<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter-Finals</th>
<th>Rayna Jones (*1)</th>
<th>Sat 02/09/20 01:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Carter</td>
<td>28 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sneha Lakamsani</td>
<td>27 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was
- Affirmative
- Negative

(Circle Winner)

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

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 (e.g., cyber attacks, 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 a 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 more cards to support his case.

Overall, this was a close debate and both did a very good job with well thought out arguments.
Aff

- Stip: - no comprehensive
  Value crit. - utilitarianism
- nuclear accident
- terrorism - sells to terrorist groups
- cyberattacks - lead to war

CPSGs - method conventional war run conv from global strike
Solves for nuclear terror - reduce risks nuclear prov. & verify
Precise attack
Extinction of humance - unjust
Miscalculation - no end

Cross out
- 0 is not moral obligation
- Accidents are not avoidable - Deter
  are respond through deterrence
- Cyber attacks - not real - just tons of smoke
- Nuclear actors - deter - deter - not deter - det.
- Cont sy not do the states do now
- CPSGs - elim. not conv war run
  old nu. ver.
  Deterrance unlikely unless distress
  Deterrence not as well as in 21st century
  Deterrence causes aggression by countries
  less tons - other factors cloud 10's cyber war
  Moral truths -

Opposes

- Value = Peace
- Deterrance
  Conventional warfare
  Environmental terrorism
  Ensures violence not increment
  Other countries decide on own defense
  Knowledge nuclear weapons fall out
  - India now test lead to Pakistan in deaths millions after nu. war

On cases
- States will gain terror or
  - 9/11 or 12; cards
  - Not because accounting
  - CPSGs - mod tech
  - Nuke defense tech
  - No one has nuc tech curtail deaths

Covl. weapon - now del. from nuc
-aff - no solution
- destruction on the lock down
  with all effects

NR - Deterrence - Aff. means
  seen valuable strategy
  Modern tech & - det. deterrence now
  Should flow through

Proliferation
- aff - elimination
  With logistics cripple benefit
  In long run

Aff - recent eon. war run
denser en. - for thre
  Power balance - allow western
  Nations defend themselves through
  Prevent large conflict

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter-Finals</th>
<th>Rahel-Zubairi (3-2)</th>
<th>Sat 02/08/20 01:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>08 Points (20-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMERICUS JENELLE TRUAUX YORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EVELYN DEVOS</strong> 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

- **National Security** "Just War Theory".
- **Ethically**
- **Nuclear Proliferation** Seriously.
- **Int’l Security Policy** “Opposite Happening Now”. Reduce after Cold War.
- **Wasn’t Happy & Design Cries**
- **Iran Can’t Use Nuclear Deterrent**.
- **Great Energy/Volume/Density**
- **Longrange Kicks/Indirect & Civilian Lives**
- **Abolishing Nuclear Testing**.

**Affirmative**

- **CoS** - Good Answers/Good Energy
- **Cross** - Virtue Nukes! 40 Days of Weeks To Re-Store. Cross!
- **Affirmative** - How much would it cost? Question.
- **Cross** - How much best would we lose into costs? Don’t know the other. I wasn’t there. Place in 70 years.

**Negative**

- **Middle Ground**? - Nuclear was gone. Happen.
- **Cry Treaty**. - Nuclear Waste. "Plutonium Rocks”
- **Human Hazards”**. - Broken Arrows.

**Affirmative**

- **Value Criteriam** - War is Eminent!
- **Int’l Security Threat**. - Poor People Die!
- **Emotional Play**. - Humanitarian Issue.
- **Bullying**

- **Very Close Debate** You Did Great!
- Keep Working Hard.

- **Not Iran Made Nuclear B-52**
- **Has Iran Become a Nuclear War?**
- **Non-Nuclear Treaty? / Triple Treaty!**

**Cross**

- **Great Answers!**
- **Good Story**

**Cross**

- **Great Answer!**
- **Great Questions**
- **Great Idea to Disarm Instead of Destroy**
- **Counter Nuclear Strikes**
- **Iran Not An Nuke Yet**

1st - **Negate** - Justice

- **Elimination Virtually Impossible**.
- **Piran (sic) / Non-Nuclear**.
- **Good Cites** - Great Volume / Nuclear Security
- **Lost Nuclear Weapons” Broken Arrows”.**
- **Nuke Ground” Disarmament Take**.
- **Good Cites” - How do you get rid of the Uranium?**
- **Very Costly To Do So.** 
- **Great Stats” 6 Cites**
- **Great Idea to Disarm Instead of Destroy**
- **Counter Nuclear Strikes”**
- **Iran Not An Nuke Yet**

**Negate**

- **Great Answer** - RIA Made It!
- **Good Story”**
- **Good Defense of Questions Asked**

**Cross**

- **Complete Resolution”** Is Impossible.
- **Dismantle Better Than Generation**.
- **Not Hard Anti-War Since 1973** (45 years).
- **Health Hazards” For Both” Not Producing Nuclear Waste.**
- **Cost Claim” 3000 Deaths in Japan” Small Cost**.
- **No Plan To Get Rid Of Waste.** - Extinction & Climate Impact.

**Affirmative**

- Great over all debate.
- You’ll make an excellent LMWYER some day!
- GREAT JOB!!
<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>24</td>
<td>McKinley Paltzik</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**.

Judge’s Signature: [Signature]

School / Affiliation / Occupation:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Cross - Challenging with Cards or Proof. Case showed cards (opponent) - Challenging process next Nuclear sleds.

1. International Welfare
2. States as a Sovereign
3. What states are Sovereign
   - Distribute of new weapons
   - Uphold Sovereignty
   - Can be sustained as "maybe more".
   - Argument 1-2 is based on "It"

Cross - Defended very well with cards & data.

Strong ability to defend points & find gaps with opponent's argument. Used data that conflict does not take war.

Has the ability to speak clearly & fluidly about all contingencies. Overpowered opponent.

Very fluid, Very strong. I have no constructive criticism - just really strong.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter-Finals</th>
<th>040</th>
<th>Sat 02/08/20 01:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rayna Shaik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie Browder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Rayna Shaik.

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? N/A

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.