

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AnCh

Angela Chu

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS


Saratoga GS

Genghis Shyy

29

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg wins because of concrete
examples given on poverty reduction,
job creation, and money generated.
Multiple studies cited by both sides,
with more specific ones given to
economic versus morality args.
Long term issues not adequately
addressed by aff.

Room: Sobrato ~~B-D~~ B-D
Flight ~~A~~ Start 10:00am
LD Jan/Feb Novice

1

10, Homestead ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU
April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AC

Angela Chu

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AD

Andrew Dong

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

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

Signed: _____

Atsushi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The AFF (Angela Chu) was "no show" at this flight. The judge and opponent waited for AFF for 45+ minutes and AFF was still a "no show". So the judge declared NEG "the winner" of this flight.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AnAg

Palo Alto CA

Animesh Agrawal

26.5

Chirag Akella

22.0

The better debating was done by the NEG from Anth Chirag Akella
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Palo Alto

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- AFF (6min) 5 intentions

- Cross 3min each
(Neg)

Neg 7min
(prep time)
(2.5 min)

- Cross 3min each

AFF (prep time)
4min

- 6min cited Affirmation side date is out dated

- Both sides debate very well. The AFF side ~~start~~ using most dates w/ quotes. However, several times use "most of the time" words which gives neg. side chances to argue back. The neg side uses very solid ~~data~~ data and good eye contact w/ judge in the last round.

Room: Check with Tab Room Benson 1e
Flight ~~A~~^B Start 10:00am
LD Jan/Feb Novice

1

AV Sakleshpur, R

Alice Xu

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius NA

Natasha Aji

28

Young Genius VC

Vivian Chiang

29

The better debating was done by the NEG from Vivian Chiang
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

- spoke fluently
- did a great job referencing evidence and other's work.
- can improve more on in-depth ~~analysis~~ analysis of balance between life and economy

NEG

- prepared evidences really well
- spoke calmly with confidence
- raised questions right to the point.
- did a great job in rebuttal during cross exam.

Both sides did a wonderful job. The negative side's argument is slightly more convincing with sufficient evidences.

Alice Xu

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius KL

Katrina LE

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius MA

Mohul Aggarwal

27

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

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

Signed: _____

Alice Xu

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

- speech content is well organized
- well-prepared references to other's work and evidence
- good eye contact
- solid skill to refute and point out neg's weakness in cross exam. value contention.
- did well in on voice
- can improve confidence, volume and complete the sentence even when time is up.

NEG

- good voice volume with confidence
- constructive argument is logic and easy to understand
- more evidence should be given on environment protection law's loophole if that's used to support Negative side. same for oil only exists in mid east statement.
- Affirmative sides did a slightly better job in content, refute, references.

Room: Sobrato B-B
Flight B: Start
LD Jan/Feb Novice

1

BA Ganguly, DD ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Silver Creek BB

Young Genius TL

Bhargavi Bhatt

22

Ted Lee

20

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

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

Signed: K. Ramkshen Washington High

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

11:40

Cross Exam 11:48

11:55 Cross Exam

11:51

Rebuttal 12:05

12:11

Room: Sobrato B-B
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Jan/Feb Novice

1

BA Ganguly, DD✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius NH

Harker AA

Nicolas Hernandez

22

Arjun Akkiraju

20

The better debating was done by the

AFF

AFF or NEG

from

Nicolas

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

K. Permalov

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

10:52 - 7
Cred 5

11:15
Environment Protection
Prioritize

Resource Extraction

11:30 8
20

11:04 - 6
Cred 5

11:21 - 7

18

Room: Sobrato B-C
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Jan/Feb Novice

1

LD Two, MVLA ✓

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Lynbrook EI

Emil Irimpan

27.8

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius RC

Rohan Cutinha

26.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from Lynbrook EI
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 this debate because this team made 4
serony counter points to the ~~negati~~ Neg team's
arguments.

NEG side can do more extensive research and better
prepared to counter the arguments from the opposing
side.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius BM

Harker SS

Benjamin Macdonald 28.0

Sachin Shah 27.8

The better debating was done by the AFF from Young Genius BM
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 ~~was~~ won the debate because this team made strong argument that extraction resource intraduce negative impact to environment and society, and cause bigger economical impact.

NEG needs to counter the AFF points more directly and better organize the ~~for~~ arguments.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius RN

Ram Nadula

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto SY

Samuel Yun

26.5

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

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

Signed: James A. [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFFIRMATIVE

INSSTEIN

MAN BEST w/ ENDURING STABILITY

Afghanistan example

Toxic metals from mineral extraction

Inc. Distribution

end global warming

cheap to do it in 3rd World
requires work in 3rd World

energy efficiency

RE : RE in 3rd World

INDIGENOUS PEOPLE DISPLACEMENT

in BRAZIL (logging)

13m deaths could be prevented

X-EXAM

- recycling
- native peoples

AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL

3rd World Still BEHIND (e.g. Africa)

Nigeria, Afghanistan, Austria Gold Rush

3rd FINAL REBUTTAL

- no ex. how to get technology
- Mention Afgh. as an example

NEGATIVE

3rd World

Questions "should"

Advocates Utilitarianism

VALUE CRITERION

1st contention: extraction improves
technology : adds
education

ED results
Food results

2nd contention:

- extraction helps w/ poverty
- helped China w/ GDP growth
- more \$ \$

Refutes

Tech adds food, \$, and trade

Urbanization is better for
environment??

Global Warming > Global cooling

Preventing Next Ice Age

Conflict is +

em Neg Rebuttal

- Food production stands
- review def'n of utilitarianism
and that some people do not benefit

Decision over →

Room: Nobili G
Flight B: Start
LD Jan/Feb Novice

1

CM Young, Pete ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Silver Creek RK

Ryan Karim

28.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AA

Abhay Aggarwal

23.0

The better debating was done by the ^{AFF} Ryan from Ryan Karim
AFF- NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The AFF side used 7 million people died of ~~industrialization~~
industrialization last year alone. The neg side
did not respond to this point very well.

The weather recovery after pollution is
done is not founded.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Lynbrook MD

Murugan Dhanushkodi 27.2

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius ST

Soumya Turumella 26.1

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

more moral aspect 24.1
definitions 0.1+0.1
Good pause between 0.1+0.1
points 0.1+0.1
1 fumble 0.1+0.1
talked about 0.1+0.1
discrepancy 0.1+0.1
Good statistics 0.1+0.1
and given 0.1+
25.8

good questions 0.1+0.1
no answer from 0.1+0.1
opponent 26.2

good and 0.1+0.1
speeches 0.1+0.1
concluded very well 0.1+0.1
to his opponent

26.8
0.1+0.1
0.1+0.1
27.2

Good questions 0.1
not convincing 0.1
answer by opponent
Start → 24.1

1 Fumble
Good definitions, 0.1+0.1
statistics 0.1+0.1
Clear speech 0.1+0.1
overtime 0.1+0.1
25.5

Answered 1
about how 0.1
many was and 0.1
by the resumption
extraction 25.5

Fumble 2
0.1+0.1
0.1+0.1
26.1

Room: Sobrato ~~601~~ B-D
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Jan/Feb Novice

1

10, Homestead ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AG

Anusha Ghosh

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AS

Anish Sundar

The better debating was done by the

NEG

from

Anish Sundar

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

At Resale

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF (Anusha Ghosh) was "no show" at this flight. The judge and opponent waited for AFF for 40+ Minutes and AFF was still a "no show". So the judge declared NEG the winner of this flight.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Milpitas AD

Aman Dosanjh

~~90/100~~ 28/30

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AW

Austin Wang

~~88/100~~ 26/30

The better debating was done by the AFF from MILPITAS AD
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 (Am!) Very strong Need eye contact Neg C1: 19+ Procrastination Just Read off Eye contact Data

Constructive Reparative
No Crote: 21
C1: Lethal 2 nutrition / diseases
connected to WHO
Human population → Data w/
dewing Urban air
pollution. Good data
C2: Harms env & ecosystem -
Bio di. Many impacts. Violence
environment Exploitation
Long term effects - resources will
die out. (C3)

X Exam
Challenged violence
At not resolved w/ violence
vs dev / env.

Potent Health point well drawn
Challenged China data. No donkey
Country data. Well presented data
Continuing natural disasters to env. (C4)

X Exam Challenging Aff's approach
Reorganizing deb.
Running out of resources - how?
even w/ protection. Values.

Constructive Reparative well established
This set important to improve life.
grants. Need grant before
env. protection come in. Need
basic needs first. Need grants to
improve sanitation. But wants to
a point where pollution control
becomes necessary - so develop (C5)
w/o env - violence increase.

Rebuttal from house goes &
Global warming - beyond vocabulary
Not flying!

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU
April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Silver Creek DV

Deepti Valliappan

~~75/100~~ 25/30

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AmWa

Amisha Wadhwa

~~90/100~~ → 28/30

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Important to connect the countries

Dev countries should prioritize car protection over rec. attraction when 2 are in conflict.

Value before: Quality of life → Morality? *Not very clearly stated*

Strong presentation
Well connected

Plur. *Def* of better & higher countries

rec. attr. good construction -

pollution, construction, health

gold ratings (CW) - Data of country

Exam

Employment value attraction got data.

Economy contr. -

May govt: *reformed.*
Just recognized

Rebuttal How were people affected by *ind* prioritization? *(talked)*

Res ext might go only to top 100 jobs - not all. Need govt.

Resource being granted to developed countries & so dev. countries do not value.

Rebuttal EP govt some does not improve QoL. *Just got* on protection affecting QoL.

Long lasting effects due to res. ext. *wrong* date *ambitious* govt is established → *Not* having to stray govt. *Dev countries* *Skills* *Presentation* *would* *Stronger* *help*

Const. Value before: dev countries need to develop & econ. growth. Data -

- Employment, Economy, Govt. *rely* *trans* *modernization* *dev.*

Xoexam Value → did not argue further.

Stroyer govt to

Did not drill down but established *con.* later.

Aff will challenge.

Rebuttal Reaffirmed that res ext. is improving QoL → good data

Drew good relations, bet. Economy & Envt.

⇒ Strongly dev countries are also on top of res ext.

⇒ No evidence given by Aff.

Some given by Aff regarded as being for Neg. all relevant data.

Direct protection to emp. *con.*

Well and put plan to go protection after dev. *No* *Nodes* at all.

Prior

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius GH

Grace Huang

26.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Valey Christian OA

Omeed Askary

27.5

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

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

Signed: _____

James A. Allen

GLOBAL WELFARE

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

VALUE: ~~3rd WORLD SHOULD~~ SOCIETAL WELFARE
CRITERION

1ST CONTENTION - EP LEADS TO ENVIR. HEALTH
FOOD, Well-being

ERADICATES POVERTY

Global Warming
Leads to environmental degradation
Gov't cannot protect its people
land decisions impt
impacts on Indians
survival

2nd contention: we live by ending global warming

X-EXAM BY GH

H2O Pollution of G.W. w/o oil

Better to focus on our own society
7m killed every year by pollution, WHO
1 in 8 deaths by pollution

Guatemala - use of river

Tanzania - fight over mines

Why have w/o good environment

Last AFF. Rebuttal

global welfare is impossible

- don't have to harm environment

HARD TO HEAR

GOING TOO FAST
TO FOLLOW

READING
BUTTING
PAPER

MISSED
A
LOT

Better at
explaining

VALUE SOCIETY, ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT WILL BENEFIT
CRITERION: GREATEST GOOD FOR GREATEST #
Resource - what a country needs

1ST CONTENTION - Resources need env. needs

BLIND EP. CAN LEAD TO ABUSE

2nd Contention: stabilization of economy is
needed for ED; maximize
employment for resource extraction

X-EXAM

1. Why would environ. be prioritized over resource
extraction? Countries - CHINA, for example
HAS AIR POLLUTION - 7% LOSS IN GDP
2. cut trees okay to make food?

Refute - it harms Indians?

3rd Contention: Australia repealing carbon tax
EXAMPLES: ECON VS.

Japan stop GHG

GH - Rebuttal

• Not made link to resource extraction & killing
• 3rd contention slowdown hurts environment
• my value covers her value
• my criterion covers my opponents criterion

POINTS OF ORDER - ANNOYING INTERRUPTION
FOR JUDGE

DECISION OVER

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius SD

28

Harker CZ

28


Sharanya Das

✓

Catherine Zhao

The better debating was done by the Aff from S. Das
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 wins with Env. Protection
being stronger arguments bas
on law analysis and analytics.
Mention of CO₂ sequestering
good focus on global
warning hazards

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto CF

Young Genius AK

Colin Fee

24.7

Aparna Kumar

26.9

A

N

The better debating was done by the Neg from Aparna Kumar (YG)
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Colin - 1 fumble, ^{the} understandable
need to be more precise
Did not give his topic
very clearly. Going without
any proper pause between
sentences and points. Did not
give any statistics.

24.1
0.1

Fumble 2

24.2

Not well believed. Stopped
opponent as soon as time was
up. without judge's permission
or without asking judge.

very rude

over time

24.2

0.1
0.1
0.1

pointing fingers
to his opponent!

24.5
0.1 to 0.1

24.7

very clear in her speech.
Gave a lot of statistics.
no fumbles so far. 24.1
1 fumble 0.1 to 0.1
counted her opponent 0.1 to 0.1
very well. 0.1 to 0.1
Takes more time 0.1 to 0.1
than specified 0.1 to 0.1
0.1 to 0.1
0.1 to 0.1
0.1 to 0.1
Answered all
the questions asked by her
opponent very well.

Good counter 26.1
0.1 to 0.1
0.1 to 0.1
0.1 to 0.1
0.1 to 0.1
convincing
closing speech 26.9

Developing countries should prioritize environmental protection
over resource extraction when the two are in conflict

Room: Sobrato B-A
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Jan/Feb Novice

1

BA Lenail, Ben ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius RS

Radhika Shina

____ N/A ____

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Evergreen AY

Anish Yakkala

The better debating was done by the AFF from Young Genius [Radhika]
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Sid Askang [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Forfeit: Neg side did not show!

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius SM

Satvik Mojnidar

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker AM

Annie Ma

28.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from Harker [Annie Ma]
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:

AS + Access to resources

1. Global warming → Food & Water Supply
→ need renewable energy → 150 mil.
People die from GW.
2. Preserving Resources → to Healthy people
→ reduce child mortality.
3. Leads to violence by devastating local
resources. i.e. Indonesia
4. Hazardous to workers.

CROSS FAR - Why do countries who rely on
resources are still developing?

PAR: Congo is corrupt. Exploiting
resource extraction "utilitarianism" not right!
reg. organ extraction: [not prepared!]

ASC

- No challenges in cross. Asked for Evidence

NS

utilitarianism immorality

1. reduces Poverty: 4 tril per year.
GDP in Saudi Arabia. 3 America 1.5 T \$
2. Essential to economy

NR:

(i) resource curse: refute "Resource Curse" in
FAR by saying NO Author Evidence
(i) kill organ was ok

Annie had better ~~research~~ Facts
& research. She used those to her
Advantage.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU
April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker AG

Palo Alto CW

Avi Gulati

24

Candace Wang

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from PALO ALTO CW (Candace Wang)
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

Sharon Byrne

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg case offered better arguments to prove their case.
Aff offered poor arguments like ~~they~~^{he} just talked about
CO2 emissions and selfishness, famine but did not offer good
arguments for her claims. Lot of good energy by both participants

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014
SCU
April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Valey Christian EN

Eddy Nassif

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius JC

John Case

20

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

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

Signed: Bharati Bengel

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

i) Good debating style. Seemed well prepared and offered good contentions for the affirmative case. Negative did not offer good counter arguments. Looks like Neg had not prepared his speech well. He offered no rebuttal for aff. case's contentions.

Room: Nobili J
Flight B: Start
LD Jan/Feb Novice

1

CJ Manga, Radhak ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto ET

Young Genius AZ

Ethan Teo

30


Allan Zhang

28

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

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

Signed: _____



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Good presentation & arguments / defense from
Ethan Teo compared to Allan Zhang.
Allan needs to present his case more
confidently and also argue well.

Room: Nobili J
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Jan/Feb Novice

1

CJ Manga, Radhak ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius RA

Rithvik Agastya

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker AH


Alan Hughes

30

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

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

Signed: _____



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Good arguments were done by Alan Hughes compared to Rithvik Agastya which were very impressive. ~~Comp~~ Rithvik didn't defend himself well.

Room: Nobili H
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Jan/Feb Novice

1

BV Askary, Sid ✓
Y G L E, NGUYEN

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius SP

Sohil Pokharna

26

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Oakwood AK

Abhi Karthikeyan

28

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Abhi presents strong argument and counters his opponent points very well. Abhi was able to demonstrate environment protection as a delayed outcome after economic development and describe a better world for the negative.

Sohil does not ~~have~~ have strong evidence beyond some scary statistics of global warming. I would recommend Sohil to work on his delivery technique.