Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate - Round 4

Double Check Sheet

Academy, 9 Canyon (	10RP	Mission Vista HS	Raquel Renee I	29.0	1AK	Bonita Vista HS	Anthony Kolshc	28.0	NEG	Room 703
Academy, 9 Canyon (	3AZ	Carlsbad HS	Arin Zwonitzer	30.0	1RR	Bonita Vista HS	Raquel Rivera	26.0	AFF	Room 703
	2NZ	Canyon Crest Ac	Natalia Cristine	30.0	3PW	Carlsbad HS	Peter Whitehea	29.0	AFF	Room 704
	2AL	Canyon Crest Ac	Annie Lu	30.0	10CH	Mission Vista HS	Christina Han	27.0	AFF	Room 704
	3PP	Carlsbad HS	Priyesh Prakas	28.0	2VC	Canyon Crest Ac	Victoria Chen	29.0	NEG	Room 705
	10MM	Mission Vista HS	Madison Reese	28.0	1MT	Bonita Vista HS	Mary Talamante	29.0	NEG	Room 705
16, MVHS	1GN	Bonita Vista HS	Gilbert Neuner	30.0	14SH	The Bishop's Sc	Sebastian Hay	28.0	AFF	Room 706
16, MVHS	9CO	Helix Charter HS	Chase Osborn	29.0	6AV	Del Norte HS	Adhvaith Vijay	27.0	NEG	Room 706
	14IS	The Bishop's Sc	Ivan Savchuk	27.0	2CC	Canyon Crest Ac	Catherine Cang	29.0	NEG	Room 707
	2RA	Canyon Crest Ac	Reva Agashe	29.0	10MM	Mission Vista HS	Megan P McDc	30.0	NEG	Room 707
Academy, 4 Canyon (	6SV	Del Norte HS	Shruti Verma	27.0	3JR	Carlsbad HS	Julia Read	28.0	NEG	Room 708
Academy, 4 Canyon (	3AL	Carlsbad HS	Anthony Li	29.0	14HK	The Bishop's Sc	Harsha Kencha	27.0	AFF	Room 708
	10KS	Mission Vista HS	Kimia Nouraini	27.0	14SC	The Bishop's Sc	Sam Chun	25.0	AFF	Room 709
	2AZ	Canyon Crest Ac	Aaron Zhao	25.0	10KM	Mission Vista HS	Katherine Laure	29.0	NEG	Room 709
	2AC	Canyon Crest Ac	Amy Cheng	28.0	10JZ	Mission Vista HS	Jared Christope	29.0	NEG	Room 801
	13AS	San Dieguito Aca	Austin Stead	29.0	1TM	Bonita Vista HS	Tasneem Muka	27.0	AFF	Room 801
	14AJ	The Bishop's Sc	Ashley Jay	29.0	10SK	Mission Vista HS	Sophia Lauren	28.0	AFF	Room 802
	10TT	Mission Vista HS	Tryston Taylor	26.0	13LL	San Dieguito Aca	Linnea Leidy	30.0	NEG	Room 802
	15MW	Westview HS	Michelle Wang	28.0	3DR	Carlsbad HS	Diego Roberts	29.0	NEG	Room 803
	10BS	Mission Vista HS	Brian Sanchez	27.0	3AM	Carlsbad HS	Anna Mellissinc	26.0	AFF	Room 803
10, MVHS	1KN	Bonita Vista HS	Katherine Neur	28.0	2WM	Canyon Crest Ac	William Mao	27.0	AFF	Room 804
10, MVHS	15DG	Westview HS	David Galash	28.0	2EL	Canyon Crest Ac	Edward Li	27.0	NEG	Room 804
2, Westview	14EW	The Bishop's Sc	Elaine Wei	28.0	6AS	Del Norte HS	Aruna Sudarsh	30.0	NEG	Room 805
2, Westview	13DF	San Dieguito Aca	Darian Flores	29.0	12AL	Rancho Bernard	Angela Liu	30.0	NEG	Room 805
Cbad, 9	12TS	Rancho Bernard	Tejas Srinivasa	29.0	10DV	Mission Vista HS	Daniel Davis Vi	26.0	AFF	Room 806
Cbad, 9	6HZ	Del Norte HS	Hannah Zheng	29.0	1CA	Bonita Vista HS	Catherine Arme	29.0	AFF	Room 806
	10CB	Mission Vista HS	Carlos Erick Va	29.0	2NC	Canyon Crest Ac	Nikhil Chilakapa	28.0	AFF	Room 807
	2AZ	Canyon Crest Ac	Ashley Zhang	28.0	10AR	Mission Vista HS	Alexis Ramirez	29.0	AFF	Room 807
1, SDA Judge	4DS	Cathedral Catho	Dominic Sprigg	29.0	6SG	Del Norte HS	Shubham Gupt	27.0	NEG	Room 808
1, SDA Judge	10JS	Mission Vista HS	Jenny Sierra	27.0	4PN	Cathedral Catho	Paulina Nguyer	28.0	AFF	Room 808
	1NM	Bonita Vista HS	Nachelle Matut	27.0	15ZL	Westview HS	Ziyang Liu	27.0	AFF	Room 809

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate - Round 4

Double Check Sheet

	10TA	Mission Vista HS	Talisa I Arboled	29.0	15NW	Westview HS	Nathan Wang	28.0	AFF	Room 809
3, Cathedral	12ET	Rancho Bernard	Eric Timmerma	28.0	6CX	Del Norte HS	Claudia Xue	28.0	AFF	Room 901
3, Cathedral	6MM	Del Norte HS	Michele Murake			BYE	BYE			Room 901

Kuangkai Estella Tai

SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Judge	
Round 4	Flight 2	Room 705	Tue 10/04/16 04:45PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Madison Reese Martin 10 Mission Vista High School	27.5	Mary Talamantez 1 Bonita Vista High School	29

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? no

Judge's Signature

CAHS / parent / physician

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Chose neg due to the following:

(1) neg had stronger argument for curbing global warming vs. the aff argument of environmental impact

(2) neg presented a good solution in the thorium fuel cycles vs using uranium

(3) neg presented good arguments that meltdown, accident, radiation problems unlikely, citing France;

(4) neg presented that global warming will outweigh the threat of terrorism and his argument was stronger than the aff argument that terrorism will occur.

(5) neg presented that uranium mining will continue and the use of uranium in nuclear power is a good benefit of uranium mining = believable.

(6) dry cask storage good

(6) dry cask storage - good, Aff didn't refute

VLD

(7) neg could've cited increasing natural disasters, increase in heat stroke/dehydration deaths. 14

(8) neg cited accelerating global warming can be curbed using nuclear power - good argument

(9) neg cited interesting evidence of nuclear increasing risk of malignancy by 0.8052%

(10) aff cited interesting data on Strontium 90 in baby teeth and increasing thyroid CA, may want to expound

(11) excellent opening Aff speech, may want to expound

(12) neg rebutted arguments well

Kuangkai ~~Estella~~ TAI

SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Judge	
Round 4	Flight 1	Room 705	Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Priyesh Prakash 3 Carlsbad High School	28	Victoria Chen 2 Canyon Crest Academy	29

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Judge's Signature

CAHS / parent / physician

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

(sorry see back)

(45min)

(ASB) 6 min

neg 3min

neg 7min

- nuclear energy
  - moral obligation
  - atomic reaction
  - value
- safety
  - ↑ pain minimize pain
  - morality decision
  - utilitarianism
- environmental consideration
  - increasing gas emissions CO2 NO2 CO
  - Kumar '01 radioactive air / water
  - CO2 CO SO2 alternatives
  - meltdown Chernobyl Fukishima

neg ↑ nuclear power

1:14:42

Close neg due to following:

1. Aff argued increased emissions but unable to produce data in comparison to other energy sources whereas neg was able to.

2. Aff argued nuclear power leads to nuclear proliferation, weapons, terrorism, but lack of data/needs linkage

3. Aff needs more data on health concerns of cancer, genetic mutations (specifically Hiroshima, Fukushima, etc.)

4. neg impact of combating global warming is a real and present concern — could've cited that we recently passed 400 ppm CO_2.

5. neg impact of global warming more detrimental than nuclear power leading to nuclear war

6. couldn't quite understand neg's argument of "fairness" and how every country should have nuclear power.

Joe Lacanienta

SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Judge	
Round 4	Flight 1	Room 704	Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Natalia Cristine Zorrilla 2 Canyon Crest Academy	30	Peter Whitehead 3 Carlsbad High School	29

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ✓

Judge's Signature

RANCHO BERNARDO NURSE SUPERVISOR

School / Affiliation / Occupation SHARP MESA VISTA

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NATALIA gave an excellent presentation in support of RENEWABLE energy. Her contentions are organized, evidence were current, and delivery succinct, clear, and to the point.

Her arguments were compelling in terms of utilization, moral concern, maximum benefit -- serving the most good for the most people regarding prem. safety, health, and economic impact.

Much details about the use co-existing or opposing, in terms of percentage which became a point-counter-point during the debate.

Economic impact regarding government subsidys for nuclear power easily defended.

PETER also gave an excellent presentation in support of NUCLEAR power..

Excellent argument to support government subsidies and source of funds to construct more nuclear power plants to provide "RELIABLE," safe, clean power that will serve more people than all renewable energy sources combined - with less emphasis on fossil fuels.

Downplayed URANIUM mining emissions, and much focus on fossil fuels, hydropower as bad alternatives to nuclear power.

VLD

Joe Lacanieta

SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Judge	
Round 4	Flight 2	Room 704	Tue 10/04/16 04:45PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Annie Lu 2 Canyon Crest Academy	30	Christina Han 10 Mission Vista High School	27

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature

RANCHO BERNARDO NURSE SUPERVISOR

School / Affiliation / Occupation SHARP MESA VISTA

Comments & Reason for Decision:

ANNIE presented affirmative contentions in support of RENEWABLE energy with focus on the immediate (TACTICAL) versus long range (STRATEGIC) implications that affect morality, socioeconomic impact, and abuse of disadvantaged population targeted for nuclear waste dumps -- mostly in INDIAN RESERVATIONS.

Excellent reasoning with current evidence about the health consequences that were not contested in the clash / counters.

CHRISTINA on the negative side gave an excellent argument about the need for nuclear power and alluded to keeping world peace by world military use of nuclear power for submarines, and aircraft carriers. This is more on the long term purpose of nuclear power which is not relevant to current issues about:

Health consequences
Nuclear waste dumps
Uranium mining emissions.

POOR REBUTTAL OF ABOVE CONTENTIONS.

VLD

2, WESTVIEW

Nadia Galash

SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Westview 2 (*15)	
Round 4	Flight 1	Room 805	Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Elaine Wei 14 The Bishop's School	28	Aruna Sudarshan 6 Del Norte High School	30

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes (N)

Nadash –
Judge's Signature

Westview HS / Atty AT Law
School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both of them spoke very fst. However, I vote for Aruna since she used reputable evidence in support of her position such as research data from a reputable American University. I also liked the fact that Aruna was more composed and maintained direct eye contact. Elaine was very nervous. However, despite that both of them were well-prepared, they were glued to their notes.

Also, Elaine did not counter-argued the fact that with elimination of nuclear power, the use of the fossil energy will increase which will lead to the global warming - which will affect of all us. Therefore, Elaine's argument that the government should care about its minorities & poor people fails if ~~everyone~~ ~~human li~~ humanity becomes extinct. Therefore, I vote for Aruna & she wins.

VLD

ACADEMY, 4 CANYON CREST Jerry Zhao **SDIVSL 1B**

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		4 Canyon Crest Academy (*2)	
Round 4	Flight 2	Room 708	Tue 10/04/16 04:45PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Anthony Li 3 Carlsbad High School	29	Harsha Kencharedy 14 The Bishop's School	27

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature

CCA

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The affirmative won this debate.
The affirmative elaborated the issue of nuclear energy, especially sustainability, poverty near the plant, and provided the opportunity of renewable sources of energy supplies.

The negative did a nice job to support the point of utilitarianism, but put much effort on debunking fossil fuel, which was not the assertion of the affirmative.

The affirmative upheld the position well.

VLD

ACADEMY, 4 CANYON CREST Jerry Zhao **SDIVSL 1B**

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		4 Canyon Crest Academy (*2)	
Round 4	Flight 1	Room 708	Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Shruti Verma 6 Del Norte High School	27	Julia Read 3 Carlsbad High School	28

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature

CCA

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The negative won this closely contented debate. The affirmative used the view point of morality. and the negative used the utilitarianism to disparate.

The main arguement of the affirmative was the issue of nuclear waste and its risk towards life and its long half life of uranium in disposal. The ~~affirmative~~ negative used an option of repurposing referrenced from France to divert the question. and successfully defend the position of ~~affi~~ the negative.

The argument of using renewable energy was not used effectively to help the affirmative.

2, WESTVIEW Nadia Galesh **SDIVSL 1B**

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate	Westview 2 (*15)	
Round 4 Flight 2	Room 805	Tue 10/04/16 04:45PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Darian Flores 13 San Dieguito Academy	29	Angela Liu 12 Rancho Bernardo High School	30

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative** (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes

Nalesh
Judge's Signature

Westview HS
School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision: Both of them did a terrific job. Spoke fast. Darian maintained direct eye contact & had a very impressive introduction by using definitions from Oxford & Webster's dictionaries.

I liked more Angela's position because she took it to a more sophisticated level talking about morality, what is justice, & what is right or wrong.

I also liked that she put countries' self-interests first & also raised the issue of global warming.

I liked that Darian in his defense & cross-exams was tying everything back to the resolution.

In my opinion, Darian did not address very well concerns raised by Angela.

Thus, I vote for Angela & her outside-of-the-box thinking & novelty.

Kevin Book

SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Judge	
Round 4	Flight 2	Room 809	Tue 10/04/16 04:45PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Talisa I Arboleda 10 Mission Vista High School	29	Nathan Wang 15 Westview High School	28

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

Grossmont — Electrical Engineer

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

Const

- op quote
- Def.
- Contries only which
- ought → morality

Value: society progress
- min risk.
- too dangerous
  - rad ex.
  - even in low rad. ↑ cancer.
- why south hemi no contamination.
  - → global consequences

dual use - tech can be used for dis.

2. nuke → retards inno. - less green energy
3. minorities more likely to be affected

Cross

- How many are 4th gen? - clear line of questioning.
  - not all
- when was completely safe?
  - esp after fukushima.
- societal prog.

4 min const

- Nukes too dangerous
  - not all are 4th gen ⇒ meltdowns still possible
  - global effect.
- not limiting (wind / solar)
  - → US - lots of land
- indigenous people.
  - Aus Aboriginal lands
- small risk still risk.

Neg

3 min cross

- good opening narrative
- good speed / needs a little more enunciation
- morality →
- society progress
- How destroy = risk
  - green = reduce risk
- How nuke = racial
  - it is factor.
- minimizing risk
- needs to proj.
- good questioning line.

Const

- societal progress + morality - louder
- utilitarianism ⇒ moral = greatest # people val.
- 4th gen reactors
  - cannot meltdown!
  - physics based cooldown
- ind. lands
  - target ind people?
  - waste disposal = safe.
  - can now contain all waste.
- nuke = necessary
  - ↓ global emissions
  - env advantages.
  - constains options.
  - add. sensors
    - more robust
- green is not fast enough.
  - nukes outweigh green.

- good proj when reading.
- need to proj when answering
- less filler "um".

2

Aff

3min reb

- terrorism huge factor ← op did not contend.
- tangible issue.

Op: not for climate change.

- ~~climate~~
- innovation of other energy
  ⇒ all together can fix climate change.
- nukes not only way to fix climate change
  - terrorism.

- Good ~~cheer~~ speech / may need a little more enunciation.

Neg

6 min reb.

- nukes too dangerous
  - ~~lith~~ → mitigate
  - investment to further convers
  - terrorism canceld by no meltdown
- Climate change rebuttal omitted by op.
  - nukes help stop.
- waste also needs more investment
- Op: "wind is good enough"
  - only nukes can mitigate climate change
- nukes risk vs climate change
- climate change → future gens.
  - cause ext.
  - 2030 cannot stop. - good proj
    - includes nuke enj
- Aff = real threats - real / happening.

- Initially needed more projection.
- Did not contend ~~terrorism~~ arg.

4pr

Kevin Book

SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Judge	
Round 4	Flight 1	Room 809	Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Nachelle Matute 1 Bonita Vista High School	27	Ziyang Liu 15 Westview High School	27

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

Grossmont. Electrical Engineer

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Construction — Aff
  - Melt downs
  - more deaths after.
  - more disatrous.
  - hazard if not maintained
  - plants → ↑ cancer rates
  - leaks
  - drinking
  - renewables - can meet demand.
  - protect citizens.

Burn.

- very clear / good proj
- needs pause btwn points. less run on.

Negative.

Cross

- morality vs law
- ends justify means.
- quantify life.

3:

- needs clear questioning line

Constructive

- consequentialism vs utilitarianism
  - save 5 vs save 1
- melt downs possible.
- harms env & due to natural disaster.
- free will / self preservation → no nukes used
  - people want to live.

- very clear.
- fr
- needs more research.

diff opp brought up?

what %?

- technology = risk
  - advancements → protection.

7 min

- needs to address opp's talking points.

Cross

- no case presented by Neg
- has data to back claims

- need to control narrative.

Const

- life is
- credible source
- melt downs potentially disastrous
  - Fukushima / Chernobl.
- waste problem.
  - long half life. dangerous
  - no way to deal with
- has alternatives.
- Prohibition ≤ prevention

Reb

- doctor saved
- legal vs moral
- physics ≠ no meltdowns.
  - current design.
- how to calc human mind? ← what does this rebutt.?
- priveledge of neg(?).
- pleasure = moral justified
- internal guideline.

Rub

- No case / only analytics.
- credible. sources.
- vulnerable to disasters.
- contamination hazard

- need to control speed / tone / frustration. Calm.

2

Aff

- good volume
- needs better pacing to drive home important statements
- learn to deal w/ frustrations.

Neg

- Needs to stay on topic
- Address opp arguments.

Paul Sheets

SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Judge	
Round 4	Flight 2	Room 807	Tue 10/04/16 04:45PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Winner Ashley Zhang 2 Canyon Crest Academy	28	Alexis Ramirez 10 Mission Vista High School	29

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes

Paul Sheets
Judge's Signature

Carlsbad
School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- I gave the win to Aff because her contentions (3) stood up through the debate and were basically dropped by Neg. I thought Neg (Alexis) was a better speaker but I couldn't get past that he really didn't counter Aff's contentions.

- I thought Aff also made good point about looking at technology in use today vice the future. →

- for Neg (Alexis): I would have given you this debate if you had provided counters to Aff's contentions. Be sure to do this in the future!

Paul Sheets

SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Judge	
Round 4	Flight 1	Room 807	Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Winner Carlos Erick Valencia Barron 10 Mission Vista High School	29	Nikhil Chilakapati 2 Canyon Crest Academy	28

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? no

Paul Sheets
Judge's Signature

Paul Sheets
School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I gave the win to Aff because I felt his contentions stood up better through the debate and were not effectively countered.

- However, I never really understood what the Aff contention #3 was - I don't think Neg did either because it was never really countered!

- for Neg (Nikhil): Try to polish your delivery; try not to move around so much in your chair. Also at times it was hard to understand you because you spoke so fast and didn't enunciate well. Try to work on that!

- for Aff: Recommend you don't call uranium a fossil fuel — it isn't, and I didn't follow your logic on this.

1, SDA JUDGE

Christy O'Brien

SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		SDA Judge 1 (*13)	
Round 4	Flight 2	Room 808	Tue 10/04/16 04:45PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Jenny Sierra 10 Mission Vista High School	27	Paulina Nguyen 4 Cathedral Catholic	28

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? yes

Judge's Signature

Carlsbad HS

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - slow down, speak clearly and try to emote more during constructive. You were more persuasive during cross & rebuttal.

Neg - Q+A only requested citations

Aff - Q+A [redacted] thoughtful questions that clarify points & issues

~~Neg~~ Aff was able to rebuttal more effectively than neg.

1, SDA JUDGE Christy O'Brien Martha Meadow SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		SDA Judge 1 (*13)	
Round 4	Flight 1	Room 808	Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Dominic Sprigg 4 Cathedral Catholic	29	Shubham Gupta 6 Del Norte High School	27

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes

Judge's Signature

Carlsbad H.S.

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff Constructive - good eye contact, pace & emotion
- no supportive evidence

Neg constructive - do not yell at your audience
Slow down, - less aggresive & patronizing
brought up monetary argument when the Aff stated during cross that that was not one of his points

- Neg wins on basis that Aff had no evidence to support claims otherwise Aff would have won.

Diana Kesharavzi

SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Judge	
Round 4	Flight 1	Room 803	Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Michelle Wang 15 Westview High School	28	Diego Roberts 3 Carlsbad High School	27

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature

Rancho Bernardo HS

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Value & morality

close to justice

similar values

Public policy => value trade of (vitalit)

① monotry cost => imense

billions (new reactors)

~~The short~~ 7.5 million dollars once its build => make money

100% w/ bio energy

Renewable energy not as good

Urinium mining?

② Can w/ the ruin of the enviroment

No, safty legislation

uranium mining

water resources

Contamination

extraction of waste

New

New reactors

N Reactors shut down

Use of sea water => Taiwan less emition

air pollution

~~Even~~ 10F/coal more dangerous

③ extremly dangrous future generation

waste

lick poison to the enviroment

~~Subsidizing~~ major accidents => How likely? Time fram? what happened in the ~~past~~?

2011 Japan nuclear disaster

high risk

Radioactivity

AFF

30 prep time

GW => NOT Practical

new reactors => every 2 week till 2050

4 billion dollars

best chance against climate

the set backs

100% renewable energy system

wind hydro solar

10 million additions

It does have emmition

proven to sustain power

The ~~$~~ unteensable

better alternative

③ expanding the NP

harms

we don't have enough water

Safety of live => real kills 4000 more ppl =>

economically impossible

it's not a tale

mine

you can live in a world w/out NE

Neg 1min prep

603

Justice def

value

① NP Saves lives

Did not remit

646T of CO2

prevent decommition energy

double the CO2

30 million

most of the plans

② good for Enviro

reactor not regulated

6% annual

w/ NP had to achieve

They can't melt down

No radio activity

2000 ll

3500 4 jobs

schools roads => infrastructure

expensive to build

relatively cheap to run

1/3 NP => quality of

down sides less life than other

logical arguments clearly speaking

economic stand? Is it possible to build more?

good sources/stats arguments good responses

Dharmendra ~~Scot Zwemitzer~~

SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Judge	
Round 4	Flight 2	Room 709	Tue 10/04/16 04:45PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Aaron Zhao 2 Canyon Crest Academy	25	Katherine Lauren McGraw 10 Mission Vista High School	29

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? N

Judge's Signature

Engineer.

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very well organized, change speech nicely based on the opponent to make opponent think twice for his counter.

Nicely use of examples to prove the point.

Very focused on opponent speech and ~~ca~~. Catch the week point ~~and~~ ~~a~~ to win over.

Able to cover all points with assigned time.

K. (N)

Very focused on opponent. (+10)
Shorten with nice cross questions.

Prep time: Nicely questioned and accepted the responce from opponent.

Speech:- Organized
Nicely start with facts. (+15)

1) Use current example to prove the point.

~~Nice from the~~
able to prove with examples.
All contention with example.
Nice exam of chemical composition.
Attacking opponent.
Nicely ended.
Provided example for questions.
Shorter speech and attack on opponent.
prep- ii
Nicely use of assigned time. +4
Answered question with examples.
good examples.
Catch the in point of opponent.
Correlate examples with each contention.
able to prove the point.
Adjust speech based on opponent question.

A. (A). 6min)

Good Reasoning used to prepare.
Impressive start. (+15)
Organized.
Explain technical terms but lagging examples.
Nuclear energy :- No Examples.
Very good information about Nuclear.
Too much detail (respective)
Not able to prove the point in given time.
Nicely responce to each question with Examples. (+9)

Cross question:- Not able to focused on opponent. (questions are not impressive and opponent easy to answer.

Prep- ii (Negative framework) (min) (+2)
Repeat same information many time. (like increase in CO_2 etc.)
Not focused on opponent speech.
Good knowledge, could not express.
lagging examples.
Discuss about incident but No example provided.

VLD

Dharmendra ~~Scot Zwonitzer~~

SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Judge	
Round 4	Flight 1	Room 709	Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Kimia Nouraini Shamsian 10 Mission Vista High School	27	Sam Chun 14 The Bishop's School	25

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? N

Judge's Signature

Engineer.

(School / Affiliation / Occupation)

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Well organiged, able to complete speech with provided time.
Use proper example with fact to let judge accept the claim.
very focused on opponent and questioned and catch the weekness of opponent.
opponent unable to justify or lagging of evidance and examples, took longer for completing speech.
opponent not able to ask impressive counter question.

very clear & effection in responcing.

Kimia :- Nice Start with proof. (completed 6 min)
Orginized / proof. with Example.
Example with fact data / Resume of data. (+10)

Not ablel to prove the point with speech / more like reading book.. (Nice Explanation about Energy resources over Nuclur Energy).
Completed in time / more reading.

Counter Attack - (Answer the cross question)
ii) valid response to qurting.
iii) Not Prepaired third Contention / iv) wrong example.

K :- Nice counted. responce. Asking for evidences from opponent.

Sam :- (Negation) Good questions question with example. (+10)
i) valid question. (7 min).
ii) Coverd All contention,
Not Clear what explaining in speech. (examples.)
Not able to produce the proof of claim)
Speech can be shorted. (unnecessary data)
Speech is good but no Example.
Nuclur is importen & Efficien :- No proof.

Counter question: Not able to responce for questions. in (+10) effective way, making hinself more questions.

Kimia :- Good Catch :- (oppointent did Not provide evidences. (+12)
for what he claims. (5 min)

SAM :- Good Catch on opponent; Good responce to the opponent. (6 min) (+12)
Accepted that No data available to prove point.
(Not organized with his paper work cause Extra time).

3, CATHEDRAL Marla Ehrlich Single Flighted **SDIVSL 1B**

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Cathedral 3 (*4)	
Round 4	Flight 1	Room 901	Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Eric Timmerman 12 Rancho Bernardo High School	28	Claudia Xue 6 Del Norte High School	28

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Marla Ehrlich
Judge's Signature

Mission Vista High School
School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff was very organized and spoke with authority. The contentions made were well supported and the rebuttals were also solid. I would have preffered that he stood up to speak as it would have given his speaking more authority. In addition, it's better to recognize something that was left out and keep notes instead of approaching the judge afterward.

Neg was a passionate speaker with convincing contentions. She also did a great job of using the opponents reference/analology of falling apples against his argument of the past repeating itself. Keeping composure and not expressing the missplacement of notes will help her to come accross with more authority.

Good job to both competitors!

Shelley Tracy

SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Judge	
Round 4	Flight 2	Room 802	Tue 10/04/16 04:45PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Tryston Taylor Trejo 10 Mission Vista High School	26	Linnea Leidy 13 San Dieguito Academy	30

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature

Poway High School

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Morality / upholding consequentialism

(L) 1) More harm than benefits from Nuclear power

15% chance of meltdown

39 reactors have 2% chance of contamination

(L) 2) Safety

Terrorism — we tend to put Nuclear American nuc power plants who

(−) * waste — some where the source of uranium from

* little eye contact made w/ judge, mostly read from lap top. (−)

Cross

Not much of a cross exam

only stated that he doesn't have to advocate the use of coal or oil.

(L) Environment doesn't to do with morality

Conversations

1) ran out of time (−)

closing

• Didn't really counter her points

mostly restated what was stated previously

cross-exam

Ethics of Justice

1) Good questions. (W)

↳ Do we need to build power plants on American Indian Sight.

* Solid delivery with authority over all her sources / data (+)

Case

1) Nuclear ~~use~~ energy is better for the environment. ! (W)

2) Production is safer than coal

Great info provided on deaths related to coal

Impact

- Green house effect, climate change
- coal / gas
- Nuclear Fusion is safer than Fission

* Wind / Sun energy requires much more

closing (W)

• Pointed out that his source was old (2010-11) as opposed to Neg that was current (2016)

• Reiterated that being nuclear would increase terrorism. This doesn't translate we could actually get rid of planes after 9/11

Shelley Tracy

SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Judge	
Round 4	Flight 1	Room 802	Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Ashley Jay 14 The Bishop's School	29	Sophia Lauren Kittell 10 Mission Vista High School	28

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

Poway High School

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Overall could cite credible sources, had a rebuttal for all questions. Time managed very well, delivery was articulate.

(W) Aff

social contract / morality

1) Harmful waste / impact to environment

2) Disasters due to nuclear weapon
↳ good examples of major nuclear accidents

3) Uranium is dangerous (deadly metal) *limited
↳ 40% increase in cancer

(L) Neg

. asked for data on impact of uranium weapons

Notes: Unclear w/ questioning, had to repeat question several times to be understood what she was asking

power / affirming

Redefined

(W)

1) win

2) Asked for sources and Neg couldn't provide.

Notes: Asked very good questions about Neg couldn't provide answers or cite sources

(L)

1) Important to our economy for energy
↳ still being used today, integral part of our economy
↳ 16 mil to govt.

2) Extreme jobs loss
↳ San Onofre
↳ Provided high salaries
↳ employees over 100k

3) Alternatives not fun answers
↳ Wind too unpredictable
↳ Solar limited to when sun is up.

Ran out of time

✓ Nuclear power only make up 11% of energy sources

✓ 100% of die from exposure to radiation

✓ Used sources that weren't benefiting the case, therefore objective sources

(AFF)

1) Brought up good points that new facts were taken out of context

2) Pointed out that AFF could not prove the 100% association died of lung cancer

AFF

1) AFF doesn't need alternative only to prove it isn't needed.

2)

Contentions

1) minority may vote to small country not w/ lg # of people

2) Clearing

NEG

closing points

1) Didn't propose alternatives

2) ~~[illegible]~~ benefits the majority not the minority

run out of time

Wei Wei TAN

SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Judge	
Round 4	Flight 2	Room 801	Tue 10/04/16 04:45PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Austin Stead 13 San Dieguito Academy	29	Tasneem Mukarrama 1 Bonita Vista High School	27

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low-point win? _____

Wei Tan

Judge's Signature

Del Norte.

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both AFF and NEG prepared very well on Constructive speech.

AFF's CE on Global warming cause and natual disastr are very well constructed.

AFF's 2nd Constructive speech also pointed out NEG's drop out of AFF's contention points. AFF also addressed all of NEG's points in a conviencing way.

NEG did well explaining what she meant on natual disaster.

AFF also covered all points again and summarized in his final rebuttal. good job.

Wei Wei TAN

VLD

SDIVSL 1B

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Judge	
Round 4	Flight 1	Room 801	Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Amy Cheng 2 Canyon Crest Academy	28.	Jared Christoper Zimmerman 10 Mission Vista High School	28.5

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Wei Wei Tan
Judge's Signature

Del Norte
School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF started with VC of morale - veil of Ignorance. NEG XC raised 2 very good questions. (1) why minority. (2) environmental impact which leads to NEG's Value and VC.

NEG also uses his contension 1 to oppose opponent's contension 1.

use of CDC's facts is convincing., Great.

~~NE~~ For creating jobs, ~~NEG~~ the jobs could be every kind. high pay and low pay, ~~[illegible]~~ Nuclear related jobs can be high tech and service oriented jobs.

In AFF's Constructive, AFF focused on the framework - which VC is more moral and attacking on the low paying jobs. would like ~~to see~~ to see rebuttal of NEG's contension.

In NEG's Rebuttal, NEG address jobs vs no job, and if China is respressive. put emphysis on VC.

Diana Keshavarzi **SDIVSL 1B**

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Judge	
Round 4	Flight 2	Room 803	Tue 10/04/16 04:45PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Brian Sanchez 10 Mission Vista High School	27	Anna Mellissinos 3 Carlsbad High School	26

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature

Rancho Bernardo HS

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

First speech 1:10

morality =>
Freedom VC: Equality
gov are the policy makers
" all ppl are treated equally
con: NW has produce waste & a huge health impact
pollution of Native American lands
Native lands were targeted This happens in
the land fields will leak poison =>
future generation
producing NP will be gov
value majority
disproportionate #
allows gov to be immoral
① indigidous land => countries
wont place them near cities
It is the fault of NP
② safety of NP
takes time

value: Justic and
VC: Util (greatest good for the
② anything at > amt ppl
① created job opportunity
clean energy can create
jobs Clean Energy NOT NE
money can be redirected to
job creation
the amt of accidents
② Nuc accidents
what would happen if it did happen
③ FF w/out NP
the energy supplical would
have been FF => (climate change)
safe alter pollute the enviro
(B) NE facilitate/generates
Produces No GHG GE
The amt energy ↑ US EDem
30%.
we will conti
③ No economic =>
countries will be forced to
shut it down
slavery was => changing

AFF

comprehensive
arguement
and responses

Neg

10, MVHS Joshua McBride [illegible] SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate	MVHS 10 (*10)	
Round 4 Flight 2	Room 804	Tue 10/04/16 04:45PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
David Galash 15 Westview High School	28	Edward Li 2 Canyon Crest Academy	27

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes.

Judge's Signature

Mission Vista / Software Consultant.

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg had better ~~arguments~~ / EVIDENCE & Prep and was strong over all ~~→ AF~~ in the end the stats won -

AFFirmative: was a super strong Cross to the Neg and was very Clever w/ using Definitions to his advantage but it did Not win out the Stats & Prep.

10, MVHS Joshua McBride Lea Smith SDIVSL 1B

VLD

3/7

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate	MVHS 10 (*10)	
Round 4 Flight 1	Room 804	Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Katherine Neuner 1 Bonita Vista High School	28	William Mao 2 Canyon Crest Academy	27

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO.

Judge's Signature

Mission Vista - Software Consulting

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Nuclear Power. Phase Out. →
Utilitarianism
Safety: 57/37 accidents 0
Meltdown 10-20yrs

Nuclear Weapons? Promotes terrorism?
Radiation.

Renewable.
Fast Speaker, slow down a little!

ON CROSS -
CROSS - Concise / STRONG

CROSS
Concise & Controlling!
Prohibit. =
Kills Death argument. - 3 DEATHS SHOT NO CARD
Renewables over fossil → Cole (GERMANY)
INTEGRAL FAST REACTORS! = FUNS IN ACTION. =

COMMENTS!

→ Well SPOKEN
→ GREAT EXPRESSION & PRESENCE
→ TALKED ALITTLE FAST
→ CARDS WELL PREPED
→ GOOD JOB LOOKING AT JUDGE & READING JUDGE EVEN WHEN OPPONENT IS ARGUING

COMMENTS!

→ INTELIGENT TACTICS ON DEF OF PROHIBIT.
→ PREP CARDS ALITTLE BETTER.
→ VERY GOOD REBUTTAL
→ LOOK AT JUDGE MORE → GIVES YOU THE OPPORTUNITY TO READ THE JUDGE & MOVE ON SOONER. COVER MORE - OR STICK TO A TOPIC BASED ON READING JUDGE EXPRESSION!
→

Reason: AFFIRM WAS BETTER PREPARED W/ EVIDENCE. CROSS WAS STRONGER & HAD STRONGER PRESENCE OVER-ALL

Sherry Nouraini

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate	MVHS 16 (*10)	
Round 4 Flight 2	Room 706	Tue 10/04/16 04:45PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Chase Osborn 9 Helix Charter High School	29	Adhvaith Vijay 6 Del Norte High School	27

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes

Judge's Signature

MVHS

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg had more substantial research to back his arguments. prohibiting nuclear power was presented as immediate, and Neg provided data about the extent to which Nuclear power is relied upon for power, and preventing further increase in CO_2 emission.

Neg had good information about safe storage of nuclear waste, very specific.

Comment for Neg speaker – Could benefit from better spirit of competition. AFF tried to exchange friendly conversation with Neg at the conclusion of the round, which was not returned by NEG. Also, NEG needs to stand up during cross examination. →

NEG ~~AFF~~ held his hands over his mouth when he was speaking which made it difficult to understand what he was saying. Also spoke too fast during the 7 min. Constructive speech.

Comment for AFF - When giving data about units of nuclear energy, define the units more clearly, use metaphors perhaps. It is hard to formulate a judgment when your audience does not have a good sense of what amount a unit refers to.

16, MVHS

Sherry Nouraini

SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate	MVHS 16 (*10)	
Round 4 Flight 1	Room 706	Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Gilbert Neuner 1 Bonita Vista High School	30	Sebastian Hayden 14 The Bishop's School	28

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Judge's Signature

MVHS

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF made strong arguments for banning nuclear energy back by a large number of citations. Also, defining prohibition as a phase out over the life time of the plant made the argument for AFF much stronger.

Neg did not have strong rebuttal for preventing use of nuclear waste fuel for terrorist purposes.

Neg did not have a strong argument against Natural disaster like eartqnakes, nor against hazards to people living near the nuclear plants.

Overall AFF was better prepared and made a stronger case for their position.

ACADEMY, 9 CANYON CREST Leo Tokman **SDIVSL 1B**

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		9 Canyon Crest Academy (*2)	
Round 4	Flight 2	Room 703	Tue 10/04/16 04:45PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Arin Zwonitzer 3 Carlsbad High School	30	Raquel Rivera 1 Bonita Vista High School	26

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Leo Tokman
Judge's Signature

Engineer
School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Arin had an excellent persuasive presentation of her argument, with lots of evidence and logical counters of her opponent. Raquel had a few valid points, but she could not connect them as cohesively and could not counter as effectively.

ACADEMY, 9 CANYON CREST Leo Takman **SDIVSL 1B**

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		9 Canyon Crest Academy (*2)	
Round 4	Flight 1	Room 703	Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Raquel Renee Parizeau 10 Mission Vista High School	29	Anthony Kolshorn 1 Bonita Vista High School	28

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes

Judge's Signature

Engineer

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Raquel presented a very passionate and eloquent case for prohibiting nuclear power based on values (of personal outer freedom), Anthony's arguments had more evidence and logical conclusion that the nuclear power's net effect is more positive compared to the alternative fuels, like coal or gas, that greatly contribute to climate change. Both Raquel and Anthony are great debaters.

Bob McCarthy

SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Judge	
Round 4	Flight 2	Room 707	Tue 10/04/16 04:45PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Reva Agashe 2 Canyon Crest Academy	29	Megan P McDonald 10 Mission Vista High School	30

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO.

R.G. McCarthy
Judge's Signature

Carlsbad.
School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision: Excellent debate. Both debaters are top-notch. Negation was more effective in simplifying ~~the~~ and articulating her position.

Reva Agashe - Affirm

- Excellent use of cross-examination to reinforce your points.
- Well thought out and logical framework
- Excellent preparation... you knew your stuff.
- Continue to develop your ability to engage the audience.

Megan McDonald - Negative

- Excellent use of cross-examination to make your case.
- Good job of simplifying the issues and articulating and easy to understand framework. You clearly stated what you needed to do.
- Well prepared

Bob McCarthy

SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate		Judge	
Round 4	Flight 1	Room 707	Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Ivan Savchuk 14 The Bishop's School	27	Catherine Cang 2 Canyon Crest Academy	~~28~~ 29

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

R.G. McCarthy
Judge's Signature

CARLSBAD
School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

IVAN SAVCHUK - AFFIRMATIVE:

- Good job establishing entry framework & value. Work on highlighting your key points and drive those home.
- Work on your cross-examination, both asking and answering. Be precise with your language and ensure questioning supports your decision.

CATHERINE CANG - NEGATIVE:

- Organized, well thought out and delivered framework.
- Excellent delivery.
- Excellent logic flow and linkage to key points.
- Excellent use of cross examination to establish your points.

CBAD, 9 Piyush Prakash **SDIVSL 1B**

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate	9 Cbad (*3)	
Round 4 Flight 2	Room 806	Tue 10/04/16 04:45PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Hannah Zheng 6 Del Norte High School	29	Catherine Armenta 1 Bonita Vista High School	29

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature

CHS

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF wins based on impacts
- scope & magnitude of AFF case impacts overrode Neg
- Stronger evidence of Thorium development would have helped Neg

General Comments

- Good organization from both debaters

Countries ought prioritize nuc pwr

(V) Morality
- deals not rightly wrong

(VC) util

Pros of making nuclear pwr

(V) life

(VC) Consequentialism

} → don't look at just life also look at well being → agree

Voters
- waste storage price > replacements
- Thorium doesn't solve
- air pollution has as bad as nuclear waste
- Thorium not implemented in USA

C1) Nuclear burn → cleanest energy → helpful for air pollution

a) Waste harmful toxic
- used fossil fuel
- contains radioactive waste
- takes alot

→ Dry Casks are safe
- low level
- storage for high levels also exist → short term only
- still harms → fixed states they are long term → expensive short term

b) problems of nuc waste disposal not addressed
- no permanent storage
- no country has done this yet

c) less dangerous fuel, uses water & contaminates environment → Thorium solves → not implemented similar costs → thorium will be implemented
- will fix in future

C2) Solar energy → Solar panels have low lifetime, become less efficient → replace the panels → replacement costs
- waste worse
- Price adds up
- sunlight super powerful
- ↑ ↓
- can be stored in batteries & transported
- won't solve

$B wasted on nuclear

C4) 13 countries rely on nuclear pwr → No link to coal, apply C2 → showed renewables not reliable so coal instead
- all countries matter
- these countries will probably switch to coal
- germany

C5) GW → Out creates waste → weigh air qual over waste b/c of tech improvements
- nuclear creates no CO_2
- avoids pollution
- harms environment

C3) Thorium alternative → limited role, still has similar waste → being implemented in other countries, Values: Safety, well being
- use instead of uranium
- less waste
- extra safety
- self sustaining

air pollution solved
- climate change
- max well being

CBAD, 9

Piyush PRAKASH

SDIVSL 1B

VLD

Varsity Lincoln-Douglas Debate	9 Cbad (*3)	
Round 4 Flight 1	Room 806	Tue 10/04/16 04:00PM

Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Tejas Srinivasan 12 Rancho Bernardo High School	29	Daniel Davis Virgil 10 Mission Vista High School	26

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature

CHS

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF wins based on impacts
- Aff's turn was not turned
- need evidence, analysis not enough regarding probability ~~this Case~~

general Comments

- Organization is important
  - signpost
  - don't jump around

Countries — All countries

right
prohibit — outlaw
prediction — creation of
nuc } fission
pwr } → ~~[illegible]~~

(V) morality
vc max well being
1) inherently value
2) Gov must be util
3) Punish bad, ~~[illegible]~~
4)

(V) Justice → Justice requires consequence
- dissolves into util

vc max benefits → - morality stays
- extinction consists first → will vio morality

c1) nuclear meltdown
- 70% this decade
- 50% in USA
chernobyl killed ~~many~~ → "did not create that much problems"
million people

→ not certain better designs → Proved 70%/50%
- no data
- wins weighted by probability
↓ less meltdown chance

→ Possible w/ shut down ~~[illegible]~~ reactors → wasn't a modern reactor
new design → better risks

c2) mining
- demand → ↑ prices
- ↑ prices → ↑ mining
- mostly Native land
- hurts them most
- high cancer
- mining → ↑ cancer
- hurts environment & people

→ ~~not that~~ wasn't be banned
- wasn't dramatically so wrong → prohibiting pwr → prohibit mines → "no it wouldn't"
- might decrease, but won't ban

O) hindrance? negation:
show there is reason to keep Nuc power

(V1) Nuk Pwr > fossil fuels
- 60% fossil fuel energy
- 20% nuclear
- Nuclear clean
- prev B.W.
- air Quality improves

→ no link to coal
- not enough nuclear reactors to protect from G.W
- leads to meltdown
- will generate as much CO_2 as coal
- look to renewables instead
- already being done

→ Currently nuc 20% right now
- time limit doesn't matter
- waiting → CO_2 impacts
link: Germany switched to coal instead
Still better for nu pwr
air Quality

(V2) Nuclear Pwr ≠ Prolif.
- ex S.K.

(V3) benefits Economy
→ ↓ electricity prices
ex: San Onofre → Victoria
- bad air quality
- economic

nuclear pwr
includes uranium pwr

NFF
Core impacts
- too many reactors to solve warming
- ↑ risk of meltdown
- switch to renewables proven n stat: Gw
- no link for coal
- dropped 2 contentions
- prolif
- econ. ← not true
- never related extinction impacts