


Kapadga, Bilal (S) NLD

FLIP: 34 Mckinley Paltzik v. 35 Alex Benson

Novice L-D Debate		Raheel Zubairi (*29)	
Octo-Finals		Room 619	Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
Affirmative Alex Benson	Points (20-30) 27	Negative Mckinley Paltzik	Points (20-30) 28
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <u>Negative</u> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		 Judge's Signature <u>Hamilton</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

At the end of the round:

I believe MAD probabilities kinda wash. However, AFF gains ~~mitigation~~ risk of offense w/ impact analysis, Neg does the best weighing here to mitigate AFF offense: destroying sovereignty now creates high war probability - Neg wins the AC C1. Then Neg has great blocks on the AC C2 that never get responded to, namely 1. Nuclear power necessitates mining and 2. Bad actors may one day require use. Finally on the UC. I buy AFF's response to the Ukraine example, but ~~the~~ Indo-Pak conflict got the cold reason, so I buy that whos are there is no war in squo.



# NLD

FLIP: 31 Hunter Travis Fenn v. 8 Liam Reynolds

Novice L-D Debate	Brittany Stanchik (*42)	Mitchelle Baye
Octo-Finals	Room 618	Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
<b>Affirmative</b> Liam Reynolds Points (20-30) 28	<b>Negative</b> Hunter Travis Fenn Points (20-30) 26	
The winner of this debate was <input checked="" type="radio"/> <b>Affirmative</b> <input type="radio"/> <b>Negative</b> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____		Michelle Baye Judge's Signature Desert Vista School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Didn't offer any <sup>def</sup> definitions
- Look up from computer when giving opening speech
- Good eye contact during rebuttal
- Give dates for sources not just name of source
- When does a terrorist organization use a nuclear weapon?
- Showing closest to nuc war in history but a small chance of it happening is confusing argument
- Good job rebutting

- Good definition <sup>neg</sup>
- Showed how his value is necessary for Aff value to exist
- Even what wars the weapons you are talking about are used in
- Good eye contact & voice control
- Admitted chem weapons still used when that was a major pt of case

Aff won for getting neg to admit his and concession was not until when said chem weapons still used



NLD

FLIP: 5 Sneha Lakamsani v. 45 Jaylin Wilson

Novice L-D Debate		Glen Uehara (*4) Loui Swain 24	
Octo-Finals		Room 602	Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
Affirmative Jaylin Wilson	Points (20-30) 24	Negative Sneha Lakamsani	Points (20-30) 28
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature 24 School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? NO			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

① Life Condition of Being (values)  
 Morality (value) - Moral frame work  
 Right to life good Speaking Voice  
 2015 - reference cited  
 Russia  
 North Korea  
 Global Nuclear Armaments (eliminate) Safe  
 Content 2 - (better off) to remove  
 Japan Middle East, India  
 1st Cross <sup>referred</sup> questions & data (struggled finding)  
 level playing field  
 Rebuttal - one day deterrence will fail. points were stated but confidence was lacking in driving points home.  
 Argument is sound just need to improve upon your conviction / confidence to sell your point  
 Make sure you are able to address Opponent's Cards and Contention  
 \* Keep going with this experience is the key to life.  
 good job


Cross - good questions appeared struggled to find some data in beginning.  
 ② very fast speaker hard to follow  
 Nuclear bombs - references cited  
 Content 1 Cross invalid  
 \* damage environmental  
 \* deterrence works  
~~strong~~ strong cross.  
 Produced Cards - strong debate.  
 Cross + data support is stronger than opponent.  
 Speaking  
 Audience slowed down as debate went on (good)  
 Peace is maintained through deterrence  
 Confident w/ material and therefore debate was stronger.  
 \* Keep going with this experience is the key to life! good job



John Saissan

# NLD

FLIP: 9 Tyler Carter v. 5 Joseph Chen

Novice L-D Debate	Judge <del>Julie</del> (*6) John Saissan	
Octo-Finals	Room 601	Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
<b>Affirmative</b> Joseph Chen	Points (20-30) 28	<b>Negative</b> Tyler Carter
The winner of this debate was <b>Affirmative</b> <u>Negative</u> (Circle Winner)		Points (20-30) 30
Is this a low point win? <u>Neg. No</u>		 Judge's Signature <u>ACP Erie / Pharmacist</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff.

Define  
Justice

Criteria

Contention 1

chance of use or accidental  
tragedy

- Destructive → radioactive

Contention 2

- Mistakenly firing and a tension  
false alarms

closed communication channels

Deter. doesn't work

examples Iran, Afghanistan

domestic terrorist attack

world w. II city bombing of London

no effect in ending war.

Neg.

counter → nuclear weapon  
wasn't used

Bombing on London wasn't

nuclear weapon

Terrorist can get hold of N.W.

Neg. Argument

Reference

The concept of mutual destruction  
if N.W remained conventional  
warfare.

Dumping nuclear weapons

could terrorist use nuclear  
waste.

contamination

Open treaty is not good reason

No accidents happened so far

\* No example of accident  
was given

See back →

Aff.

The aff's defending  
contention's

Justice

minimizing wars

Aff. only relied on  
value and justice for  
future generation

Aff. didn't defended

The Neg's position as  
lack of N.W. could  
increase the chance  
of conventional wars  
and therefore more  
human lives will be  
lost.

RFD:

The Neg had more reasons against aff. and  
backed them up effectively.

Neg.

past 70 years showed no chance  
of accidental launch of N.W.

The Neg. was able to  
answer all questions clearly  
and rejected the aff's contention  
with logical flow.

No clear evidence future gen.  
can be protected.

- Nuclear weapon cost-effective
  - so far no evidence of nuclear war  
for 70 years.
  - Nuclear deterrence is very  
strong reasoning. not a gambler  
or
  - should have confidence
  - can recycle N.W. wastes
  - when destroying; N.W. can be stolen
  - conventional war can ↑ violence
  - violence can increase upon  
lack of N.W.
  - Terrorism can be stopped by  
N.W.
  - No chance N.W. will happen
- This was proven ✓



~~JOHNSON, KAREN~~  
 CHEEMA, DEEPAK

NLD

FLIP: 42 Vincent Montalbano v. 35 Rayna Shaik

Novice L-D Debate		Karen Johnson (*8)	
Octo-Finals		Room 614	Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
Affirmative <u>Vincent</u>		Points (20-30) <u>28</u>	Negative <u>Rayna</u>
		Points (20-30) <u>29</u>	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature <u>Hamilton</u>	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO.</u>		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

1 pm

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Uhl

↳ no makes no war  
 ↳ harmful effects of nukes - WMD

Don't agree with the  
 past decisions (nukes always)  
 Nazi hypothesis considered  
 but can't control on nukes  
 would prevent such production

K.V. Counter to My → did  
 not give convincing reasons for  
 dropping them. Just because Aff  
 does not agree .. does not mean  
 they are dropped..



↳ Deterrance  
 ↳ Impact  
 ↳ Modern  
 Good explanation of Aff counter  
 ↳ Effective first speech.  
 ↳ Agree Deterrance works  
 mostly..  
 K.V. Nukes is also harmful  
 for people's health.  
 Modern of Nukes is in  
 future - At need.

RFD Agree with Neg as their args were more convincing  
 with clear examples from history on why they would.



# NLD

FLIP: 8 Alex Hall v. 51 Sophia Browder

Novice L-D Debate		Tony Nesteruck (*3)	
Octo-Finals		Room 615	Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
Affirmative	Points (20-30)	Negative	Points (20-30)
Sophia Browder 51	28	Alex Hall 8	27
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature  School / Affiliation / Occupation	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative (Circle Winner)	Is this a low point win? _____		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

SOPHIA: You did a great job making your case & arguing the Neg. You had a lot of information to give & made your opponent 2nd guess some of his cases. I know you'd not have a lot of time to make your case but focus on the things that you believe are more important.

Alex: Great job making your case going with the cost basis & detourance was a great idea. In CX you did a great job making your point & staying strong. Before starting your round I recommend taking a deep breath just to calm down & make your point a little more clear.



~~RUMSEY, ANDREA~~

Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020

Mallya, Achimik

NLD

FLIP: 1 Abhiram k bobba v. 4 Evelyn DeVos

Novice L-D Debate		Andrea Rumsey (*35)	
Octo-Finals		Room 616	Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
<b>Affirmative</b> <u>Evelyn DeVos</u> Points (20-30)		<b>Negative</b> <u>Abhiram k bobba</u> Points (20-30)	
The winner of this debate was <input checked="" type="radio"/> <b>Affirmative</b> <input type="radio"/> <b>Negative</b> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>N</u>		<u>Achimik</u> Judge's Signature <u>Hamilton</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:


verbal RFD

I vote aff - weighed 200k deaths from nukes over 10k deaths from chemical weapons.



# NLD

FLIP: 6 Cooper Somora v. 30 Americus Jenelle Truax York

Novice L-D Debate		Raj Maddirala (*39)	
Octo-Finals		Room 617	Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM
Affirmative <u>Americus York 28</u>	Points (20-30)	Negative <u>Cooper Somora 24</u>	Points (20-30)
The winner of this debate was <b>Affirmative</b> Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature 5 School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <del>Yes</del> No.			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Cooper ~~was~~ talked very fast when he started his debate. He interrupted his opponent many times. When ~~she~~<sup>was</sup> questioned by his opponent, he didn't have supporting data/arguments/statistics  
 → made a good point of people/human resorting to advanced tech warfare → which is bio and chemical warfare.
- Americus talked very clearly, paused ~~giving good~~ at appropriate times, had ~~her~~ well structured points to support her case. played with buttons in the beginning, but quickly moved on. she didn't ask the right question in the cross when her opp said I states she ~~kept asking~~ got confused and asked him about allies later on. That part was very confusing to me and her opponent.

## Americus

- 1) playing  $\bar{e}$  buttons.
- 2) Nuclear weapons against -

3) strong points - highly destructive

4) Uranium killing millions of people  
developing cancer/exposure of radiation

- destabilizes relations between nations

argued well in the cross examinations against  
didn't ask the right question  
during cross regarding allies

## Weakness

- reading from
- no eye contact
- pauses ~~total~~ of too many pauses.

## Cooper

Interrupting the opponent.

did not hear his opponent talk correctly  
needed to double confirm

talks very fast, hard to understand.

did not pause for others to understand.

supports biological & chemical weapons.

- good points constructive

~~didn't~~ did not have answers supportively  
his contention of biological & chemical  
war methods (effect on people's life)  
said probably / no data/quotes being given.