<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 815</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varsity L-D Debate</td>
<td>Nandita Verma (2)</td>
<td>Aatmik Mallya (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ezri Tyler</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Adyant Mishra</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Sunnyslope High School</td>
<td></td>
<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? **Yes**

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Verbal RFD**

I vote neg on 2 case turns:
1. reprocessing nuclear material
2. eff results in uranium dumping
While the 2Ar was well structured, the 2Ac's was not. The 2Ac's argument was on an emotional level, but both holistically satisfied.  

Affirmative: Mackenzie Rae Spencer  
13 Desert Ridge High School  

Negative: Valerie Peters  
42 Desert Vista High School  

The winner of this debate was:  
Affirmative (Circle Winner)  

Is this a low point win?  YES  

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Case was well built. Did have some challenges coming off case as 2Ac's were new and needed to refine.  

2Ac did a good job of coming back to their FW's andontology.  

2Ac did a good job of coming back to their FW or deontology.  

2Ac did a good job of coming back to their FW or deontology.  

Did feel either side directly attacked the other's FW or had their flow.  

This was a tough call as the 2Ac's FW never came bent to the new assertion that the 2Ac's were an off fee.  

2Ac's did bring through their value kites. The cases were both developed.
### VLD

**Varsity L-D Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 817</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidhi Pathak</td>
<td>Vishaan Hari</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td>5 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The winner of this debate was**

- **Affirmative** (Circle Winner) | **Negative**

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Vidhi:**
- Strong defense of the practicality of realism
- Briefly other conflicting countries (N.K., Russia, Iran, etc.) fostered the unilateralism framework of the Aff
- Power vacuum argument was only weak and comparing millions to hundreds of thousands was to your detriment
- But very good and consistent defense of points

**Vishaan:**
- Good attack by getting timeframe of when make war present in CBW context
- Emphasis on what played into argument quite well (unilateralism at play)
- Bad lack of assurance of what broke argument apart
- Weighing if any "well being" of their own country was not backed up by substantial evidence
- Overall, brave for finding weak points but more support needed
- CBWs are not delivering well argued w/ historical examples (i.e., G-12 US)
- Also, good eye contact and confidence
**Varsity L-D Debate**

**Round 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D</th>
<th>Rahul Zubairi (*29)</th>
<th>Susan Kessler 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points 24</td>
<td>Bennett David Fees 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhaj Baaaz</td>
<td>42 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td>50 Brophy College Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Both had great questions for cross exam.

Jhaj be careful about talking into your computer/putting computer too close to your face.

Recommend both of you slow down and allow more emphasis on your major points. Need smoother transitions/flow.

All contentions were supported, enjoyed some of the examples/details provided. Example: Nuclear Bombs are aimed at seas, example of 50 lakes & track.

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Bridgett Bayer (*50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trisha Panse</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Hu</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- Affirmative
- Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very tough call, but AFF was slightly more effective in rebuttal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 802</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM</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>Gaby Chu 18 Chandler Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Dens Sumesh 38 BASIS Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td>Affirmative Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:
Both students had good eye contact. Very courteous to each other. Both brought up good points. However, I think Negative presented a better case.
Good framework explanation.
Good case showing problems
with the deterrence as well
as harm to EP. Also
good job mentioning use
for decommissioned material
and reliability/ unreliability
of CBWs.

Need better preparation
and confidence in own
argument/case. It was
pretty basic and underdeveloped
Also use cross to ask
questions that then can
help your case. You essentially
just extended her time by
ask her for a synopsis.

RFD
Aff won of framework and case.
- Voting on Framework of Utilitarianism
- Had good stats to support nuclear winter, food production and mass extinction
- Great points that nuclear weapons might not be used in a nuclear war but by rogue states, cyber attack or terrorist attacks
- Super polite competitor - even shared your snack!

- Spoke a little too fast in beginning, hard to follow
- Great recap with voters at the end
- Would have liked to see more stats or cards instead of "Not likely to happen"
- Very polite competitor as well
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>VLD</th>
<th>Nik PCIece</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 810</td>
<td>Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary Jones</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ethan Dean Nicoll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Mountain View High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative** (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- You broke my speech paradigm...

- You shall have broken the bioweapon party by saying coronavirus is already a leaked bioweapon

2:40

2:20

RED:Act on bioweapons turns
The page contains a question on the left side and a table on the right side. The question asks, "Is this a low point win?" with options for "Affirmative" and "Negative." The table lists two students and their occupations. The text appears to be hand-written and partially legible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VLD</th>
<th>Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 826</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia Lupica</td>
<td>Sara Korpe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 McClintock High School</td>
<td>38 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>27</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:

**AFFS - CRITIQUE FOCUSED ON INDIGENOUS RIGHTS & COLONIALISM**

**NEGS - POINTED OUT THAT THESE SOVEREIGN NATIONS DO HAVE A VOICE IN WHETHER TO ALLOW URYAUM MINING.**

**NEGS - UTILITARIANISM GETS US BACK TO THE DEBATE ON WHETHER TO DISCONTINUE NUCLEAR ARMS.**

**AFF - BROUGHT UP NEW MATERIAL IN REBUTTAL WHICH I HADN'T HEARD IN CONTEST, SO IT WAS OF LITTLE USE.**

**NEGS - POINT THAT NUCLEAR ENERGY REQUIRES URYAUM MINING AND THAT AFFS' RATIONALE DOESN'T SOLVE FOR THIS WAS HUGE!!!**

**NEGS CASE HELPS NATIVE PEOPLE THROUGH THE NUCLEAR DETONANT WHICH KEEPS MORE OF THEM ALIVE.**

**AFFS CRITIQUE WAS GENERALLY UNDERWEIGHING AND FAILED TO PROVIDE ENOUGH REASON TO ELIMINATE NUCLEAR ARSENALS.**
Patil, Prashant

VLD

Varsity L-D Debate

Prashant Patil (*'38)

Round 3

Room 829

Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM

Affirmative

Pratik Shah
10 Mountain View High School

Points
(20-30)

27

Negative

Frances Acueza
9 Bonita Vista High School

Points
(20-30)

28

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Negative

Is this a low point win?

Judge’s Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- 
Case was presented in a organized way with details to examples and articles

- Targeted cross ex. for specific & trying to get a answer. At times seem the questions were broad (general).

- Closing argument was well organized within the format. Aff case was presented well.

- Good cross ex. Questions were specific and trying to get the outcome expected.

- During cross ex by Aff. The response shows good presence of mind and answers were appropriate to the questions. Good preparation. rejected.

- Neg. Closing argument was strong with examples and referencing the opening argument of Neg. Case on why Neg is better. Examples & instances provided more insights into Neg case.

- Overall I think both candidates are equally ready and did the debate well. Presentation, framework, and cross ex was nicely handled.

To choose one I think Neg, framed better on cross ex and was able to take on Aff question elegantly. Presentation of Neg during the closing argument had more specifics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Marissa Hart (*8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison Nichole Clark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Mountain View High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dylan Lifshitz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Sunnyslope High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

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

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg did an excellent job weighing frameworks, impacts, and attacking cases. However, the resolution implies that all nuclear taken away permanently; if you could prove that states (into theory agreed to disarm) would ignore the treaty anyway, you might have had a solid point. You could also bolster on the knowledge brought on by nuclear secrets more dangerously + make a solid solution for that too.

Aff did a nice job weighing impacts in rebuttles. I liked the point about nuclear being intended for destruction - attack new global order would be built on fear, not progress as framework states. (“Idealism or progress” was a nice touch – ZAB)
If a F# is possible: what's the worst case scenario?...
Aff resolution eliminates nuclear arsenal, but by its terms it doesn't eliminate them tried. I think Neg made this point well.

"Space armed" might be an obvious Neg's why not argue for risks of blasting nukes to space. It's risky and space accidents don't seem rare. Even and the harms would result. This would help rebut the debater's space case.

The round turned on Neg's failure to tie the case to a utilitarian standard. Aff did by placing evidence that possibly 125 million lives saved... but I don't think Neg offered a clear argument how the Neg case maximizes well-being for most people/racial beings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Alicia Andrews (*'35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 809</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcello Garbo</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Bonita Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tran Thien Nguyen</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Mountain View High School</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:

**AFF PROVIDED STRONGER SUPPORT FOR ARGUMENT**
### VLD

**Varsity L-D Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 816</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM</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>
| Jared Maurice Perkins  
13 Desert Ridge High School | 26 | Isaac Kan  
42 Desert Vista High School | 28 |

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative** (Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature: **Anna P.**  
School / Affiliation / Occupation: **TFA**

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Jared** - good communication, arguments are spoken a bit fast  
- rebuttal is relevant to the subject.

**Isaac** - questions are relevant to the arguments  
- good communicator  
- confident in his arguments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VLD Litz, Ramirez</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opening speech was distracting:</strong></td>
<td>opening speech was distracting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>voice was too much:</strong></td>
<td>voice was too much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>gave good cross-exam questions:</strong></td>
<td>gave good cross-exam questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>was persuasive:</strong></td>
<td>was persuasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>was very organized and I was able to follow:</strong></td>
<td>was very organized and I was able to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>supported arguments with no energy:</strong></td>
<td>supported arguments with no energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>closing was very quick:</strong></td>
<td>closing was very quick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>support arguments:</strong></td>
<td>support arguments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Judge's Signature:** [Signature]

**School Affiliation / Occupation:** [Affiliation]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L/D Debate</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round:</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date/Time:</strong></td>
<td>1/27/20 6:15PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Room:</strong></td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Opening speech was distracting and voice was too much.
- Made eye contact right away.
- Was persuasive and ended closing very quickly and convincingly.
- Presented and ended closing very quickly and convincingly.
- Affirmative was very organized and I was able to follow their arguments with no energy.
- Supporting arguments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Susan Seep (*'45)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 827</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>Maria Cazzatto 26 Catalina Foothills High School</td>
<td>Ved Patil 38 BASIS Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**. 

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge’s Signature: Lexi Vanderwee

School / Affiliation / Occupation: Hamilton

---

**Aff**

- Good job anticipating deterrence argument in first speech and providing evidence against it off the bat.
- Effective to debate goal of deterrence and how Neg does not accomplish safety/peace.
- Don’t rely on “it’s common sense” or “we both know that happened” as reasoning; since rebuttals that attack the opponent’s ideas are stronger, and that tie back to own framework.
- Could do more to point out contradictions in opponent’s case.

**Neg**

- By having no framework yourself, I felt that using Aff’s framework made a lot of your points from your first speech irrelevant (like space exploration) and ultimately a waste of your debate time.
- The idea that shifting away from nuclear weapons would prioritize and increase bio + chemical weapons is a good argument. I would have liked you to have held to your evidence that Bio+Chem are the worst weapons rather than conceding that the impact of nuclear weapons if used would be just as bad.
- You brought up the example of countries starting war not with others with nukes, but with those without, which seems to be a problem still, if value is life.

RFD: The Aff effectively showed the impact of allowing the status quo to continue as well as upheld the agreed value better in their definitions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VLD</th>
<th>Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varsity L-D Debate</td>
<td>Ranjana Burke (5) Brandon Favre (C+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sartaj Malhi  
2 Scottsdale Preparatory Academy | 2.9 | Zoe Soderquist  
35 Arizona College Prep | 2.97 |

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature

Hamilton / Judge / PhD student

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- That definition debate fluked
- Solid line

Review:

**Adj**

- Aff's definition eliminates neg C2, as production facilities eliminated no first. However, opposition shows this is actually, factually unlikely due to fact 10. Full list Pinkus is (independent of & del) means global economy for S3 when attempting. This prevents neg C3 from coming to loss, removing potential for tve difference. Anti-deterrence by neg is insufficient, though correlation ≠ causation argument is compelling. Neg wins on C3 disad.
KLOTH, CHRIS

VAR - LD - DEBATE - 3

Room 601

Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM

Affirmative

Points (20-30)

Jerod Folden
18 Chandler Preparatory Academy

26

Negative

Points (20-30)

Josh Tint
26 Catalina Foothills High School

29

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Judge's Signature

Sahu Rite High School / Teacher

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- incredible use of cross x to build a case slowly by distancing and clarifying opponent's stance, in order to both stabilize their argument
- expert calling into question of opponent's reliability of opponents sources
- incredible efforts to pull opponent into a conversation they tried to have distracting them from their own
- expert use of cross x
- expert use of road signs to direct and frame argument
- Don't make argument very clear as it is built and then shifted into the argument against opponent
- great shift of conversation into a "new understanding of our"
- great use of cards
- expertly utilized as smoothly embedded evidence
- incredible use of theory
- if theory is not explicit, but expertly used as a support of the argument being made
- great use of opponent's evidence against them and carefully and meticulously responding to arguments presented
- not precisely respectful of time
- great response to question about whether nuclear weapons necessitate extinction
- shift of argument to bio-weapons as an actual threat is the best I've seen so far in a tournament
- not strong evidence that we will necessarily use bio-weapons if we don't have to
- for this reason I would either beef this position up, or focus more on just breaking down opponent's argument
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Anthony Hall (*'31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>Room 819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan Kraver</td>
<td>Danielle Muller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 McClintock High School</td>
<td>26 Catalina Foothills High School</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 makes best arguments that **upholding the specific view due to essentially supporting the same values as the Aff.**

- Nuclear weapons have more likelihood of extinction than bio-weapons which have been proven to being controlled.
**Round 3**

**Affirmative**
- Joey Antonelli
- 6 Perry High School
- Points (20-30): 25

**Negative**
- Will Altermann
- 2 Scottsdale Preparatory Academy
- Points (20-30): 26

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

> Aff started round, did not state the resolution stated no framework and no value criterion.  
> First time I have ever seen that in a round.  
> Later he accepted the neg framework.  
> Aff asked for paradigms before the round,  
> Then completely ignored request for clear sign posting.  
> So very difficult to follow the Aff case.  
> Neg case basically seems to be deference,  
> But didn't really engage the Aff case.  
> But what exactly was your Aff case?  
> Aff cross asked a lot of rapid fire questions,  
> At least half seemed to support the Neg case.  
> Neither side gave clear evidence supporting their case.  
> Because I really couldn't follow Aff case,  
> and burden is on the Aff, I'm reluctantly giving to the negation. At least he has 70 years of proof that deference works.
note on reg - why would Russia attack Baltics with nukes?

Aff - I couldn't follow the hypersonic missile thought process at all.

Contestation was a winner, but when asked for an example, you couldn't provide one.

I think a lot of young debaters worry so much about whether or not an opponent responded to every one of their points, rather than making fewer, clear points.

Remember: your job is to persuade the judge. Make it easy for the judge to pick your side. Make clear voting issues. Make clear contaminations, subpoints. Have a framework!

You can learn a lot from this round.
### VLD

**Varsity L-D Debate**

### Round 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Brady</td>
<td>Griffin Eckstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Horizon Honors High School</td>
<td>24 Chandler High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative** (Circle Winner)

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

**Judge's Signature**

Desert Vista
School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- you've never been an action to achieve your value.
- How are you conveying your value?
- I feel like your conclusion becomes a little repetitive.
- You don't need an entire conclusion for your rebuttal. Each conclusion should have some reasons for you to vote for you. Just make it exciting and believable.
- You have to work on structuring your rebuttal - it was pretty messy and hard to follow.
- I also am a sum to return to all points (time allocations).
- I couldn't find agreement in the DA.

---

**Topping Notes:**

- don't look at your opponent during the round-it's awkward.
- You are repeating a lot of the same points on the case.
- You spent way, too much time on explaining points on the PW - go live by bringing down the flow & the arc.
- Start on your case first in the JAR.
- Good voter in the JAR.
- thanks for the heckle.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Room 606</th>
<th>Fri 02/07/20 06:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dohyun Ku</td>
<td>Katelyn Kim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 BASIS Ahwatukee</td>
<td>2 Scottsdale Preparatory Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</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:

AFF

- *you don't weigh who saves more lives under don't sense that is a consequential impact.*
- I'd recommend having more framework justification for deontology as that really is more important debate will happen this round
- *you don't tie back your 3rd contention to 3rd so unless you plan to use it as a way to win if you like F can then I'd recommend dropping it for something else.*
- *Don't quote your case during CX you Job trying to win under your opponents FNC but you forget to attack your opponents FNC as well*
- *can't make new arguments outside in the 2AR about your opponents framework this is why your speaks are low*

RFD

Neg wins the framework debate and outweighs under their framework
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity L-D Debate</th>
<th>Erin Granilo-Walker (*'34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 821</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerardo Gonzalez Martinez 9 Bonita Vista High School</td>
<td>Andrew Garcia 30 Mullen High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Win **Psi Delta Chi**

Judge's Signature **PCDS/A&U**

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Not sure you need to define "states"
- Consequentialism is a fine criterion but life is not really a value
- Security may be better
- Interesting choice to specify a plan in this case
- or is it just an example?
- Terrorism deterrence - were a bit conflated in the 1st ab
- Paradox? - could have been more clear

**RFD** - The negative successfully proved why the model of deterrence in the status quo is preferable to the affirmative world.
Neg

Good job calling out my abusive over-
interpretation of fact - all while staying calm.

"You were the ones focused on the topic
+ your assertions didn't hold up better.

Aff

Try limiting your argument to 2 countries +
Telling a broad interpretation of that. You
came across by trying to gamed a straw man
on a subject more narrow than the topic
at hand.

Be careful! I loved the passion, but using
"garbage" + "begus" to describe your opponent's
work is not persuasive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The winner of the debate was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varsity L-D Debate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative: Savannah Elizabeth McNamara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative: Anushka Suneel Mitander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joel Sanes (18)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VLD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F1/02/07/20 06:15PM</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affirmative**

- Point
- **(30)**

**Negative**

- Point
- **(20)**

**Vote:**

- Yes

**Affirmative's Argument:**

- Key argument about CLIMs doesn't make sense - what part of the off-plan isn't their use from the start now? A point that end up being overlooked.
- They aren't spending enough time on climate change.

**Negative's Argument:**

- Joel's point was strong but not enough to push him out of the whole round.
- Voting on solving climate crises.
- It's not a low point win.

**Annex:**

- Brandon Summer
Affirmative: Very well spoken with that he slowed down a bit knowing that I was a new judge. You made a lot of good points and I think you were very strong towards the end.

Negative: Slowed down for me a new judge made lots of eye contact good job on not just reading off a script.