

24

Ryan Ohanessian - Wilshire

FLIGHT: B

Open LD - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 307

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM

10:30

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
JW

Name

PTS (30-1)

Julianne Wu

98 20**Negative:** Academy of Higher Learning SJ

Name

PTS (30-1)

Soren Jensen

99 20**Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.**

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Refuted

- Overall debate was responsive and organized.
- Came down to aff methane vs neg natural gas
- Neg did a good job ~~in~~ minimizing and reversing disads with cheap fuel production arguments.
- Aff lobbying arg carried over. Political will doesn't stop fiat power.

^{both sides}
overall, be more open in cross for responses. Too many interruptions.

- Almost voted on methane arg. Neg needs to do a better job at reducing its impacts.

23

Christian Nunez - Kudos Leadership

FLIGHT: A

Open LD - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 553

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM

10:30

Affirmative: Nova 42 Academy AP

Name

PTS (30-1)

Andy Pan

28

Negative: Academy of Higher Learning OZ

Name


PTS (30-1)

Olivia Zhao

27

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

Low Point Win? _____


JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Kudos
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

22

Ted Kim - Nova 42

FLIGHT: B

Open LD - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 255

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM

10:30

Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning JM

(70-100)

NamePTS (30-1)

James Miller

93**Negative:** Kudos College of Youth Leadership RX

(70-100)

NamePTS (30-1)

Rachel Xu

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

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

AFF extends FW of Environmental Ethics, Neg drops FW debate. AFF ~~proceeds~~ proceeds to delink Neg's major impacts off of ~~FW~~ ^{FW}. Cleanest place to vote is AFF saving 7M lives/yr. by solving Climate Change. Neg's only chance was saving carbon capture, but lacked rebuttals/blocks to debate it. Neg CP Advantages were dropped in 2NR; I had no reason to prefer retention over elimination.

21

Ted Kim - Nova 42

FLIGHT: A

Open LD - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 255

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM

10:30

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
DW

(70-100)

NamePTS (30-1)

Daniel Wu

90**Negative:** Academy of Higher Learning OC

(70-100)

NamePTS (30-1)

Olivia Cha

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

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Lack of coverage in INR means AFF case stands for the most part. More needed to be done on AFF's solvency, which was primarily the shift to green tech post-elimination. From what I could tell, AFF's stance on the fuel shift was purely analytical, meaning the take-off argument is a bust. That's where Neg needed to attack: link to solvency.

I whiffed AFF on government accountability at efficiency. Insufficient attacks on how eliminating subsidies would produce extra spending on alternatives forced me to buy AFF's take-off arg. A lack of specific returns, along with with prob. and timeframe, drops Neg's return arg.

20

Derek Faraldo - PSA**FLIGHT: B**

Open LD - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 557

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM**10:30****Affirmative:** Nova 42 Academy PT**Negative:** Academy of Higher Learning NHNamePTS (30-1)Paige Tang60NamePTS (30-1)Nelson Hu85**Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.**

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

PSA

Paige (PT) Terms/Value/Debate/Topic

- 1) Fucking - subsidies - is sues, subsidies allow for inefficient results
- 2) make it difficult for renewables to compete → keep fossil fuels alive, climate change problems in North America - methane problem
- 3) Global catastrophe

aid drilling: BP example/tax issues, environmental impact
all spills - frequent enough, disastrous, accidents.

→ Damaging vulnerable environment →

Conclusion → a little rushed but still clear.

Climate vs. defense?

Upsides → climate change → transition → less subsidy → less fucking → encourage renewables? → aid countries need subsidy? → be polite

Nelson Neg 1) Def/Value, Defense okay /mutuality → consequences

- 1) harm transition to renewables. Encourages coal, hurts environment → other countries take place. - slow ease into renewables of back to coal.

- 2) Climate change: what behaviors, ~~we should~~ Natural gas good → but other firms → Need subsidies → should have funding.

- 3) Opponent case doesn't correct or solve what she proposes.

Climate Policy and Environment → difficult for renewables to compete → environmental sustainability.

Style

Emphasizing points, a little rushed, lots of evidence, great eye contact, style, but slowing down on convey confidence and be personable too.

Style: lots of passion, client speaking, a little fast, but still clear. could use a little more eye contact, emphasize ending/big impacts.

bad class attitude in courtroom

1AR 4min; Page Opponents case: 1) People being harmed, need to get now. Universal consequence.
ex. Remove subsidies/stocking → lower methane emissions.
China/bringing them up why? → other countries do something.
ex. England/Fracking → made a difference.
Spend money elsewhere - new contention?
value: Human health vs. environment?

1NT Nelson 6min; Page Opponent case; Refutations still stand → so her points do not stand.

STYLE
Slowed down a bit
much more persuasive

Consequentialism → Court plan to meet → Do as much as possible, changing plans, AFF multiple plans.
Electric trucks → not enough to compete with Natural gas.

Hydrogen → subsidies increase → evidence shows climate change opposite

Natural gas → meet subsidies ↓
India example? ↓
more effective/useful, Neg wants to sunset subsidies, not eliminate.

Economic benefits → overall, Neg side

2AR 3min; Page Voters/defender: multiple plans abusive, renewable energy alternatives. Natural gas not a? Refuted earlier
oil stilling contention stands.
Impacts universal → slow global warming. enough of a connection? to truly slow down climate change.
appeal to environment. ✓

Decision/Reasoning

See my previous comments to get an idea of arguments and inferences I understood. I apologize for any mistakes. It is your job to make structure/arguments/evidence clear and help the judge. Great debates, lots of passion, close call.

First, on style both of you can slow down a little bit, but conclusions were much better and more persuasive.

Next, see my comments on arguments, but I found Page's case to be a bit reliant on hypothetical examples of other countries that did not seem relevant to U.S. actions to eliminate subsidies, one example was good so focus on examples that are very relevant and on topic.

Also, Nelson did a good job of showing his case had clear harms/impacts that were connected to refuting AFF case, you showed why subsidies still important.

Finally, Page could have won at the end but you kept bringing up new arguments for your case and I prefer if AFF only testifies their case or refutes opponents points in final rebuttal. If you refuted the Nat gas argument earlier I might have been persuaded that NEGs case was in fact entirely on.

Therefore I believe Neg won this case, it was a close call and both sides can improve. Good luck and consider law school!

1AC 3min Neg 3min 1AR 4min 1NR 6min 2AR 3min 4min prep

19

Derek Faraldo - PSA

FLIGHT: A

Open LD - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 557

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM

10:30

Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning CZ

Negative: Nova 42 Academy JJ

Name	PTS (30-1)
Connor Zhao	75

Name	PTS (30-1)
Jeremiah Jung	85

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

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Connet 1AC: Topic, quote, intro, UN, global action: Eliminate - Dict.com / Subsidies - Free from ^{1AC}Dem checks, undermanned
 1AC: Fed Reg, Proposed reg, receive comments, publish. but agency decisions different. ^{2AC}EX: Admin agencies, potential corruption, inefficiencies
 2AC: ~~expensive~~, harmful collateral effects, global warming, poverty alleviation issues, subsidies for poor countries a problem. ^{2AC}Don't benefit low income pop.
 3AC: expensive, waste of money, more efficient uses. Taxpayer money wasted. ^{2AC}hospital issues, pollution
 4AC: cost/benefit, give up money on other matters. ^{2AC}opportunity cost.
Style → good research, clear voice, maybe a little more eye contact during conclusion & to emphasize main points.
 CX: contention #1 - Dem checks, summarize, clarify - Fossil fuel subsidies, personal example. what if we get rid of them? renewable energy?
 Subsidies → Fossil fuels → harm → climate change. ^{2AC}Solutions wrong. AS President?
 Jeremiah Neg: Value, citation, contentions, Neg: "US ought to eliminate fossil fuel subsidies."
 "Quality of life - value, citation to weigh."
 1) Transparency/Food, low income households, expensive, 2nd income of this/cost energy. If no sub → Energy cost. Poor become impacted, example: Nigeria
 2) Elim sub does nothing → EX using coal more, doesn't stim renewable energy, maintain coal industry. Accidents, carbon emissions still continue regardless of subsidies.
 3) Coal plants, largest contributors, huge income, need to transition away, Elim subsidy doesn't eliminate that
 Neg case: apparent value, subsidies being value.
 1) Sub exempt → Coal still then outside impact, subsidies irrelevant
 2) Low income pop - see contention #1, coal/gas/Food costs.
 3) US spends too much → Not relevant, but see content 2
 - illnesses, fossil fuels bad. Does not solve with aff case.
 CX: Coal cheap, not subsidies, so doesn't matter what we do. ^{2AC}Dem not from subsidies attend spending late minimum. Public trans → still need fossil fuels → renewable public trans? → Fossil fuels → green energy → actually some issues
 1AC: Responding to Neg case, coal & subsidy defendant? irrelevant. other subsidies do harm environment/poor. Transition with money. ^{2AC}subsidy
 Can use money on other things, improve other areas/quality of life. societal welfare is aff wins/Trans to clean energy.
 Trans/Food can be taken care of. IF no subsidy → Renewable energy → get rid of coal? keep track of time. How? or why?

Jetimiah
Neg/Deb

1) Poor People & Things / Foot Cost → IF no CF sub → ↑ prices → ↓ lower quality - lots of interference.

2) Coal stay the same → widely used → coal/port cheap → climate change → but prices high?

3) Transition to Renewable energy → problems → actual harms → Solar → Not common → not enough → expensive [infeasible]
Wind → Too much speed → bits/annoyance

Vote/impact → climate change, my case makes it better, alternatives a problem

Poor worse off overall.

Value even possible L's.

Nuclear → cost → time → management → need subsidies
Hydro-electric → too big of a country
Nuclear energy / ethanol, etc → not for environment? Food - fires, etc.

Conner
2 Aff N6

1) Renewables → issues are cost/efficiency, we can make subsidies. actual harms much worse for fossil fuels.

2) Value of societal welfare/transition / can use money to benefit society → bad for environment.

3) Dem checks → coal argument, subsidies not good for people trying to benefit.

4) Waste of money → spend on other things, how would this money be spent/accepted.

Decision/Reasoning

See my previous comments to get an idea of the arguments and inferences I got from both of you.
Great structures, easy to follow. My decision comes down to the burden of proof and style points since the debate was a close call.

First, regarding style, see previous comments, Jetimiah seemed more persuasive to me with extended eye contact and speaking style. Conner just went on eye contact and speaking with more confidence.

Next, AFF has burden of convincing me to adopt ideas. Great arguments, but needed to convince me that poor would impact directly and show how and when money would go to poor (educating politicians), would politicians then give subsidies to help the poor? Needed more evidence that subsidies would be spent on other things instead of being wasted.

Finally, ~~Conner~~ Jetimiah could have stuck to his evidence and not relied upon personal examples of making conclusory arguments.
See my notes above for your conclusion, your rebuttal could have been more persuasive w/o exaggerating at introducing many new arguments in your final speech [see all points of renewable energy].
Jetimiah had a strong case, need to be selective in rebuttal and stick to big issues not make a new case at the end.

Therefore, I found that by a preponderance of the evidence and style points that the Neg won a close debate. Both sides have room to improve, but very impressive, Apply to Law school, Go Bruins!!!

18

Lori Khashaki - Nova 42

FLIGHT: B

Open LD - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 257

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM

10:30

Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning SB**Negative:** Kudos College of Youth Leadership NCNamePTS (30-1)

Sansur Borijn

LK 98NamePTS (30-1)

Nathan Chen

LK 97**Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.**Low Point Win? NO

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Aff - SansurNeg - Nathan

- good eye contact
- good job → you know your case very well
- good question ~~asking~~ when you related your opponents value criterion to the fact that wasting 100 million dollars is not pragmatic
- good rebuttal speech. you countered all of your opponents arguments
- try to ask more questions to attack your opponents case
- try to talk more slowly to ~~not~~ not stumble on ~~your~~ your words
- Good job!!

- good confidence
- please try to speak a little slower during your speeches
- try to ask ~~more~~ less questions about what your opponent's case is about, and ask more questions ~~to~~ to attack the case
- need to quantify the effect of carbon capture. even though it takes away 90% of CO₂, what effect has it had already? how is it fighting climate change?
- ~~why~~ why is CCS needed for green energy revolution?
- need ~~to~~ ^{to} refute more of your opponents contention
- good job ☺

17

Ryan Ohanessian - Wilshire

FLIGHT: A

Open LD - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 307

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM

10:30

Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning IK**Negative:** Nova 42 Academy EPNamePTS (30-1)

Ian Kim

Dropped

NamePTS (30-1)

✓Ethan Peng

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

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Forfeited