

106

Richard Hu - ELAC

Open Lincoln Douglas - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 5:00 - Debate Prelim Elim 2

Room: E3 - Emergency 559

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

ASAP

Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning NH

Negative: Nova 42 Academy JJ

Name	PTS (100-70)
Nelson Hu	<u>99</u>

Name	PTS (100-70)
Jeremiah Jung	<u>98</u>

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

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

ELAC

AFF

Neg

* good definitions
 * solid CI
 * I really, really love your contention 2
 - my only problem is the link
 - your impacts of 2°C ↑, low income communities and democracy all make sense → but they are generally more holistic/involved to climate change, not fossil fuel subsidies themselves, and the same applies to your 3rd contention
 - I need a more clear link to how subsidies themselves can reduce impacts of climate change. Even if we get rid of subsidies, who wouldn't companies like Exxon for example, be able to sustain themselves regardless of subsidies? That's something that could crumble a lot of your impacts I would say
 * You have really good ideas for your refutations however:
 1. slow down, you're tripping over your words
 2. synopst more clearly

* Why would eliminate imply immediate action?
 - If I want to eliminate world hunger for example, I would take steps (small steps) to eliminate it. I can't eliminate it right away. We take steps to eliminate it
 * Also: It's just more practical to phase out
 * Good contention 1
 * Your 2nd ~~step~~ argument is missing ~~with~~ a link
 - In your defense, I might have missed it because flowing and judging at the same time is harder - but I don't see the link between coal and fossil fuel subsidies
 - Doesn't the U.S consider geothermal a fossil fuel? wouldn't remaining coal subsidies at least incentivize companies to use geothermal?
 - I think you hinge a lot of your responses on the idea of the word "eliminate" meaning "total ban". I still don't get that definition and I think I either want to hear a better link, or a different framework

2. Use explicit language such as:

"My opponent's first argument was _____,

he explains that _____ and _____,

that's not true, we have 3 responses. First turn it, 2nd _____, and 3rd _____."

* Try to take more time refutations

- don't just use your source to prove your opponent wrong; deconstruct the small, contextual details to get rid of the warrant and his impacts.

* I feel like I remember a source stating that fossil fuels are 2x more expensive than re (like ~~renewable~~) renewable energy. For example, furthermore, electric cars are 2x cheaper than normal cars. Maybe it's something you could look into? It didn't affect the round - just something I found

* I like the idea of the 2nd rebuttal - interesting.

Just streamline it

- Summarize the round, and address voters - thank H.

* I think you need to spend more time on rebuttals

* Maybe it's an LD thing I don't get but you go from defending your case, to refutations, and then rebuttals - which seems very repetitive.

* I would suggest just going into their arguments, and using clear signposting, such as this example

* Because you spent so much time on your case at the beginning, you ~~sound~~ kind of lost time in your VAPs - be careful of time allocation.

For both ~~round~~ sides

- You are great! Both of you - just need to fix issues about:

1. Structure

- signpost clearly; and be clear where you are

2. Links

- Must: / for the aff, linking subsidies were disaster to climate change
- and neg: coal argument to the resolution

Congrats!

Eric Orozco - Wilshire

107

~~Lori Khashaki - Nova 42~~

Open Lincoln Douglas - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 5:00 - Debate Prelim Elim 2

Room: E3 - ~~Emergency~~ 507

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

ASAP

aff

Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning SJ

Negative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
DW

Neg

Name	PTS (100-70)
Soren Jensen	<u>100</u>

Name	PTS (100-70)
Daniel Wu	<u>99</u>

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

Low Point Win? _____

Eric Orozco

Wilshire

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

- very nice cross
- quick, meaningful questioning
- should be decreased but not eliminated
- morality value
 - consequentialism
- pragmatism not always moral
- aff has no env. solvency
 - no impact on fossil fuel
- eliminating fossil fuels makes them attractive
- renewables unaffordable
 - counters aff india statement
- nat gas or fossil fuels useful as back-up
- aff unable to access renewables
- magnitude or timeframe of environmental impact
- power from oil to nat gas
 - takes from oil lobbyers

- pragmatism value
- subsidies cost the govt
 - freed up funds for india
- sub hurt the environment
- 1% increase in gas prices
- lowers lobbying and corruption
- very solid info on company ROCl and political connection
- solid defense of contentions
- possible shift in lobbying power
- morality achieved through govt accountability
- lobbying causes a corrupt cycle
- stumps growth for renewable projects
- poor would not be heavily impacted
- reallocating funds creates a different issue

Neg

- natural gas on incline
- unaffected by lobbying
- doesn't give an inch during cross
- effective shutdown of implications

-
- aff dropped values
 - nat gases increase govt accountability
 - aff needs proof of lobbying/solution
 - aff argues for decrease but not elimination
 - natural gas improves economy and renewable goals
 - elimination plan not viable because wouldn't pass under current term
 - air pollution and global warming also impact the disadvantaged

Aff

- green energy funds for research and development
 - other resources in large supply
 - opportunity for more green R and D
-
- mentions elimination, topic is upheld
 - ~~can't~~ neg can't guarantee fund allocations
 - motivation to lobby
 - pragmatic, free up money
 - moral, helps provide green energy

RFD

Neg had stronger cross rounds