At the end of the round:

I believe MAD probabilities kinda wash. However, Aff gains 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: the Indus-Pan conflict got resolved

### NLD

**FLIP: 31 Hunter Travis Fenn v. 8 Liam Reynolds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>Brittany Stanchik (*'42)</th>
<th>Michelle Sage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Octo-Finals</td>
<td>Room 618</td>
<td>Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liam Reynolds</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Hunter Travis Fenn</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **Yes**

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Aff**

- Didn't offer any 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?
- Sitting closest do not use in hostage but a small chance of it happening is confusing argument
- Good job rebuttally

**Neg**

- Good definition
- SHowed how has value is necessary for Aff, value do exist
- Length of wars the weapons you are debating about are used in
- Good eye contact, good control
- Admitted chemical weapons still used when they was a major part of case

Raw notes:

- Aff wins for getting neg to admit has 2nd
- Compensation was not offered when sec Chem weapons still used
# NLD

**FLIP:** 5 Sneha Lakamsani v. 45 Jaylin Wilson

**Novice L-D Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeylin Wilson</td>
<td>Sneha Lakamsani</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Room 602**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **NO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Condition of Being (Values)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morality (Values) - Moral Frame Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to Life - Good Speaking Voice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015 - Reference cited

- North Korea

Global Nuclear Arms (eliminate) Safe

**Cross:**

- Good questions apparent struggled to find some data in beginning.
- Very fast speaker hard to follow
- Nuclear bombs
- Inadequately valid
- Deterrence works
- Strong cross
- Produced cards
- Strong debate
- Cross + data support is stronger than opponent
- Cadence slowed down as debate went on (good)
- Peace is maintained through deterrence

Confident with material and therefore debate was stronger

*Keep going with this experience is the key to life! Good job*
**Novice L-D Debate**

**Affirmative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joseph Chen 28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Negative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tyler Carter 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative** (Circle Winner).

Is this a low point win? **Neg. No**

**Judge's Signature**

ACP Eric (Pharmacist)

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Aff.**

---

Justice

Criteria

Contestion 1

- Chance of use or accidental tragedy
  - Destructive -> radical change

Contestion 2

- Mistakenly fired and tension.
- False alarms
- Closed communication channels
- Deter desertion of nuclear weapons
- Examples: Iran, Afghanistan domestic terrorist attack
- World war II city bombing of London
- No effect in ending war.

**Neg.**

- Counter - nuclear weapon wasn't used
- Bombing on handen wasn't nuclear weapon terrorist can get hold of NW.

- Argument

- Deficiency
  - The concept of mutual destruction if NW removed conventional weapons.

- Dumping nuclear weapon's concepts
  - Terrorist uses nuclear weapon's contamination
- Open test is not a good reason
- No accident happened so far
- No example of accident was given

See back →
Aff. only relied on value and justice for future generation.

Aff. didn't defend The Neg's position as lack of N.W. could increase the chance of conventional wars and thereby more human lives will be lost.

R.F.D.
The Neg had more reasons against Aff. and backed them up effectively.
**FLIP: 42 Vincent Montalbano v. 35 Rayna Shaik**

**Novice L-D Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Room 614</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vincent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rayna</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

*(Circle Winner)*

Is this a low point win? **Yes**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Karen Johnson (*8*)

---

**Li delenit**

**Li Dexter**

**Li Modern**


**Modern of Nukes is in**

**RFD Agree with Ag as there always more coming**

*With clear examples from history on why they work.*
**NLD**

**FLIP: 8 Alex Hall v. 51 Sophia Browder**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>Tony Nesteruck (*3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Octo-Finals</td>
<td>Room 615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20-30)</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sophia Browder</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alex Hall</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Sophia Browder**.

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

**Is this a low point win?**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Sophia: You did a great job making your case and arguing the Neg. You had a lot of information to give & made your opponent and guess some of his case. I know you didn't 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 & delinquency was a great idea. In CX you did a great job making your point & staying strong. Before sending your Round I recommend taking a deep breath just to calm down & make your point a little more clear.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Room 616</th>
<th>Sat 02/08/20 12:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evelyn DeVos</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Abhiram &amp; Bobba</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **N**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Verbal RFQ**

I vote aff - weighed 200k deaths from nukes over 10k deaths from chemical weapons.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>Raj Maddirala (*'39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octo-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 617</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americus York</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper Somora</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is this a low point win?</strong></td>
<td><strong>No.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judge's Signature</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

1) Cooper talked very fast when he started his debate. He interrupted his opponent many times. When he was questioned by his opponent, he didn't have supporting data/statistics made a good point of people/humanity resorting to advanced tech warfare which is bio and chemical warfare.

2) Americus talked very clearly, paused at appropriate times, had 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 9 states in the cross when her opp said 9 states she got confused and asked him about allies later on. That part was very confusing to me and her opponent.
Americans
1) playing & buttons.
   against -
2) Nuclear weapons
   - readiness from -
   - no eye contact -
   - paused too many times
3) Strong points - highly destructive
   - destabilizes relations between nations
   - argued well in the cross examination against
     didn't ask the right question cooper.
   - during cross regarding allies

Cooper
Interupting 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 supporting
  his contention of biological & chemical
  war methods (effect on peoples life)
  said probably no data/quotes being given.