

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL (Kus, Jie)

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE / Gov.

POS	Lynbrook KL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Rohan Khasgiwala	27.8	4
	Louis Luan	28	3

NEGATIVE / Opp

POS	Washington SM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Manveer Singh	28.1	2
	Vignesh Muruganantham	29.5	1

The better debating was done by the Neg from Wu
AFF OR NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Benefit: allocate FBI to monitor. need pass
Content i. Drugs & child safety
1) data drugs, 19 m rehab, drug & hospital
bills → high interest local
2) Child safe traffic, most
3) social issue, safety bomb, terrorism.
4) Boston Marathon

Regulation
- definition: for criminal activity, regulation
- Enforce - can not do it
- child safety, worth

good
- good starting point, maturity.
- good structure, good/convincing data.

social killing, what deep web is bomb.
- cannot enforce, gov. will have method
- waste resource - good intention, not waste, not
\$ spent in doing. \$ if not

to improve.
- High level summary for each arg then
details
- Can ask questions more aggressive.
- Strong ending - confidence.

Summary
Topicality: definition
Not talk about hard to hand, off topic, deep web
Transaction, for tracking, - Benefit, not op not
able to rebuttle.

Top sentence.
1) Definition: → Deep web, no in search engine
regulation, deep web, tech, resource
not impact change
2) Regulation not definitions, not creating
not valid // exist-FB: no change: solventy
Opp: Drugs - web is not main gateway - data/human
2) means of other countries, child traffic
3) Terrorism - Deep web not unique, religion mosque.
Need 1) cannot find web site.
2) waste of resources → most → members of resources
Time management to improve.

Topicality.
definition: → deep
regulation - enforceable, but cannot really take
action due to sovereignty.

Children - Knowledge of tech how deep web work
- efficient support details

Bomb - one occurrence, not generic.

Contradiction → website in diff countries, diff
nations have diff policy, only in US take action
waste if not stop, but only monitoring.
go to root of problem

Activist - threat
Definition: → Discal 2. cannot solve.

Enforce plan: 1st Amendment

- give eye contact, conversational, fluent opposition.

- Ask questions. good rebuttle.

- Very substantial content, excellent flow, mature.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	San Marin SC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Gabriella Skarka	27	2
2	Chloe Cheng	26	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Mountain View DK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Spencer Dembner	29	1
2	Serena Kapur	26	4

The better debating was done by the NEG from MOUNTAIN VIEW DK
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF's debate did not hold well since it failed to create a strong foundation of good arguments based on good understanding of the motion. AFF failed to identify what regulations for Deep Web really meant here and ~~that's~~ how "those regulations" would be enforced and what will they really solve the problem. Yes, AFF did point to the underworld criminal activity in the Deep Web, but if the Govt can already address that, as they already did in the case of Silk Road incident, then ~~the~~ what these regulations are addressing - AFF failed to show how these regulations would stop these criminal activities from happening. AFF's argument about the element of free speech in Deep Web was contradictory to regulating it. Overall, although OPP did not work hard in debating why regulations should not be done, they did debate well in finding deficiencies in AFF's arguments.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Notre Dame San Jose DN	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Meredith Duflock	29	1
	Divya Nekkanti	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Evergreen LL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Kalvin Lam	26	3
	Albert Le	25	4

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

PM	1. ban for the Economy 2. threat to Hunts Super power trade 3. increase US autonomy	ban not tied to Economy therefore unstable US versus China as an Example
LO	counter plan: UN instead of US should ban the currency 1. drugs abuse - trading via crypto currency 2. Solveneg	
MG	1. ban in the US will prevent cross-border drug trade 2. opposition did not address PM's #2 contentions	counter plan: no mutual exclusivity impractical in the US due to veto by other countries
MO	Inherit PM's plan benefit mutually exclusive	
LO	5 min.	
PM	mutual exclusivity	1. issue of FIAT infensible 2.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Washington TS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Abhinav Tripathy 1	28	1
2	Rahual Sheth 2	26	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland TM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Charles Tang 1	28	2
2	Madhukar Muralidhara ²	27	3

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

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

Signed: SMJ

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Gov side made a number of arguments that were not rejected:

1. Dollar is traceable to owner
2. The job of govt is to protect the people
3. More bitcoins can be printed

The gov side also made a POI that was valid. The opp side brought up education in the closing speech.

The opp side made some arguments that were not rejected by the gov side:

1. Credit card money is already spent before loss is detected.
2. Stolen credit card may lose millions/billions!

Both sides made valid rebuttals → gov side on Amazon & eBay, and opp on the value of bitcoin. But on the basis of number of arguments & the POI, the gov side won the debate.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Irvington BD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Abhinav Bhardwaj	30	2
1	Nishanth Dara	30	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Evergreen RH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Swetha Revanur	28	4
2	Joanna Hu	29	3

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams presented their Affirmation and negation cases well.

The affirmative team presented had strong arguments, extremely focused rebuttals, supporting facts for all their arguments and a great delivery.

Negation team held well, but should have brought up appropriate rebuttals.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Washington DC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Rohit Dhar	28	3
2	Cynthia Chang	29	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Aptos JA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Kyle Johnson	28	2
2	Josh Agbayani	28	4

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Framework by AFF was very well defined and structured. However there should have been a follow up with specific regulations as it was stated in the PM opening 3 speeds. NEG did pick up on this but could not use it to their advantage. ~~NEG~~ AFF's clever question about why is free speech on Deep Web is being regulated was a key POI. ~~NEG did not pick up on this~~ AFF did not pick up ~~on it~~. Voter issues were not clearly presented by NEG.

Speaker Notes:

AFF 1: Good speaker. Articulate, can make better eye contact. Good flow.
AFF 2: Eloquent and clear speaker. Best in both teams. Well stated arguments and good eye contact.
NEG 1: Casual style was very engaging. Your first speech was very good but closing could have been more structured.
NEG 2: Good speaker. Pleasant speaking style and engaging. Please refer to opponents in third person.

Room: Graham 164
Start: 4:30 pm
Parliamentary Open

3

~~BR Sharma, Anura~~
Kevin Lane

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	San Marin CL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1A	Erik Cervantes	27	2
2A	Manny LaCarubba	23 20	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Prospect HK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1N	Livermore Herman	29	1
2N	Pranav Krishnan	26	3

The better debating was done by the Neg from Prospect HK
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 2nd aff just dropped too much for me to award them with a win. I agree with the last affirmative speaker that only illegal content will be blocked, however 2A never said that, the final speech is a little late even though it was in 1AC. So neg gets ① loss of info, ② inability to reg. ③ bad precedent. The Aff gets some is better than none, but still also says "we should do it even if it is not effective." That is not too strong an argument given that the Aff says that this is a policy debate. Neg could have really ripped Aff on this point, but did not (still it does weaken aff case).

Room: Eng 108
Start: 4:30 pm
Parliamentary Open

3

BP Rathi, Ashok

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Saratoga BY	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Rohan Bhardwaj	26	4
2	Jerry Yang	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland NL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Sathvik Nair	29	1
1	Alex Luo	27	3

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

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

Signed: SBH

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

ORAL RFD / critique

RFD: neither side has offense

Vote neg on presumption

(As I said, I did not having to vote like this)

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Piedmont Hills HL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Andre He	26	1
2	Alvin Loi	25	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Irvington SA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jessica Singh	24	3
1	Medha Acharya	24	4

The better debating was done by the NEG/OPP from Irvington
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: ☒
Signed: Dore H. Clark
speaker points reduced due to issues covered in verbal critique

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams agreed: Policy round (+true)
Both teams agreed: NB as criteria
Gov articulated a plan with clear ADs but lacking a Sol^y mechanism. Opp resp: by attacking this hole & also asserted ADs of the SQ as a SIGLINH mech. (RTP Opp)
Gov response to the solvency hole was to assert FIAT power. FIAT does not extend to entire sol^y - there are private parties who will resist enforcement
New Arg P00: asserted vs Opp - invalid - nothing thrown off flow
Prima Facie P00: asserted vs Gov. also invalid Gov did not modify plan only articulated & clarified.
- Dore H. Clark

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	San Marin BM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Michelle Bollinger	25	4
1	Sumaiya Mubarack	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Irvington MC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Neel Mishra	26	3
1	Vinayak Chetlapalli	28	1

The better debating was done by the Neg from Irvington
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 PM's speech lacked impacts almost completely.
- LO did a good job articulating impacts.
- Second aff was all over the place, more sign posting would've been good in addition to a line by line.
- Aff should've better contested Neg's definition of currency, it could be classified as a foreign currency, thus businesses aren't forced to accept it as payment.
- Second neg should've hit all of the disads, not just the final two incomplete ones.

Room: Kenna 212
Start: 4:30 pm
Parliamentary Open

3

BD Pokharna, Anu

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	San Marin MT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Bilal Mubarack	(24) 27	(4)
	Nathan Troup	(17) 29	(1)

NEGATIVE

POS	Milpitas HB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Ivan Huang	(22) 28	(2)
	Daniel Brewer	(19) 28	(3)

The better debating was done by the Affirmative from San Marin MT
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: K. Chen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The USFG should create regulation for the
Deep web →

Affirmative :- valid points.

Negative :- not very convincing reason. but both

the team have good points.

→ Deep web vs Dark web emphasis was
not clear.

→ Negative team → Criminal activity can happen
anywhere, any time
does not have concrete evidence.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Proteus KK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Rugved Karhade	27	4
1	Kart Krishna	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Valey Christian DH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Jeremy Dong	28	2
2	Josey Hu	27	3

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- ① This is a tight match. Both teams are excellent!
- ② There are some improvement both teams could have made. for example:
 - A) The aff. could have argued the privacy could not be guaranteed if the NSA/FBI could crack the criminals
 - B) The aff. did not attack on the exchange rate benefit
 - C) The neg. did not good reason why trust could be established without backing from gov./banks.
- ③ I vote for the neg. because their overall performance is slightly better.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Bentley HF	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Sam Huang	28.5	3
1	Paul Furer	30	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Irvington SB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Tanisha Singh	28.5	2
2	Shreya Barma	28.5	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Bentley
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 great speaker. Well organized thoughts
clear direction. good arguments.
convincing

1N great eye contact.
clear speech
good volume

2A Nice eye contact & delivery

2N great job & delivery
nice eye contact.
presented material well

Decision: I voted for affirmative. Their arguments were clear and convincing and they were both well prepared. The negative team had a weak argument about the lack of paperwork. ~~the~~ The volatility of the currency as outlined by affirmative & the difficulty in regulating and tracking were strong arguments.

Room: Arts 246
Start: 4:30 pm
Parliamentary Open

3

~~AJ Pullela, Venk~~

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL
SCU
April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Irrington DP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Emon Datta	27	4
	Ankit Patel	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga RO	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Sudeep Raj	27	3
	Michael Ong	28	1

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Irvington GK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Soham Ghosh	28.0	4
	Aditya Kaushik	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Notre Dame San Jose MH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Grace Mondry	28.5	3
	Lilly Hackworth	29.5	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from Notre Dame
AFF OF NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg: Countered & made an alternative case well
• Countered AFF's case strongly
• pointed out loopholes in the APF policy framework & contentions. For example:
(1) Expanded the defⁿ to cover all digital currencies
(2) Issue with 6 months timeframe
(3) How digital currencies can help people like American Indians
• Pointed out that the current issue with cryptocurrencies can be improved over time

AFF:
• If was little hard to follow - Flow can be improved
• were not able to address loopholes brought up by the opponents
• provided good data (e.g. tax losses)

Room: Kennedy 108
Start: 4:30 pm
Parliamentary Open

3

1, Valley Christ

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Irvington SS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Aayush Sharma	29	1
1	Aditya Sriram	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Prospect SP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Mehak Sharma	28	3
1	Paige Prudhon	27	4

The better debating was done by the Aff from Aayush Sharma Aditya Sriram
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: R. Solanki

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I have Chosen Affirmative team to win this debate because they gave more arguments, good clarity about this topic: like. Saving lives, stop drug issue and Computer wireesses.

Affirmative team

* Aditya Sriram

Good Speaker, needs to more clear and aggressive.

→ gave good point like 14000 people died USA. lives lost.

→ Drug issue.

→ He can give more issue, who can prevent by for the deep web.

* Aayush Sharma

→ Good speaker, very effective. Still needs improv.

→ he gave good point, (New York Times) catch virus

→ Security major, for drug good point

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Washington KV	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Lemar Karimi	28	4
	Anirudh Veeraragavan	28	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga GR	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Alex Guo	28	2
	Michael Ren	29	1

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

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

Signed: Sonal Patel.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg won through convincing, logical arguments. Good examples. Very good, point by point, easy to follow rebuttal & restating of their points.

Aff. gave spirited response but lacking in good examples. Too much emphasis on Judicial vs Executive. No examples/data for their contention "it's becoming more popular". Similar lack of specific examples.

Both teams ~~missed~~ mis-stated that Bitcoin was "property tax". Actually it is classified as property.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Irvington LoDh		
	Tiffany Lo	27	3
	Elisheba Dhillpe	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Evergreen PK		
	Jay Paranjpe	27	4
	Srinath Kausheeka	27	2

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

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

Signed: Rhalest

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~IT WAS AN~~ THE TEAMS PICKED 'UCFG SHOULD
BON CRYPTO CURRENCY' AS THE TOPIC.
BOTH TEAM DEBATED VERY WELL WITH AFF TEAM
BUT MORE ARTICULATE. 'NEG' TEAM BROUGHT
GOOD POINTS TO SUPPORT THEIR ARGUMENTS BUT
IT STARTED TO BECOME BUT REBUTATIVE. AT THE
END. 'NEG' TEAMS DIDN'T PICK ON ARGUMENTS
FOR CONCEPT OF CRYPTO CURRENCY VERY
EFFECTIVELY.

Room: O Connor 110
Start: 4:30 pm
Parliamentary Open

3

35, Leland Judge

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Prospect MT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Pradyuman Mittal	29	3
1	Ameya Thakur	30	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Evergreen JP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Rahul Joshi	29	2
1	Ashwinee Panda	30	1

The better debating was done by the

neg
AFF or NEG

from

Evergreen
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

Shane Sweet

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams Excellent
Speakers both teams pushed
the envelope on time.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

Deep Web

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Milpitas LH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jacky Lu	27	3
1	Sahil Hansalia	29	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland LS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Jurrien Le	28	2
2	Laura Shieh	26	4

The better debating was done by the

Aff
AFF or NEG

from

Milpitas HS
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Karen Keryn

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A Nicely organized. Good answer to the question. Talk a little more slowly. Rebuttal - You did an excellent rebuttal.

2N You had some good analysis, but I felt you jumped around. Need more organization. Also watch repeating the same argument too many times. Good speed.

1N I liked your attack on the aff. plan. Good delivery. Good questions - got at some weaknesses in their case. Rebuttal - You did a good job of developing voting issues. I felt the "moving target" issue wasn't worth the time.

2A You had some good analysis. I don't think I would answer 3 questions - used up a lot of your time. Not a little disorganized at the end.

Reason for Decision - This was a very close debate, but my decision became clear in the rebuttal. The biggest issue was funding, and aff. shows that they can get a sizable amount by re-directing illegal spying activities of NSA/FBI to more productive ones. If they have funding, they can accrue the benefits mentioned - drug, forgery etc. As for freedom argument - Aff. shows that only those engaged in illegal activity will be shut down.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Mountain View PM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Yashwant Parmar	28	34
	Zoe Morgan	30	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Irvington MM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Sampreet Moturi	29	2
	Rishabh Meswani	29	2

The better debating was done by the

Neg
AFF or NEG

from

Irvington mm
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

yes and no " "

Signed:

Debra Notari Aptos "

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The bottom line is the resolution → "USFG should create regulations for the deep web." Are new web regulations needed, really?

Aff Strong speakers! Highly articulate. It is clear that you are experienced debaters. Your argument - contentions for regulation were compelling. However, is new regulation necessary? The flaws in your debate really emerged in your rebuttal. It is true - you did not bring up the point that some criminals had actually been found earlier in the debate. This is a critical error. Also, the neg. did present offensive arguments. Finally, you mentioned that part of the problem with the deep web is that it is a black market organization. Thus, really, tracking Bitcoin users in a black market is not viable.

Neg Again, great debaters! I was worried at first, when you somewhat hastily lumped their first three contentions into one. However, you brought your argument around. It was a case of logic. You conceded when it was necessary - that yes, this is a problem, but stuck to the resolution. Are new regulations needed? Is that the answer? According to your excellent refutations, no. The argument was close - the debate. But the neg was stronger. Excellent job Everyone!

Room: Kenna 105
Start: 4:30 pm
Parliamentary Open

3

BR Rajesh, Mishr

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Leland HL		
	Dong Hee Han		
	Stephen Li		

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Lynbrook ZS		
	Andy Zhang		
	Rahul Sarathy		

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

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

Signed: Fred Zell

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

No

Show

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Evergreen ZS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Marek Zielinski	27.5	1
1	Poojan Shukla	27.5	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Lynbrook JR	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sujeeth Jinesh	27	3
2	Kartik Rathi	27	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from EVERGREEN ZS.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff① Well presented the plan. & Net Benefits.
Good contentions but you can simplify with some
use case. Good theory lesson but I would focus/support
first only your team's points then move on into theory.

Neg① Good & well paced speaking style, but a bit long list
of contentions in the counter plan. I would first refute
& then move on with your points. Due to too many
contention points, you couldn't take POI.

Aff② Very well spoken & supported your team mate. Refutation
of Neg team was pretty good. Overall good team work.

Neg② You could have strengthen the already spoken points.
The last point wasn't necessary, Very good response to the
POI.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Prospect GS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Rohan Grover	24	4
1	Mayank Srivastava	26	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Bentley PP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Shane Pracar	29	1
2	Alexis Pracar	27	2

The better debating was done by the NEG from both Shane and Alexis
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 IRS should reclassify Bitcoin as a Currency.

- I vote the NEG team with a win over the AFF team, due to
- Both speakers in NEG team were able to articulate their points very clearly and logically. They were able to address each every argument stated by AFF team, never dropped anything.
 - The key points addressed by the NEG teams also ~~hold~~ are true (or more logically), a. Bitcoin if recognized as currency, it could cause chaos in the monetary market, cause volatility in every aspect of our life (such as our property ~~and~~ used be purchased in paper currency, stock, ~~every~~ our investment etc). b. constitutional tragedy also true. IRS is not, should not also does not have the infrastructure to make such decision.
 - Aff team's one point "currency has no risk, no bubble" is not true, currency market is also very risky, has its upside/downside. This is why each company has its treasury department to do hedging. (continue other side)