

66

Henry Marston - Wilshire

FLIGHT: B

Open Lincoln Douglas - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 12:30-2 - Debate Round 3

Room: E3 307

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

ASAP

ASAP

Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning SJ

Negative: Nova 42 Academy JJ

Name

PTS (100-70)

Name

PTS (100-70)

Soren Jensen

100

Jeremiah Jung

98

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

Low Point Win? N

Henry Marston
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Wilshire
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

67

EP
SACS EB**Henry Marston - Wilshire****FLIGHT: A**

Open Lincoln Douglas - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 12:30-2 - Debate Round 3

Room: E3 307

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

ASAP**ASAP****Affirmative:** Academy of Higher Learning NH**Negative:** Nova 42 Academy EPNamePTS (100-70)NamePTS (100-70)

Nelson Hu

92

Ethan Peng

90**Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.**Low Point Win? Y
JUDGE'S SIGNATUREWilshire
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

70

Nova 42 judge Valeria - Nova 42

FLIGHT: B

Open Lincoln Douglas - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 12:30-2 - Debate Round 3

Room: E3 255

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

ASAP

ASAP

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
DW

Negative: Academy of Higher Learning SB

Name

PTS (100-70)

Name

PTS (100-70)

Daniel Wu

95

Sansur Borijn

93

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

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

AFF

Pragmatism - value
Criteria - Gov't Acc.

Gov't spending Eff.

- sub unnecessary
- India sub ↓ ↑ renew.
- Carbon Emissions ↓
- Oil poor
- ↑ oil 1%, 2%

Lobbying corruption

- 2 billion \$
- cutting sub ends
- quid pro quo
- climate crisis

CX - reform subs?

- precedent
- renewable better
- than natural gas
- India - 4x budget

NEG - morality

- decrease is possible, & elimination
- crit - conseq.

HARM TRANSITION
for RENEWABLES

↑ coal

NATURAL GASES

↓ carbon emission

- dependent on subsidies
- developing countries cannot transition to renewable energy

RENEWABLE

UNPREDICTABLE

- ↑ price increase for electricity

climate, & large effect

- ↑ investment
- moderately
- fair countries

AFF

value criteria
uphold's NEG's morality

- \$ allocated elsewhere
- renewable energy helps aid climate change
- ↓ CO₂ emissions

NEG -

- precedent
- renewable expensive
- US = biggest exporter of natural gas
- Net needs subs
- conseq → Gov't Acc.
- energy expensive if RE.
- sub → poli divide (NA)
- new arg

AFF

precedent, ex → trend

- renewable better - conceded
- GE. research \$ allocated
- fossil fuels
- money going to the rich → & the poor
- lobbying
- denying climate change
- VOTERS
- freeing up budget
- Gov't ACC + MORAL
- rather welfare policies
- corruption

NEG

The ~~AFF~~ ~~conceded~~ conceded that renewable energy is better than natural gases allowing the AFF to turn the NEG's second contention. The AFF provides more advantages/benefits and provides evidence for how the resolution would extend as a precedent for other countries which the NEG does not negate. The AFF also upholds their value and that of the NEG with their contention on lobbying and corruption.

71

Nova 42 judge Valeria - Nova 42

FLIGHT: A

Open Lincoln Douglas - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 12:30-2 - Debate Round 3

Room: E3 255

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

ASAP

ASAP

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
RX**Negative:** Academy of Higher Learning OC

Name

PTS (100-70)

Name

PTS (100-70)

Rachel Xu

89

Olivia Cha

87

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

Low Point Win? _____

Valeri

NOVA

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

value: pragmatism
AFF. gov't accountability
AFF. government spending ↓
• renewable energy
• ↓ carbon emissions
• gas prices ↑ 17% (0.02)
• Congressional corruption
• \$ for gov't
• support climate change movement, but fund fossil fuels
• India spent \$290 million on subsidies

USFC remove ~~subsidies~~ subsidies

NEG

Value-morality
criteria-upholding
consequentialism
• ~~coal~~ coal
• natural gas ↓ CO₂
• natural gas dependent on ~~subsidies~~ subsidies
• India → renewable energy
• ~~unprecedented~~ ~~unprecedented~~
• price shocks
• sig difference
• investment in renewable energy
• cut back
• harm transition to renewables

for fossil fuels

AFF

• keep all subsidies
• oil, gas, and coal companies
• corruption in gov't
• India spends \$ on subsidies → renewable energy
• 20-30% of fossil fuels → RE.
• does & address other contentions

NEG

• reforms could still ↓ corruption
• subsidies being removed will make it harder for ppl to pay for electricity
• other countries will subsidize
• energy cheaper
• dropped contentions

AFF. India

• corruption
• allocated elsewhere
• climate change
• Green Energy

Arguments were dropped from both sides, making it difficult for there to be clash in this debate. AFF provided more advantages to removing fossil ~~fuel~~ fuels than the NEG did for the status quo ~~and~~ nor an alternative negating the resolution. AFF turned the NEG's point on India not being able to afford renewable energy. AFF showed that gas price will not increase significantly, negating the NEG's contention on price shocks. The AFF solves for both their value, pragmatism and the NEG's value of morality, upholding both, through their contention on lowering corruption. Both the AFF and NEG needed to be more organized with their rebuttals.

69

Eric Orozco - Wilshire

FLIGHT: A

Open Lincoln Douglas - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 12:30-2 - Debate Round 3

Room: E3 557

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

ASAP**ASAP****Affirmative:** Kudos College of Youth Leadership
JW**Negative:** Nova 42 Academy APNamePTS (100-70)

Julianne Wu

99NamePTS (100-70)

Andy Pan

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

Low Point Win? ____

Eric OrozcoWilshire

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

- unrelated to climate change
- don't let speed lose your clarity
- causes death and quality of life
- severely affects the economy
- reducing global emissions
- govt spending efficiency
- lowers lobbying and corruption
- creates positive climate actions
- renewables have fallen behind

- always funding transportation
- supply/demand will raise prices
- argues about subsidies already being status quo

- subz are govt duty
- transportation funds go to education
- minimal impact but helps maintain balance

- pragmatism - practicality
- govt accountability → values
- impact - democracy

- good questions, unsure about asking for elaboration on renewables
- society wellbeing
- food and transportation
- disproportional costs
- debt for basic needs
- coal
- global impact
- argue for quality of life
- removing subsidies not significant
- coal use
- economy
- watch timer

Aff

- losing \$100s of billions worse than typical economic crash
- leads to a loss of soft power
- claims neg only went on defense

Neg

- societal welfare best value
- quality of life influences govt choices
- natural gas use causes distraction
- solar too expensive, wind hurts animals
- lot of effort for economy to rise
- aff has no numerical impact
- poverty and death is longterm
- nice passion, very clear final statements

68

Eric Orozco - Wilshire

FLIGHT: B

Open Lincoln Douglas - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 12:30-2 - Debate Round 3

Room: E3 557

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

ASAP

ASAP

Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning JM**Negative:** Nova 42 Academy PTNamePTS (100-70)

James Miller

100NamePTS (100-70)

Paige Tang

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

Low Point Win? _____

Eric OrozcoWilshire

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

- keep your clarity
- help prop up fossil fuel
- renewables tipping the scales
- health effects of pollution
- harmful to low-income and poc
- subsidies harm economy
 - renewable cost-efficient
- companies held unaccountable
- would not make air better, just less worse
- coal would shut down *cross*
- a few mixed messages
- questioning can be improved
 - spending too much time
- having neg repeat points instead of showing the flaws

- questions in cross can be more efficient
- twisting of word "elimination"
- value is quality of life
- transportation costs
- the reading is getting blocky and it's killing the momentum of your arguments
- aff's plan is improperly laid out
- nice job hitting on air statement
- renewables are expensive
- aff doesn't provide solvency for climate change
- no link of where money goes
- neg doesn't need to provide solvency
- green tech needs Chinese minerals vs US natural coal

Aff

- value of environmental ethics
 - defense of use of word "eliminate"
 - neg provides no solvency
 - renewables more efficient
 - hits ~~El~~ Tesla remarks
 - renewables in 3 states support whole country
 - no link with coal and evidence
 - neg doesn't hit whole plan
 - much better energy on rebuttal
-
- \$629 billion is sufficient solvency

Neg

- may be more efficient, but where is green tech money
- can use more time to produce a proper plan