

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		2 Bonita Vista (*1)	
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 705	Tue 10/04/16 01:45PM
Affirmative Linnea Leidy 13 San Dieguito Academy		Negative Michelle Wang 15 Westview High School	
Points (25-30) <u>28</u>		Points (25-30) <u>29</u>	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		Lawrence Castillo Judge's Signature Bonita Vista High School School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff:

Linnea: confident, poised, good tone of voice in presenting material. Unable to counter the neg with key issues. Had a bit of trouble maintaining fluidity in presenting research material.


Neg:

Michelle: From the onset this presenter showed confidence, good articulating tone of voice, eye contact when addressing the judge. Present showed confidence in presenting research material and stayed on track at all times. Address all counter argument's.

Decision: Flawless.

Neg: I made the decision for the Negative in this debate because the presenter never wavered from her key research issues. Maintained her confidence, poised, enthusiasm, vocal tone, eye contact and addressed to the judge key points.

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Judge	
Round 3	Flight 1	Room 806	Tue 10/04/16 01:00PM
Affirmative		Points (25-30)	Negative Points (25-30)
Tasneem Mukarrama 1 Bonita Vista High School		<u>28</u>	Ivan Savchuk 14 The Bishop's School <u>29</u>
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative <u>Negative</u>			
(Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		Mission Vista	
		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirm - Tasneem - Power from. (Pronounce ^{works} correctly)

Life is value animals and or plants.

Value 1) Safety - accident inevitable

2) Environmental impact - material impact -

3) Uranium E.I. →

4) Too expensive Finland example

→ Rely on subsidies

5) Fuel not available

6) Terrorism - 13500 attacks - 2013 materials stolen

⑦ → Proliferation - conceded to

Neg.

Is there connection?

(connection never made)

Neg Ivan Cross ex -

1) Storage question -

2) Energy prices Question relevance - too expensive should

3) Proliferation cross ex → Aff F concede ^{she mentioned Nuke is} have pulled that point up you let it go.

Ivan opening speech - Nuclear → better quality of life

10.9% of Electricity -

Value = Quality of life for greatest # → utilitarianism - improve greatest # -

1) Competitive source & safer No emissions plus more efficient

2) Safe → Coal produces toxic waste

3) - 40 times more death Natural Gas

Efficiency strong argument

Nuke is viable clean - Good quality of life →

- Prohibition - would cause loss of power if stopped
not be able to replace easily. plus increase
in prices. San Onofre shut down & increase of
cost of power

→ Iran's was clear & easy to follow..

Attack - value proposition at Aff hard to follow &
dots not connected (agreed)

only 3 major accidents -

Nuke waste on site stored

Terrorism argument hard - very good -

AF Cross - Looking for dates & cards

Not sure of tactics you chose gave him a
good opportunity to defend his value statement. I would
not sure where you were going.

AF Rebuttal - refute arguments - Value criterion - majority
good - slavery strong should expand that thought process
it is a good argument -

Costs → In US overran budget. why over that would help
your case.

Nuke plants = much of emissions - release chlor -
proliferation you covered that point. → in cross - Why
not bring up terrorist sponsoring states that are seeking
nukes like Iran / North Korea - that would strengthen
your case on proliferation -

Neg rebuttal -

VLD
① MUKARRAMA V. SAVCHUK
BVI 28 NEG 29
N

Neg rebuttal.

Quality of life - you do have the argument here - she did not make connection (good catch...)

① Competitive - CO₂ emissions Britain atomic energy commission.

- Nuke is more efficient → Brookings 90%
your round - expand this ...

→ She did not address -
attache value criterion - (good job here)
Solar & wind less efficient - capacity is low

will she address

- Proliferation - only slight possibility - How?
not easy Pakistan example - good

AFF close - / Rebuttal

→ Value proposition - slavery - justifies only majority good - what is your example.

Mining for From uranium is what causes CO₂ emissions -

I don't understand your value statement -
You should be more articulate

Terrorism missed IRAN Deal very strong for your case - need to do a better job to articulate this point.

①
②
③
④
⑤
⑥
⑦
⑧
⑨
⑩
⑪
⑫
⑬
⑭
⑮
⑯
⑰
⑱
⑲
⑳
㉑
㉒
㉓
㉔
㉕
㉖
㉗
㉘
㉙
㉚
㉛
㉜
㉝
㉞
㉟
㊱
㊲
㊳
㊴
㊵
㊶
㊷
㊸
㊹
㊺
㊻
㊼
㊽
㊾
㊿

I am deciding for the Neg.
Overall Ivan was able to articulate
his case more clearly and AFF did not
clearly explain value criteria I could
not make the connection

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Judge	
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 806	Tue 10/04/16 01:45PM
Affirmative	Points (25-30) <u>30</u>	Negative	Points (25-30) <u>29</u>
Anthony Kolshorn 1 Bonita Vista High School		Chase Osborn 9 Helix Charter High School	
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 Mission Vista	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very observant and articulate

Anthony AFF case -

- Consistency with / Fair moral just value -
Pluralistic society - Discrimination

- 1) Environmental Racism - Indigenous people hurt
90% on American Indian Land Leases tilted to
Corporation - hurts some toxic waste not subject
- 2) Economic racism - causes health problems
violate human rights
- 3) → adverse health - cancer research -
- Nukes rely on marginalized

Melt down - about 10-12 years - such events
Chernobyl & Japan - radioactive contamination -

Terrorism - attempting to steal waste - use fissile

Neg Cross case -

- Value justice - How apply - governments action -
Not agree that Nuke is clean -
France example - 75% of power -

Neg Chase open - Chase is articulate + a quick thinker

Case - Energy efficiency / Clean -

I) Reliable -

efficient - more cleaner energy than any other use

2) Emission free environmentally

II Reliable - 24/7 12% capacity more efficient than any other

→ Generates more electricity than any other source

III 16 countries Depend - 25% of power

many examples on wide spread use -
France highest use -

Precedents set very strong argument

Attack - racism - not caused use correct way

Governments using it wrong -

justify loss of life way to use AFF terms
good job.

[France how many reactor accidents there you should
bring this up because it is ~~Ø~~. you should]

Terrorism -

Clear wrap up very good job!

Page 3

VLD
(A) KOLSHORN v. (N) OSBORN
BUTS
30
HHS
29
(AFF)

AFF Cross

Utilitarianism - clarity -

Govt use right way - plays into
AFF case good job catching this.

→ Why want efficiency -

Environmental - energy efficiency -
Good discussion - Good cross -

AFF rebuttal - rebut Neg case -

- Clean + efficient energy

cleanliness - not effective renewable is
more effective -

not all that clean -

- Not reliable - because fuel + minerals,
have environmental impact + hard to mine -
Uranium is running out.

- Renewable by 2030? what is renewable
energy - this needs to be better articulated
to strengthen your case.

④ Transition to renewables? I don't make
the connection here evidence was weak.

Neg rebuttal -

→ Uranium is on indigenous people's
land - just located there is not a rebuttal.

- Nuke cited case

REDUCE EMISSIONS - BE CLEAR ON WHAT
EXACTLY THE EMISSIONS ARE THAT ARE
BEING REDUCED

Neg Rebuttal - good argument that if we give up state power no evidence from AFF Good point!

→ Neg summary - attack - renewable energy productivity - energy production would be cut by 2/3rds - Very strong point followed up by long list of countries currently using + stresses the case parameters Really good job there

I don't think you need to address deaths here since France has ~~0~~ Nuclear accidents to date. You should take that fact here.

AFF - 3rd Speech

How much round

- Native population take advantage of good point - Neg did not respond -

→ Chernobyl 1 million deaths -

Emissions - Plant itself + mining process contribute to CO₂ emissions not addressed.

- Transition away from Natural Gas but nuclear will Neg catch this.

Renewables not defined well by your case they have inherent

Decide for AFF

OVERALL AFF DEFENDED: THEIR CRITERIA & NEG MISSED ~~key~~ POINTS TO WIN DEBATE

Deanna Murphy *Marta Ebertich*

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		MVHS 8 (*10)	
Round 3	Flight 1	Room 703	Tue 10/04/16 01:00PM
Affirmative Sam Chun 14 The Bishop's School Points (25-30) <u>29</u>		Negative Jenny Sierra 10 Mission Vista High School Points (25-30) <u>28</u>	
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		<i>Deanna Murphy</i> Judge's Signature Bonita Vista HS School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

neg failed to successfully refute Aff's contentions.

*well-researched
good pace & volume*

*well-researched
good eye contact
watch use of "UM"*

8, MVHS

Deanna
MurphyMarla Ehrlich
VLD

SDIVSL 1B

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		MVHS 8 (*10)	
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 703	Tue 10/04/16 01:45PM
Affirmative Julia Read 3 Carlsbad High School Points (25-30) <u>30</u>		Negative Kimia Nouraini Shamsian 10 Mission Vista High School Points (25-30) <u>28</u>	
The winner of this debate was <u>Affirmative</u> Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		<u>Deanna Murphy</u> Judge's Signature <u>Bonita Vista HS</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg failed to successfully refute
Aff's contentions.

Spoke with great
confidence and composure.

Good pace & volume

10

VLD