VLD

Varsity L-D Debate
Eli Botham (*7)
Round 2
Room 829
Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM

Affirmative
Will Altermann
2 Scottsdale Preparatory Academy
Points (20-30) 27

Negative
Danielle Muller
25 Catalina Foothills High School
Points (20-30) 28

The winner of this debate was
Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I think that a better usage of Cross is to just role to see the states for speed/weight.
I don’t think it’s like millenium to just use it.
Think of Cross as an opportunity to poke holes in your opponent’s case.

Just concede FW.
Don’t need to define bio-weapon.

Calculate weird = nuclear well-being = will
You can use will as a criterion.

Glad you extended both extension.

I.e. Good Key Votes and weighing.

I end up relying on a conventional explanation and nuclear stance that you primarily responded to.

Be careful of contradictions - 1940s.
Brazilian andостоведнік сыріт - not.
Bundilard or the Four.

I don’t think it’s the same role of Cross.

Nuclear well-being - instead of: magnitude, time, force, arbitrary, reason...
### VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Lars Niemi (*'47)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 816</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin Eckstein</td>
<td>Vihaan Hari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Chandler High School</td>
<td>5 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points (20-30):**

- **Affirmative:** 25
- **Negative:** 27

**The winner of this debate was:**

- **Affirmative**
- **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge's Signature:**

**Basis for Ruling:**
School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**Affs Deontological framework was weaker than Neus Utilitarianism.**

**Failed to show that terrorist had any real possibility of using Nucs**

**Neo was able to show that many more lives have been saved post NUC than pre NUC.**

70 million

The conclusion that CBW's would proliferate was a strong point that wasn't well rebutted.
### VLD

**Varsity L-D Debate**

**Shanna Altermann ('2)**

**Room 818**

**Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connor Clark</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Katie Ann Jones</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The winner of this debate was**

- **Affirmative**
- **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

**Judge's Signature**

**SPA 2**

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Aff. Construct. (3 min)**

- Good speaking voice, quality
- Well explained arguments
- Used quoted evidence to support his argument

**Neg. Construct. (3 min)**

- Katie speaks clear, good pace
- Speed & diction
- Appears confident

**Ex. Exam. (3 min)**

- (2 min prep used)
- C1 -

**Cross Examination**

- C2 -
- C3 -

**Evidence based (N.K.)**

**Notes:**

- Evidence based references
- Used inhaler before debate
- Cross examined, she seemed
- Nice job!
I think that CBUs would fill in to a greater extent. I do not think that CBUs would fill in enough to contradict your argument. Overall, you are doing very well. What you need to do is not explain your position as well. I feel like you do not explain this as well as you could. I think you need to do a better job of explaining your position. I also think that your argument is not sufficient. I disagree that CBUs are not feasible. I do not think that CBUs are not feasible. I think that CBUs are a viable option. I think that you need to do a better job of explaining your position. I disagree with your argument. I think that you need to do a better job of explaining your position.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Eric Neuner ('9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dens Sumesh</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 BASIS Peoria</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:

Gave some feedback briefly.
In general, found Aff to not be organized enough in his style and time management.
Aff realized the neg CBW evidence (was lacking. Actually she couldn’t find it)
but ran out of time before she could really attack this point.

Neg - first, if you cite evidence, you better be able to pull the card.
Second, “common sense” is not provable and argument. I did not buy your second contention at all, plus you couldn’t find evidence, yet Aff didn’t exploit this.

In a sloppy round, I give to neg because I could more clearly follow her argument.

P.S. nukes never got to Cuba. Know your history facts
Is this a low point win?  

Affirmative  
Jhaj Baaz  
42 Desert Vista High School  
25

Negative  
Andrew Garcia  
30 Millennium High School  
21

Judge's Signature  

Sudha R. High School  

School Affiliation: Organization  

Judge's Signature  

Round 2  

Affirmative  
Varsity L-D Debate  

Negative  
Chris Kloth ('33)  

Room 809  

Fri 02/07/20 05:15 PM

2/7/2020

Affirmative  

Negative  

Comments & Reason for Decision  

KLOTH, CHRIS  

Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020
## VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Rahel-Zubahri (*29)</th>
<th>Susan Kessler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 815</td>
<td>Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan Kraver</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ved Patil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 McClintock High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>38 BASIS Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The winner of this debate was</strong></td>
<td><strong>Judge's Signature</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Affirmative**
- **Negative**

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

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Ved:** Good job asking question on top of question during cross-exam.

- **Logan:** Noticed that you explained why detente worked during Cold War but not now. You brought it up before Ved, proactive!

- **Both:** All contentions were solid.

- **Ved:** Slow down during your constructive. I understand you want to provide a lot of information during your time but the flow is too fast which makes it harder for audience to follow.

- **Logan:** Your rebuttal on Alt. Energy/Renewables was short. However, you did good job on Rebuttal #2.
**VLD**

**Varsity L-D Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 607</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Savannah Elizabeth McNamara  
45 Horizon High School | 2-8 | Delaney Krieger  
35 Arizona College Prep | 2-7 |

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

*Interesting debate!*

---

**Aff:** You need some more connections to immediacy at the top.

2025 is only 5 yrs away (say 2040 - 15 yrs away) but more than

2025 is only 5 yrs away (say 2040 - 15 yrs away) but more than

---

**Red:** LAR on framework: you're a moral agent + moral

agents will weigh less suit higher than general good.

Nice right on views!

---

**Neg:** I wish you had more meat to your MAD con... Japan was interesting, but

not pushed. Also: you said in **NL** that you proved it was impossible to

do both, but I didn't catch that - maybe make it clearer?
What does need mean? Could we grow food in space? Clear while organisms - more important. How about research? How about our orbital satellite? What's that? WAD - nuclear weapon. US launched civilians. But our rules aren't possible. The fact is: things work. It's not aboutal policies, not just living. Nukes will ucncerse anything. It's stopping nukes. Concern with the bomb. What's possible? How do we have a world? It's just living. Have fewer nuclear warheads. How do we have a world? Think about nuclear warheads. Could we do that? We need fewer nukes. Could we grow food in space? Yes, we could. It's not possible. How do we have a world?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Erin Granilo-Walker (*34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe Soderquist</td>
<td>Nolan Burke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td>5 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**  **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

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

*Judge's Signature*

**ASU**

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**RFD:** The debate ultimately came down to deterrence. I buy the aff's link chain about how certain actors and accidents can lead to war. The terrorism debate ended up being a wash. Solid round.

- Don't reference evidence in CX that you have not read yet
- NC could have benefitted from subpoints
- When in the past have terror groups stolen nukes?
- Missed an opportunity to turn the aff's 3rd contention

- The terror argument, as read in the AC, seems a bit extra-topical
- Good organization of the AC
- The economy point did not really flail through
- Future weaponry point was a bit unclear
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Ryan Kibby (442)</th>
<th>Nik Pearce (35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 814</td>
<td>Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidhi Pathak</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Marcello Garbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 Bonita Vista High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

"Nuke war is inevitable. Soviet harms the..."
This was a difficult round to decide on.

Aff: Able to respond quickly to questions and makes strong points that are very swaying. Good job identifying weak points.

Neg: Delivered a strong argument and your language is very clear and eloquent. Passionate on topic and able to respond to questions.

Reasons: Aff better attack on Neg's and stronger argument.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VLD</th>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Derek Chisum (*1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 826</td>
<td>Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Mae Mullings</td>
<td>Nicholas Bukiewicz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hamilton High School</td>
<td>50 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ <strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>✅ <strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

"No Show"
**Varsity L-D Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 810</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Trisha Panse  
5 Hamilton High School | Pratik Shah  
10 Mountain View High School | 27 | 27 |

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

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

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

* **Affirmative** made a clear connection to happiness as a priority, which holds, it was argued that security should be a higher priority.

* Due to nuclear weapons being removed, countries will begin to look at conventional war, which is lowering happiness in the countries involved.

* Although terrorists won't have enough to create nuclear weapons, the risk is still high.

* Aff argument: terrorists won't have access to weapons supplies in order to build weapons (an example should be given on ways these supplies can be kept away).

* I voted **Aff** only due to the core values at play.

Neg made it clear that security is of more value than happiness. However, **Aff** made it clear that the same results would still occur in the event of the end and deconstruction of nuclear weapons.

**Aff**: Be more confident in speech, the facts were more

the only object you lacked was confidence in your argument.

**Neg**: The confidence was there, and so were the facts and evidence. I didn't feel that the only Aff having last speech was necessary.
## VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lizzie Beistle</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Rio Pham</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Gilbert Classical Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td>35 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Affirmative** very well spoke very easy to follow. Soft spoken but very articulate to make her point.

**Negative** started out slow but then picked up. If he started out stronger would have been a closer match.
VLD

Varsity L-D Debate

Jesse Flores (*3)

Room 803

Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gerardo Gonzalez Martinez</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Dylan Lifshitz</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Bonita Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>51 Sunnyslope High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? √

Judge's Signature: [Signature]

School / Affiliation / Occupation:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Aff**
- Very good use of sources and empirical data
- Good clarification between consequentialism and utilitarianism
- Smart to use Pakistan & India as a whole pack of concept
- Stay engaged w/ judge despite all the reality
- Very hard to keep track of lack of acknowledgment (Neg conceding)

**Neg**
- Demanding attention with strong command of vocabulary, consistent eye contact, despite several vocal pauses (um, like, etc.) on non points.
- Good nitpicking of potential inconsistencies during X exam.
- Attack of consequentialism and essentially exchanging it for utilitarianism made argument more about semantics and less about ideas.
- Felt like you used framework to almost expand the idea of Nuke removal. But good follow then with necessity to defend against conflict.

RFD: I felt that Aff had more evidence of the current harm the weapons pose through the risks of accidents, which addressed alleviating the people's fears better than historic examples from the Neg.
The Affirmative made a very good case. Did especially well in using the cross to bolster the case. Did end up misinterpreting one neg card. Essentially led to main neg to flow. Too many arguments were predicted on maybe voices data. Key weak felt rushed and lacked clarity. Also could have been better in first rebuttal.

The negative did a better job of looking into determinism. The point of showing if one side needs need it proves the case was brilliant and very kept that theme entire debate. AF used cross to enhance case but could not cover needs main pt enough to stop the flow. The value judgment got somewhat mudded but neg was the clear winner.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Room 824</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Hu</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Points (20-30) 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frances Acueza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 Bonita Vista High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbal RFD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote neg on nuclear terrorism.
Lack of rational state actors

higher probability of nuke war
Also, terrorists can obtain nuke material through black markets.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 820</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Cazzatto</td>
<td>28 Catalina Foothills High School</td>
<td>Gaby Chu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- **Affirmative**
- **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? \(\text{No}\)

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**AFF:** Clear organization of argument; referred back often & highlighted key items multiple times. Avoid unsupported claims e.g. bio weapons not as bad, as developed, etc.

**NEG:** Also laid out a clear argument. Could benefit from going back to 'best case' & arguing against it e.g. how deterrence was a big factor in provenly escalating in certain conflicts or how bio weapons could pose a health risk too. Speak a bit slower to increase flow - starting & stopping mid-sentence is hard to follow.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Kelly DeVos (*4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>Room 825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sohani Sandhu</td>
<td>Zachary Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td>1 BASIS Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

"Neg was able to refute Aff points on QA, more effectively than opponent.

Neg needs to be mindful of snarky responses during question/answer periods."


Replay to be argued.

Judge's Signature

Comments & Reason for Decision

Room 804

Fri. 02/01/20 05:15 PM

Judge's Affiliation: Catalina Foothills High School
### VLD

#### Varsity L-D Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 802</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ezri Tyler  
51 Sunnyslope High School | Jared Maurice Perkins  
13 Desert Ridge High School |
| Points (20-30) 29 | Points (20-30) 27.5 |

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge's Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McAnreoch HS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**RFD:** Neg is simply non-responsive to the issues raised by the Affirmative. The very question that the Neg addressed, his organization toward is problematized by the Aff, and failing to respond ultimately exacerbates the problem.

If your opponent is critiquing settler colonialism, addressing the issues of indigenous people, you should really mention indigenous people at least once in your responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affirmative**

- **Round 2**
- **Varsity L-D Debate**
- **Santa Cruz High School**
- **Saratoga Preparatory Academy**

**Negative**

- **Kurt Nielsen**
- **Kurt Nielsen (27)**
- **Room G189**
- **Points**
- **25**

---

**Affirmative**

- **Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020**

**Negative**

- **Kurt Nielsen**
- **Kurt Nielsen (27)**

---

**Affirmative**

- **Nicolle, Sarah**
- **School Affiliation: BASIS**
- **Points**
- **25**

---

**Negative**

- **Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020**

---

**Affirmative**

- **Nicolle, Sarah**
- **School Affiliation: BASIS**
- **Points**
- **25**

---

**Negative**

- **Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020**

---

**Affirmative**

- **Nicolle, Sarah**
- **School Affiliation: BASIS**
- **Points**
- **25**

---

**Negative**

- **Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020**

---

**Affirmative**

- **Nicolle, Sarah**
- **School Affiliation: BASIS**
- **Points**
- **25**

---

**Negative**

- **Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020**

---

**Affirmative**

- **Nicolle, Sarah**
- **School Affiliation: BASIS**
- **Points**
- **25**

---

**Negative**

- **Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020**

---

**Affirmative**

- **Nicolle, Sarah**
- **School Affiliation: BASIS**
- **Points**
- **25**

---

**Negative**

- **Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020**
## VLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 805</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VLD</strong></td>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varsity L-D Debate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tim Parra</strong> (24)</td>
<td><strong>Derrill Riley</strong> (35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Affirmative
- Kevin Soto
  - 9 Bonita Vista High School
  - Points (20-30): 29

### Negative
- Ben Brady
  - 43 Horizon Honors High School
  - Points (20-30): 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge's Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Aff argument for weapons being susceptible to cyber warfare flawed through as did argument around escalations in unclear hot spots. Negimada strong argument around MAD being effective but it wasn't enough to counter aff arguments.

*You did a great job at keeping the debate on point and preventing your opponent from focusing on how danger would occur. Which would be a great debate.*

* Spend less time arguing framework when they are overlapping so much. There wasn't much differentiation of the 2 so don't spend time here.

* Your 1st contention was attacked pretty bad your argument was MAD presented nuclear war not war in general. Aff attacked that during counter by stating that several wars have occurred.*
Affirmative

Ac. - Affirmative's case seems to narrowly focus on one topic. As case could have been stronger if she presented additional based on other topics.

Cx. - Good job in attacking evidence cited by N in support of her case. Were able to have N admit that she was not able to cite to certain items. Good fact checking.

Var. - Very nice job attacking each of N's contentions and evidence and turning them against N. Made a good showing that her case is better than N's case.

A made good arguments why nuclear weapons should be eliminated, but many of them were new arguments that were not presented in her Ac.

Reason: I really enjoyed listening to both sides' cases. They both actively challenged the other side's cases. However, N presented multiple arguments that I thought were well thought out.

Reason: N's cross-exam also seemed to focus on one area. N was able to get concessions from A regarding safe storage of nuclear waste.

C made an effective job in presenting contentions that were well thought out. N also did an effective job in incorporating her main arguments against A's case.

NR. - Made good arguments about a new argument that A made in rebuttal. I.e., that it should be disregarded.

Nice job in rehabilitating her arguments. N, however, agreed with A that no more nuclear weapons should be made.
The debate started with a rules overview that had arguments. Neg must have 1 loser argument, must respond to 2 Aff arguments. Aff criteria was philosophy of mind, metacognition, and Rawls veil of ignorance. Neg veil argument was environmental damage, uranium mining, genetic disease and unique visis to children. Neg criterion was govt legitimacy, that it is analytically flawed to talk about nations as moral actors, so topic is decided on whether states can legitimately develop and possess nuclear weapons. Neg, tried 7+2 arms and deterrence, quad war deterrence + small state deterrence. Neg, argued we wouldn't fight for a cbw war or nuclear war behind the veil. Neg turned all case with evidence that we don't have any reason to expose weapon to environmental which occur with use of disarmament. Good coverage of case, light extension of topic overview, heavy on using veil of ignorance as the criteria, expanded three reasons to use ethics as the criteria. 3-point RFP!

Aff won value + criteria debate. Neg didn't respond to

Aff's three reasons to prefer a-priori meta-cognition: Value Pluralism, egoist problem & a-priori paradox. Neg, argued state actors don't act morally, all outcomes individuals state actor can use a-priori. The way to round developed though made Rawls veil a wash. Neg, argued we wouldn't want a world with a risk of cbw war - Aff didn't argue. I prove it in means-end argument w. Rawls but Aff didn't know. It's a means-end argument within an incomplete argument framework. Aff, gives us this argument turns into an incomplete argument. Aff also dropped topic.
Both are great speakers, easily understood, and very impressed by the Neg. I was more convinced by the Neg, with every detail, argument, and very impressed by the Neg. The Neg had direct, clever, and adopted their debate rebuttal very well. I missed some because I was more convinced by the Neg. This speech was quick enough to get all points on the constructive speech. While also speaking quickly enough to get all points on the constructive speech.
VLD

Varsity L-D Debate  
Jason Peper (*'26)

Round 2  
Room 827  
Fri 02/07/20 05:15PM

Affirmative  
Points  

Dohyun Ku  
39 Basis Ahwatukee

29

Negative  
Points  

Addison Nichole Clark  
10 Mountain View High School

27

The winner of this debate was  

Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  

No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

North k. knows USA is a threat to invasion due to nuc.w.  
De-stabilizing.

- National Security.

Chemical / bio. weapons more likely to kill people by something other than nuc.

Haunt been used in recent years.

- She has not proven that they don't threaten people.

- Has proven that it does not cause envir. value: max happiness.  
Dead people = no good.

- Extinction =

But don't nuc. w. Perpetuate extinction?  
Nuc. weapons

- If they go off = they cause extinction.

Lemin: Ku

- Threatening = immoral  
Nuclear less does not save lives

More existence of nuc. weapons = threat

India =

Deterrence doesn't work.  
Process of making = causing environmental harm.

Eliminate harming.

Every action should be considered.

Great distress on people  
Negativity impact people  
[not morally right]

Nuc. = does not increase happiness

Distress = unhappiness

Doesn't address national security.

Immoral = point made  
Eliminate weapons

threats for protection = immoral

- Make more eye contact

- When your head is tilted, hard to hear, stand straight.
Addison:
you state that if nuclear weapons go off, then extinction is inevitable. I wish you would address Dohyuni's points regarding morality. I think your points could have been stronger, and I am not convinced that a world with nuclear weapons is safer than one without them. Great work though!

Dohyuni:
make sure to add more relevant issues or news, stand straight, make eye contact, be confident. But your points are valid and you've persuaded me that nuclear weapons cause environmental harm and are immoral.
**VLD**

**Varsity L-D Debate**

**Lexie Vanderveen ("5")**

**Round 2**

**Affirmative**

Joey Antonelli  
6 Perry High School  
Points (20-30)  
29

**Negative**

Valerie Peters  
42 Desert Vista High School  
Points (20-30)  
28

The winner of this debate was __Affirmative__  
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  
no

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- *Aff*  
  - Clear logic connecting Aff case to prevention of global extinction, showed link well  
  - Would have liked to see your own framework behind the contentions, especially given the wording of "ought" and where the obligation lies in  
  - New evidence in last speech?  
  - I thought the argument against mutually assured destruction due to advancements in technology was a strong one for your case  
  - Many counters against the Neg felt to be nitpicking problems with evidence, rather than attacking ideas and reinforcing your own

- *Neg*  
  - Strong 3-tiered framework, I would have liked to see your contentions refer back to how they uphold all 3 within your speech  
  - Good job critiquing how threats would still occur (and weapon advancement) in Aff world; a bit unclear in your explanation why it is clearly worse than status quo though  
  - I was intrigued by the deterrence case, but WWII bombings are historical counter to Cold War evidence  
  - Does framework apply to uphold every nation's gov't legitimacy?

**RFD**: I felt that Aff had more evidence of the current harm the weapons pose through the risks of accidents, which addressed alleviating the people's fears better than historic examples from the Neg.