## Novice LD Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>CDS 15</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (20-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas Von Borries</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Emma Nesteruck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Willow Canyon High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

**AFF**

- Initial argument was full of
  - citations & was put out clearly + logically. Pace was great & easy to follow.
- rebuttal did not address costs passed on to consumers due to healthcare +
  - heating costs or how renewables would counter this.
- Did a great job pointing out issues in
  - the NEG arguments w/ viz plastic imports of environment + jobs (renewables will point this).
- Good tone, volume, + delivery. Good eye contact. Relaxed!

**NEG**

- One of the better NEG arguments of the day! Costs of healthcare + jobs & infrastructure
  - gave you a big advantage. The civil unrest could have used a bit more clarity.
- Try to give a bit more eye contact + stand in line w/ AFF.

In the end I was素养 by rising costs to consumers + the decreased quality of life caused by increase fuel/plastics prices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Kayla Green (*10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>EDB L1-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Marie Sherwood</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Paradise Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative  Negative

(Circle Winner)  

Is this a low point win?  


e

Judge's Signature

Hamilton

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote neg b/c arr dropped neg counter-plan, and their 2nd contention (in IAR). Too much time was wasted in IAR reading new cards that were not used in dAR. Arr case was lost in this debate.
Novice LD Debate

**Affirmative**
Andrew Xie
10 Hamilton High School

**Negative**
alex somoza
22 Desert Vista High School

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very solid, well organized, articulate AC

Good job pushing opponent to back statements with facts and not great conceding points.

Try to look up at judge make eye contact when possible

Your argument of subsidizing renewables in lieu of fossils isn’t ideal as these renewables aren’t fully developed and can’t replace fossil fuel yet.

Very good sportsmanship you made several assumptions toward the end - good counter to the benefits of a recession

Push back on your opponents assumptions

I like how you look up at judge while talking during NC/INR - repeated points a few times

Good point about controlling gas prices

Practice speaking a little more clearly by just slowing down a tiny but good point about renewable not being ready

Really solid job. Could have gone either way.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Matt Reynolds (*4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>CDN 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda Jarvis</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Phoenix Country Day School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole Montei</td>
<td>89</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? **Y**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Comments given Verbally to the Debaters*

Love the bold approach Cole.

In the end, the criterion of “Utilitarianism” was established by the **Affirmative**. Lost points for “wtf” moments.
**Novice LD Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>CDN 60</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mckinley Paltzik</td>
<td>23 Phoenix Country Day School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Travis Fenn</td>
<td>20 Mesquite High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**RFD** Very prepared

Aff: polite - great eye contact - great voice level + posturing - great rebuttal answers.

Neg: great eye contact - polite - great cross Q's. to much reading.
## NLD

### Novice LD Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>EDB L1-32</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong> Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillimon Yosafat</td>
<td>2/1</td>
<td>Nancy Pham 2/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 Horizon 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:

**RFD:** I vote **AFF** because the terminal impact was not attacked or refuted in the NR, which means **AFF** wins under both worlds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>SCOB 150</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Popescu</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Joey Antonelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Willow Canyon High School</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Judge's Signature**

**Hamilton HS**
School / Affiliation / Occupation

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Great round!
Aff's arguments were very well structured and clear. Negr's arguments were not as clear. I was a little confused by the arguments surrounding china. I was hoping they would be clarified in later arguments, but I'm afraid they were only mentioned in passing way that didn't help. Many of the arguments on both sides were not addressed. Negr did not address oil spills, global emissions, and health risks.
Aff did not address rare earth metals, or China (2 pts on China)
I felt negr's rare earth metals argument was strong. The subpoints made in that unitenthin should have been re-iterated to oppose some of Aff's argument (could have used pollution/destruction from mining of rare metals as counter point to oil spill destruction).
Aff should be careful what agrees to in Q&A. Some points (and I didn't write down specifics), but Negr was able to say "Aff agrees that..." on a few points.
GRANILIO-WALKER, ERIN

NLD

Novice LD Debate  |  Erin Granilo-Walker (*23,11,7)
Round 3          |  EDB 208

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Lee</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Jhaj Baaz</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative  X  Negative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Winners:

PCDS

Judge's Signature

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Not sure that there is a clear logic between fossil fuel industry spending and the effects.

Framework discussion (the TAR) could have been much cleaner.

The debate term for telling the room where you are on the flow is “signpost.” Where was this in the TAR?

The climate change impact weighing could have been much stronger.

RFD: Many of the arguments ended up being a waste but I ultimately buy the negation argument that oil is an inelastic good + that subsidies will not help.

Stand for CX

Some of your rebuttals on the aff case could have used data + been more specific.

Meyer is argues that “if U.S. subsidies were to be cut, other countries’ oil would be relatively cheaper - not changing anything about consumption.” You really needed a response to C2 of the TC, since it seems to link well into your fuc.

Not sure the economic explanations make sense.
### NLD

**JONES, KIM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Kim Jones (*3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>SCOB 210</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anushka Suneel Mitbader</td>
<td>10 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ____________

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

---

Aff Constructive (1)

1. fossil fuels negatively affect minorities
2. fossil fuels are harmful to the environment
3. alternative energy can be used

Neg Cross (1)

Forgot she was doing cross and did a rebuttal.

Aff Rebuttal (1)

- Justice is more important.
- What happened in
- Oil firms don't need subsidies in USA.

---

Neg Constructive (2)

1. Subsidies contribute to countries prosperity
2. Workers will lose jobs

Cross (2)

1. How does it cause oppression?
2. Can you elaborate on contention 1?
3. Fossil fuels will be depleted by 2050

Agrees with aff contention

---

---
Neg Rebuttal
- Justice = prosperities
- Subsidies can result in loss of jobs
- Uses Canada as an example a lot.
- Will lose transportation
- Oppression on minorities

Aff 2nd Rebuttal
No guarantees that the minorities will get these jobs. Wealthy + higher class will take these jobs.

* Neg texting during 2nd rebuttal round
* Completely drifted off
## NLD

**Novice LD Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>EDB L1-36</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liam Reynolds</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Nate Leahy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Gilbert High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 Chaparral High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Judge's Signature

Tempe prep

School / Affiliation / Occupation

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Aff:**
- Too many frameworks only 1 value + value criterion
- Name your 1st contention
- I like your use of economic inequality but I need further sources proving businesses only use subsidies to save on taxes. Need proof it's not helping the people.
- Good Cross, be more confident in your approach.
- Tell me where on the flow we're going. Tell me where to flow the card you read. It's a helpful flex, use it.
- I need you to connect back to framework, set it drop in your second speech. Why does this work best under UTM, your 1st running it.
- If your opponent dropped their own contention, you just have to say they dropped it and move on.
- Crystallize the round in your last speech. Give me clear voters, walk me through the impacts.

**BFD:** I ended up voting **Aff** because the **Neg** dropped the carbon tax and the carbon tax counterplan but if you're using it as a reason to jump to the neg I need more evidence.

**Neg:**
- Can always say can I see that card in my prep.
- Value and value criterion are the same
- I like the carbon tax counterplan but if your using it as a reason to jump to the neg I need more evidence.
- Be louder in CX, your saying good responses but I can't hear.
- I need the neg argument to be crisper up. If your attacking economic inequality through jobs, I need that explicitly said.
- Dropped the unaddressed carbon tax tax.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>EDB L1-24</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Affirmative** | Muntaha Islam  
10 Hamilton High School | Points  
(20-30) | **24** |
| **Negative** | Cooper Somora  
21 Perry High School | Points  
(20-30) | **25** |

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

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*talked in person*
This was the best novice debate I have seen. Both did excellent job in going over other cases.

Affirmative: original value & criteria with respect for all life forms. Make sure to define all terms to the 500 word limit, otherwise the resolution was clearly defined. The import & effect of subsidy was mentioned & good. Only one mention of some mention of subsidies. Good 2nd & 3rd speech.

Negative: 3 good continuations about fossil fuels. Use more w/ subsidy. The resolution is about getting rid of the subsidy if you concentrated on how important fossil fuels are. Medical prices to go up if necessity was good. This was strongest argument w/ subsidy. Did not mention in 2nd speech. Good points on coal to India & Mexico worst.

Very close vote for AFF - mentioned of subsidy taken away only small increase in prices. Neg had nothing bad Neg needed to either flow medical increase in how 1-2 good subsidy examples. Did not convince needed subsidy - must told me oh to reiterate. Concl ABDS.
Novice LD Debate

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

Round 3

Affirmative
Trisha Panse
10 Hamilton High School

Points (20-30)

29

Negative
Madeleine Joslin
7 McClellan High School

Points (20-30)

28

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ______

Judge's Signature

Brophy/Couch

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

* Careful not to make your arg in cross-x

* Time management definitely needs work for that AR

* 2AR was kinda soft, you can go a lot harder with your impacts

Neg

* You gotta make more substantive responses to the aff c1 and c2

* Extend your c2 more properly, you literally just said "extend" and then moved on

* The main problem is that your affs are just mostly mitigatory defense, the aff impact can still flow through just to a lesser extent

RPO: I affirm on the aff c2 and c3. Neg only puts some defense on them while not having much offense coming off the neg necessarily. More impacting and weighing would benefit both sides, but particularly the neg.
# NLD

**Novice LD Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>SCOB 152</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasha Sai Guntu</td>
<td>Austin Keith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hamilton High School</td>
<td>3 Willow Canyon High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative  Negative

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Aff**

Great job. You provided explanations to each of the arguments points you made. This helps to keep it up.

During the last rebuttal, it seemed that you were adding an addition argument to your case.

**Neg**

Great job. Each point made had an explanation to help support them. Keep it up!

Maybe explain more how the US would affect other countries.

RFD: The neg better defended their framework.
**NLD**

**Novice LD Debate**  
**Ryan Kibby ('22)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>CDS 137</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dens Sumesh</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Trex Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BASIS Peoria</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:**

- You overemphasized Putin & China.
- Use Flex Prep in the future.
- You need to explain why methane Arg is not unique.
- You need to do more leg work on the China Argument.
- The switch to different types of fuel systems Arg would apply more to.
- You really needed to address the Arg that under both worlds we won't transition for 100 years.
- Both sides shouldn't worry so much on exact spending numbers and instead focus more on transition times to renewable under both worlds.
- If people are still dying explain how the aff saves.
- No new args in the 2 AR (make sure to practice 1AR, Robby's notes).
## Novice LD Debate

**Victor Cervantes (**'16**)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>EDB L1-34</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 06:30PM</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>260</td>
<td>Sophia Browder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Sunnyslope High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge's Signature**

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- both: make sure to be respectful - this is about connection & exchange - not yelling at each other
- more notes in round

# This round came down to JUSTICE - since that is the value agreed upon in this round - both the most good for most people & the most fairness is in a NEQ world wherein we **continue w/ subsidies**.
### NLD

**Novice LD Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sofia Sills-Freeman  
8 Arcadia High School | Nicholas Butkiewicz  
16 Brophy College Prep |

**Round 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points 20-30</th>
<th>Points 20-30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Easy to follow - well organized case
- Good prep
- You handled CX very well. Good overall thinking on your feet. Continue to work on that because you will be in rounds.

Both of you did a nice job and you are both polite, respectful. I really appreciated that.

I'm voting for both, but just barely. I think Nicholas did a little better controlling the economic issues/arguments. Toast and claus.
GALARDI, LUCAS

NLD

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Lucas Galardi (*'21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>CDN 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri 12/06/19 06:30PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofie Chung</td>
<td>Jared Maurice Perkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 McClintock High School</td>
<td>15 Desert Ridge High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**  **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Lucas Galardi
Judge's Signature

Perry High School
School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff: Social contract- govt is meant to protect people, if they can't do that, chaos ensues and people are obligated to disobey.

- Minorities - POC disproportionately 2x as likely to live by power plants
- Be of this, subs directly hurt POC, hurting them more, violating sec. contract, from pollution
- Gov. corruption
- Massive flow of money from FF corps to keep profits from subs
- FF corps spent hundreds of millions to put GOP in power and guard FF profits, violates contract

Neg: Efficiency

1. U.S. Reliance
   - We depend on FF for majority of our energy
   - If US switches to renewables there will be recession
   - Used by 92% of transport

2. Cost
   - Renewables more expensive to maintain
   - Subs help US develop better renewal

3. Reducing emissions
   - Sub reform important to reduce emissions
   - Would generate trillions of dollars
   - Carbon pricing could return money to citizens

PD: The links were much more clear for aff and she extended and added to her case throughout, while also fulfilling neg's value. Neg wasn't able to fully explain his impacts/links and didn't dismantle his opponent's case.
Neg, very important that you use all CX and prep time. Also, assert yourself in CX if you have more to say. Aff - good question about it being worse to switch in the future, addresses his value as well. Some advice for neg, reading up on the topic and looking deeper into your cards a bit goes a long way in making you seem more confident/knowledgable on the issue. Great aff card about ending subs actually helping GDP while reducing emissions, fulfills both values. You easily address both goals and explain your cards effectively.

Neg, never concede anything in CX; she was able to exploit your answer about climate change. Also, you should always be writing down what she's saying. It helps a lot in effectively filling your own time in future speeches and helps organization tons.

I would like to see from neg how much this carbon tax would provide in revenue. That would give it much more weight be right now it's purely hypothetical that we could invest this revenue elsewhere. Saying that we need FFs bc we rely on them now doesn't make much sense. There's not really a specific reason provided that renewables couldn't generate as much power as FFs. Also, you need to address her point that FFs will eventually run out.

I appreciate the key voters from aff, and her organization made it easy to flow. Neg, carbon tax is an argument with a lot of potential. If you can strongly link it to increased revenue and fighting CC by reducing emissions, it would be a very strong argument.