

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFBYE

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Leland AJ Ira Advani	28	2
1	Andy Ju	27	3

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Lynbrook MK Nikhil Mannem	29	1
	Chris Kim --(not here)		

The better debating was done by the N/A from Lynbrook MK
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Jammie Schletzbaum

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

(
• AFF dropped environmental DA
• AFF dropped that Cuba will not trade with U.S, (loses Solvency.) - CP also has no solvency if you are arguing that Castro will not agree.
)

Nikhil: INR: you were basically admitting your CP would fail by saying Cuba would say no to conditional relationships.

Andy: When you drop things in policy, you can't pick them back up (envirn DA was dropped by AFF)

2FD: AFF dropped environmental DA in DAC, Neg extended leads to extinction. AFF can't respond. Impacts won by

neg- (Human extinction) impacts. dropped by aff.

No Solvency (dropped by aff)

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU
April 12-13

Murphy

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Leland XV	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Calvin Xu	24	3
1	Anuj Varma	27	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Lynbrook PC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Daniel Park	27	2
	Anand Chukka		

Aff wing on technical front

The better debating was done by the _____ from _____
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: *[Signature]* *Murphy* coach and physics teacher

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*Anuj - Case has nebulous impact
Chain for solency. Need
to make scenario clearer.*

*Calvin - pet-en - Yahoooooo
Very choppy - Partner
Had to use you as a
Puppet too much
Attempt to take out
war impacts on Policap
Hurts case side advantage
midway conflict wont escalate
can also kill some case advantages*

*RFD (If murphy allowed)
t - with/towards dropped in IAR cold*

Case - nebulous Advantages. Some answers on OA hurt case

Disaid - both terms mistake Policap for Dircap

*Worst part of the CP is that it is the only topical plan in the round
Otherwise it has a prob capturing supposed Aff Advantages*

*Chung A is Not
Present
Park Debating alone*

*Park - Learn to slow down for
Tag & cite. They Blend together
You give no change in pace for
cards/tags, careful since
CP is basically topical
Also - case dump is Bad.
8th post on case*

*neg wins if there were
2 debaters*

Because this is no ↑ in relationship

Room: Bannan 135
Start: 10 am
Policy Open

1

2, Leland Judge

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU
April 12-13

BEN LENDAL
PACIFIC HILL
School

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Bishop O'Dowd JJ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Eunice Jung	24	1
	Hunter Johnson	21	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Nevada Union UJ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Stephanie Ulatowski	23	2
	Sydnee Jewett	20	4

The better debating was done by the (AFF) from Bishop O'Dowd
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: (NO) NO

Signed: Ben Lendal

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

extensive comments & feedback given to all 4 debaters

Room: Bannan 142
Start: 10 am
Policy Open

1

BZ Olson, Gabe

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Lynbrook OS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2AC	Ahmed Omer	26	3
1AC	Nitin Selvamani	25	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Milpitas BJ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1AC	Anoosha Balebail	28	1
2AC	Alexis Jetomo	27	2

The better debating was done by the NEG from Milpitas BJ
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Spade

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff Zailed. counter neg point

2AC essentially gave evidence against

Not using all the time.

Stock issues not presented or

countered or justified well

Room: Bannan 241
Start: 10 am
Policy Open

1

~~BP Park, Joon~~

Jennifer Ulatowski
Nevada
Union

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Leland IS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Linus Im	23	4
1	Anirvin Sikha	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Harker VK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sonya Verma	26	2
2	Anusha Kuppahally	24	3

The better debating was done by the Aff from Leland
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Jennifer Ulatowski

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Aff was very clear on what they wanted me to know and spoke it in a way that I just wanted to watch them 😊
The Neg stumbled with explaining what they were trying to tell me. They were great in cross X and will be amazing with more practice!
great job!

Room: Bannan 238
Start: 10 am
Policy Open

1

CR Clark, Michel

Judge: Kevin Lane

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Leland DJ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2A	Prashant Desai	27	2
1A	Shivam Jindal	27	4

2.2

NEGATIVE

POS	Nevada Union FS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2N	Joe Fenner	28	1
1N	Colby Scanlon	24	3

The better debating was done by the Neg. from Nevada Union
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1N - would have been much better if you gave me a short explanation of your argument before you read your evidence.

Also just saying "Next" is not my idea of good substructure & It was hard to tell when you moved from Topicality to DA's to case. (not "hard" but "harder" than it should have been). (↓ & from 1 DA. to another)

2N & 2A → Please ask questions during C-X, don't argue

(RFD) Aff. IAR just dropped too much. U.S involvement would make food more expensive. (even if more \$ "cash flows" into Cuba). Also Cuban water use model would be harmful (not argued as evidence indicated, but still impact). Child prostitution also goes neg. Would happen faster & we have moral obligation.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Bishop O'Dowd HC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1A	Julianna He	27.5	3
2A	Gabriel Clark-Clough	28.5	2

2A

28.5

NEGATIVE

POS	Nevada Union CZ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2N	Samantha Carson	27	4
1N	Leo Zlimen	29.5	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from LEO ZLIMEN AND SAMANTHA CARSON
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A (Julianna) - Some words are not very clear when you speak. Rebuttal - not a clear flow. Hurricane you are bringing it on the rebuttal - It was never discussed before.

2A - Slow down on the response - Not clear response. Economic war (Gabriel) with Cuba? delivery flow issue. US economy in decline now? 3rd world country issue - Not very clear argument. Nuclear war - Not a relevant discussion here.

1N (Leo Zlimen) - Very good delivery, good cross exam. very good evidence. Good discussion about Saudi Arabia being the no.1 oil producing nation.

2N Samantha Carson - Delivery ^{and speech flow} can be better.

Good argument ^{excellent} evidence from negative team -
Losing largest oil supplier Saudi Arabia - economy is not in decline
Need Biodiversity law to protect the environment

I voted NEGATIVE because they showed very good evidence
good cross exam and well delivered speech.
Affirmative team did not proof the case some of the evidence
and discussions are not clear, not the fact.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Harker VL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1 st	Abhay Varmaraja	27	3
2 nd	Jonathan Liu	27	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Milpitas TT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2 nd	Elakya Thirumorthy	29	2
1 st	Sonia Tripathy	29.5	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from Milpitas TT
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The negative team launched successful attack on the stock issues of affirmative teams' argument, including the AFF side lack of plan off actions, and solvency. The criticism of AFF side's description of harm of status quo is also right on spot. AFF team need improve their debate by providing a more clear road map of and how to bring up of new evidence to support it. In some cases, evidence is not clear to support the argument, until being probed in cross-examination. AFF team should also improve eye contact while presenting.