

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Harker SR

Sagar Rao

29.0

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Milpitas SX

Stella Xu

28.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from Milpitas (Stella)
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 spreads well and use the advantage to deliver a large number of points in his AC. He was quick on his feet in cross-X and in rebuttal and eloquent in his command and use of language. Neg was more composed and deliberate but was less effective.

Neg was particularly good in cross-X, unveiling a number of potential weaknesses in the Aff argument, which to Aff's credit, manage to close out off the cross-plates effectively. Aff's own rebuttal however, did not match his strong start in the AC, and never really extended his own arguments sufficiently, or rebutted the Neg, although he must be credited for articulating the gem of a point on "correlation without causation", which he repeatedly used to great effect to minimize Neg's cards.

Overall, Aff was the better speaker but the round is awarded to the Neg for a better structured, more discipline use of the rebuttal. It is a very, very close decision however, and both debaters should see themselves as winners for years to come.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Harker KA

Kai-Siang Ang

29.0

NEGATIVE

POINTS

La Reina ~~ES~~ HS.

Elleora Svoboda

28.5

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: Yes ✓

Signed: ch

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both Aff + Neg ^{spoke} ~~spoke~~ very eloquently. Aff was more of a bullet train, cramming a large number of points & sub-points into his delivery, while Neg was slower, more deliberate & more composed.

Wonderful to see ^{two} experienced debaters spar and ~~argue~~ ^{argue} their cases with great intensity. Aff started out with a strong prepared AC, seemed to have lost his way a little in the AR but recovered to deliver the critical issues in the summary. Neg was similar strong in her NC, although delivered with less points & sub-points. While both were very good at cross-X, the rebuttals seemed to have focussed on what the opponent had said that was wrong or inadequate, instead of taking the opportunity to extend fully their own arguments.

Aff in his closing, pointed out that an LD debate was essentially a values debate ~~and~~ ^{and} so an implementation was helpful but not paramount. A good point.

Overall, the round goes to ~~Aff~~ ^{Neg} on account of a better structured and clear rebuttal. A very close decision though and both debaters should be very proud of themselves! Good luck!

Room: Kenna 218
Flight B: Start
LD Jan/Feb Open

2

~~AB Desai, Young~~
Brooks, Judge 1

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU
April 12-13th

✓

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Mountain View JW

Julia Wang

20

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Lynbrook HW

Harrison Wang

24

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

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

Signed: M. Moneron

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Julia off.
opening:
monotony, global warming,
No ^{explanation} evidence how to stop global
warming - asked by Harrison

Harrison neg:
Expl. economic prosperity
improve environment
stems statistic and
evidence

Room: Kenna 218
Flight A: Start 2:30
LD Jan/Feb Open

2

~~AB Desai, Young~~
Brooks, Judge 1

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto TC

Tiffany Cai

24

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker SL

Serena Lu

26.5

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: ☒

Signed: A. Monerone

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Tiffany - aff.
Very good opening arg.
- extraction natural environment
- instability, social dislocation
exp. Nigeria, Congo

Serena - neg.
- good examples of Saudi Arabia
oil export 87%, economic
progress. 46% of GPA made of oil
+ question about exploitation of
labor.
good explanation of resource
course

Good debate

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Brooks LS

Lavanya Singh

26/30

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Saratoga SD

Shrey Desai

28/30

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

(2:13) Aff (very fast)
Constructive
Social conduct, Max societal welfare,
+ their nation's welfare.
Data: CO₂ for global warming →
human extinction → inhabitable (2013)
try: Env. Harm. → loss of life.
\$ cost done to renew. env. endangerment.
Multiple data on deaths (incl. violence).
welfare not maximized due to env.
endangerment, wages ↑ due to uplift.
Economic decline → due to resource
exhaustion.

Cross Exam
Correlation bet. corruption & # of pro.
in env. protection policies → debated,
but neg was good.
Morality: moral obligation.

Rebuttal Opp/ Aff, Value
growth is not sustainable at
resources will become scarcer.
Govt cannot hand free money!!

(2:2) Neg (well organized +
cross exam annals & connects
data)
global warming linked to
env. protection ? link?

Constructive Neg + then Affirmative.
Morality: values.
Poverty is worst form of inequality.
poverty is addressed by res ext.
decrease proposal - data: Zimbabwe;
money directly to citizens and ↑ quality - India, Morocco.
of life. - govt transp.

Aff : over res ext ①
global warming ? no evidence that
res ext. can fix this → Human!!
env. protection will fail in developing
countries ②
Economic growth needed.
Violence: Indian case corruption ③

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Mountain View AC

Adrienne Chen

28/30

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker AS

Ameek Singh

24/30

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 (28/30)
Dgn ✓ Val: societal welfare (incl. quality of env. + social)
C1: Health impacts due to env. issues. Good data wrt disease. availability of water, sanitation, drinks.
C2: Airborne long-term viability. Illness wrt financial disability → prevent deforestation.
- Env prot creates jobs.
- Running out of resources. data pt ✓
- Protects future.
C3 ~~Focus~~ Climate destabilization - ecosystem impact.
Cross Exam
Good x exam on Riche phosphate. - no more phosphate either. (Neg - was not clear on soda).
|| Neg. did not clearly state/emphasize why ~~res ext~~ will same env.!!
Rebuttal, Neg to Aff

Neg (24/30)
Cross Exam Volcan pop. Utilitarianism
Problems of developing vs developed country. needed to live?
Rebuttal Merry up Aff's contentions.
Did not seem to lead in x exam.
Not very formal.
Contrast Neg follows by Aff.
Res ext is a must for survival of due to resources → India. Very little phosphate
Wardue to no res ext. → Very little phosphate
No food → war.
Aff's case: 1. Merry has helped Peru achieve economic growth.
Rebuttal Rebuttal Rebuttal
Data ✓

Did not have strong points
ex India
Did not have strong points - India
as example wrt phosphate.

Room: Kenna 308
Flight A: Start 2:30
LD Jan/Feb Open

2

BH Maheshwari, H

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Mission San Jose CH

Chaksu Hurria

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Mountain View DZ

Derek Zhang

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from MISSION SAN JOSE CH.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Deb Dutta Ganguly

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both debaters were excellent. What tilted the balance away from the NEG was "~~she is~~ lying". When he said: "she is lying".

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

2

BH Maheshwari, H ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Evergreen AT

Amit Tallapragada

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto CZ

Carissa Zou

29

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: Deb Dutta Ganguly.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Very, very close
Aff: your ~~and~~ ~~a~~ ~~contentions~~ ~~were~~ about ① Climate change
② -ve impact ~~w~~ were solid. The 3rd contention was not as solid.

Neg: Focusing on ~~pro~~ eco. growth and poverty was a great idea.