GRIFFIN, HANNA

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

NLD
FLIP: 5 Sophia Browder v. 7 Louisa Kaplan

Novice LD Debate
Hanna Griffin (*16,9)

Quarter-Finals
PSF 166
Sat 12/07/19 01:45PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Louisa Kaplan
Sophia Browder

The winner of this debate was
Affirmative (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Judge’s Signature

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- your case is well-structured & thought out
- you should have turned her arg saying that humans ought to be 1st → we rely on ecosystem
- impoverished ppl more affected by climate change
- extend during the TAK
- weigh the reversibility of the situation

RFD: I vote NEG because there is more offense coming from that side and the fact that they offer an effective reason as to why I should not consider plants/animals under the scope of justice. While I think the AFK was better situated case wise to win, they did not extend offensive arguments, rather they focused on putting defense on the NEG’s case that the NEG was slightly able to refute.

- you need to argue why we shouldn’t consider plants/animals under our scope of justice other than they can’t think or have will
- be more clean about rebuttals
- when looking @ the impacts, make sure to weigh under both worlds

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Judge’s Signature

Brophy / Student

Points
(20-30)

### NLD
2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

**FLIP: 2 Philimon Yosafat v. 10 Trisha Panse**

| Novice LD Debate | Micah-Sandys (+25) | Pratt, Gre
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarter-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>PSF 123</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sat 12/07/19 01:45PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Philimon Yosafat</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Trisha Panse</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner) **NO**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**AFF:** Playfair in CX - directly answer NEQ question. Anticipate solvency attack with the case you present and: (a) Directly respond to solvency in CV and prepare defense for certain NEQ case attacks. Make certain you focus on questions in CX and how to catch Neg - impact. Focus year offense is ??; Aff. You have so little time so you need to crisply defend and they stuff to offense. Do you really need (b) - throw trees and they stuff to offense. Do you really need (c) - throw trees or is this just a red herring. OK on you time frame argument you are arguing that Climate A will occur faster than B - convincing.

**NEG:** CX don't use in CX ask questions - Syria trees may too much CX time to certain to balance time in 1st Neg to allow sufficient time for offense - you certain you flow sufficiently address flow on offense - good thing Aff asked chart (c) structural violence so you could clarify your cross application of Neg CV/2 to AFF (c) be certain when you cross apply argumentation you provide sufficient rationale WHY.

**RF B:** AFF/NEG agreed on framework so AFF V/C used to evaluate debate so the case was based upon which side maximized happiness. The ballot rested on impact of subsidies to the poor - As is the case with novice debates analysis & extension of arguments in out speeches was weak. I was convinced that Neg provided due to impact of climate change by eliminating subsidies retaining that.
# NLD

**FLIP: 10 Andrew Xie v. 3 Austin Keith**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Sameed Irfan (*6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarter-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>PSF 173</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Keith</td>
<td>Andrew Xie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was:

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? N/A

**In a large room like this, it is important to speak up.**

**Look ahead in CX.**

**Util framework may work better for this sort of case.**

**Time allocation in the 1AR.**

**The rare earth metals 2AR response came too late.**

**RFD:** Framework was more or less a wash. Ultimately, most of the negs offensive arguments flow through take out the AC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Shawn Yousefelah (*22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter-Finals</td>
<td>PSF 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong>: 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muntaha Islam</td>
<td>10 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Stated Case Well
- Could not produce card when asked.
- Good CX → Good questions asked.
- REBUTAL started good but ended repeating some points without really addressing points. Brought up emissions in closing argument too late.

**Criteria:** Preserve Life
- Did not make the point that ending subsidies will automatically preserve life. At times almost sounded like using "Justice".
- One last point: Preserve Life during crisis you said "some may die now but in long run people will survive" - DON'T DO THAT.

- Good CX → Very organized
- Good Rebuttal. Attack the AF Case systematically and point for point, really addressed the AF Case well.

**Justice for All**
- Made good argument that subsidies support the poor and bring justice from bottom.
### NLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Shawn Yousefzahi (*22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Octo-Finals</td>
<td>PSF 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeleine Joslin</td>
<td>Trisha Panse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 McClintock High School</td>
<td>16 Hamilton High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Is this a low point win? ______________

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- You need more justification for your framework.
- Your analysis is weak in the TAC.
- You need to impact your C3, why do you dislike matter?
- Your framework is the same, so you don't need to repeat it.
- Great responses to the A3.
- Just be a little more organized (sign rest move)
- Do more within you for meta DA, but don't [redacted].
- This was a little messy, tell me what you think.
- Again, DA was a little messy - tell me what you think.
- Make sure to weigh your impacts in the AF. Why are yours more important than theirs? Also strategy.
- Neg only concerns S2--2, does not help prove solvency.
- Neg made new context in the DA.

RFD: I vote neg on the core of the DA. With little evidence offense can disprove the DAF. I can vote off a risk of a link to the Robin Form's DA which gives uncontested neg offense.
NLD
FLIP: 7 Louisa Kaplan v. 3 Andrea Popescu

Novice LD Debate

Maanik Chotalla (*16)

Octo-Finals

Affirmative: Andrea Popescu

PSF 123

Points (20-30)

Louisa Kaplan

Points (20-30)

The winner of this debate was:

Affirmative (Circle Winner)

No

Judge's Signature

Brophy/Coach/Fightin' of Nightman

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Cool stock af & I like the way about children being particularly impacted
- gotta defend your framework it is super important this round
- 1AR needs more impact extensions and rephrasing
- 2AR was just too little too late
- 1AR needed more
- Interesting way to harden on the framework debate because your RW is very advantageous for you this round
- I wish you made the impact chain more clearly in your 2NR, but you got enough of it all

RFD: I negate using the hegemony framing. Neg is the only one with a solid impact to stability and hegemony and aff just isn't defending their framework adequately, the defense comes in the 2AR which is too late.