<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter-Finals</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Delaney Krieger</strong> 30</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Logan Kraver</strong> 20</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? N

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **Delaney** -
  - Positive - Peace - Respectful
  - Snaps your attention
  - Stakes all facts
  - Good speech flow
  - Speaks clear and uses opponent's facts against him.

- **Logan** -
  - Positive - Aggressive - Respectful
  - Rushes speech, uses "like" as a word filler.
  - Stakes facts
  - Does not use her facts against her.

*Overall great job on both sides. Arguments were fair and complex. Logan gave good facts and reason, but fell short in Conv. to change policy. Delaney was on top with using Conv. to change. Both used all that her opponent had to try and change. But used it against him and made her point just in time.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter-Finals</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Danielle Muller 29</td>
<td>Zachary Jones 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**AFF:**

Value

Ultra-nationalism

Maxim: 75% good for human Iran: A stockpile enriches uranium. Israel will attack 3rd possibility of war in mid-east. Nuclear winter increasing investment in N.W. Mendelev 19 evidence was presented. Begin doctrine? Not rational beings. I.A.E.A. will inspect and demilitarize israel.

The idea that neg presents V.W. didn't reduce conventional wars, so stay Afghanistan, Vietnam 3-4.

**NEG:**

Does Iran have nuclear weapon? Not clear

Presence of N.W. & clashes if it causes extraction of human race no state will use it.

U.S. nuclear umbrella does work for israel.

Conventional war will increase

Neg was successful in defending his position, good reasons and supportive evidence.

→ Nuclear deterrence can work many evidences presented.

→ Just concentrating only on israel. If israel gained rise of N.W. then Arabs can attack israel and worse problems in mid-east.

See back
using one treaty can support the belief of localized genocide events

impossible to reverse nuclear war but conventional war can be reversed

Neg
Israel doesn't need to get rid of N.W.

decrease to a level of self defense

possibility of Israeli attack Iran

International monitory can regulate region

Deterance can solve this problem

This will destabilize the region

Neg had good flow on reasoning and refuting Afl's argument

Reason for decision

Neg had multiple reasons to refute Afl. The plan was very clear and very persuasive. Afl only concentrated on middle east and conflict between Iran and Israel, in which Neg. could refute and bring alternatives more unstable.
VLD

Karen Johnson (*8)

Affirmative
Zoe Soderquist

Points (20-30)
28

Negative
Will Altermann

Points (20-30)
27

The winner of this debate was
Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Utilitarianism states ought to eliminate nuclear weapons.

1. Risk of Error
2. Fatal Miscalculation - 40 minutes

People who launch weapons unstable

Carnegie Corporation

excellent introduction of framing the problem
your presentation is superb

dust, smoke, temp inversion, food chain, nuclear winter

India / Pakistan

eliminate weapons to deter war - main point.

A)

Hawaiian miscalculation

Crossey

we need a layer of protection above

excellent quotation of neg argument

and

excellent argumentation of neg arguments and

value argumentation

All points

N)

Councils - national theaters

question about types of weapons - arsenal definition paid

yural meaning - pleasure/pain

Battles - Russia - not using weapons, not available

Russia - defend against attack

Indian / Pakistan - armistice once

Bio-war: nuclear capable country no worries

(excellent rebuttal)

Very informative, well supported.
**VLD**

**FLIP: 9 Marcello Garbo v. 47 Camila Hess-Neustadt**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter-Finals</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Marcello Garbo</td>
<td>Camila Hess-Neustadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge's Signature**

Brophy

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

Comment & Reason for Decision:

- Run this as a plan because you have the inhereency.
- You need to respond to the cyber warfare argument.
- Use all of prep.

---

RFD: In terms of the flat arg, I don't buy that Aff has infinite flat powers. The main reason I vote NEG is the cyber warfare arg turns any solvency that LPGs would assume if enacted. In addition to this, the neg effectively demonstrates that nuclear warfare will not happen bc of deter. But it mitigates conventional warfare impacts.