## VLD

### Varsity LD Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Jackson Wakefield (*9,22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tran Thien Nguyen</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Mountain View High School</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**

- If production won't change how do emissions decrease
- Good utill weighing
- Explain how even collapse outweigh
- Make sure to engage in extinction timeline
- You need to state whether or not the end cases solve for extinction

**Ney**

- Don't forget to answer the CC priority card if you concede
- Even though you lose, your paper may go Impact is strong considering that OPEC already did this during Carter administration
- Don't focus on validity of sources if neither side has evidence of bad sources
- If both have extinction as impact then the weighing will go to timeline which you need to weigh on
- Make sure to take a minute in last speech to give voters
RFD: Neg won on energy poverty disad. I buy that it is unique to Neg and threat of uprising from energy poverty outweighs Aff impacts. If there is a "Moral responsibility to not harm others" as aff claims then there is also a moral responsibility to ensure poor people don't have to decide between buying food or heat. Recession caused by oil shock also harms people in poverty the most.
**VLD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Kim Jones (*3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>WXLRA302</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>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Peters</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Maya Conroy</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Desert Vista High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 Mountain View High School</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:

Constructive Aff (4)

(1) Value Justice
(2) Public officials are poorly informed. Policy must be justified to the public

Contentions

(1) Tax instead of taxes. The subsidies would see $ come back
(2) Other countries have done this so the US can do the same

Aff Cross (1)

(1) Use EU stopped using coal because it's expensive

Neg Cross (2)

Large population of people would pay the taxes

Less dependent on fossil fuels

Sandberg - consider good & bad

Use nuclear energy

$40 billion spent on subsidies

Neg Constructive (2)

Coal = CO2 emissions

Coal is bad

EU shifted to other things - environmental

Not solving environmental changes
Aff:
332 billion subsidies
280 petroleum
Emissions will go down.
EU shifted away from coal
Dollar amounts changed all the time

Neg:
Coal causes more to emissions
Worse emissions of all
Can't compare EU to the US
Recession leads to violence
Many cards went uncontested.
The negative argument is still largely uncontested.

The winner of this debate was

The winner was

Affirmative

Ben Cougur Phillips
24 Mountain View High School

Keyla Green (Chad)
Mia Lupica
7 Mcclung High School

Affirmative

Round 4

Varisty LD Debate

Fri 12/6/19 07:30PM

WSLR A304

17

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Is this a low point win? No.

Judge's Signature

Hamilton Goff
School/Affiliation: Occupation

RJ: Pem Stahs on cp. lack of timeliness is winning for neg.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Khoa Nguyen (*'24)</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>WXLR A109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Savannah Elizabeth McNamara  
9 Horizon High School | 30                | Logan Kraver        
7 McClintock High School |

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**  
(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The aff provided numerous points that helped provide a better idea of how each point's effect. The neg made to help the audience better understand the argument. The neg rebuttals were great, but they maybe didn't have enough explanation to connect them to an effect that relates back to their framework.

RFD: The aff slightly better presented argument points that fulfill their framework and connected them to present a better outcome.
### VLD

**Varsity LD Debate**

**John Browder (*5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>WXLR A113</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Affirmative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Ria Umesh Manathkar  
10 Hamilton High School

**Negative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Lili Wen Jing Chambers  
24 Mountain View High School

**The winner of this debate was**

**Affirmative**  
(Circle Winner)

**Negative**

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

1. Subsidy removal promotes increased coal use or be divided to increased exploration?
2. Recession is not as easy to bounce back from. Structural differences in multiple results.
3. Not a subsidy or all of the result.

**Pia,** I understand your point that Lili/Ng didn't show evidence demonstrating the point which keeping subsidies work for natural gas and removing them to oil would lead to economic trouble, but the fact subsidies exist implies some degree of effect will occur upon removal. So I'm voting Ng based on a counterpoint. Great debate.
It is a very close debate. But affirmative has stronger cases than negative, especially affirmative attacks negative or job security that only on fossil fuels, fossil fuel industry or small regions such as West Virginia. Also, affirmative emphasize elimination of subsidies can be faded away instead of overnight, which will not cause big impact on job loss.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Maanik Chotalla (*'16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>ED 340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ava Claus</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sunnyslope High School</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:

- The 2NR was recently more supportive and try to stick to the roadmap.
- The neg arg would definitely be better if you prove a renewable transition.
- APA needs to be more specific, you tell me the affirmation will reduce emissions, but tell me where you say that, we your evidence.

RFO: I end up negating on the turn that affirming will lead to more coal usage which is worse for the environment. APA had what they needed to pull the round out but a vague APA didn't help. I need more specific impact.
Affirmative case was clear. Evidence was good.
Neg. case was also clear and evidence was good. Be careful not to cut off your opponent during cross-x.
During the rebuttals, I feel like you both weren't really responding to each others arguments. It just seemed like you just repeated your arguments without real explanations. You are both good speakers and have good evidence. It was a tough round to judge.
It came down to who was doing the best for the most people. I found the argument and evidence of the affirmative to be more compelling.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Aniruddha Deb (*2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>WXLR A106</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Affirmative</strong></th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th><strong>Negative</strong></th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axel Vaillancourt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nolan Burke</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sunnyslope High School</td>
<td></td>
<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? __________

Comments & Reason for Decision:

---

**Neg argument is based on**

1. **Micro grid**: need fossil fuel.
   - All energy source will create result

**Neg did not answer why** micro grid a
other energy distribution system will not
work. Neg did not provide answer on why
by Aff will not work.

Aff build his case around protecting the
Ocean without providing any concrete
alternate source of energy. Since Neg
subsidy will reduce our dependency on fossil
fuel and how stopping subsidy will protect
that stopping subsidy will help our environment.
Wave energy materials \rightarrow\textcolor{red}{alt\text{\,}\textcolor{red}{source}} \rightarrow \textcolor{red}{China\, dependency.}

Why not microgrid?

How the ocean will be protected

Poverty.
### VLD

**Montero, Armando**

**2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Armando Montero ('22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>WXLR A311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe Legay 9 Horizon High School</td>
<td>Ezri Tyler 9 Sunnyslope High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was <strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>(Circle Winner) <strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Make sure to keep impacts back to both FUs
- The IA was pretty nice - Pick an impact area time and go down it and win next butter.
- Don't stress so much time summarizing your points instead keep giving your responses.
- Give new respect to new sources. You need to save new main time on it.
- You did a good job setting up facing in your favor, not sure explain why the only new objection is. How an your main before comes over the long term.

PFD: Judge very on the details case terms and context to solve deficit argument. Only to lose points off the off is will spill. But this won't weigh against all points. MY cases other cases were won and review will fortify non-predictable groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity LD Debate</th>
<th>Lucas Galardi (*'21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>WXLR A102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Cheeti</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raunak Deb</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BASIS Peoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Consequentialism - pragmatic analysis of impacts

1. Pollution
   - Ocean pollution exacerbated by subs, killing thousands of fish
   - 80% of water sources in world contaminated
   - 5 billion affected
   - 1/6 of world dependent on fish

2. Recession
   - Global recession likely soon
   - Aff increases labor force by investing into renewables
   - Would create 1mil jobs

3. Rural Areas
   - Renewables expands living space, would reduce urbanization
   - Rural towns could see 3000 jobs made per year with renewables
   - Would add $135B to GDP yearly

RFD: More clear impacts from aff that were better explained throughout the round. I ended up buying the point that FFs are worse for the oceans than mines and the nuclear chain was fed.
Dangerous for neg to say FFscause climate change explicitly; obviously it does but like don't say that.
Aff has good command of the CX, smart idea to ask neg about impact on China.
Aff did a good job of bringing up good cards in rebuttal to delink the neg case.

What is a gigaton lol

Good extensions on aff case, but didn't extend rural living space argument.

I'm kind of iffy on the strength of neg's links to nuclear war.

I don't quite see how neg solves extinction; it seems like the squo has us headed there and that oil is probably worse for the ocean than mining.

Neg doesn't extend argument about the US becoming energy independent because of subs.

Very specific impacts from aff on lives and the economy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VLD</th>
<th>2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varsity LD Debate</td>
<td>Richard Glover (*7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>WXLR A309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor Clark</td>
<td>Jacob Migel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Tempe Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>6 Catalina Foothills High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner) **NO**

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

Judge's Signature: [Signature]

School / Affiliation / Occupation: McClintock HS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Not sure if trolling, or just outrageously racist and silly, but that wasn't an acceptable way to debate by the Negative debater. I will be addressing it with the coach. I don't believe in putting up with this sort of nonsense in an activity. I've given 24 years hard work to promote and support. I find it personally offensive, for reasons even beyond the absurdity and racially insensitive remarks deployed in this round. Even your