

VLD

FLIP: 9 Kevin Soto v. 35 Delaney Krieger

Varsity L-D Debate		Kathleen Clark (*36)	
Octo-Finals		Room 805	Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
Affirmative <u>Kevin Soto</u>		Points (20-30) <u>29</u>	Negative <u>Delaney Krieger</u>
		Points (20-30) <u>29.5</u>	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Circle Winner)		<u>K Clark</u> Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		<u>Tempe Prep</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - not clear on if 4th Contention stated
 - ~~able to use the definition & the aff~~ (Neg point) KC
 - need more information necessary on how rearmement would not occur.

Neg - Rearmement possible
 - Irrational actor turned to Neg case

Definition of eliminate which was stated in the aff start - flows through and was the basis for the determination for the Neg as she showed & demonstrated what would happen in the world following the initial elimination

VLD

FLIP: 26 Josh Tint v. 2 Will Altermann


Varsity L-D Debate		Saiful Islam (*5)	
Octo-Finals		Room 807	Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
Affirmative <i>Josh Tint</i> Points (20-30) <u>29</u>		Negative <i>Will Altermann</i> Points (20-30) <u>29</u>	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Circle Winner) <u>NO</u> Is this a low point win? <u> </u>		Judge's Signature <i>[Signature]</i> School / Affiliation / Occupation <i>Horizon High School / Parent / MR</i>	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

143

VLD

FLIP: 10 James Gallery Driscoll v. 9 Marcello Garbo

Varsity L-D Debate		Jonathan Lifshitz (*51)	
Octo-Finals		Room 801	Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
Affirmative <u>Marcello Garbo</u>	Points (20-30) <u>30</u>	Negative <u>James Driscoll</u>	Points (20-30) <u>29</u>
The winner of this debate was <u>Affirmative</u> Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature <u>Sunnyslope</u> <u>Professor Medicine</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? _____			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both debaters are at the top of their game. This was a professional and powerful debate to watch. The AFF provided a framework of societal welfare, but did not reference back to this in the same way as the Neg case. The neg case used a utilitarian framework and focused on preventing mass extinction. Overall, the AFF case usurped the utilitarian framework by showing the risks of nuclear weapons and presenting an argument that swords can be turned into plows. The case of climate change by NEB was not supported in the current argument. The conventional weapon argument was uncontested by the NEB against the AFF. The bio weapon argument is strong on both sides. Each side can benefit from more developed argument about bio weapons. Final voters go to AFF because nuclear weapons are not needed to develop nuclear energy.



VLD

FLIP: 26 Danielle Muller v. 4 Lizzie Beistle

Varsity L-D Debate		Rayna Jones (*1)	
Octo-Finals		Room 804	Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
Affirmative Beistle	Points (20-30)	Negative Muller	Points (20-30)
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____		Joel Sannes Judge's Signature Chandler Prep School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:


IAZ Criteria was utilitarianism with an extinction contention, Nuclear War destroys agriculture, Nuclear Winter and a games-theory analysis of probability of nuclear war is effectively 100% over time. Neg. conceded util as the criteria. Neg. contentions were 1) CBW shift with extinction scenario and 2) conventional war with a possible extinction threat with advanced A.I. weapons. IAZ had good coverage of CBW's (they are unpredictable so not likely to be used) but the answer to the ~~new tech~~ conventional war distad was a one-line analysis that conventional war has been occurring for 1000's of years w/o extinction... but did not answer the "new tech" or "AI" scenario in Neg. evidence. Neg. extended BioWeapons and the tech. scenario on conventional war but isn't doing much on the aff. probability evidence.

RFD: A straight util debate w/ an impact and probability debate. Neg. evidence on CBW shift is very good and extinction scenario also. Aff answer that CBW is unlikely because unreliable and then an defense helps mitigate that risk. But aff drops the conventional AI/Tech extinction scenario.

So in terms of impact framing I have I dropped Neg. scenario and give Neg. most of CBW. Aff probability evidence doesn't give me enough to outweigh Neg. winners the conventional war scenario plus a risk on CBW.

VLD

FLIP: 35 Zoe Soderquist v. 26 Bella Wexler

Varsity L-D Debate	Josh Beistle (*4)		
Octo-Finals	Room 806	Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM	
Affirmative Zoe Soderquist	Points (20-30)	Negative Bella Wexler	Points (20-30)
The winner of this debate was <input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		 Judge's Signature Desert Vista School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Your C3 is fairly weak and ~~doesn't~~ non-specific to notes - why can't study full-freds from other sources to find this?
- Give me more justifications for your Util RW.
- Always start on the AC in the IAR
 ↳ Case → line by line → NC
- Great job weighing in the IAR
- You can't claim no burden
- Good ~~weighing~~ notes in the 2NR
 ↳ made a decent ballot story

- ask more offensive questions during CX - not just ~~defensive~~ clarifying ones.
- Good weighing in the 1NR
- The 2NR was fairly messy
 ↳ it was also repetitive, work on word economy
- I think you are fixated on the wrong cross in the 2NR - you try to go for too much
 ↳ Pick one choice, a core of cross to collapse to in the 2NR.

FD: I vote all on the extended IEAE and Base evidence which proves ↑ probability of nuclear war which gives all access to ~~the~~ nuclear war impacts which clearly is all over ~~the~~ environmental impacts under ~~the~~ concrete util framing.

VLD

FLIP: 47 Camila Hess-Neustadt v. 36 Connor Clark

Varsity L-D Debate		Caroline Sheridan (#24) delbos, Kelly #4	
Octo-Finals		Room 802	Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
Affirmative Connor Clark Points (20-30)		Negative Camila Hess-Neustadt Points (20-30)	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature Gilbert Classical #4	
Is this a low point win? _____		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:



Thanks for letting me judge your debate.
Both speakers were powerful and persuasive.

While I felt that the affirmative case did an excellent job arguing for the disarmament of India and Pakistan, the resolution is more general reading, "States ought to eliminate their nuclear arsenals."

Ultimately, I felt that by not addressing the more general question the aff case didn't speak to what we were asked to judge. I did want to note that the India/Pakistan case was well structured and well argued.

On the neg side, I felt your level of engagement was excellent and I felt you did a particularly good job with your chemical/bio weapon argument.

VLD

Varsity L-D Debate		Jinhui Chen (*35)	
Octo-Finals		Room 803	Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
Affirmative Trisha Panse 5 Hamilton High School		Points (20-30) <u>27</u>	Negative Zachary Jones 1 BASIS Phoenix
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		 School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Comments and reasons


- Ⓐ good construction of case with 3 contentions
- Ⓝ good questions to challenge Ⓐ in numbers.
- Ⓝ then takes good time management to build his case and at the same time rebutte ~~two~~ of Ⓐ in N. Korea; conventional war vs N. War.

On proxy wars:

Ⓐ has good data and debate flow but failed to persuade and rebutte her opponent Ⓝ when Ⓝ reinforced his case and Ⓐ fought against her case. It shows Ⓝ has a stronger hand to win this debate

VLD

FLIP: 9 Frances Acueza v. 7 Logan Kraver

Varsity L-D Debate		Lori Swain (*26)	
Octo-Finals		Room 808	Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
Affirmative Logan Kraver		Points (20-30) 28	Negative Francis Acueza
			Points (20-30) 27
The winner of this debate was <input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		Gilbert Classical Acad School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

⇒ AFF won on Framework + Drops