

Room: Kenna 308
Flight A: Start 830
LD Jan/Feb Open

4

CJ Manga, Radhak ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto CZ

Carissa Zou

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Saratoga SD

Shrey Desai

30

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

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

Signed: _____

Fuj Zell

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Oral

RED

Room: Kenna 308
Flight B: Start
LD Jan/Feb Open

4

CJ Manga, Radhak

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014



SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Mountain View AC

Harker KA

Adrienne Chen

27

Kai-Siang Ang

29

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

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

Signed: _____

Fung Gill

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Oral
RFD

Room: Kenna 306
Flight B: Start
LD Jan/Feb Open

4

Dong, Jianming

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Mountain View JW

Harker SR

Julia Wang

29.5

Sagar Rao

29

The better debating was done by the AFF from Mountain View
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 ~~did~~ highlighted different benefits for environment protection.

Neg did a good job of cross examination. During cross examination, the speaker did not let the opponent complete her statement.

Room: Kenna 306
Flight A: Start 830
LD Jan/Feb Open

4

Dong, Jianming

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Lynbrook HW

Harrison Wang

29.6

NEGATIVE

POINTS


Palo Alto TC

Tiffany Cai

29

The better debating was done by the AFF from Lynbrook HW
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 won the major issues. Had good cross examination.
persuasive arguments with various examples.

Neg did a good job, but was less persuasive.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker SL

Mission San Jose CH

Serena Lu

Chaksu Hurria

27.6

27.0

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

S. points: corruption?, GDP ↓, does not ~~not~~ exclude extraction, exploitation.
CO₂, big \$ impact.
No eye contact

C. Cross Ex - CO₂, violence, wealth to people...
Serena very good at answering cross ex. evidence
Points: morality, welfare, env. change inevitable, war??
economy:

S. operating two PCs therefore not smooth
Cross Ex - Probability of nuclear war -
C. didn't answer cross ex well -
2nd speech OK -

C. rebut corruption, not well done
leading from PC, hesitations -
spent too much time on rebuttals but not strong

S. good summary - adequate eye contact this time

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014 ✓

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

La Reina ES

Milpitas SX

Elleora Svoboda

27.3

Stella Xu

28.2

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- E - points medicinal plants violence resources, future
held PG, read from PC
- S - attacking medicinal plant excellent cross examination
need more eye contact, talk too fast
- Points - man up, poverty, development → env. health, tipping point of wealth
- E - cross examination - not strong, played into competitor's hand
eco imperialism, rebut? left rebuttals hanging...
- S - good summary
- E - Sustainable economy - reasonable summary

Room: Kenna 304
Flight A: Start 830
LD Jan/Feb Open

4

AB Gnanansekhar,

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014 ✓

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Evergreen AT

Amit Tallapragada

~~19~~ 29

Brooks LS

Lavanya Singh

~~19~~ 27

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

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

Signed: Ravikumar 4/13/14

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Amit: Referee

~~Good points~~ Support with facts - 5
Defense - 4
Nice cross examination
Second Round presentation - 5
Third Round presentation - 5
19

Lavanya

~~Referee~~ 5 (good points presentation)
Presentation - 5 (good points)
Defense - 4 (could not support)
Second Round Presentation - 5
Third Round presentation - 3
17

Decision

6 min
3 min
2 min
3 min
4 min
6 min
3 min

Decision & Comments

- Both of them Presented Very well
- Amit Did better on defending his Case on Cross-examination

Room: Kenna 304
Flight B: Start
LD Jan/Feb Open

4

AB Gnanansekhar,

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker AS

Ameek Singh

~~27~~ 27

Mountain View DZ

Derek Zhang

~~28~~ 28

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

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

Signed: Ranjan 4/13/14

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Ameek
First Round - 5
Defense - 4
Second Round - 4
Third round - 4
17

Nice
Cross-exam
(13)

Derek
First Round - 4 1/2
Defense - 3 1/2
Second round - 5
other - 5
18

Could not defend
4 min
✓ 6 min
✓ 3 min
✓ 7 min
✓ 3 min
✓ 4 min
✓ 6 min
✓ 3 min
-

- Good Presentation
- Clear points
- Clear Contention points

Good

Decision & Reason

DEREK did good Cross-examination and
refuted all opponents's Cross-examination Contentions

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Lynbrook HW

Harrison Wang

28.6

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker SL

Serena Lu

27.1

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Speech! 24.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
Excellent stats 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
Destruction fishing 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
Coral reef, fishing 0.1 + 0.1

Wt no jobs provided by eco tourism 25.5
Good an 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
Cross X + 0.1 + 26.1

Good question Presented to the opponent w.r.t. Peru and Opponent agreed that ~~there~~ their case is based only on Peru!! 26.7 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 = 27.0

Good point! All develop + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
Countr in only Peru!! + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
talked Ecuador oil extracts + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

Good content about developing countries vs. developed countries 28.2 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 = 28.6

Talked about lot of Pl. Country, e.g. African, Asian and South American country

Cross X 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
over fishing 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
resource extraction
directs terrorism
no answer by
NA

Speech! 1.0 + 24.1 + 25.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
Good speech! excellent stats Presented!! 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
Nazi genocide? 25.8

only talked Peru! no own places. terrorism is a good thing → very bad comment!! No. points crisis given because her case only on Peru and she can't answer against it! (Cross X)

Resource curse! Again Peru!!! There are other developing countries in the world! 26.6 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 = 27.1

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker SR

Mountain View DZ

Sagar Rao

Derek Zhang

29.8

29.6

The better debating was done by the Aff from Sagar (Harker)
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Speech:

24.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

Gave the names of
Developed Countries.

+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

GDP, Did not give
Good clear Speech

+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

exponential growth is not
sustainable!

↓
25.6

Global warming!

exploitation of natural
resources

too far and families

Presented good stats!!

Cross X

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

25.9

impact of global
warming

Cross X

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

27.3 + 0.1 + 0.1

+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 → 27.8

+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

+ 0.1 → 28.9 + 0.1 + 0.1

29.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

+ 0.1 + 0.1 → 29.7 + 0.1

→ 29.8

Speech

Cross X

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

Good context, intelli
ger question, not

convincing answer

by opponent

Why do people attack

miners → no answer

by opponent

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

0.8

Speech:

0.8 + 24.1 → 24.9 +

Not prepared the
doc properly, took

along time to show

to the opponent

Gave good Defs.

Presented excellent
stats! WTS of it.

Economic Prosperity
and environmental uplift!

Data generated from 1950!

60% vs 10% presented

by opp.

Destruction of ice age!

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

26.8 + 0.1 + 0.1

+ 0.1

27.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

→ 27.3 + 0.1 + 0.1

+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

29.0 + 0.1 → 29.1 +

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

29.6

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Mountain View JW

Julia Wang

20

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker KA

Kai-Siang Ang

28

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Value: Morality / Criterion: Utilitarian
Cont 1: Resource extraction is detrimental.
Cont 2: Protection of Env. is advantageous.
Good presentation/Overview.
Defended Cross-X well by asserting that extraction shld. be done responsibly.
- Good counter-argument on China/Phosphate/Cancer arguments.
- Can be more forceful and not concede so easily.
- Nigerian extraction has hurt economy was good argument.
- Emotional, convincing debator.
- Good counterpoints on phosphate depletion, Nigerian extraction and impact of pollution in developing countries.
- Nigeria example was strong.
Value: Morality / Criterion: Utilitarian
Cont 1 counterpoint: China's need to extract resources to stay ahead.
- Not extracting resources will hurt (not improve) economy.
- Phosphate is important resource (India/Jadar Card). - shld we starve?
- Lack of resources leads to scarcity leads to war.
- Good counterpoints and debator.
- Good at highlighting points that favor his case.
- Too much of the argument was around China's collapse (and WW3), India's phosphate need (and starvation) both of which were being supportive by selective reading from a skewed card.
- One counterpoint to pollution death arguments.
BOTH WERE GOOD DEBATERS - TOUGH CONTEST

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Mountain View AC

Adrienne Chen

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto TC

Tiffany Cai

27

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Value: Social Welfare

Criterion: Improving Human Life

- Good research on impact of extraction on Eco/humans/Env.
- Data on Env. protection on Eco. was strong.
- Climate de-stabilization from resource extraction was ~~not~~ good.
- Spent Gross-X on clarifying Opponent's case as opposed to countering her points.
- With resource extraction, greed will drive toward of Eco. instability is a good argument.
- Extraction is risk of Env. extraction & degradation.
- Shld. counter opponent's point of why she is "pulling developed countries into the discussion" should counter ^{with} that resource extraction is ~~NOT~~ the ONLY way to combat poverty.

- + Good arguments and pinning the opponent to cite specific cases where GreenTech & Biodiversity has helped economy/protect environment.
- Value: Morality Criterion: Max. net benefits.
- (Filtered through national benefits).
- "Resource extraction is ONLY way to combat poverty."
- (Logistically & politically protecting resources are not possible ~~is~~ a strong case.)
- Good point on why this shld. be burden on developing countries (vis-a-vis) developed countries.
- Good play of pinning the opponent by asking her to define "level of prioritization" and "right" level of extraction.

GOOD DEBATERS.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

Brooks LS

Lavanya Singh

Winner

POINTS

29

NEGATIVE

Harker AS

Ameek Singh

POINTS

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from Lavanya Singh
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME Brooks LS

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

Signed: NSD

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Framework:-

Both debaters argued for util. as the value for the round. AFF pruned that util. was best achieved when we use the criterion of social contract. AFF presented clear and consistent framework w/ arguments that link back to the standard.

Case Analysis:-

AFF presented argument clearly ~~as~~ contention by contention w/ adequate evidence. NEG's speech was all over the place. NEG had a lot of good evidences but it would greatly help in future if ~~referred~~ used in contention based refutation. Going organized would help NEG not to bring any AFF's arguments in future. By reading the evidences, are not going to help ^{NEG} ~~but~~ as he dropped

*Presentation:- a couple of AFF's. Great IAR and CX by AFF!

AFF: Appropriate speaking pace, volume

NEG: Fluency of speech, off time roadmap

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Mission San Jose CH

Chaksu Hurria

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Evergreen AT

Amit Tallapragada

29

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

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

Signed: NSD

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Framework! -

Both debaters argued for morality as the value for the round. NEG proved that morality is best achieved when we use the criterion of net benefits. NEG presented clear, and consistent framework, w/ arguments that link Case Analysis! - back to the standard.

This was a close debate round! Both opponents presented arguments clearly, speeches were well organized and I was able to follow reasoning clearly. Both used arguments w/ very well supported evidences. However, when arguments clashed, AFF dropped 3 of NEG's argument which were very important points for the round. I would love to see AFF to go after her opponent ~~to~~ more aggressively moving forward.

Presentation! - Great job both!

AFF: Fluency of speech, offtime roadmap

NEG: Appropriate speaking pace, volume, CX.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto CZ

La Reina ES

Carissa Zou

28.5

Elleora Svoboda

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from La Reina [Elleora]
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: SID ASKARY

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AF v: Political Morality
C: Maximizing common good.

- ① Resource Ex to climate change
 - ④ dev. country contribute the most to carb. dioxide.
 - ⑥
- ② loss of bio diversity ① Human extinction?

Focus only on GW

CE: Any ex. of percent of developed country contributing?

RB Not Doomed to Extinction yet.
1 Res. Ext. Does not mean Econ. Dev.

FA - RB not effective to solve GW
repeat the Developing Country Argument!

CE: gov. involved? Global Warming
Timeliness? Human extinction tactics?

AF v: societal welfare

- ① ~~Res. Ex.~~ Res. Ex. can lead to EPA Laws
- ② Res. Ex. can lead to improved infrastructure

Good Examples

- ② Econ growth lead to better Environment
i.e. Chile
- { Nigeria both good & bad?
- { ~~Developed~~ Developed countries are short-term
goal oriented

RB Added new Evidence. (Good Jobs)
- Developing countries rely on resource
Extraction.
good Job of Attacking points

1. Had more Points
better Counter Args.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Milpitas SX

Saratoga SD

Stella Xu

29

Shrey Desai

29

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

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

Signed: SID ASKARY *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

A-F | ①
② Morality -

① Env. Harms Air/water: 20% DISEASES

② A → Air Pollution
C → Toxic Pollution

③ Violence
→ resource wars? Example

③ f Eco. tourism.
Econ growth.

2-E | How Does corruption & EV work?
How much Money? Evidence? Can we
have EV & RB?

RB | Good. Reb. ① knock on Indonesia
eg. RB still leaves many in poverty in
Africa

Do not need to focus only on
poverty. Resource wars!

2-E | where is the correlation b/w EPA &
ECO tourism solves harm?

NEG | poverty reduction by RB

① ←
② Dev. countries can convert Money to citizens
③ Most poor communities earn Money by
Mining

① ENV leads to corruption

② As you get ~~richer~~ richer, EV moves up

③ prices may increase as a result of EV

① [Reduced conflict]

RB | focused only on Poverty.
Botswana is not war-torn!

↑ Slightly Better Arguments