

103

Ethan Chang - Kudos Leadership

Open Lincoln Douglas - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 4:00 Debate Prelim Elim 1

Room: E3 553

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

ASAP

Affirmative: Nova 42 Academy JJ

Negative: Academy of Higher Learning NH

Name	PTS (100-70)
Jeremiah Jung	<u>97</u>

Name	PTS (100-70)
Nelson Hu	<u>95</u>

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

Valeria Chang

NOVA

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

The US ought to eliminate subsidies for fossil fuels.

(AFF) (ecosophy)

- ↑ enviro protection
- ↓ fracking
- ending climate change crisis
- carbon emissions ↓
- methane ↓
- 1 billion climate refugees
- EX. deep water horizon spill
- 2,240 spills ↑
- killed island plants + animals on coastal areas
- renewable energy sources

(NEG) (morality)

- ↓ → reasonable
- ∅ → harmful
- other countries will fill in the market
- ↑ coal, cost efficient
- ∅ sig ↓ in investments of fossil fuels
- USE NG - alt.
- India cannot afford renew.
- electricity & ↑
- price shocks
- poor countries ∅ → R.E.
- RE. ineffective

(AFF)

- ecosophy
- morality → subjective
- China will reach its carbon goal
- NG come from fracking
- tap water flammable
- non-resolutional
- US will set a precedent

(NEG)

- ∅ state how
- coal dropped
- NG prevents extinction
- HOW?
- If we ∅ frack NG, India will use coal
- RE card ∅ used
- dropped
- transition → RE.

(AFF)

- IMPACTS...
- fracking leads to climate change
- consequences of fracking more detrimental

The AFF dropped the NEG's contentions on price shocks and the increase use of coal. The NEG dropped the AFF's contentions on oil spills, climate change, and their effects on humanity and the environment. NEG did not provide argumentation as to how NG prevent extinction. The AFF turned the NEG's argument for the use of natural gases, by providing the harmful affects of fracking on people and the environment, therefore upholding their own value and that of the NEG's.

Dawson Khoury

104

~~Lori Khashaki - Nova 42~~

~~Eddie Venable~~ ~~Holt~~

Open Lincoln Douglas - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 4:00 Debate Prelim Elim 1

Room: E3 431

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

ASAP

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
RX

Negative: Academy of Higher Learning SJ

Name	PTS (100-70)
Rachel Xu	95

Name	PTS (100-70)
Soren Jensen	100

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____



JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Nova

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

-Soren, excellent performance. You commanded the debate with authority, great projection, & exhibited mastery of the subject matter. No loopholes I could discern from your case. Nothing short of exceptional.

-Rachel, you had a solid case, but you need to be more assertive in cross ex & your rebuttal. Don't allow your opponent to push you into his trap. You faced an opponent with a plethora of empirical analysis that you need to counter with your own.

I vote Neg based on CP due to the access Neg has to advanced solvency while avoiding the harms inherent to the Plan.

Good job!

105

~~Dawson Khury - ELAC~~

Open Lincoln Douglas - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 4:00 Debate Prelim Elim 1

Room: E3 557

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

ASAP

Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning JM

Negative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership DW

Name	PTS (100-70)
James Miller	99

Name	PTS (100-70)
Daniel Wu	100

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

ELAC

Aff: AC: Value - environmental ethics

- Reduction of fossil fuels reduces emissions
- Renewable energy
- Subsidies encourage over consumption
- Excellent delivery
- racial disparities
- renewable energy cost efficiency
- Solid cross ex answers.
- Asking for specifics is kind of a red herring or even an appeal to authority. Did not like how much time you spent digging for an answer you knew was not there.
- Tried running a K, did not work by bringing up this is all hypothetical. - Doubt its "credibility"
- Went too broad Too many fallacies Ad hominem Slippery slope.
- rebuttal cancelled out several factors needed for humans to live.
- + Don't say "hellony name is James" at the end of

Neg: Cross ex

- All impacts require elimination of subsidies, zero-sum game
- Awesome cross-ex trip up, don't forget to make your point. *your opponent tripped up.*
- Solid cross ex.

NC: Value - pragmatism

- Government accountability,
- Hep program - results in cuts
- Socioeconomic disparities
- Appreciate the nuance of your arguments.
- CCS can decarbonize economy.
- ↳ Counter plan
- Awesome rebuttal to the appeal to hypotheticals.