

NLD

FLIP: 34 Mckinley Paltzik v. 9 Tyler Carter

Novice L-D Debate	Caroline Sheridan (*24)	KIET NGUYEN (4)
Finals	Room 109	Sat 02/08/20 05:30PM
Affirmative Points (20-30) TYLER CARTER		Negative Points (20-30) MCKINLEY PALTZIK
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Kiet Judge's Signature
Is this a low point win? _____		4 School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both Delivery was somewhat fast for both debaters.

AFF: Terrorism & cyberattacks arguments are persuasive. Modernization argument less persuasive. Modernization can mean more safeguards and better communication between nations. CBGS argument mixed, since it can still give stronger states an advantage.

NEG: Sovereignty argument mixed. States may not be stable or behave rationally. ^{its leaders may not}

Both debaters provide limited examples, focusing on Crimea and Kashmir, and a near miss incident. Need more discussion on feasibility of disarmament and feasibility of its enforcement.

AFF makes a strong moral argument. NEG makes a strong pragmatic argument. The moral argument is slightly more persuasive.

~~YAMINIKRISHNA SABESAN~~
YAMINIKRISHNA SABESAN.

NLD

FLIP: 34 Mckinley Paltzik v. 9 Tyler Carter

Novice L-D Debate		Rebel Zuber (#29) - Yaminikrishna Sabesan (#39)	
Finals		Room 109	Sat 02/08/20 05:30PM
Affirmative <u>Tyler Carter</u>		Points (20-30)	Negative <u>Mckinley Paltzik</u>
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Circle Winner)		Yaminikrishna Sabesan Judge's Signature (#39)	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision: States ought to eliminate their nuclear arsenals.

Aff. was able to make a good argument by outlining dangers of nuclear arsenals - rogue states, terrorism, and cyberwarfare to cause accidents.

Neg was able to convincingly rebut Aff contentions with examples.

Neg was also able to make a good argument, with examples, why NWT provide a good deterrent and provide reasons why Aff's contentions would still exist in the absence of Nuclear weapons. Aff was not able to convincingly rebut Neg.

NLD

FLIP: 34 Mckinley Paltzik v. 9 Tyler Carter

Novice L-D Debate		Saiful Islam (*5)	
Finals		Room 109	Sat 02/08/20 05:30PM
Affirmative Tyler Carter Points (20-30)		Negative Mckinley Paltzik Points (20-30)	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____		Jane Edgix Judge's Signature Carlsbad High School School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Reason for decision

Ms. Paltzik was very effective at establishing the framework for her case. She established through specific examples that ^{secure of} sovereignty and the argument of a state's sovereignty, states ought not eliminate their nuclear arsenals. ~~It~~ ~~was~~ the evidence of Shedd '13 explained how sovereign states struggle for dominance in the world. Ms. Paltzik showed through the example of Russia's invasion of Crimea that Ukraine was no longer to maintain its sovereignty in the region and that international dispute. I also appreciated that Ms. Paltzik offered a second example of how India currently chooses not to invade Pakistan. Ms. Paltzik mentions that India won't invade Pakistan because of the concept of deterrence.

The three reasons I voted for a negative side win were what Ms. Paltzik laid out in her arguments: 1) ensures an inward, 2) sovereignty of a nationstate is necessary for citizens to have justice, and 3) nuclear weapons will always exist.

over ✓

This was an excellent debate. Mr. Carter had a strong case for the affirmative. I appreciated the framework he established and the contentions he used to support the framework. He did an excellent job giving reasons why nations should eliminate their nuclear arsenals. In particular, his use of the example of CPDs was effective and ~~is~~ relevant.

I really appreciated how respectful and polite both ~~the~~ participants were both prior to and during this final debate. It was a pleasure to witness this debate.