

# NLD

FLIP: 9 Tyler Carter v. 5 Sneha Lakamsani

Novice L-D Debate	Rayna Jones (*1)	
Quarter-Finals	037	Sat 02/08/20 01:45PM
<b>Affirmative</b> Tyler Carter 28 pts	Points (20-30)	<b>Negative</b> Sneha Lakamsani 27 pts
The winner of this debate was <input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature Basis Phoenix / Attorney School / Affiliation / Occupation
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both debaters did an excellent job. I thought the neg was especially strong in presenting her negative case. However, I thought she failed to address head on several contentions of the aff case (eg. cyberattacks, accidents). I didn't think it was as strong to say later in your rebuttal that you didn't have to address because your argument of technological advancements covered it. The aff's 2nd AR was very strong. For lay judge, he did a good telling me why I should vote for his side. I also liked how he brought it back to the resolution itself. Aff may benefit from few more cards to support his case. Overall, this was a close debate and both did a very good job with well thought out arguments.

states ought to remove nuclear arsenal

# Aff

- Justice - for all encompassing
- Value Crit - utilitarianism - for benefit of majority
- 1 - nuclear accident
- 2 - terrorism - sells to terrorist groups
- 3 - cyberattacks - lead to war
- 4 - not rational actors

did not intend contention not off balance

CPGS - method conventional warfare  
conv prevent global attack  
Solves for nuclear terrorism  
Reduce risks nuclear prolif  
& WMD

precise offset  
Extinction of humankind - unjust  
Midcalculation - no end  
elim = completely remove

# Cross X

- Ought - moral obligation
- ① accidents - she not respond - (Pro)
- ② cyberattacks - not refute - just 70% not indicative next 70%
- ③ irrational actors - deterrence not work

- Cont say not do b/c states do now  
- CPGS  
- elim not ↑ conv warfare  
- also nuc weapons  
- Deterrence unlikely w/ times distress  
- Deterrence not as well as in 21st century  
- Deterrence causes aggression by countries

pass 70% - other factors checked  
as cyber warfare  
Moral truths -

# ones

- sec of weapons

opponent value = Peace

- ① Deterrence - ensures not over occur
- ✓ conventional warfare
- ✓ environmental terrorism
- ensures violence not increase
- other countries decide on their own defense
- ✓ knowledge nuclear weapons still out there
- India nuc test leads to Pakistan deaths military after nuc weapon

on case  
- states will still terrorists  
stress - 2 cards  
that not happen  
no not fact accountability

CPGS - if modern tech  
nuc detection tech  
no cost why nuc tech  
could do this

conventional weapons  
more deaths than nuc


- aff - no solving  
- deaths happen b/c luck determine  
with all effects

NR = Deterrence - Aff concedes  
seen valuable strategy  
modern tech ↑ → deterrence slow  
should flow through

- ② Proliferation
- Aff - elimination  
weigh why pass & why benefit military in
- Aff - not respond conv warfare  
denser environ - fourth world
- power balance - allow weaker nations defend selves - for most
- prevent large conflict - elim 95%

NLD

FLIP: 30 Americus Jenelle Truax York v. 4 Evelyn DeVos

Novice L-D Debate	Rahele Zubairi (#29)	
Quarter-Finals	039	Sat 02/08/20 01:45PM
Affirmative 28 Points (20-30) <u>AMERICUS JENELLE TRUAX YORK</u>	Negative Points (20-30) <u>EVELYN DEVOS 29</u>	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <u>Negative</u> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>YES</u>		
 Judge's Signature <u>ACPERIE / BUSINESS MANAGEMENT</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation		

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- 1st - NATIONAL SECURITY "JUST WAR THEORY"  
- ETHICALLY /  
- NUCLEAR ARMAMENT SERIOUSLY  
- INT'L PROHIBITION PUCKY → OPPOSITE HAPPENING NOW.  
- REDUCE AFTER COLD WAR. \*GOOD CITES  
- WAR'S DON'T HAPPEN BE DESIGN CITES  
- IRAN EXAMPLE / NUCLEAR 'DEP' LIMIT.  
- GREAT ENERGY / VOLUME / CLARITY.  
- LINGERING EFFECTS / INNOCENT & CIVILIAN LIVES.  
- ABOLISHING NUCLEAR TESTING.
- cross - GOOD ANSWERS / GOOD ENERGY
- cross - VICTIM NUKES! HOW LONG? \*GREAT  
- DAYS OR WEEKS TO RESTORE. QUESTION  
- HOW MUCH WOULD REPARATION COST?  
- HOW MUCH DEBT WOULD WE GO INTO / COST?  
- DON'T KNOW THE GREAT / WAR HASN'T TAKEN PLACE IN 70 YEARS
- 2nd - "MIDDLE GROUND"? - NUCLEAR WAS GOING TO HAPPEN  
- START TREATY. - NUCLEAR WASTE "URANIUM LEAKS"  
- HEALTH HAZARDS. - "BROKEN ARROWS"  
- NO COST STATS ON DISMANTLING. \*SH. 2B COST TO GET RID OF.
- 3rd - VALUE CRITERIA → "WAR IS EMINENT!  
- INT'L SECURITY THREATS. - 200K PEOPLE DIED!  
(EMOTIONAL PLAY). - HUMANITARIAN ISSUE.  
- MONEY OVER LIVES. - INT'L PEACE CARDS!  
- BULLYING

- VERY CLOSE DEBATE YOU DID GREAT!  
- KEEP WORKING HARD.

- cross - "JUST CAUSE"? \*GOOD QUESTIONS  
- DOES IRAN HAVE NUCLEAR BOMBS?  
- HAS IRAN BEEN IN A NUCLEAR WAR?  
- NON-NUCLEAR TREATY? / SMUD & TRUCKING!
- 1st - NEGATE → JUSTICE /  
- ELIMINATION VIRTUALLY, IMPOSSIBLE.  
- DISMANTLE / NO! DISARM!  
- GOOD CITES → GREAT VOLUME / ENERGY & CLARITY.  
- LOST NUCLEAR WEAPONS - "BROKEN ARROWS".  
- MIDDLE GROUND / DISMANTLE THEM.  
- GOOD CITES - HOW DO YOU GET RID OF THE URANIUM?  
- VERY COSTLY TO DO SO. GREAT STATS & CITES.  
→ GREAT IDEA TO DISMANTLE INSTEAD OF DESTRUCT.  
→ COUNTER NUCLEAR STRIKES. / DETERRENCE.  
→ IRAN NOT AN ISSUE YET.
- cross - GREAT ANSWERS. REW MATERIAL!  
→ GOOD STATS / GOOD DEFENSE OF QUESTIONS ASKED!
- 2nd - COMPLETE RESOLUTION IS IMPOSSIBLE.  
- DETERRENCE BETTER THAN ELIMINATION.  
- NOT HAD A WORLD WAR SINCE 1945. (75 YEARS).  
- HEALTH HAZARDS FOR BOTH! NOT PRODUCING NUCLEAR WASTE. - COST CLAIM. 200K DEATHS IN JAPAN (SMALL COST). - NO PLAN TO GET RID OF WASTE. - EXTINCTION & CLIMATE IMPACT!

GREAT OVER ALL DEBATE  
YOU'LL MAKE AN EXCELLENT  
LAWYER SOME DAY!  
GREAT JOB!!

Swain, Lovi

NLD

FLIP: 34 McKinley Paltzik v. 8 Liam Reynolds

Novice L-D Debate		Saiful Islam (*5) Lovi Swain 26	
Quarter-Finals		038	Sat 02/08/20 01:45PM
Affirmative Liam Reynolds	Points (20-30) 27	Negative McKinley Paltzik	Points (20-30) 30
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature 26 School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? NO			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Cont 1 - Nuclear bombs

Based on "if war" underlying treaties treaties  
Nuclear war will be press  
eliminate all

Cont 2 - heat is Shrapnel - shock wave  
After math is devastating  
Nuclear fallout - Thyroid Cancer  
and others. No weapons no  
war

\* global  
"if war"

Cont 3 - terrorist organization

\* struggled to show data in support of contingents

Cross - sound points in the Cross. opponent  
had a strong stand points with supporting  
data

\* Improve on your ability to respond  
Confidently and fluidly to your opponent  
Rebuttal

\* build a stronger framework

Liam, for a novice you are a strong debater.  
Your opponent was really strong and was  
able to debate at a higher level w/  
data and fluid speak.

Keep practicing, your core is strong.

Cross - challenging with cards or  
Proof. Cont show cards (opponent)  
- challenging process not nuclear bombs

1 International Wellfare

2 States as a Sovereignty

3 What states are Sovereign

- distribution of Nuc weapons

- Uphold Sovereignty

\* Cont be challenged on "may be away"  
Contingent 1-2 is based on "If"

\* Cross - defended very well with cards &  
data

\* Strong ability to defend points &  
find gaps w/ opponents argument.  
Cited data that conflict does not = Nuc  
war

\* has the ability to speak clearly &  
fluidly about all contingents. Overpowered  
opponent.

Very fluid, very strong, I have  
no constructive criticism - just really  
strong.



**NLD**

FLIP: 51 Sophia Browder v. 35 Rayna Shaik

1:38

Novice L-D Debate		Caroline Sheridan (*24)	
Quarter-Finals		040	Sat 02/08/20 01:45PM
Affirmative Points (20-30) ∞	Negative Points (20-30) ∞	The winner of this debate was Affirmative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Negative <input type="checkbox"/> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>N/A</u>	
EOW <del>Rayna Shaik</del> Rayna Shaik	EOW <del>Sophia Browder</del> Sophia Browder	Judge's Signature 34/7 School / Affiliation / Occupation	

1:30 used

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Stay confident in cx!
- For the future, you can just say "is everyone in the room ready"

- The util type Q seemed a bit odd.
- Liked your standard
- Contention 2 seems like it is tagged a bit defensively

RFD

• The negative's protection of smaller states argument better fit both frameworks.  
 Great round.

