

LD Mar/Apr Open Semi

① Palo Alto ¹HY ^A vs. Westmont ¹¹BY
O'Connor 105

② Homestead ¹¹EG ^B vs. ¹Evergreen TG
O'Connor 1005

Flight A: Start ASAP
LD Mar/Apr Open

5 Homestead EG vs Evergreen TG
G'Connor 1045

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

School: Homestead
Speaker: Eriza

POINTS: 29

NEGATIVE

School: Evergreen
Speaker: Tanmay

POINTS: 26

The better debating was done by the

Aff
AFF or NEG

from

Eriza/Homestead
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Eriza

Speech A

Counter A

Speech A

Tanmay

Counter B

Speech B

Counter/Speech A

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Homestead EG

School: Evergreen TG

Speaker: _____

Speaker: _____

The better debating was done by the AFF from Homestead
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
little
human short
justice
decently →
ends don't
inst. by the end
1) hurt innocent
civilians.
no good to police
relearn.
(denialism
not
desirable
treatment
dose
effective...
breaks
intermedial
law
UN, & B...
3) ignores
the principles
not successful.
ignores humanity
not blackmen
deception
1) not successful.
not properly directed.
Prohibition

or
→ no
camp
→ not
minor
death
death
• NA
• Aff.
cash v. v. p. s
ad to you
works
→ not
obvious
indirect.
net
20%
at them die

case is a little
unstructured.
Neg
and → alternate
1) more
paper
2) unable
to
no specific
example
average well
Lehman
before
a little
sent.
suffer
death
etc.
S. Africa
Africans
since
1990's
need to be
on restriction.
Neg
LD does not
all for a plan

B

5

Homestead EG vs Evergreen TG
O'Connor 1005

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Homestead EG

Speaker: _____

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Evergreen TG

Speaker: _____

The better debating was done by the neg from Evergreen
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:

neg looks until →
stops one of
bigger scenarios plus
70% of all did
φ in aff work

A

5

Palo Alto HY vs. Westmont BY
O'Connor 105

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Palo Alto HY

Speaker: _____

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Westmont BY

Speaker: _____

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

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

Signed: Michael

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

ZAR drops

that neg stops

perpetuation of violence
in internment camps.

That probably lines into
the (u) of saving lives.

At least he has defense
on the 4th example

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: PA

School: Westmont

Speaker: HY

Speaker: BY

The better debating was done by the Neg from Westmont
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
unjust
lives
ineffective
no change since
no relationship
conditional
denial matter
setbacks
don't save as
many lives
judges before
aid
women
babies die
don't form
incentives
wastings
wastes
resources
50-40% of
funds to
negotiate

humanitarian
aid def
normal
development
non-uniform
busily
World
Bank
policy
change
in
aidance
26 examples
Alghanistan
then had
an election
women &
US citizens
ultimately
off, LT
Stop legitimization
non-uniform
financing
advice
to aid

Neg
unjust
life
developmental
aid
humanitarian
aid
presumes
are fuel
gov't can
drive to
internment
camps
freedom
states on
mergers
no link to
value
LT
Being
and reflect
give to
demographic
and states
Japan uses
aid
more effect
than
policy
net reform
specific
political
aid
Ghana
war a
band
economic
always a
normal
issue,
budgeting
GDP

value
utilitarianism?
humanitarian
aid
no examples
no linker
expert
testimony
never proves
he solves
no examples
conditions
notable
to paper
intern
camp
or
military
budget
political
aid can't
change gov't
strategy
misunderstood
domestic
political
aid
prefer
26
examples

Flight A: Start ASAP
LD Mar/Apr Open

A

5 Palo Alto HY vs. Westmont BY
O'Connor 105

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 29

School: Palo Alto
Speaker: Helen Yan


NEGATIVE

POINTS: 27

School: Westmont
Speaker: Bruce Yong

The better debating was done by the Helen Yan from Palo Alto
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~Speech 100~~
~~Speech 100~~
Speech - A
Counter - A
Speech - A

Good counters
~~Counter A~~
Counter A
Speech A
Speech A

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: X

School: Norva TR

Speaker: Vickie, Julia

Flip

NEGATIVE

POINTS: X

School: HARKER BS

Speaker: David, Sorja

winners (11)

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

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

Signed: Ann Cady

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both cases were strong so thank you. However I had to side with Neg solely because their case was able to hold up throughout the debate. I had to agree with the Neg that the AFF's def. of Environ. protection proved the Neg's case so that was a miss for the AFF. Also the AFF dropped a major Neg point of 20% increase of pollution from building of roads. Also the argument from the Neg about 50mil ppl displaced by infrastructure was great and compelling. And when the AFF use FDI as a main focus they never really gave direct effects, so it was hard for me to side with that. You can refer to the back and see more reasoning, but you all were great and I see great futures so Thanks.

Great Job (80)

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

~~AFFIRMATIVE~~

School:

Surli RV

Speaker:

Rashan, Arrian

POINTS: ~~X~~

~~NEGATIVE~~

School:

Brooks BE

Speaker:

Bounak, Akhil

POINTS: ~~X~~

The better debating was done by the

Neg
AFF or NEG

from

Surli RV
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

Adrian

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Honestly both teams throughout the debate had me lost. Arguments from both sides went nowhere. Each team wasted cross fire with pointless arguing. Ultimately I sided with the Neg because their case seem to make a little more sense. With you all the best,

Good Job (u)

Novice
Rehab

SCU PHILATHLETIC INVITATIONAL

Santa Clara University

April 6-7, 2013

Flip for sides if teams have met before.

AFFIRMATIVE Leland TA POINTS: _____
School: ~~Miller KL~~
Speaker: _____

Flip

NEGATIVE Miller KL POINTS: _____
School: ~~Leland TA~~
Speaker: _____

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

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

Signed: AP. Posco

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams did a very good job by clearly stating their case, contentions and evidence. All speakers were great w/ good voice clarity, pace and enunciation. Overall, NEG did a better job rebutting AFF's arguments of Infrastructure, Air Pollution, and health benefits by arguing that India can't organize big projects effectively and poor distribution of health benefits still exists. In other words, NEG convinced me that money is not the solution in solving congestion and health issues. AFF did a great job in winning the poverty reduction argument. Considering all points, I vote for NEG in this debate. Overall, excellent debate by all parties. I enjoyed the debate. All the best!

Flight A: Start ASAP
LD Open Intervention

1

OC
2046

Semi
Finals

B

SCU PHILATHLETIC INVITATIONAL

Santa Clara University

April 6-7, 2013

Flip for sides if teams have met before.

~~NEG~~
~~NEGATIVE~~

School: Miller KL

Speaker: _____

POINTS: _____

Flip

~~AFF~~
~~NEGATIVE~~

School: Leland TA

Speaker: _____

POINTS: _____

~~AFF~~

The better debating was done by the Neg from Miller KL
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:

Neg

Aff

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

B

SCU

April 12-13th

Neg

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Miller K

Speaker: _____

Aff

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Leland TIA

Speaker: _____

FLP

The better debating was done by the

Neg
AFF or NEG

from

Miller
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

[Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

A

April 12-13th

POINTS: _____

neg team is able to provide better strong reasons based on the currently 4.69 GDP annual w/ the economy but failed to provide environmental conditions to see picture of future that mark a stronger outlook to Aff. team debate.

Notice
Rehab

SCU PHILATHLETIC INVITATIONAL

Santa Clara University

April 6-7, 2013

Santa Clara

OC
209
A

Flip for sides if teams have met before.

AFFIRMATIVE

Amador

POINTS: _____

School: AV MT

Speaker: _____

Speak

NEGATIVE

Miller

POINTS: _____

School: Miller HN

Speaker: _____

Flip
neg

The better debating was done by the Amador valley from Amador valley
AFF OR NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: for

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted for neg because the points they made were stronger.

1) the caste system they had a good point about how it was cultural and slavery wouldn't change.

2) tipping point by ignoring ~~global~~ the environment, we speed to the tipping point they mentioned.

Really, they're point about economic growth - how the richest countries have the poorest people.

Opp - you had great contentions. You should have stressed those more instead of just focusing on attacking their plan.

Otherwise you both are great debaters and this was an excellent debate.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: AU MT

School: Miller HN

Speaker: _____ Flip

Speaker: _____

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The arguments brought up by Affirm were ultimately not fully rebutted by the Neg.

Specifically I want to note the crossX. Those are great times to rebuttal points. However during the 1st cx, most of it was spent on "let me finish" or not saying anything on topic. 2nd cx I noticed Neg had a harder time rebutting Aff points.

Ultimately Aff proved their side more clearly to me.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 28.4

School: LA REINA ES

Speaker: ELLEORA SVOBODA
ES

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 29.2

School: SARATOGA SD

Speaker: SD (SNREYA DESAI)

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

SUMATHY PANICKER

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

YOUNG GENIUS

I voted for the negative
as better evidence was
presented for the value
criterion and the neg
argued very effectively against all
the intentions of aff.

A

5

Saratoga SD vs La Reina ES
Eng 107

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 27.8

School: La Reina

Speaker: ES

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 29.5
~~27.8~~

School: Saratoga

Speaker: SD

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: Colli BA

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both sides presented very well-structured and well-said arguments. However, the negative's logical progression about poverty impeding the purchase of medicine (even if the environmental resources were available for its use) really put him over the edge. Both sides pressed far in their cross-examinations over what is defined as resource extraction; this time might have been put to better use arguing/questioning other points. ~~??~~

A

5

Saratoga SD vs. La Reina ES
Eng 107

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

2:29 1:52

6373763

204

SCU

Union Prep

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 28

School: La Reina

Speaker: Sheray Desai

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 30

School: Saratoga

Speaker: SD

The better debating was done by the Neg from Saratoga
AFF OF NEG TEAM OR CONTESANT NAME

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

Signed: Austin Green

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: "Holistic"

way better evidence on Neg
way bigger impact, more countries
overall view.

Neg had a very impressive case
and was a very good speaker
This was the best Neg I have
seen

waiting time on deforestation was unwise
on Neg's part, it should Aff should have just stated
why definition proved

Flight A: Start ASAP
LD Jan/Feb Open

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

Milpitas SX vs Lynbrook HW
Dinner 107
Eng 107

AFFIRMATIVE

School:

Milpitas SX

Speaker:

POINTS: _____

NEGATIVE

School:

Lynbrook HW

Speaker:

POINTS: _____

The better debating was done by the

AFF or NEG

from

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed:

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This round was so
so close. Could be the wrong decision.
I have several places on flow that
could be winning argument

RFD: Aff solves 20% of
diseases is biggest impact

Aff says neg defends status quo, shows
in status quo china hasn't solved solution
using resource extraction, shows Aff
solves for diseases using some kind of magic
neg doesn't refute.

VC minimize suffering. 20%
of diseases is most suffering in round.

Flight A: Start ASAP
LD Jan/Feb Open

B

5

Milpitas SX vs Lynbrook HW
~~Scanner 107~~
Eng 107

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 29.1

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 29.5

School: MILPITAS

School: LYNBROOK

Speaker: SX

Speaker: HW

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: _____

[Signature]

SOMATHY

PANICKER

YOUNG GENIUS

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The neg was able to refute
aff's contention in a better way
and defend his value criterion by providing
evidence. The aff was not able to
support her contentions in a effective
manner.

B

5

Milpitas SX vs Lynbrook HW
~~22 Jan 10T~~
Eng 10T

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 29

School: Milpitas

Speaker: SX

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 27.5

School: Lynbrook

Speaker: HW

The better debating was done by the AFF from Milpitas SX
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:

The negative made good points regarding development of more safe and sustainable methods of resource extraction when R.E. is emphasized, how decreasing poverty and saving millions of lives should take priority over minimizing smaller numbers of cases of mercury poisoning and autism and that the vast majority of child workers (at least in South America) are in school and work only a few hours per day. However, the affirmative's evidence against the general safety of workers in resource extraction jobs, point that R.E. jobs do not pull people out of poverty (which the negative never fully refuted), and the social dependency/temporary nature of R.E. jobs made for a stronger argument. Her points regarding violence + advantages were also well-founded and never fully refuted. Good use of evidence from both sides.