<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Zani Encinas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>SCOB 250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alex somoza 22 Desert Vista High School 29</td>
<td>Trisha Panse 10 Hamilton High School 29</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:

I voted *negative* because they turned the Aff’s 2 contentions, and there was no Aff offense by the ZAR.

In terms of the debate this means:

- Removing subsidies causes shift to renewables which require mining of rare earth minerals which hurts the environment and people.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Ryan Ferdowsian (22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDB L1-20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karim Jayyusi</td>
<td>Philimon Yosafat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Willow Canyon High School</td>
<td>2 BASIS Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative** (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ______

Comments & Reason for Decision:

[Handwritten notes: RFD: Backsliding turns the case, means affirmative doesn't get benefit of stopping harm to people. External neg disadvantages are biased from mining. ]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>EDB 208</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate Leahy</td>
<td>Andrea Popescu</td>
<td>25 Chaparral 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:

- Need to be aware of prep time and understand time is running during all prep
- Don't let a random timer go off during opponents presentation
- More contentions flowed through contentition 1 - A, C contentition 2 - B
- Need to both be polite to each other.

Great facts for your case but needed to rebut opponents case properly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Sameed Irfan (*6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>CDS 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri 12/06/19 07:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Nesteruck</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Willow Canyon High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? [Affirmative/ Negative]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Need to time yourself better
- Need to be more attentive and take notes while other debaters are speaking
- So as not to talk over crossex on repeat
- Need more eye contact
- Louder, clearer speech
- Need better preparation
- Could be less intimidating to debate
- Inhibiting to these
2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

NLD

Novice LD Debate
Harsha Hakkal

Round 4
EDB L1-27

Fri 12/06/19 07:30PM

Affirmative

Points
(20-30)

Trex Jones
8 Arcadia High School

Negative

Points
(20-30)

Anna Marie Sherwood
17 Paradise Valley

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? [ ]

Affirmative

25

Negative

24

Judge's Signature

Sunny Slope Parent/Watcher

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: Good pacing, + presence in constructive
- a little targeted, 3 values (survival, justice, until)
- no clear criterion given for judging the round
- excellent job addressing your case in 1st AR
- good use of impromptu language to drive home
- very points “not hurting anyone in Beverly Hills”

Ney: Effective use of cross-x for clarification but
- no probing your opponent’s case cards/statement for weakness
- solid understanding of form + logistics
- you’ve got good material, your presentation
- you’re not drilling in cards, in constructive, debated

Reason for Decision:
- Ney did not refuse/address integration theft +
- Aff carried until criteria
- offered by Ney
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Micah Sandys ('25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>EDB L1-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Pham</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Horizon High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Nancy**
- Organize your rebuttal and have a better roadmap of where you’ll be taking the debate.
- Keep an eye on the time and finish strong with a conclusion.
- You were very interested/focused on declining infrastructure, but I never found the argument warranted this.

**Muntaha**
- Smooth and controlled speech. Could be more aggressive against opponentsURE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>EDB L1-24</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia Browder</td>
<td>James Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sunnyslope High School</td>
<td>10 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was: **Affirmative** (CIRCLE WINNER) **Negative**

Is this a low point win? [ ]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Comments for Both:**

Use more cited evidence and recent evidence. Sometimes a stat or fact would be mentioned but I was not sure where it came from.

Thank you both for providing definitions.

**Aft:** Great organization. You are very thorough in your speech but would slow it down a bit. You did well at rebuttal.

Also, your argument of value of social justice was solid.

You are skilled at clashing, but be careful about being too short and cutting others off continually during cross-exam.

**Neg:** You also had great organization. When doing cross-exam, make sure questions are clear. You gave some solid logical arguments such as plastics potentially going up in price, but this would be one to try to support as well. Good job arguing the value of utilitarianism.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Pam Sherwood (*'17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>CDN 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fri 12/06/19 07:30PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waad Rahal</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Mountain View High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sofia Sills-Freeman</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Arcadia 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:

**RFD - good opening - good Questions.**

aff - Simply reading instead of speaking make for a boring debate. Could use more eye contact.

Neg - More projection of voice would help show passion. Good eye contact.
**REYNOLDS, MATT**

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

NLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Matt Reynolds (*4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td>CDN 62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Butkiewicz</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anushka Suneel Mitbander</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature: **Gilbert Forest / IT Sales**

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Comments delivered weakly*

You both did a great job!

Toughest decision of the night. I'll give the nod to Affirmative because I felt they addressed the most points brought up in the debate overall. Great exchange.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jared Maurice Perkins</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Lucas Von Borries</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 Desert Ridge High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative  Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ___

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff. was straight to the point, confident, persuasive, and had great points.

Neg. did well but could use more preparation.
**Aff.**

10

Confident, Persuasive, have great points

$10

$8

**Neg.**

9

Good Question
Not factual

4

3

26
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Susan Seep (*9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>SCOB 210</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter Travis Fenn</td>
<td>Andrew Xie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Mesquite High School</td>
<td>10 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td>Judge's Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>School / Affiliation / Occupation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

aff: excellent IQ quick

We are resolved...
"The resolution..."
"I resolve to..."

NEVER: "the resolved"

RFD:

Consider "ought". It isn't = should.

Ought implies a philosophical or moral benefit. SO, that means an aff argument that eliminates the now will result in consumer subsidies/programs later. Actually, it's not to negate your argument. Also... you need an actual reason to prefer libertarianism. (there are many!) Increasing the happiness of fossil fuel producers is... not persuasive, to put it mildly.
### NLD

**Novice LD Debate**

**Gabby Paffumi (*11)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>CDS 137</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Keith</td>
<td>Mckinley Paltzik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Willow Canyon High School</td>
<td>23 Phoenix Country Day School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

**(Circle Winner)**

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

**Judge's Signature**

Tempe Prep

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Aff:**
- I think you should re-do your value+value criterion+to human life and util.
- Subpoint 1 vs Subpoint B.
- Have to explain why things get to flow through. Give me the warrant.
- Framework should always go first 4 it structures all of your arguments.
- Crystallize what affirmative is running, is it quantity of lives over the poor? Droped how its cheaper.
- The poor in 2nd speech so I now am bound by negs argument that it will hurt the poor economically.
- If your doing a framework debate I need it in the first speech. I need to know its impacts earlier or else its a new arg as to why to prefer yours.
- Ask! The aff you had a lot of missed impact turns on the neg. Use your 3rd contention and perm.

**Afd:** I ended up voting Negative because I am bound to Justice and the difference principal. From this neg outweighed by proving aff hurt the poor economically.

**Neg:**
- Look toward the judge in CX, wonderful tone though.
- Your observation is really a burden for aff.
- If you have the same value talk about how you are the ONLY one to define justice.
- So we must go off of our own definition now talk about why you fit this better.
- Good speech in first rebuttal but focus on 3rd contention more for its where they have the most offense.
- Perfect weighing through justice. I wish it came earlier though.
- Good crystallization of the road, I wish there was a better road map jumped between his case, to key voters, then to your case and then back to his. I wish it was crisper.
- Bless key voters.
- Be careful for a perm on your Benifits to subsidizes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>SCOB 150</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Joey Antonelli  
21 Perry High School | Vincent Montalbano  
22 Desert Vista High School |  |
| Points (20-30) | 28 | Points (20-30) | 26 |

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

*(Circle Winner)*

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

---

**AFF**

- Good justification of value/criterion based off of the language in the resolution
- You mention cards and arguments around the idea that the US has or will have a hard time justifying the subsidies; I'd have liked to have heard more about the reasons behind it/examples of it being the case
- Bloomberg evidence was effective
- Organization of argument could be tailored neater to each cause vs. effect (separating economic impacts from environmental ones for example)
- Smart choice to not focus on renewables, but could do more to argue against fossil fuels as necessary for construction of many clean options

**Neg**

- Needed more evidence to support contentions (cards could be cut longer as well to explain further)
- Good case on how fossil fuels are a prereq. for sustainable energy options. Also, the 90% of healthcare materials made from plastics made from crude oils was effective. Reinforce this in relation to Util impact of what increasing this cost would look like for people in America
- You move quickly from topic to topic, make sure that you are focused on specific points/effects in your contentions+ evidence and explain each step all the way through
- For rebuttals, I recommend commenting on each of the opposing side's contentions so they can't flow any as uncontested.

---

RFD: The Aff's case went largely unrebutted and had strong evidence backing that it would have the most benefit to people in America.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>EDB L1-36</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>29 <strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole Montei</td>
<td>11 Tempe Preparatory Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>28 <strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofie Chung</td>
<td>7 McClintock High School</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: **YB**

School / Affiliation / Occupation: **DV**

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- You could make an argument about fossil fuels being unstable - that it's a highly volatile fuel.
- Impact out the argument about wasting taxpayer money.
- Nice evidence weighing - make sure to include in other places on the flow.
- Make sure to clearly extend your impacts.
- No new arguments in 2AR re: nuke war impact being nonsensical.
- I vote on the Affs jobs/economy impact - it sufficiently answers the Neg arg about the econ.
- Compare frameworks. Why is yours preferable?
- I would find a more recent card to read for reliability claims.
- You need to answer the green jobs claim = more jobs than w/f fossil fuels.
- Clearly explain link chain to war - warrants!
Novice LD Debate

**Affirmative**
Madeleine Joslin  
7 McClintock High School  
Points (20-30)  26

**Negative**
Sasha Sai Guntu  
10 Hamilton High School  
Points (20-30)  27

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**
(Circle Winner)

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

---

**AFF**

- Wow! Great job w/ emphasis + timing  
  One of the best paced + best delimmed arguments of the day (for me).
- Well cited
- Rebuttals were direct, but delivered w/ a bit of "tone" (be nice!)

---

**NEG**

- Excellent delivery  
- Clearly laid out ideas in preatch of NEG case  
- A few contents were hard to follow (plants + poor area; Govt debt)  
- Well cited  
- Value was not defended well
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Yegor Zenkor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>EDB L1-23</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>Jhaj Baaz</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Louisa Kaplan</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 McCLintock High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Won on framework.

Good presentation of case, but didn't provide enough of a link between lower Ann production and solving climate change or even that the ff use would decline and switch to renewables.

Framework was a little rough and even your case was weak in parts, but you were able to use your case and your rebuttals well enough to poke holes in his case so that you won even under his framework.

Neg was able to use Aff own framework to disprove his case.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>CDN 68</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper Somora</td>
<td>Dens Sumesh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Perry High School</td>
<td>2 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? [ ]

Judge's Signature

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**AFF**

Good job - his good value criterion. Content is good - can talk more on subsidies - where does money go? Why is it bad. All agree is based on climate change.

**Neg**

Content is good on rare earth, pollution used good content on terrorism, child abuse. Did well in both speeches - be clearer on Neget card and on your rebuttal - stopped + started.

Winner **Neg** is winner in close debate. Aff did not mention his Neget card. On removing subsidies cannot solve or reduce climate change. The result is on subsidies - in Neg world if farmers onlyclimate change does not reduce. Also relates child labor. Terrorism shows did flow, used greater good for both. Slight win to Neg. Subsidies do not increase pollute as stated. Aff did not use content that card on rare earth materials.

Good debate.
**NLD**

**Novice LD Debate**

**Erin Granilo-Walker (*'23, '11, '7)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>CDS 15</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 07:30PM</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>Katie Ann Jones</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Liam Reynolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Desert Ridge High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Gilbert High School</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:**

RFD: I vote **NEG** because they have a more compelling argument with **time frame and scope**, thereby netting more impacts. Additionally, a full length case would've helped **AFF** substantially.

- Look up from screen in speeches
- Tag cards with authors last name and year
- AC 4 min too short