-D Debate		Kurtis Nielsen (*27)	
Finals		Room 114	Sat 02/08/20 05:30PM
Affirmative <u>Zoe Soderquist</u>		Points (20-30)	Negative <u>Camila Hess-Neustadt</u>
Points (20-30)		Points (20-30)	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/> (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, if
- reason, you need more warrants for your FW besides a state government card.
- you need to weigh on more than just probability in the LTR
- you need to diversify responses to determine works, just saying climate is not a crisis ~~is~~ really a mess warrants.
- you focus too much on the impact of the war that you feel higher on the over that since you access to this impact.

- you need to do more weighing in the LTR.
- ~~you don't need~~ you have a lot of restriction in the LTR which was pretty messy
- This Dore card about rewording of all claims filed, but the didn't matter.

RFD: I took neg on determine on the concrete base evidence. Neg is winning that defense is effective and minimizes impact under util. Aff's only response is climate system = crisis not affect the world. Dore etc. minimize risks, solution only = how to cope off

VLD

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

Varsity L-D Debate		Maniak Chotalla (*50) Derek Chisum (1)	
Finals		Room 114	Sat 02/08/20 05:30PM
Affirmative	Points (20-30)	Negative	Points (20-30)
Zoe Soderquist	29	Camila Hess-Neustadt	29
The winner of this debate was		Derek Chisum	
Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/>		Judge's Signature	
(Circle Winner)		BASIS Phoenix	
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

2 Bron weapons contention seems purely defensive, which seems better to score for a block. I just don't see any offense generated from this contention. Since ~~the~~ contention is also mostly defensive there's just not a lot of offense in the case itself.

Useful on arguing that cyber & bio weapons won't work as deterrents, since that feeds in to the Neg case.

Steps should be offensive, so calling bio & cyberweapons votes for you is a bit odd.

really weigh nuclear warfare, I need some kind definite probability to ~~make~~ it to the 90% reduction in conventional warfare ^{compare} deaths.

not bring up 0.001% args in the 2AR. If you're going use that arg, set it up earlier.

especially since I told you the last time I judged you that I don't like this argument.

Neg

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.

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

