

The Final Round¹

Everett Rutan

ejrutan3@ctdebate.org

Westhill High School, December 9, 2023

This House prefers that Ukraine pursue a negotiated peace with Russia.

A Note about the Notes

These are my notes from the final round at Westhill High School in Stamford. They are limited by how quickly I could write and how well I heard what was said. I apologize for any errors, but I hope debaters will appreciate this insight: what a judge hears may not be what the debater said or thinks they said.

There are two versions of the notes. The one below is chronological, reproducing each speech in the order in which the arguments were made. It shows how the debate was presented. The second is formatted to look more like my written flow chart, with each contention “flowed” across the page as the teams argued back and forth. It’s closer to the way I take notes during the debate.

The Final Round

The final round at Westhill was between the New Canaan team of Ankita Kuttichiriyal and Thomas Crehan on the Government and Ridgefield team of James Cox-Donovan and Gabriel Uceda-Sosa on the Opposition. The debate was won by the Opposition team from Ridgefield.

1) Prime Minister Constructive

- a) 10,000 deaths and 100,000 displaced
- b) Intro/Motion
- c) Definition: TH is the US
 - i) “Negotiated peace” is a cease fire bargain
- d) G1²: Ukraine (Uk³) can’t win against Russia (Ru)
 - i) Ru has greater population, industry, resources, military
 - ii) Uk depends on Western aid
 - iii) Sanctions not harmful to Ru
 - iv) Countering Ru has been ineffective
 - (1) Uk manpower, population, infrastructure suffer
 - v) These all imply Uk cannot win
- e) G2: US hurts more than helps by aiding Ukraine directly
 - i) Consider the Hungarian Revolution
 - (1) US did not get involved, USSR took over

¹ Copyright 2024 Everett Rutan. This document may be freely copied for non-profit, educational purposes.

² “G1” indicates the Government first contention, “O2” the Opposition second contention and so forth.

³ Introduces “Uk” as an abbreviation for “Ukraine”.

- ii) Congress is split on continued aid
 - (1) EU is not meeting its aid promises
 - iii) => aid will decrease
 - (1) Uk will get weaker
 - f) G3: Peace is the best outcome
 - i) At best cont'd fighting will lead to a stalemate
 - (1) Uk population, infrastructure suffer
 - ii) Normalizing US/Uk/Ru relations
 - (1) Global impacts, e.g., China/Taiwan
 - (2) Compromise will prevent worsening
- POI: Won't conceding territory to Ru set a precedent?***
So would conquering territory
- (3) West unlikely to support Uk win
 - iii) Best outcome a diplomatic peace
 - iv) Ru has incentives to agree
 - (1) Cost, length of continued war
 - (2) Losses: diplomatic, manpower
 - (3) Remove sanctions lead to increased trade

2) Leader of the Opposition Constructive

- a) Intro/Motion
- b) We accept the Gov definitions
- c) Observation: If it is obvious Uk will lose, why should Ru negotiate?
 - i) Neg. Peace will require enormous concessions
 - ii) Remember 1937 and 2014
- d) O1: US should fight for democracy
 - i) Uk part of a larger conflict
 - (1) China/Iran/Ru/North Korea see this
 - (2) NP sets a precedent
 - (3) 1937 compromises led to WWII
 - ii) Putin doesn't want a stalemate
 - (1) Intends to move beyond Uk

POI: Won't a Ru takeover incentivize China?

Yes, no international limits if Putin acts and we don't reply

- e) O2: Cease fire isn't worth it
 - i) Any ceasefire would require giving up territory
 - (1) Loss of land, resources, people, possessions
 - ii) Putin has time, no motivation to take a deal
- f) G1: Assumes Ru winning
 - (1) Actually scraping for men, many dodging service
 - (2) Economy suffering from worse inflation than in the West
 - ii) Motivation: Uk defending home, Ru not
 - (1) =>Uk can win with \$/Equipment
 - iii) Real problem is Western weakness
 - (1) Israel/Palestine distraction
 - iv) West should provide aid/defend democracy
 - (1) Potential for a huge victory

- g) G2: Hungarian Revolution: 100,000 left, many died
 - (1) =>NATO should stand tall
 - ii) Uk still holding on despite aid issues
 - (1) =>more aid and they can win
- h) G3: We agree peace is good
 - i) Bad precedent if aggression gains territory
 - (1) Ru will continue to invade and destroy

3) Member of Government Constructive

- a) Intro
- b) Restate G1/G2/G3
- c) G1: Ru is strong: population, military, resources, land area
 - i) Uk barely hanging on according to Zelensky
 - ii) Ru continues attacks on pop/infra
 - iii) =>need to give Uk time to recover

POI: Why would Putin agree?
Wouldn't look weak to Ru people

 - (1) Cut losses on economy, trade
- d) G2: Western aid leading to corruption
 - i) WJS quote on Uk corruption
 - ii) Better to spend funds in the US
- e) G3: Any victory comes at high cost in Uk/Ru lives
 - i) Peace through diplomacy sets a good precedent
 - (1) Continue war, losses, trade problems, no aid
 - (2) Iran and China will see no support
 - ii) Ru gains from peace

POI: Who would support us if we cut funding, pressed Uk to give up territory?
European allies, Canada, Japan support ending war

 - (1) See it as best way to stop Ru expansion
 - iii) Ru was provoked by the West
 - (1) Replaced Uk President w/anti-Ru candidate
 - (2) NATO expansion plans against earlier promise not to
 - iv) Diplomacy means suing for peace
 - (1) Aid is declining

4) Member of the Opposition Constructive

- a) Has Uk lost?
 - i) No strategist or state agree
 - (1) Only Ru propaganda
 - ii) Entire Gov case relies on Uk losing or that “war is bad”
- b) Can a ceasefire be negotiated?
 - i) What would Uk have to give up?
 - ii) Putin has no incentive to agree
 - (1) Dictator in power, stable
 - (2) No concern for human life
 - (3) Has made a big commitment, why stop when Uk on back foot?
 - (4) Sees hard war but eventual victory
 - iii) Not a serious option, lose ½ of Uk, no real cease fire, loss of morale

- c) What precedent will it set?
 - i) West will give up if cost is high
 - ii) Ru/China can throw bodies in to win
 - iii) West will give up others for peace
 - (1) ½ of Uk, Putin believes in victory
 - iv) Harms to Uk people, Ru immigrants
- POI: Don't Uk losses harm Uk people?**
Opp doesn't believe US/Allies will quit
- (a) Congress believes Uk doing well
 - (b) Uk losses get attention
 - (c) Understand comparison to 1930's, 2014
- v) =>Ru cont'd aggression in the fuure
 - (1) Uk would rebuild, Ru would re-arm
 - (2) Ru broke word in the past and will do so again
 - vi) Opp supports fight for freedom, democracy, world order
- d) Who started it?
 - i) No one is forced to joining NATO
 - e) Issue is what's best for Us, Uk, Taiwan

5) Leader of Opposition Rebuttal

- a) Consider additional questions
- b) What does Putin want?
 - i) Ru restored to former glory
 - ii) Peace only an opportunity to re-arm
 - iii) North Korea/Iran/China aid and support
- c) How will it affect the World?
 - i) Gov plan is about getting bullied
 - (1) Shows gain from invasion
 - (2) No promise Putin won't attack again
 - ii) If Putin is winning (as Opp says), why would he agree
- d) Long and bloody struggle?
 - i) Gov only delays continued fighting
- e) What does the US want?
 - i) Against appeasement, remember lessons of WWII
 - ii) Won't give up just because of cost
 - iii) See no incentive for Putin to stop
 - iv) People want Uk victory

6) Prime Minister Rebuttal

- a) Clash/Questions/Weighing
- b) Is the war lost?
 - i) Uk can fight but they cannot win
 - ii) Opp says West will fund, but Senate is wavering
 - iii) =>aid would be nice, but unlikely
- c) Ru/Putin?
 - i) NATO offer to Uk origin of the war
 - ii) Ru was willing to leave Uk alone before that
- d) Democracy?

- i) What happens if there is no Uk victory?
 - (1) Ru subjugates Uk population
- e) Opp world?
 - i) Pro-sovereignty is a nice sentiment
 - ii) In fact, anti-West sentiment grows in Ru
 - (1) Fuels tension with West
 - iii) Ru turns to China for support
- f) Gov world?
 - i) Sets state for diplomacy
 - (1) Avoids failing support for war
 - (2) Supports democracy, prevents violence
 - ii) Avoids Ru falling into China's hands
 - iii) Avoids growing anti-Western sentiment