**NLD**

**Novice L-D Debate**

**Semi-Finals**

**Affirmative**

- Tyler Carter 28

**Negative**

- Sophia Browder 27

**Points**

- (23-30)

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Aff win based on clearer arguments for
  - example: Neg didn't come up with evidence of
  - counter-examples.

**Judge's Signature:**

- Desert Vista H.S.

---

**Affirmative Opening Statement:**

- 9 countries possess nuclear weapons.
- Utilitarian: prevent nuclear war.
  - nuclear accidents
  - Fukishima event
  - TMI events, etc.

- Terrorism: nuclear terrorism.
- Cyberwarfare: cyberwar against nuclear targets.
- Nuclear weapons are easy for attacker.
- Launched nuclear weapon.
- Irrational: N. Korea.
- 5.6 million dust in atmosphere: weather patterns, cold winter.
- CGW: advanced missiles.
- Disarmament of nuclear arms.
- Deterrence: Measure of nuclear proliferation.

**Negative Opening Statement:**

- Nuclear proliferation.
- Russian aggression: Russian/Czech.
- Nuclear war: mass destruction.
- Proactive system: disarmament.
- Temporal limit: decommission.
- Russian (Ukraine = detonating Russian excursion into Baku)
  - with nuclearization does not prove
  - countries won't invade.

**Affirmative Closing Statement:**

- Curea annihilation: legalization of
  - ICBs: crimes against humanity
- Civilian casualties.
  - Russia had no intention of
    - killing civilians.
- Nuclear weapons.
  - Small countries are safer from
    - nuclear threats.
  - speaker had a break in her
    - speech, lost her place, but
      - was able to recover.

**Negative Closing Statement:**

- X-fires: speaker asked that
  - not-Q's: Russian/Ukraine
  - CERS: conventional weapons.
  - nuclear weapons happen in the context
Sum - framework justice/utulitarianism - "prefer lives"
- chance of nuclear war -
- irrational actor -
- accidents - 50% fukishima, chernobyl type in the next 50yrs.
- terrorism - state sponsored terrorism
- CPIS - deterrent
- Nuclear weapons - stability paradox - oppressive system
**Novice L-D Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn</td>
<td>McKinley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

**Affirmative Points (20-30)**

**Evelyn 29**

**Negative Points (20-30)**

**McKinley 29**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Political legitimacy
  - Irremovable danger
  - Psych. probability

Egypt/Israel case was not an actual nuclear response issue.

MAD does not make war and not to lose war. It's only called mutually assured destruction.

Sustainable full desalination vs. getting to desalinate expires is high probability by is also sat subject to.

Israel's pro vs. potential cost vs. society keeps off.

For Ng made a more Convincing case of agreeing. The point made are more probable and realistic. Very good counter by Ng to Agy's argument. Agree with the seemingly less argument offered by Ng.
**NLD**

FLIP: 51 Sophia Browder v. 9 Tyler Carter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>Caroline Sheridan (*24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Finals</td>
<td>018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Carter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophia Browder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- **Affirmative**
- **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _____

Judge's Signature: Hamilton

School / Affiliation / Occupation:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote aff

No weighing - I had to weigh nuclear accidents over Russia/Ukraine
**Novice L-D Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>Andrea Rumsey (*35)</th>
<th>Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tyler Carter</strong> 27</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sophia Browder</strong> 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is this a low point win?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **prophetic pragmatism**
- **do not give up**
- **democratization**
- **consider not replacing one with another.**
- **Contention 1 - Ukraine Russia**
- **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 warfare**
- **Nuclear weapons increase stability - prevent further war**
- **Regional stability**
- **Economic growth**
- **Global order**
- **Defense deterrence**
- **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 of war**
- **Atomic autumn**
- **1.2 billion starving**
- **CPLS - misunderstanding false launch**
- **Reliance on conventional warfare deterrence**
- **Nuclear terrorism, high value targets**
- **Reduce nuclear proliferation probability**
- **Nuclear weapons have not modified - dropped CPLS**
- **Some have tried - no real solutions for cyber warfare**

**Robert Agson - shift to wrong character**

**Cyber warfare - malware worms - internet - defense failure - cyber attacks - false warning**

**Irrational actors - N Korea**

**No deterrence**

**Increase likely head of war**

**Consequences of war**

**increased likelihood of war - consequences of war - atomic autumn - 1.2 billion starving**

**CPLS - misunderstanding false launch - reliance on conventional warfare - deterrence - nuclear terrorism, high value targets - reduce nuclear proliferation probability**

**Affirmative**

**Nuclear weapons increase stability - prevent further war**

**Regional stability**

**Economic growth**

**Global order**

**Defense deterrence**

**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 of war**

**Atomic autumn**

**1.2 billion starving**

**CPLS - misunderstanding false launch**

**Reliance on conventional warfare - deterrence - nuclear terrorism, high value targets - reduce nuclear proliferation probability**

**Nuclear weapons have not modified - dropped CPLS**

**Some have tried - no real solutions for cyber warfare**
Observation: voter issues
lives (?)
chances of nuclear-
irrational actors
accidents - nuclear - catastrophic
terrorism - right now - practicality

CPS -
providing deterrence
- Russian - Ukraine (reverse)
**Armando Montuo**

**NLD**

**FLIP: 34 McKinley Paltzik v. 4 Evelyn DeVos**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn DeVos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Points (20-30)

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

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? __________

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Don't read all lines in the L3C - just read the key and note any points at the case and save any
- Always start with your case in the L1C
  - L1C: Family Line to NC
- Don't go down other speeches
- Make sure to respond to all points you make on your case (work on time allocation - you spent way too much time on the NC)
- No more waving (many on probability in this case)
- Too much impact, impact with more

- Good structure to your rebuttal
- Own 'a get what you need to get done in the L5C - you are going for too much -> identify the moment to knock out one's collapse (or score motion) on them
- Great visual and bullet points

RFTo: I vote neg on the canceled. Mainly, IJ on auditors which come as a salutary
deficit. With canceled terms on AFF-RF, they try RF which extinction on the
old has very little impact. My case a good job on weighing the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice L-D Debate</th>
<th>Rahel Zubairi (&quot;29&quot;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Finals</td>
<td>017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat 02/08/20 03:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Evelyn De Vos</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mckinley Paltzik</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Evelyn:** You did a great job making your case. You spoke loud & clear. You made your case credible & easy to understand. A tip for the future when CX don't give up on your questions as easily. Fight back & make your opponent think about their response.

**Mckinley:** Mckinley 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.