


# VLD

FLIP: 35 Zoe Soderquist v. 1 Zachary Jones

Varsity L-D Debate		Caroline Sheridan (*24)	
Semi-Finals		Room 101	Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM
Affirmative	Points (20-30)	Negative	Points (20-30)
ZOE SODERQUIST	27	ZACHARY JONES	26
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative (Circle Winner)		BASIS FLAGSTAFF	
Is this a low point win? _____		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

STATES OUGHT TO ELIMINATE THEIR NUCLEAR ARSENAL


AFFS CASE WAS WELL SUPPORTED AND DELIVERED  
ERROR, TERRORISM, DETERRENT, ETC...

NEGS CASE WAS LESS STRAIGHT FORWARD, BUT LOGICAL NONETHELESS.  
I.E. LET N. KOREA KEEP NUCS TO MAINTAIN PEACE.

ZACHARY'S CONTENTION THAT THERE IS A ZERO PERCENT CHANCE OF NUCLEAR WAR WASN'T WELL SUPPORTED

ZOE'S CLAIM OF A MASS EXTINCTION EVENT IN A PRO NUC WORLD WAS REAL.

NEG USING N. KOREA AS AN EXAMPLE OF WHY WE/THEY SHOULD KEEP NUCS WASN'T VERY STRONG. A CLAIM OF MORE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT w/ NUC WASN'T SUPPORTED, OR THAT EVERYONE IS SAFER IN THE REGION WITH AN NUCLEAR K.J.V. WASN'T REASON ENOUGH TO KEEP THEM IF UTILITARIANISM IS THE POINT WE SHOULD GET RID OF THEM COMPLETELY TO PRESERVE THE MOST LIVES AS ZOE SHOWED!



FLIP: 35 Zoe Soderquist v. 1 Zachary Jones

Varsity L-D Debate		Saiful Islam (#5)	
Semi-Finals		Room 101	Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM
<b>Affirmative</b> Points (20-30) <u>ZOE Soderquist</u> 29		<b>Negative</b> Points (20-30) <u>ZACHARY Jones</u> 28	
The winner of this debate was <u>Affirmative</u> Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____		_____ Judge's Signature Sennyslope Professor School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The neg case had a single point to contend, which was the presence of nuclear weapons deters invasion and attack. there was little support for continued development and funding these actions, if this is the only purpose. Since the framework was utilitarianism, then we value life. And so, the AFF came back with no action by the neg having a detrimental impact on the current welfare of people. Therefore, action wins over the status quo and deterrence inaction.

The AFF responses were 100% in alignment with my own concerns about the neg argument. The AFF attacked the NEG specifically at the weak parts of the argument.

great points and cross regarding leaders, errors, risk, etc. A well played debate.



FLIP: 35 Zoe Soderquist v. 1 Zachary Jones

Varsity L-D Debate		Raheel Zubairi (#29) — Lori Swain 26	
Semi-Finals		Room 101	Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM
<b>Affirmative</b> Points (20-30) Zoe Soderquist		<b>Negative</b> Points (20-30) Zachary Jones	
(28)		(29)	
The winner of this debate was <b>Affirmative</b> <b>Negative</b> (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature 26 School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			

Overall Very good debate!


Good voice inflections to make points.

Comments & Reason for Decision: STATES OPT TO Eliminate Nuclear Testinals  
 Whitticism. Magnitude: Scope  
 Cont 1. Risk of error  
 - accidents  
 - rationality of decision makers  
 - terrorism  
 Can escalate to true war  
 India vs Pakistan - weight and  
 \* Can escalate (opponent attacked) low point  
 Mass destruction -  
 Cont 2 - Deterrence is not effective  
 Elimination is the only way  
 ② probability all is probable if you have the means.  
 ③ Biological attack  
 NC - Conventional weapons/warfare has not been deterred by nucs.  
 - North Korea - human rights violator  
 - Libya - ~~because~~ "this" happened doesn't mean "that" will happen.  
 Accidents can escalate Nuc war doesn't mean it can't -  
~~States~~ lack of flexibility in certain spots within debate.  
 North Korea - no conventional weapons only defense is nucs.  
 In my opinion your opponent out debated you

cross good 1st cross challenged India & Pakistan relevance and won points. did not use nucs in 1991.  
 Con 1 - conventional war  
 prevent a deter Nuc weapon  
 Cont. 2 - North Korea. Conventional Arms build up -  
 standing begin  
 \* Speaks very fast -  
 - Maximize work being - 3000 Accidents  
 - there have been no Nuc wars ever  
 Accidents -  
 - Deterrence requires common sense not probability  
 - Very fluid delivery w/ speak & catch  
 - Very strong debater  
 facial expression can be negative, like you seem bothered by the opponents questions. be aware of this: they have a right to cross and question.  
 NC - remove nucs removes deterrence -  
 AC - prevent deadly conventional war.  
 \* good voice inflections to make points  
 \* Really good debate



FLIP: 47 Camila Hess-Neustadt v. 35 Delaney Krieger

Varsity L-D Debate		Damodarum Biju (*39)	
Semi-Finals		Room 107	Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM
Affirmative <u>Delany Krieger</u>	Points (20-30) 30	Negative <u>Camila Hess-Neustadt</u>	Points (20-30) 29
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature <u>Bonita</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <u>Yes</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Started out too fast for me, but I felt it was a calculated decision based on the experience of the other two judges

- Had good questions during cross, but Neg's responses were great.

→ same

Had great questions during your cross and AFF response were OK. liked the passion you brought  
- Some ums & ahs

Neg had a better argument & convinced me that I should use the Neg case. I felt neg had better questions & answers. I also felt like Neg believed in her argument. I did however think that AFF was a slightly better speaker.





VLD

FLIP: 47 Camila Hess-Neustadt v. 35 Delaney Krieger

Varsity L-D Debate		Brittany Stanchik (*42)	
Semi-Finals		Room 107	Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM
Affirmative <u>Delaney Krieger</u>	Points (20-30) <u>∞</u>	Negative <u>Camila Hess-Neustadt</u>	Points (20-30) <u>∞</u>
The winner of this debate was  Affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Circle Winner)		<u>Erin Granillo-Walker</u> Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>N/A</u>		<u>34,7</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Not sure there was a strong enough link between nuclear weapons + economic inequality

Perhaps numbering your framework reasons to prefer in the NC would have been a good call?

On the AC, you tried to extend an impact on an argument whose internal link you had already called a wash.

RFD

- Frameworks were functionally the same by the end of the round. Ultimately, I buy that the bioweapons/cyber argument takes out the AC + give enough weight to the NC deter. contention.



FLIP: 47 Camila Hess-Neustadt v. 35 Delaney Krieger

Varsity L-D Debate		Renee Solinsky (*38)	
Semi-Finals		Room 107	Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM
Affirmative <u>Delaney Krieger</u>	Points (20-30) <u>28</u>	Negative <u>Camila Hess-Neustadt</u>	Points (20-30) <u>29</u>
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)		<u>Jud Clair</u> Judge's Signature <u>BASIS Phoenix</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

"Maximizing" justice seems strange since we can only minimize something measurable. How do we measure justice?

When talking about impacts, I'm a bit confused as to why you chose to focus on the cost. Why is cost relevant in a justice framework?

I really don't get the link chain from economic inequality to nuclear war.

Weapons weren't developed to harm innocents???

Why do the prerequisite morals of judges matter under a util framework? I didn't get what "prerequisite words" were even using.

The fact that you ~~basically~~ ignored bio & cyber weapons in the 2AR.

Neg

Strong warrants ~~in~~ in cross for why bioweapons would not have the same deterrence.

Save time in the 2NR ~~to~~ to move beyond the line-by-line and give clear voting issues.

Response to "bioweapons aren't developed to harm innocents" was OK, but there are bigger issues than uniqueness.

FD! Voting Neg since deterrence, bioweapons and cyber attacks flow through, easily outweighing other impacts under either framework.

