<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>EDB L1-36</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sophia Browder  
5 Sunnyslope High School | 28 | Emma Nesteruck  
3 Willow Canyon High School | 25 |
| The winner of this debate was **Affirmative** |  |
| **(Circle Winner)** |  |
| Is this a low point win? | **NO** |

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Confident in her presentation. Asked strong questions during cross. Very professional.
- Made a strong statement about global price of fossil fuels rising $0.10 if subsidies removed. Neg's first contention is a strong point as well.

Emma needed to be more prepared. Shuffling through papers is tricky and makes locating research difficult. A partition of rationality is tough because everyone is different.
### NLD

**Novice LD Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>CDS 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Joey Antonelli  
21 Perry High School | Sofie Chung  
7 McClintock High School |
| Points (20-30) 27 | Points (20-30) 26 |

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

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

---

**Judge's Signature**: CFHS

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**RFD**: I buy the affirmative FW, and buy that the Aff case best solves for utility. Neg FW is slightly contradictory with case and has less concrete impacts.

---

**Aff**:  
- Don't have clean energy debate  
- Ill minority debate  
- Don't look at each other in CX  
- Don't argue potentials against Concrete  
- Extend better/flow  
- Review LD rules

**Neg**:  
- Don't have Value debate.  
- Narrow Crit. solvency argument  
- No "entire case" attack  
- Don't look at each other in CX  
- Weird "better solve for util" and minority contradiction
**Novice LD Debate**

**Maanik Chotalla**

**Round 1**

**Affirmative**

Hunter Travis Fenn  
20 Mesquite High School  
Points (20-30)

**Negative**

Cooper Somora  
21 Perry High School  
Points (20-30)

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  

**Judge's Signature**

Brophy / Coach / Goat Wrangler

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Aff cards sound like they're cut not very efficiently, try to shine it down
- Smart 1AR start to kick your frameworks overall it was solid
- 2AR was decent, you make good use of what you had to work with but you could go bigger

**Neg**

- Go harder with some of your args, you could turn the econ point
- Unique neg, it's fairly defensive, though, not much of an impact
- Your 2AR was kinda repetitive, you gotta do more impact weighing comparison instead of just saying it can't be weighed

RFD. I affirm on this argument that condition get worse over time. Main issue is that neg is largely defensive, there isn't much of a reason to vote on it because I'm unsure how negative gets us away from the impact.
## NLD

### Novice LD Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>SCOB 150</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trisha Panse</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>Nate Leahy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 Chaparral High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affirmative** **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**AFF:** Look over your case

You'll get to know it better as you keep explaining, but know what each of your cards says individually and you'll have a better time in rebuttal.

**NEG:** Write more

- Add 3-5 minutes to the case to make it debatable
- Respond to as much of her case as possible
**NLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Clayton Guy (*8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>EDB L1-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas Von Borries</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Affirmative -** had good contentions, value & anterior. Used their 1st AFF speech. In second speech lost way attacking NEG case - did not use all time or did not restate case or contentions & values again. Good voice and presence. Use your research and repeat if necessary.

**Negative -** good knowledge of case, good details. Good contentions and values. NEG seemed a strong debater. ATTacked AFFirmative points - did good job in debate. AFF did not stop using contentions - NEG did a good job.

NEGATIVE WINS - stronger debate, knew case and did a good job on debate. Contentions flowed well.
**Novice LD Debate**

**Walter Burke (*10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>EDB 208</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Popescu</td>
<td>Anna Marie Sherwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Willow Canyon High School</td>
<td>17 Paradise Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Andrea (Affirm) was more convincing. She stated her case better & was more prepared. She answered the questions better.

Anna did well also. She a few times started an argument, then wasn't able to complete it & moved on. It would have been better if she completed each issue or rebuttal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Lucas Galardi (*'21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>CDN 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Butkiewicz</td>
<td>Alex Somoza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td>22 Desert Vista High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

---

**Pro:**

1. **Global Warming**
   - Many countries have pledged to phase out FF
   - US biggest FF producer
   - Trump admin. expanding FF and polluting more
   - Not too late to stop CC
   - 2° increase results in many dead
   - Damages could cost $5000 trillion
   - Reduce deficit w/o other issues

2. **Solvency**
   - FF will continue to expand be of substitutes
   - Elimination would significantly reduce carbon emissions
   - Would reduce by 10% by 2050

---

**Con:**

1. **Would not stop CC**
   - Would bring more CC be industry can move to more pollutive substances

2. **Economic Downturn**
   - Oil prices would increase, which also precedes a recession
   - Would drastically reduce growth by half

---

RFD: Pro couldn't meaningfully prove that a recession wouldn't happen and also didn't quite disprove con's assertion. Pro couldn't address CC, so it went to con.
Aff, don't concede that ceasing subs. could hurt relations, neg will definitely try to use that against you. Good questions from neg, clean ICX in general. Good explanation by neg about how aff would increase CC. Sometimes difficult to understand neg. Speed is totally fine but if it leads to stumbling over your words then there's nothing wrong w/ slowing down.

It seems like aff is running a plan to move subs to clean energy. If so, be explicit about this and state that that is your position.

Good that aff explains why recession wouldn't happen.

Victor 2009, subs serve no legit purpose.

Aff, definitely try to use all your speech time, even if you're just re-iterating your points.

I buy the neg point that recession would be disastrous if neg can prove that aff increases CC then neg wins.

Aff hasn't addressed neg point that oil prices would increase. To negate the neg recession point, aff must go after this vital link, not simply say it wouldn't happen.

I don't quite see the aff link to neg reducing trade. I need to see a specific climate impact from aff other than reducing emissions by 10% — would that stop CC meaningfully?
**NLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Amin Jayyusi (*'3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>EDB L1-32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>27</td>
<td>Jhaj Baaz</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Gilbert High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 Desert Vista High School</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:

*Negative had a stronger argument, also positive struggled to answer a question.*
FERDERER, BRANDON

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Brandon Ferderer (*'23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>EDB L1-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeleine Joslin</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 McClintock High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dens Sumesh</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**  (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  NO

**Cross**

- While the primary focus here is on the argument, work on becoming a more dynamic speaker as well.
- I understand the grounding in utilitarianism, I am always a bit skeptical of moralistic arguments, but I do think it works here.
- Your response to pro's community - focus on how factories are built in poor communities - that just like FF subsidize - we subsidize the rich by placing high pollutant factories in poor communities - essentially, we subsidize the health of the rich with the histories/lives of the poor.

**Cross**

- I want you to be able to more fully counter the OPEC argument - moving to renewables would equally get us out of OPEC and make us energy independent - additionally, even if we are leaders in oil production, it's not going to get us out of OPEC.
- Poor people can't afford renewables cause they can't subsidize in ways that might benefit them - respond to this.

**Cross**

- You have a good response to the idea that removing FF subsidies would open up new money, but build this case more.
- Solid block of his pro argument FF subsidies pro's and the flaw of your 3rd.
- Focus on moving away from solar - renewables didn't need earth metals - wind, hydro, etc.

**Cross**

- Your cross was a bit weak - consider how you might more fully engage.
- To address the economic argument you need to find a way to argue that factories in poor, underpopulated areas help.

**Cross**

- Define your framework - You said if SiC was that it was hard to know what frame guided your contentions, okay - utilitarianism - I'm not sure you make a moral argument here - happiness well-being.
- Your major card was a good counter for two of you opponent's contentions.

**Cross**

- Overall, how you do a fairly good job furthering your argument by returning to your contentions.

**Cross**

- Do you have a card for the fact that we have spent many trillions to find rare earth minerals? - your simulation card on carbon footprint was a good rebuttal.
- I want evidence for how is by Saudi's would impact U.S. natural debt.
- Your strongest counter here is the mining of rare earth metals - I hate the "if you vote for you support terror and abuse" - this is a slippery slope fallacy.
Overall, solid rebuttal here!

Cross - yes, focus on cost/amount if subsidies was good here. I still want you focus on other remedies.

**AFF WINS** - This was a close debate but aff did a better job (particularly during cross at attacking opponents argument.

Ref onפק
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>EDB L1-20</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 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>Vincent Montalbano</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sofia Sills-Freeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 Arcadia High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The most good for the most people was argued—both did a great job laying out an argument for how people would be affected. The **AFF** claimed climate change would be worse if they were eliminated. The **NEG** argued it would not help with climate change as much as the **AFF** suggests (2.5% to 1.3%, both unsupplied). The **NEG** also put forth an economic argument for individuals in the overall economy.

**AFF**
- Asked great questions during cross and followed up on them
- Provided facts and explanations to help move the argument (OPEC + Tech, etc)
- Be sure to cite sources (study the givens) stats.

**NEG**
- Had a well-constructed argument
- Spoke clearly
- Did not address any points in rebuttal.
- Dismissed the **AFF** arguments too easily
- Did not use full time to develop
**BROWDER, JOHN**

**NLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>John Browder (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>SCOB 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Xie</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole Montei</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Tempe Preparatory Academy</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:

**Affirmative**

- There are more points to make as to why species = racism.
- Andy - maybe clarify in CX that the stripping of big land is for a fascist.
- I'm not sure that was established.

**Neg - Cole**

- I'd like to see a more robust definition of "speciesism."
- I think it could help to strengthen claim that all renewables require "rare earth" metals
- Left indigenous people argument unaddressed / unrefuted
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Lauren Barney (*’22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>CDS 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Pham</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Horizon High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trex Jones</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Arcadia High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of the debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- You need more specific numbers about carbon
- Question lack of neg evidence
- Save prep time for the 2AR
- Don't talk during neg

- Ask more pointed questions
  - you ask very open ended/vague ones
- You need cited evidence
- Explain why your actions are bad
- Natural gas = oil, is not exactly true
  - liquid = oil
  - vapor = nat gas

---

This was a difficult round to judge—what were the impacts, or warrants. I vote aff, on the climate change argument.
RFD: Neg had more thorough impact analysis specifically using "Magnitude"
+ "Timeframe." There should have been more clash on AC II + NC II but Aff didn't extend or
use their biodiversity argument to refute NC biodiv.

Claims.

Both: When you have competing Deon V Util framework
you don't necessarily need to link in to your opponents
framework; outweigh! Use words like "Extend" and then
tell me how that gives you offense.

Aff: get Keystone empirics for Structural violence
against minorities happening TODAY!
Comments & Reason for Decision:

Good pace / clear / concise.
You create a very understandable narrative. Great 1st debate!

Contention #1 - WMD/Civil unrest
- Not entirely addressed by negative.
- Which unrest is greater?

Contention #2 - Bio Diversity
- This holds US argument by negative that Bio Diversity is improved.

I was not convinced the world would collapse w/o subsidies, though higher prices would seem imminent. What I never heard though was how removing a subsidy would improve the environment. The negative effectively challenged that enough to win the round.
**KIBBY, RYAN**

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Ryan Kibby (*'22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>SCOB 152</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Keith</td>
<td>Miranda Jarvis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Willow Canyon High School</td>
<td>23 Phoenix Country Day School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</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:**

"Your guardian card in your 3rd contention is the same as the IMF card in your 1st contention remove one to save time!"

"In your 3rd contention you don't have evidence to show subsidies if cut would be reinvested in renewable energy."

- Make sure to extend your Fuk at the VC level and your impacts as your opponent dropped them.
- Practice extension drills!!!
- Make sure to attack your opponent's Fuk.
- What's the impact of subsidies being used in a different manner.
- Don't make new Args in the 2AR they should be made in the 1AR.

During cx don't ask if benefits might outweigh instead ask what the benefits are.

- Value debate really doesn't matter just focus on vc debate (both sides)
- You do a good job of explaining your imp but you need to explain why your Imp matter more than the act
- Make sure to explain why Rawls beats cost-benefit because you dropped Aff's Fuk
- Make sure to use all your preptime.
- You have no evidence for death vs an Imp. Food scarcity and homelessness are solid impacts and expand on those.
- Don't make new Args against the Aff in the 2AR.
- Make sure to tie back to your Fuk during voters."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>CDN 60</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 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>Katie Ann Jones</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Louisa Kaplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Desert Ridge High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 McClintock High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative** [ ] **Negative** [X]

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? [N]

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff: No clash - How was not proven.

Neg: more eye contact, please. Speak a little louder.

Prepared. Reasons were given.

Could be more polite to opponent.

Aff: [Handwritten notes]
### Novice LD Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>EDB L1-24</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mckinley Paltzik  
23 Phoenix Country Day School | Muntaha Islam  
10 Hamilton High School | |
| 30 | 28 | |

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**  
(Circle Winner)  
Is this a low point win? **No**

**Judge's Signature**

Perry

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Safety - pre reg
- Climate change
- Health risks
- Low income
- Deaths
- U.S. worst and expensive - 67
- Eliminates helps global warming

Great Speech & YC Contact

- High Quality of life
- Tax breaks
- Subsidies
- People at risk
- Job loss
- Lag period - transition
- Death better than low quality of life

Great YC Contact & Speech
Aff:
- I need a framework from your case to care about your contentions. Framework = Why I should care, without it I have to default to only caring about whatever your opponent's framework is.
- Try to cancel your cards/sources. I need more statistics, some were repetitive as well.
- Tell me to vote Aff at The end.
- Always use the whole of your cross, don't let them say "it can only be with fossil fuels" if they don't have a card to prove that. So you can refer and do both.
- Say I am using my case as a block against their contention 1. Impact turn Their Case!
- Start to focus on key voters. If you concede to their framework hype up the fact that you meet justice better your looking for a "perm" on microgrids. GOOD JOB on argument but I also need extensions to vote asf.

Neg:
- Great tone in CX, very respectful. If you have them by the throat don't drop The point, say "do ya have a card for that?"
- I have a big problem with your contention 2 and 3. I don't understand why Aff can't perm and DO both? Why can't Aff remove subsidies and then impact a green new deal? A net benefit is still a benefit for Aff regardless of magnitude, and there are solar panel microgrids up so why can't we implement more?
- Tell me where on the flow you want me to put arguments. "Use my Paris card as a block against their 3rd contention!"
- Tell me why your value is so important. "Judge I am the only value in the round, so you are forced to care about justice. Now let's talk about why I am the only one who can meet that value."
- Don't forget to weigh and tell me to vote Neg.
- Thank you for being a nice person and helping your opponent.
- Connect all contentions back to your value. I want you to explicitly tell me why each contention works with improving justice. I need you to weigh and give me key voters.

PhD: Voted Neg for on a Justice framework The Impacts from poverty outweigh Aff Impacts.