

*42

NLD

FLIP: 51 Sophia Browder v. 9 Tyler Carter

Novice L-D Debate	Brittany Stanchik (*42) Meena Shahi	
Semi-Finals	018	Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM
Affirmative Tyler Carter	Points (20-30) 28	Negative Sophia Browder
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Points (20-30) 27
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		Time used 2:44
		Meena Shahi Judge's Signature
		Desert Vista H.S. School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision: Aff win based on clearer arguments for his contentions. Had more responses & examples. Neg did a good job also but only used Russia/Crimea Ex etc

Aff - 9 countries possess nuclear weapons (state) utilitarian - prevent nuclear war - nuclear accidents ↑ - Fukushima event - TMI events, etc.

- Terrorism - nuclear terrorism - Cyberwarfare - malware - cyberhorses, Pentagon hacking is easy - for cyber attack - Launch code for nuclear attack.

- Irrational actors - N. Korea - 5-6 million dust in atmosphere - weather patterns, cold winter

- CPAS - advanced missile sys. - disarmament of nuclear arms - more countries to CPAS - deterrence - nuclear proliferation

- fire 1 - good Q's on Neg + follow up

Aff - did a good job responding to Q's. Russian winter theory atomic autumn.

crude bombs easy to design & deadly w/ little nuclear materials - Nuclear weapons - deterrents

Neg - preventive pragmatism - dogmatic system - temper (critic) democratic part - Russian (Ukraine) deterring Russian excursion into Crimea - denuclearization does not prove that countries won't invade.

Crimea annexation - unlawful ICC - crimes against humanity - civilian casualties ↑ - Russia had no intention of invading smaller countries + regional fighting for smaller weapons - stability

* Nuclear weapons - stabilize security of smaller countries (deterrence) / deference - saves aligns of countries

Nuclear arms umbrella - Small countries are safer from their bigger neighbors.

Speaker - had a break in her speech, lost her place - but was able to bounce back & finish

Council - terrorism groups have had a chance to acquire nuclear weapons:

x-fire 2: Speaker 1 had well thought out Q's - Russian/Ukraine - CPAS - conventional warfare - Syria Example - Nuclear aggression happen in the countries that have them.

- # Sum - framework justice/utilitarianism - "prefer lives"
- chance of nuclear war -
 - irrational actor -
 - accidents - 50% Fukushima, Chernobyl type in the next 50 yrs.
 - terrorism - state sponsored terrorism
 - CPGIS - deterrent
 - Nuclear weapons - stability paradox - oppressive system

#

NLD

FLIP: 34 Mckinley Paltzik v. 4 Evelyn DeVos

Novice L-D Debate	Saiful Islam*5) Cheema, Deepak (5)	
Semi-Finals	017	Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM
Affirmative Evelyn	Points (20-30) 29	Negative Mckinley Points (20-30) 29
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>also</u>		Judge's Signature Hamilton School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Political legitimacy

- Irreversible damage

- Psych. mutability

Suez → Egypt / Suez canal
argument was not a nuclear level
response issue.

MAD does apply to nuclear war
and not to conventional war. This is why
it's called mutually assured destruction.

magnitude of full destruction vs.
return to empirical lives is high

probability arg is subjective.
~~subjective~~

Int. welfare

protecting state sovereignty

Ukraine / Russia issue

Nukes levels the playing field.

Good weighting of probability &
magnitude on case.

MAD applies to nuclear war only &
not to conventional war - Agree

misc → improve system → agree
0% human extinction of all norms
not just nuclear.

fix
status quo vs. potential of
society beyond tech.

RFQ Neg made a more convincing case of agrary. The point
made are more probable and realistic: Very good counter
by neg to Aff arguments. Agree with the sovereignty of
states arguments offered by neg.



NLD

FLIP: 51 Sophia Browder v. 9 Tyler Carter

Novice L-D Debate		Caroline Sheridan (*24)	
Semi-Finals		018	Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM
Affirmative <u>Tyler Carter</u>		Points (20-30)	Negative <u>Sophia Browder</u>
The winner of this debate was <input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative (Circle Winner)		<i>Aatmik</i> _____ Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____		<i>Hamilton</i> _____ School / Affiliation / Occupation	


Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote aff

no weighting - I had to weigh nuclear accidents over Russia/Ukraine

NLD

FLIP: 51 Sophia Browder v. 9 Tyler Carter

Novice L-D Debate		Andrea Rumsey (*35)	
Semi-Finals		018	Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM
Affirmative	Points (20-30)	Negative	Points (20-30)
Tyler Carter	27	Sophia Browder	28
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature	
Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)		ACP School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

accounted for in Justice & Militarism crude weapons very easy to make

- slow down -

Comments & Reason for Decision:

set rid of
 definition - states - moral obligation
 value justice - utilitarianism -
 prevent war AP states are trying to sell
 increasing conventional warfare (?)
 50% chance in 50yrs
 1 per year
 terrorism - escalate - suspicion
 Robert Ayson - shift to wrong character
 cyber warfare - malware worms
 - internet -
 - defense failure
 - cyber attacks - false warnings
 irrational actors - N. Korea
 No deterrence
 increase likely hood of war
 consequences of war
 - atomic autumn
 - 1.2 billion starving
 - CPBS - misunderstanding false launch
 - reliance on conventional warfare
 - deterrence
 - nuclear terrorism - high value targets
 - reduce nuclear proliferation
 prevents good relations

prophetic pragmatism - do not give up
 democratic faith - considers not replacing one w/ another.
 - Contention 1 - Ukraine Russia (no Rebut.)
 1994 2011 no tolerance - current status
 - cost - give up security - land safety -
 - great example - high casualties
 - 1.7 million children - crimes against humanity
 - Russian never wanted or planned to uphold - nuclear deterrence
 - nuclear weapons increase stability -
 prevent further war
 regional stability
 economic growth
 global order
 defense deterrence - another aggressive structure -
 limited in scope - when conflict occurs
 nuclear umbrella - security guarantee
 states agree to protection -
 - small countries will be very vulnerable
 - no direct effects of direct fallout consequences
 - terrorism - (pause) - becomes a target
 requires full control - no proof of acquisition
 - no means to overcome acquiring weapons
 because nuclear weapons are maintained by other countries.
 No major Nuclear War -
 probability has no effect - there have only been attempts
 dropped CPBS - not solving for cyber warfare

increasing conventional warfare (?)
 accidents global nuclear war
 broken arrows - accidents global nuclear war
 No nuclear conflict - chance is available -

no proof from an attack timer if can make bombs either way


probability(?)

Observation - voter issues

lives (?)

- chances of nuclear-
- intentional actors
- accidents - nuclear - catastrophic
- terrorism - right now - practicality -

- CPSS -
- providing deterrence
- Russian - Ukraine (reverse)



MADDIRALA, RAJ


Armando Montano

#4

Jackrabbit Jamboree 2020

NLD

FLIP: 34 McKinley Paltzik v. 4 Evelyn DeVos

Novice L-D Debate	Raj Maddirala (#39)		
Semi-Finals	017	Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM	
Affirmative Evelyn DeVos	Points (20-30)	Negative McKinley Paltzik	Points (20-30)
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <input checked="" type="radio"/> Negative <input type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature Joseph Vists School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? _____			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Don't read anything in the AC, just read the case and save any

- always start with your case in the AC

→ AC → 1:1 → line → NC

- don't do much during speeches
- make sure to respond to all points
- neg makes on your case (work on time allocation - you spent way too much time on the NC)

- do more weighing (many on probability in this case) - ~~the~~ also weigh on extraction impact much more.

- good structure to your rebuttals

- which you get what you need to get done in the AC, you are going for too much → identify the argument you know are most important / likely to win and collapse (or score max) on them

- great voices and ballad story

RFW: I vote neg on the conceded on analogy to evidence which acts as a solvency deficit. With conceded term on APF-FL, I vote neg FLW which extraction on the def has very little offense under. Neg does a good job weighing under FLW.

FLIP: 34 Mckinley Paltzik v. 4 Evelyn DeVos

Novice L-D Debate		Rahel Zubairi (*29)	
Semi-Finals		017	Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM
Affirmative <u>Evelyn DeVos</u>		Points (20-30)	Negative <u>Mickinley Paltzik</u>
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____		Moayd Warrayat Judge's Signature ACP School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Evelyn: You did a great job making your case you spoke loud & clear. You made your case relatable & easy to understand. A tip for the future when cx dont give up on your questions as easily fight back & make your opponent think about their response.

Mickinley: Mickinley you did a great job speaking loudly & clearly. You were very confident in what you were saying. did a great job shutting your opponent during cx.

