GALARDI, LUCAS

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

FLIP: 5 Sophia Browder v. 10 Andrew Xie

Novice LD Debate

Lucas Galardi (*21)

Semi-Finals

WXLR A308

Sat 12/07/19 03:30PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophia Browder</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Andrew Xie</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Lucas Galardi

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro:

Social justice is value
Human rights is criterion
Legal Violations
- 136 petrol plants in Missouri have heavily polluted the region
- 22% more cancer
- Area mostly black, disproportionately hurting poor POC, violating an executive order
- Exploitation of Deiving Countries
- People in 3rd world have to deal with huge pollution because of US oil corps
- Eni violation of Stockholm Declaration
- 4.3m gallons of oil find way into Amazon river

Eziovec: Erikson 2019 - subs responsible or continued expansion of FF industry

Con:

Happiness is value
Being is criterion

1. Mining
- Renewables won't be enough as of REMs that must be mined in China, more environmental human rights issues
- Deep-sea mining would also devastate ocean ecology
- 5A M oppl engaged in ocean-related jobs

2. Subs help poor
- Low-income homes spend 7.2% on utilities, more than usual
- Subs save these ppl hundreds
- Removing subs would be making these people financially insecure

FD: Pro didn't access any of her cited impacts, and con accessed some of them. If we can help some low-income households, we should do that. I would've given it to pro easily if she showed it could actually fight poverty/pollution.
Not sure I buy pro’s argument that as long as it’s off our consciousness it’s better... She even concedes that ending subs wouldn’t do much.

Yes. This resolution definitely covers consumer subsidies as well. It’s understood that when it says we are ending FF subsidies, that means all of them. Unless I see a very good argument saying otherwise, I’m sticking with that.

Pro, you can’t really say that your side won’t hurt the FF industry at all and then say that pro will somehow help the environment at the same time. At this point, I can’t see what the impact of the pro case is.

Neg, happiness on its own isn’t exactly measurable, but it’s fine because her framework isn’t exactly measurable either. However, that being said, the surveys you use are probably the best way to support your case.

Pro, you could easily access the very large impacts you cite in your case if you use cards to show how much removing subs would hurt the FF industry. That would give you credibility on stopping climate change. You also kinda shoot yourself in the foot by saying both renewables and FFs are bad because that traps you.

It’s never possible to make EVERYONE happy. His framework is to make the most amount of people happy. Pro doesn’t make everyone happy either. Is that oppression? His slave labor and deforestation arguments weren’t new. They were in his case.

Xie, don’t let her dominate you in CX.
**RFD:** This was a really great and close finals debate. I vote neg on the poverty turn under Timetrame framing. I think it's questionable whether the aff solves climate change, but for sure removing subsidies creates a price shock that hurts poor people, so I default to that impact. Because it's the most immediate and proximate and, as per the NR's framing, I should evaluate concrete short term impacts more than nebulous long-term impacts.
**NLD**

**FLIP: 23 McKinley Paltzik v. 10 Andrew Xie**

**Novice LD Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finals</th>
<th>WXL R A104</th>
<th>Sat 12/07/19 05:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley Paltzik</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Xie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></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:**

- You should add a still over point to your AC.
- Don't bother with the fordrable - our argument time is basically the same.
- Good starting of the AC not you need to save time to respond to the NC.
- You can make new argument for C1 *in the 2AR.
- You need to show how shit you marine
- I know I'll voted against you twice on small things, you are such a great debater! You will do great things.

**Judge's Signature**

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

**RFD:** I voted neg on the conceded contention 1 and 3 of the NC. With the only internal link to solve their reminders are the start and choosing solace (which neg mitigates). Neg ever short-term impacts can hurt on all outside impacts prove neg is not weak on short-term. After only has direct risks solving in the long term.
SHAH, SIMOL

NLD

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

FLIP: 23 McKinley Paltzik v. 10 Andrew Xie

Novice LD Debate

Simol Shah (*24)

Finals

WXLRA104

Sat 12/07/19 05:15PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McKinley Paltzik</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Andrew Xie</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative  Negative
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

I Calaway
Judge’s Signature

24

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Andrew - I think it would help if you had more passion in presenting your case & material. The monotone dulls our senses this late at night.

All was more persuasive convinced me that utilitarianism was most imp. We need argument about being cozy & happy. (Frame work)

Neg was arguing the value of security & happiness. Life before one can get to happiness (Maslow's hierarchy) How does poor benefit from status gain?

Neg kept saying AFF not solving climate change but didn't explain it well enough for me to buy it. Aff renewables stood after Neg attack. Extremes going extinct worldwide is serious

Both debaters were well prepared and organized. Neg started with his base but gave me no roadmap that he was, and that had yet to see all case later.

McKinley made the most of his speaking time.
2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

NLD
FLIP: 5 Sophia Browder v. 10 Andrew Xie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Mark Phillips (*24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Finals</td>
<td>WXLR A308</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>Sophia Browder</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Andrew Xie</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was
**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ______

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Aff**

In the issue of impact, which where I see, I vote

**Neg**

UN HR.
2/3 judges said Impact Calculus is important in their paradigm and neither debater mentioned Timeframe Probability Scope Magnitude. Saying "Extend" is not an argument. What is the impact of that extension on the round? Why do we care that the argument extends?

RFD: I buy the Neg argument that removing subsidies harms the poor and that consumer subsidies are in fact included under the agreed upon definition, thus not protecting Human Rights.
- Great presentation & the AEC.
- Your FUs are basically the same, wherever you win, the VC is the same. 
Your util is only. You should focus on how you win util to achieve either search or happiness.
- You should so AC -> NC in the final.
- You hurt yourself by twin take with NF since we keep fossil fuels (MUC FR C.C.)
- She did show why mining is very bad for the environment.
- You need to make your responses clear with "evidence/examine".
- You need to extend & cite off the all...
- Litany extas anything that departed.
- You don't look at your opponent during the round.
- Ask more offensive questions, not just clarifying questions.
- Your FUs are basically the same, dont read on & off.
- Good organization and sign posting in the LMC
- Don't spend so much time explaining your opponent's arguments to me.
- You need to extend our old.


ACL

- You keep saying how climate change is a bigger issue, but don't explain how this.

- Consider new solutions in the OAAT.

- You seem surprised by the OAAT.

- You know you are wrong.

- You can do something. You don't need to live in the OAAT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Sara Armistead (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Finals</strong></td>
<td>WXLR A307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley Paltzik</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trisha Panse</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Raised key issues but your values argument failed.
- Point of compound damage was your best argument.
- Some distracting habits: giggle, "like", held paper in front of face, head resting on hand, slow.
- Smart rebuttal.

Max Cheedester

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

FLIP: 23 McKinley Paltzik v. 10 Trisha Panse

Novice LD Debate | Nidhi Jain (*2)
Semifinals | WXLR A307 | Sat 12/07/19 03:30PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McKinley Paltzik</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Trisha Panse</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative [Circle Winner]

Is this a low point win? NO

Max Cheedester
Judge’s Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative: Keep your line by line extensions. Try to keep your speed consistent throughout and slow down on tags. You need to do some work on FW; you gave your last speech number 116, which was under 3.30, and I had to stop listening. Maybe switch your value to Life? I think that’s where you went wrong.

Negative: Spend more time working on FW; you need to do more work on FW. You need to know your voters before you give your last speech. You need to consider that you didn’t win any votes in your last speech.

RFD: AFF

FW: She spends more time developing this argument and shows its necessity. I would still vote AFF

Cone: AFF win. Note that removing fossil fuel subsidies will help prevent or reduce impacts. Neg does not prove that a switch to clean energy demands rare earth metals.