


VLD

FLIP: 35 Delaney Krieger v. 7 Logan Kraver

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Varsity L-D Debate | | Johnny Ramirez (*3) | |
| Quarter-Finals | | 036 | Sat 02/08/20 01:45PM |
| Affirmative <u>Delaney Krieger</u> 30 | Points (20-30) | Negative <u>Logan Kraver</u> 20 | Points (20-30) |
| The winner of this debate was | |  Judge's Signature 3 School/Affiliation / Occupation | |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative (Circle Winner) | Is this a low point win? <u>N</u> | | |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Delaney -
 - Positive - Polite - Respectful -
 - Grabs your Attention
 - States All Facts
 - Good Speech flow
 - Speaks clear and
 uses opponents facts against
 him.

Logan -
 - Positive - Aggressive - Respectful
 * Rushes speech / uses "like"
 as a word filler.
 - States facts
 - Does not use her facts against
 her.

* Overall Great Job on Both Sides. Arguments were fair and complex. Logan gave good facts and Reason, But fell short on Conv. to change policy. Delaney was on top with using all that her opposite had to try and change But used it against him and made her point just in sound.

John Saissan (35)

VLD

FLIP: 1 Zachary Jones v. 26 Danielle Muller

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Varsity L-D Debate | | [REDACTED] & 35 John Saissan | |
| Quarter-Finals | | 034 | Sat 02/08/20 01:45PM |
| Affirmative | Points (20-30) | Negative | Points (20-30) |
| Danielle Muller | 29 | Zachary Jones | 30 |
| The winner of this debate was | | John Saissan | |
| Affirmative <u>Negative</u> | | ACP Grieb/Chandler/Pharmacist | |
| (Circle Winner) | | School / Affiliation / Occupation | |
| Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u> | | | |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF:

Value

Uplifting
 Maximizing good for human
 Iran ↑ stock pile
 enriches uranium
 Israel will attack 1st
 possibility of war in mid-east
 Nuclear winter
 increasing investment in N.W
 Model 19 evidence was presented.
 AN: Begin Doctrine?
 Not rational beings
 I.A.E.A will inspect and denuclear Israel.
 The idea that neg. presents
 U.W didn't reduce conventional wars; ie Iraq / Afghanistan
 Vietnam s-for the

Neg.

Does Iran have nuclear weapons?
 Not clear
 presence of N.W ↓ clashes
 If it causes extraction of human
 race no estate will use it.
 U.S nuclear umbrella does cover
 Israel.
 - Conventional war will increase
 Neg was successful in debranding
 his position; good reasoning and
 supportive evidence
 → Nuclear deterrence can
 work many evidence presented
 → Just concentrating only on Israel
 If Israel gets side of N.W then
 Arabs can attack Israel and
 more problems in mid-east.

See back

Aff

using one treaty
can support this better

Localized genocide events

impossible to

reverse nuclear war

but conventional war
can be reversed

Neg

Israel doesn't need to get rid
of N.W.

→ decrease to a level of self defense

of possibility Israel attack Iran

international monitoring can regulate region

Deterrence can solve this problem

This will destabilize the region


— Neg had good blow on reasoning
and refuting Aff's argument.

Reason for decision

Neg had multiple reasons to rebut Aff. The plan was
very clear and very persuasive. Aff only concentrated
on Middle East and conflict b/w Iran and Israel.
in which Neg. could refute and bring alternatives
and show me in Aff's argument the region will be
more unstable.

VLD

FLIP: 2 Will Altermann v. 35 Zoe Soderquist

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Varsity L-D Debate | Karen Johnson (*8) | |
| Quarter-Finals | 035 | Sat 02/08/20 01:45PM |
| Affirmative <u>Zoe Soderquist</u> | Points (20-30) <u>28</u> | Negative <u>Will Altermann</u> Points (20-30) <u>27</u> |
| The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____ |  Judge's Signature <u>Gilbert H. S.</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation | |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Utilitarianism / states ought to eliminate nuclear weapons.

1. Risk of Error
2. Fatal miscalculation - 40 minutes
People who launch weapons unstable
Carnegie Corporation
5 minutes of consultation
Argumentation points are substantial.
Threat of extinction was the tipping point.

A) excellent introduction of framing the problem
Your presentation is superb
Dust, smoke, temp inversion, food chain, nuclear winter
India / Pakistan
eliminate weapons to deter war - main point.


N) Hawaii - miscalculation
Councils - national threats
question about types of weapons - arsenal definition
we need a layer of protection. Well
excellent presentation of neg. arguments and value argumentation. All points are supported.

Crossed
moral reasoning - pleasure/pain
Battics - Russia - not using weapons, but available
Russia - defend against attack
Indian / Pakistan - squish once
Bio-war: nuclear capable country no worries
(excellent rebuttal)
Very informative

VLD

FLIP: 9 Marcello Garbo v. 47 Camila Hess-Neustadt

Hanna Griffin #50

| | | | |
|--|----------------|---|----------------------|
| Varsity L-D Debate | | Kurtis Nielsen (*27) - *35 Nick Pearce | |
| Quarter-Finals | | 028 | Sat 02/08/20 01:45PM |
| Affirmative | Points (20-30) | Negative | Points (20-30) |
| <u>Marcello Garbo</u> | | <u>Camila Hess-Neustadt</u> | |
| The winner of this debate was | |  Judge's Signature | |
| Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner) | | <u>Brophy</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation | |
| Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u> | | | |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- run this as a plan because you have the inherency
- you need to respond to the cyber warfare argument
- use all of prep

- you put them in a nice double bind!
- you do a nice good of gaining offense through turns

Really good round for both of you!

RFD: In terms of the fiat arg, I don't buy that. Aff has infinite fiat powers. The main reason I vote NEG is the cyber warfare arg turns any solvency that CPGS would assume if enacted. In addition to this, the neg effectively demonstrates that nuclear warfare will not happen b/c of det. but it mitigates conventional warfare impacts.

