

SCU Philalethic Invitational 2014 -- LD Jan/Feb Open

Page 2

SCU

April 12-13th

Quarterfinal Round (Start Time: ASAP)

A	Kenna 304 EVHS	La Reina ES (Aff) Books PHS VC	Palo Alto CZ	AU	10, Homest	2, Notre D
B	Kenna 218	Evergreen AT (Aff)	Lynbrook HW	Ramarao Ch	BA Huang,	LD One, MV
A	Kenna 304 Valley	Milpitas SX (Flip) Lynbrook Books	Harker SL	Harinder P	BA Lenail,	Raghu Sakl
B	Kenna 218	Saratoga SD (Flip)	Mountain View JW	Daniel Teo	AB Ding, Y	BH Maheshw

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

Saratoga SD (Shrey Desai) vs. Mountain View JW (Julia Wang)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

JULIA WANG

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

SHREY DESAI

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Ranghraj

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: Julia no eye contact, 30secs left
+ Value mobility - utilitarianism.
Greatest # of people get greatest benefit.

1. Detrimental to human growth
- a. Exploitation of minerals.
- b. Harms human environment.
- c. Social collapse

1. Protection plans - \$3.2T saved.

- a. Deforestation
- b. Save rain forests - evidence for med. value.

Cross. Exam: Questioned evidence (responded to the refute).
- Impact - resource.

Neg: Shrey 2 mins prep used
Cross exam: 2. evidence is dev. countries
- No examples by Aff.
✓ Rain forest - med. value (probably).
- No author of article. US data but for dev. countries. - Global Issues.

Neg. case

1. Poverty reduced by res. extr. Botswana, India examples. Cash to poor.

- 2.
3. Wealth from mining - increases revenue.

All refutes

1. Corruption - environ. protection causes more poverty

2. Priority does not eliminate

3. Some countries too poor to extr.

- Use res. extr. to solve environ. prot.
- Environ. prot. plans fail

RFD: I voted negative because the points were articulated very well and each study associated with the points. Neg. made convincing arguments about poverty reduction, wealth generation, and priority of environmental protection does not solve problems.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

Mountain View JW (Julia Wang) vs. Saratoga SD (Shrey Desai)

AFFIRMATIVE

Julia Wang

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Shrey Desai

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: V: Morality

Protility

- ① RE inhibits growth.
RE harms Env.
RE leads to resource collapse

- ② EP has advantages
cuts Emissions / improves lives
Left 30secs

CE not very strong. But Shrey "used the time to Argue his case" he was warned not to do that!

RB introducing new ~~points~~ points
① Nigeria
② resource curse ~~[points]~~

RE is limited, NO?

CE Evidence of Benefit to Specific Countries? Not ~~sure~~ about Medicine! Why this line of question?

NA Morality = equality → Poverty - Poverty to die from Poverty.

① RE reduces poverty [Morgan Example]

② Cash from RE can eliminate poverty

③ Most of income from Mining

④ EP causes corruption.

⑤ Green Jobs are not available to the poor use RE to get deving countries up the chain.

⑥ using RE does not lead to EP [Brazil] political will lacks!

RB only Negate the Arg based on quality of Evidence Not additional Discussions Goal 2nd argument? Poor Countries Don't have the Infrastructure to deal w/ EP.

Shrey won because he had more evidence & had better RB

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

Saratoga SD (Shrey Desai) vs. Mountain View JW (Julia Wang)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE


Julia Wang

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Shrey Desai

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Julia started off her ^(AFF) case good but was not able to defend her case well during cross-exam by her opponent. Shrey started off his NEG case strongly and also defended strongly during cross-exam. Julia had a good affirmative rebuttal overall. Shrey had a strong negative rebuttal compared to her opponent. Julia had a strong final rebuttal but could not defend strongly her case and couldn't do a good job in refuting her opponent arguments. Overall Shrey came out strong and is a winner.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

Evergreen AT (Amit Tallapragada) vs. Lynbrook HW (Harrison Wang)

AFFIRMATIVE

Amit Tallapragada


NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Harrison Wang

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Amit started off strong with his case^(AFF) and Harrison did good cross-exam. Harrison started off his case (NEG) well and also strongly defended his case during cross-exam. Amit had good counter-arguments during affirmative rebuttal. Harrison supported his case strongly and also counter-argued very strongly and overall had a strong case and defence compared to his opponent. Even though Amit had a good final rebuttal, that was not strong enough compared to Harrison. Overall Harrison did a great job and he is the winner of the contest.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

Evergreen AT (Amit Tallapragada) vs. Lynbrook HW (Harrison Wang)

AFFIRMATIVE

AMIT TALLAPRAGADA

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

HARRISON WANG

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Rongh

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

3:10 used

2 mins used

Aff: Amit

+ Value - morality & net benefits (Lives)
Iran & Iraq evidence
- Res. extra → climate change → humanitarian effects is huge impact.

2. Corruption due to res. extra
Evidence.

3. Causes physical conflicts.
Evidence

Neg. → will only get jobs.

Jobs - 100K → 3M jobs WW

Cross exam:

1. Evidence about poverty decrease.

2. Creates jobs - what happens when we run out.

Neg: Harrison

Cross exam

+ Saving lives. is priority
+ Questioned evidence - Amit provided.

Case

1. Quality of life - give money from res. extr.
Evidence - Botswana to citizens.
30% rev. in educ and health.

2. Employment opps - poverty decreased in Ghana
Evidence on Ghana
Deaths due to poverty

+ Opps case - 1. Circumvent to extr. for own needs. by poor people.

2. Opp only looking at

RFD: I voted for negative because he convinced me environmental protection should be prioritized. Provided solid evidence w/ examples and sources. He also argued the affirmative side's evidence. Negative side had a good closing analogy.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

Lynbrook HW (Harrison Wang) vs. Evergreen AT (Amit Tallapragada)

~~NEGATIVE~~ AFFIRMATIVE AFF

~~AFF~~ NEGATIVE NEG

Amit Tallapragada

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Harrison Wang

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from Amit Tallapragada

AFF OF NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Sid Askary

Harrison

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF / vi Morality Not benefit

- RE cause for GW
① GW cause 600B loss, 300k killed, 300mil affected.
- RE causes corruption.
Daring rely on RE and don't change
RE causes conflicts.
Air pollution prev. creates jobs (Not in developed countries)

CE / Money back to citizens?
② What happens when we run out?

RB / Good counter points: Petrones
1- climate change
2- conflict

CE / Benefit smes lives? stats?
Econ benefits?

- NEG
- RE improves quality of life
 - RE provides employment. 1 Mil in Brazil reduced poverty.
 - Poverty causes more death than Env.

opp: ① Econ growth leads to GPA i.e USA
② 3rd world die of poverty

NRB / Not all countries are RE
② 60 countries pay their citizens.
③ Growth reduces poverty.
Green jobs are not everywhere.

Both are very strong. Amit won because Harrison introduced new point: "EP would eventually happen as result of Econ Dev", kinda conceding the point!

Room: Kenna 304
Flight A: Start ASAP
LD Jan/Feb Open

QUAR

10, Homestead

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

La Reina ES (Elleora Svoboda) vs. Palo Alto CZ (Carissa Zou)

AFFIRMATIVE

Elleora Svoboda

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Carissa Zou

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the *AFF* from *Elleora Svoboda*
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: *AM*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

Palo Alto CZ (Carissa Zou) vs. La Reina ES (Elleora Svoboda)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

~~Carissa Zou~~

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Elleora Svoboda

~~La Reina Elleora Svoboda~~

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Carissa Zou

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

Signed: Dylan K. Wan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Developing - ONI 6min
+ quality of life
medical important
- plant - transitional medicine
- cause virus needs
- community
necessity
help endogenous animals
benefit
sustainable.

Clarification 3min
- medical
in situation
why all dev nations empty
- virus
spread

Decision: affirmative because she pointed out that the resource extraction may not benefit the people and solve the problem. The negative side mentioned how important resource extraction is for solving the problem but did not give enough evidence on why this is over evident extraction.

negative speech 7min
case first
1. mortality value
2 well being
- input for developing
- income
- employment & income
3 property -
resource extraction

3. Resource Extraction
Value
Rebuttal
- bidirectional
- violent
- this is happening on the spot
- not cause
- if resource extraction is
lost
- Env protection benefit?

rebuttal
- max well being
go back people?
generalization no evidence
property.

diversity 3min
estible any way
- A+B or A.B happy society?

affirmative speech
- not max well being
life first, mortality
priority
- mitigate property
not reduce
evidence not given & property
channel to people
- diversity
protect plant that are
crucial
- Good example
water
virus caused by resource
extraction

2min prep
negative rebuttal
negative case
- life is important
bad condition stay property
28% need first
- only way to develop
need resource extraction
never said medical
not show how
- property causes water
problem
case/example or all
africa -> all.

3min prep
1. argument
no evidence that it
go to people
must solve it if they live
in a bad env
2. quality of life
3. value
Life is meaningless if health

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

Palo Alto CZ (Carissa Zou) vs. La Reina ES (Elleora Svoboda)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

LA REINA ES Elleora S.
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

CARISSA ZOU
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from CARISSA ZOU FROM PA CZ
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

(PLEASE SEE THE OTHER SIDE OF THE PAGE)

AFFIRMATIVE:

- ~~NOT~~ ENV vs RESOURCE EXTRACTION.
- ENV & JOBS
- ENV & MEDICINAL VALUES.
- ENV & COMMUNITY.
- ~~IMPACT~~ ON HABITAT.

- QUALITY OF LIFE

X- ~~GOOD~~ QUESTIONING THE SOURCE

- VIOLENCE ACTS? SMUGGLING, RESOURCE WARS.
- ⊗ - DIAMOND ARGUMENT WASN'T THAT GOOD.
SMUGGLING, NOT CLEARLY SHOWN TO BE RELATED.

NEGATIVE:

CONT I: ~~ENV~~ EMPLOYMENT, ECONOMIC GROWTH.

4.2). LOSS OF INCOME FROM NR EXTRACTION, POVERTY.

BIO-DIVERSITY.

VIOLENCE, CIVIL CONFLICTS.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

Harker SL (Serena Lu) vs. Milpitas SX (Stella Xu)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

STELLA XU

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

SERENA LU

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from SERENA LU FROM HARKER SL.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

(SEE OTHER SIDE)

AFFIRMATIVE

- HEALTH HARMS, RISKS.
- 1/5 CHILDREN, MORTALITY RATE
- ⊗ - GOLD MINING, MERCURY POISONING.
- AUTISM, MERCURY POISONING.
- MR. WARS, AFRICA.
- POLLUTION.
- DEVELOPING VS DEVELOPED.

NEGATIVE

- ⊗ GDP ↑ SAUDI ARABIA.
- 80% GDP, OIL, CRITICAL FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH
- ⊗ ECONOMIC GROWTH RELATED TO ~~BETTER~~ BETTER ENV.
- e.g. U.S. (PROSPERITY).
- ⊗ CHINA ~~NOT~~ RESOURCE EXTRACTION NOT ~~AT~~ BIGGER PART OF ECONOMY
- PERU: RESOURCE EXTRACTION BENEFITS
- CHINA: REDUCED POLLUTION.

X-EXAM

- GOOD CORRELATION BTD. AUTISM/RE.
- VIOLENCE: RESOURCE WARS.

X-EXAM

RESOURCE WARS BECOZ OF BAD POLICIES AND NOT BECAUSE OF RE.

- ECONOMY BEFORE. POLLUTION CONTROL.

⊗ EXTRACTION DOES NOT MEAN. BAD POLLUTION

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

Milpitas SX (Stella Xu) vs. Harker SL (Serena Lu)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Stella Xu

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Serena Lu

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Dylan H. Wan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

<u>AFF</u>	6 min	<u>NEG</u>	7 min	<u>CX</u>	3 min	<u>defeat.</u>
obsessive + not priority today 1) air. v. air pollution. 2) disorder. / child 3) nursery & air. / water delay speech 4. - (too fast) 5. -		Reserve Exten. → benefit dev (not say is more important than pollution) Case - health risk. many other factors. conflict health won't be able to solve the issue due to Res Exten. - bad policy not the other way - not all clear how such tourism like proto vico - low job.	ear. issue = health issue - job - reserves returning - how long pollution goes down - same. QND Prefer go over <u>AFF</u> - reserve > pollution. 4 min. - milky cori gold mining - ar - pull resources - contention proto vico - protestant cause env? - already developed can reduce not to develop can	- use oil company old industry - reduce unemployment rate - china is strange - reduce pollution - after we have food. water, ... then we can reduce the env - p8c conflict env & conflict health <u>AFF</u> - pay more - new point - not only Res. ... use china - people can get it? - not mention how long		
<u>CX - exam</u> prevention env - conflict #8 cause ARIZON not take away Res. Exten. let environment only conflict	3 min					

I voted for AFF side since she has a strong point about
that the environmental issue affect health. she used real examples
The NEG side failed build the case to against the proto vico cause.
and a introduced new point in the end.

Room: Kenna 304
Flight A: Start ASAP
LD Jan/Feb Open

QUAR

Raghu Sakleshp

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

Milpitas SX (Stella Xu) vs. Harker SL (Serena Lu)

AFFIRMATIVE

Stella Xu

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Harker SL Serena Lu

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the

Aff
AFFIRMATIVE

from

Stella Xu
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed:

asm

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: