TYLER, ROBB

VLD

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

Varsity LD Debate

Robb Tyler (5)

WXLR A106

Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM

Round 1

Affirmative
Logan Kraver
7 McClintock High School
Points (20-30) 28

Negative
Lili Wen Jing Chambers
24 Mountain View High School
Points (20-30) 27

The winner of this debate was
Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Affirmative

Negative

Judge's Signature

Sunny "Parent/Note order"

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

"AFF" & Bold stance on Bio-Egalitarianism vs. and I exploded but if your goal to carve a new path for the debate you would be bolstered by not just a strong organizational approach (which you have) but reinforce your structure with consistent references back to it at each new step.

"Excellent ownership of Counterplan in TAR."

"Great articulation in plain language of philosophical underpinnings - you could have leaned even heavier on the "injustice stance from specieism(4?)"

Neg - Very strong turn into AFF's criteria and very strong prepared material (cool facts!) and bold counterplan

"Strong presence in cross-X but careful with sensibly too dismissive with "cool..." as your cutoff tool."

"Replace "um" + "like" with a breath or silence.

Reason for Decision:

"AFF Pinned (successfully) Counterplan" 

"Aff's solvency of deploy current stockpile's foster not dictated by Neg's disadvantage or cool in short term"

"Neg agreed as AFF's criteria "on greatest good" but failed to address AFF's "spiritual pluralism"

Debate 56
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Melissa Daub (*3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>WXMLR A113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Affirmative</strong></th>
<th><strong>Negative</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan Dean Nicoll</td>
<td>Savannah Elizabeth McNamara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Mountain View High School</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:

**Affirmative case was strong. Contentions were well supported with evidence.**

**Negative case was creative. I feel like it is much easier to argue the positive side, but you had an interesting take.**

**Affirmative rebuttal** - I don't feel like you really understood her neg. util. argument. You kept equating it to your value but they are different. Don't get flustered.

**Negative rebuttal** - Clear flow. Easy to follow. Although I am not sure I agree with your reasoning, it was well thought out and persuasive.

Both sides had positives but I felt like the negative side was more persuasive and upheld the values more.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>WXLR A104</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Peters</td>
<td>Carter Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td>7 McClintock High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></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:

1. Subsidy funding can be used to other countries have done it. Pub.
2. Safety cutting pollution. 
   
   → Harmful.

Adaptation → No example.

NO answer on fossil fuel economy.

GDP = debt. Stopping subsidy will decrease income growth.

Both sides agreed that fossil fuel cause harmful for pollution control by reducing fossil fuel usage. Aff argued that we can still work on adaptation and economy → neg argued that economy in providing reasons why the third economy is not doing good just because fossil fuel subsidies. Aff argued that cutting fossil fuel can cut the subsidy money saved by cutting.
Subsidy can be used for pollution control and adaptation research. A win-win economy front.
### VLD

**Varsity LD Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Armando Montero ('22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia Lupica&lt;br&gt;7 McClintock High School</td>
<td>Bennett David Fees&lt;br&gt;16 Brophy College Prep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ☐

**Judge's Signature**

Desert Vista

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- You need to inspect out your C1 better, my friend. I can't read that the US saved more.
- You repeat emmssn a lot.
- You need more offensive questions in C1, you made just a lot of clarifying questions.
- You should send more time on C2 (or an extensio of dems); Medved was a lot.
- The 2AR was very needy and you couldn't allow new cores that were brought up in the 1AR.
- You have too many new aren't in the aff.

FDP: I vote neg off of the debate are incompetence. At all cases, neg go unheard and neg clm w/ all AFF offense/misters. At best, neg debate turned that he reuni neg off.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Lisa Mullings (*'10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>WXLRA102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ava Claus</td>
<td>Maria Cazzatto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sunnyslope High School</td>
<td>6 Catalina Foothills High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20-30)</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature

Hamilton

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Case only supported protecting human rights of economically disadvantaged
- Interesting points w/ firewood + charcoal
- I just couldn't see how subsidy removal would negatively impact all of lower income people
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Kim Jones (*3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>WXLRA309</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avi Agarwal</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Mae Mullings</td>
<td>24</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?

**Willow Canyon High School**

School / Affiliation / Occupation

**Judge’s Signature**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Constructive (1)**

- Speaks WAY too fast
- Couldn't understand anything (auctioneer)
- Heard “Trump”
- “fossil fuel” and “subsidies” a few times.

- Read entire opening argument from computer. Not sure he understood what he was arguing or just reading it.

**Cross (1)**

- He answered cross questions much more confidently and without reading from computer.

**Constructive (2)**

- Speaks clear/annunciates
- Makes eye contact well
- Renewable ↑ prices
- ↑ utility rates
- 1/3 of American households struggle to pay power bill
- CO₂ key problem false
- Aff Contention

- Got faster as time ran out ↑ and louder
Aff

1st Rebuttal (1)
* Shift toward renewal is a good first step

Just re-read previously read information rather than attacking the neg contentions/argument

2nd Rebuttal (2)
* Colony 19 card

* Can't make sense of his second rebuttal due to such fast speaking

* 89% only go to the poor?

Neg

Rebuttal (2)
* Opp never responds to contention

* Cost goes down for the rich and up for the poor.

* Opp never refutes poor americans can't afford

* Opp never responds to financial times 19 card

* Opp never responds to needing more than just a shift to fossil fuels
NICOLL, SARAH

VLD

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

Varsity LD Debate | Sarah Nicoll (*'24) | WXLR A108 | Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axel Vaillancourt</td>
<td>5 Sunnyslope High School</td>
<td>Chloe Legay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative: Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- passionate about case but it needs more depth and breadth.
- doesn't tie impacts directly to resolution
- no proof impacts will happen if affirmed

Good basic argument
- good cross and finding the holes in aff argument.
- need to work on having more confidence in your argument and it could also use more depth.

RFD - Neg was able to prove that aff impacts didn't directly connect to the resolution.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>WXLRA306</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VLD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Varsity LD Debate</strong></td>
<td>**Kayla Green (<strong>10)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raunak Deb</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Antonio Gomez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The winner of this debate was</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Judge's Signature</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote neg because AFF dropped solvency; in order to give the Aff the ballot, they need to win they either solve or have a significant impact on climate change to access their impacts. That was missing. AFF dropped extinction impacts as well.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong>&lt;br&gt;Maya Conroy&lt;br&gt;24 Mountain View High School</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong>&lt;br&gt;Connor Clark&lt;br&gt;11 Tempe Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ultimately, the round was judged on who did more good for biodiversity — which would continue harming the most — since that’s the framework you both agreed upon: therefore, subsidies harm more due to pipeline & nuclear. More notes gone in round.
VLD

Kessler, Susan

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

Varsity LD Debate | Susan Kessler (*3)  
---|---
Round 1 | WXLR A311

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pratik Shah  
24 Mountain View High School | 29 | Nolan Burke  
10 Hamilton High School | 25 |

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Good eye contact w Judge + Nolan. I like to see Aff + Neg engage each other which includes looking at each other while debating.

Both parties spoke well and at a good rate which can be followed. Aff had preponderance of argument and evidence. I agree that branch of government used to deter develop this policy is not an issue for this debate.

Both parties seemed comfortable debating the issues and were respectful to each other. Nice Job!
## VLD

**Varsity LD Debate**  
Khoa Nguyen (*'24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>WXLR A304</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ria Umesh Manathkar  
10 Hamilton High School | Jacob Migel  
6 Catalina Foothills High School |

**The winner of this debate was**

- **Affirmative**  
  (Circle Winner)
- **Negative**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Aff**

- There were some great examples and connections made during the argument to support your argument.
- Neg: For this case, presenting an argument without some effective evidence makes the argument appear weaker. Even when the example of snow in Egypt is mentioned, an example from a source would show that it exist would help to your case, ease es

**Neg**

- The flow of the argument went well. Countering and defending each point all while explaining each of them.

**RFD:** The aff presented more numerical data compared to the neg’s argument. In addition, the aff better supported their framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>WXLR A111</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>Tran Thien Nguyen</td>
<td>Ezri Tyler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Mountain View High School</td>
<td>5 Sunnyslope High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</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>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ultimately, Neg offers several reasons why ending subsidies abruptly would be both ineffective and potentially catastrophic. All tries to extend though not without clearly answering those issues in a way that even win her sufficient offense to win.

Bellor to Neg. Good Rand.

Oral critique offered on style/substance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>WXMLR A119</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>Jay Cheeti</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>Rhegan Clarisa Crabtree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></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? **N/A**

---

**Judge’s Signature**

**PCDS**

**School / Affiliation / Occupation**

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Interesting approach to consequentialism
- If the aff framework is conceded in the NC, you really don't need to spend time on it in the IA. Save that time to explain why your case fits best into that agreed-upon aff.
- Nice job not being distracted
- Not sure how your 2AT logic-empirics argument added to your case

---

- Try to only ask one question at a time
- Slow down in CX
- Smart call to concede the aff's flw in the NC
- Did your evidence for renewables + steel say that U.S. subsidies go to steel production?
- Meta study would further develop your evidence comparison argument

---

RFD: Phenomenal round. I negate because of conceded laundered arguments from the line by line. The power vacuum argument thus treated