

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto TC

Harker AS

Tiffany Cai

29.2

Ameek Singh

27.7

The better debating was done by the Aff from Tiffany (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:

Speech → 24.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
Morality, Political + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
clear speech, + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
talked about green + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
hms gases + 0.1
gave lot of stats!
talked about rural + 25.7 + 0.1 + 0.1
areas! + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
unstable climate
hazy! New clear
winter! Talked about
various countries + 26.2 + 0.1 + 0.1
and the world, specially + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
developing countries!! + 0.1 + 0.1
Relate Resource extraction
& corruption! + 26.9

Cross exams
Presented good
argument about
refuting her contention
opponent could not
answer
Presented
countered about
nuclear war + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
very well, opp. couldn't + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
answer + 27.8 + 0.1 + 0.1
countered very well + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
about only India!! and + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
nuclear war + 28.9 + 0.1 + 0.1
29.2

Cross exams

Developing vs Developed
Countries 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
+ 0.1
is resource extraction
necessary for human
development? 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
1.1

Speech → 24.1 + 1.1
25.2 + 0.1 + 0.1
+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
talked a lot about
developing countries like
India, China + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
talked about essential
food source + 26.4 + 0.1
+ 0.1
+ 26.6 + 0.1
+ 0.1 + 0.1
+ 26.9 + 0.1
+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
+ 27.7
talked about CO2 level!
but was not very clearly
defined!!
talked about only India
too specific!!
called his
opponent as
partner several
times!!

Room: Kenna 218
Flight A: Start 430
LD Jan/Feb Open

6373463

3

Yg Le, Nguyen

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Milpitas SX

Stella Xu

29

Mountain View JW

Julia Wang

26

The better debating was done by the Aff from Milpitas
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:

RFD: polluted water kills. Aff wins ~~up~~ on a utilitarian framework

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU
April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Mountain View DZ

Derek Zhang

30

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker SL

Serena Lu

30

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


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

Signed: *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff needed a little offense on the
(K) to win. Easy K to kill.

Aff Theory won - kinda... (K) comes
before theory.



(I wanted to vote aff.)

Both sides

Speaking Drills
all summer long.
enunciate

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Brooks LS

Lavanya Singh

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

La Reina ES

Elleora Svoboda

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from Elleora Svoboda
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 AFF and NEG made clear and sufficient arguments.~~

~~I voted~~

The negative established that the developing countries need to focus on short term vs. long term issues therefore resource extraction has higher priority. The affirmative couldn't have sufficient arguments to contest this point. This has been repeated in 3 rounds debates, and the negative caught this and won argument.

Room: Kenna 304
Flight A: Start 430
LD Jan/Feb Open

3

AJ Soni, Mankama

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Saratoga SD

Lynbrook HW

Shrey Desai

29

Harrison Wang

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from Shrey Desai
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 AFF and NEG made clear and sufficient arguments.

I voted AFF because he was a better speaker.

Room: Kenna 308
Flight A: Start 430
LD Jan/Feb Open

3

AU Reddy, Vasu

Ted Liang, Pinewood

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker SR

Mountain View AC

Sagar Rao

28

Adrienne Chen

27.5

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: _____

pinewood

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:


Affirmative (fast speaking)
development
prioritize morality
- Res. Extraction causes conflict
- Violent/military
- global warming, catastrophic change
- ocean acidification
✓ cited ppbs to highlight the dangers in marine life
Good discussion on (single) resource sectors, should highlight the effect on resource vs. environment, → diversify other sectors/extract less → pt by Aff.
vs. dependency
Neg: scored pt by explaining economic benefit will allow solutions for environment protection & help people to survive.

Negative (clear speech right speed, understandable)
- societal welfare
- maximize benefit
- employment, trade & income for locals
- growth allows environment protection technology
- Diamond/oil → integrity corruption → resource extract

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Mission San Jose CH

Palo Alto CZ

Chaksu Hurria

29

Carissa Zou

29.5

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

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

Signed: [Signature] Pinewood

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative (speech, good speed & clear

should; morality

value - human health

- mining - Rivers contam. Conseq.
- immoral - chemicals, lives

- developing countries - corruption
- well being of poor people

- Example of Albania, protecting environment

Negative (speech: clear & emphasize content
& X-exam. very well)
- health ↔ well being
- how many people affected
- government is for people's

Value - well being
- Extraction necessary (26% inc)
- mitigate poverty (28% inc)
- prioritize resources

Rebuttal: narrow on health
- how protection will solve
resource extraction issue

prioritizing environ. will create jobs, example
→ if you have examples, that'll make
your rebuttal strong on the 26% argument

* → countries w/ high extraction actually
have high poverty → good points, but
need to explain why & why should
prioritize.

Good rebuttal (speech: how to
compensate the 26%
loss of wealth)
② health impact, how
many people, Alaska
& Canada, not
developing countries
③ Asking for more ex. g.
→ need more trials.

both debaters have a very engaged debate!

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

✓

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker KA

Evergreen AT

Kai-Siang Ang

27.5

Amit Tallapragada

28.0

The better debating was done by the Neg from Amit (Evergreen)
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

NO definition!

fumbles

not very clear in his speech

Talked about a lot of theory and how to spend time about argument instead of contentions and presenting his case

Too fast! not so clear!!

Cross exams

Asked about developed vs developing

Talked about CO2 emission

lots of fumbles!!

But less evidence

Presented a good case of developed and developing countries together as presented specific examples only about Peru

24.1

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

24.9

0.1 + 0.1

25.1

27.0

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

27.5

0.1 + 0.1

25.3

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

0.1 + 0.1

26.2 + 0.1 + 0.1

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

26.8 + 0.1 + 0.1

Argument

Raised a very good question but opponent can't answer

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

+ 0.1

0.4

Speech

24.1

24.5 +

Definition

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

Presented statistics

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

Very clear speech

Presented my good argument about developed & developing

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

countries

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

Talked about bio diversity

0.1 + 0.1

and convinced his opponent

26.2

Presented very good argument to counter his

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

opponent (Developed vs

26.5 + 0.1 + 0.1

developing)

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

Talked about slippery slope

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

argument which is not countered

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

by his opponent

0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

Presented argument about

28.0

all over the world.