

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

3

BH Maheshwari, H

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014 ✓

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Valey Christian OA

Young Genius KL

Omeed Askary


28.3

Katrina LE

28.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from Young Genius KL
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~~ AFF dropped third contention and argued too much over mining/extraction and not on other contentions. AFF did not have solvency or any way to be successful and help developing countries. AFF also did not defend overpopulation's static. AFF also dropped NEG's 2nd contention and cannot find a way or plan. Also did not list ways to help its country.

Room: Sobrato B-A
Flight A: Start 430
LD Jan/Feb Novice

3

~~BA Yun, Xiaohan~~

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Saratoga GS

Genghis Shyy

NO SHOW!

Young Genius RS

Radhika Shina

27.5

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

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

Signed: S. Raghun (RAGHU SAKIESIPUR) BROOKS ACAD

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The NEG debater won as it was a forfeit by the AFF debater. We waited 30 minutes but the AFF debater was a no show.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius BM

Valey Christian EN

Benjamin Macdonald 27.3

Eddy Nassif 28.3

The better debating was done by the NEG from VALLEY CHRISTIAN EN
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: S. Dym (RAGHU SAKLESHAPUR) BROOKS ACADEMY

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The NEG debater won this round for the following reasons:

- 1) ~~The AFF~~ NEG was able to make a very good case about how prioritizing RE does not mean you do not do env. protection.
- 2) The AFF debater had a hard time countering the doctrine of double effect.
- 3) ~~The~~ The AFF debater did not counter the species extinction case well that the NEG debater made.
- 4) The NEG debater summarized the points well and spoke well done.

Room: Sobrato B-D
Flight A: Start 430
LD Jan/Feb Novice

3

BH Maheshwari, H

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto CF

Young Genius AZ

Colin Fee

27.8

Allan Zhang

27.0

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

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

Signed: T. R. Raju

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG didn't really address issues other than lumping all of PRO's contentions into 1.
NEG also repeated all his contentions while dropping PRO's contentions.
NEG didn't argue, just restated his, also did not have solvency.
AFF had more of a plan than NEG and addressed more issues. They also had solvency; NEG did not address drinking and food supplies that are ~~toxin~~ poisoned.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

✓

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius GH

Grace Huang

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto CA

Chirag Akella

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from Chirag Akella
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 Neg team presented better evidence
- the Neg team had better rebuttals
ex) pointing out that no correlation between global warming and resource extraction
- You can do better job by making notes and giving speech rather than writing full sentences and reading them.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius NA

Natasha Aji

27.5

Oakwood AK

Abhi Karthikeyan

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from Abhi Karthikeyan
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 Neg Team had better rebuttals against The Aff Team's claims.
- Very close call!
- The Aff. team did very well but mistake of Mexico example hurt a little.

Room: Benson 1h
Flight A: Start 430
LD Jan/Feb Novice

3

BW 2, FHS Debate

Botsch-McBunn, Sarah

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

✓

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AnAg

Silver Creek BB

Animesh Agrawal

27

Bhargavi Bhatt

28

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:



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Vote on environmental impacts leads to destruction → very close, neg you give me some impacts w/ tar sands causing environmental problems but you basically just give turns to the Aff case. Both of you need to be clearer! It was hard for me to be sure what was being achieved by whom. Be clearer w/ impacts. I think Aff does a better job of explaining how the resource extraction will cause more harms & has bigger impacts so I go Aff.

Room: Benson 1a
Flight B: Start
LD Jan/Feb Novice

3

LD Two, MVLA

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto SY

Samuel Yun

25

Young Genius MA

Mohul Aggarwal

24

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:

Room: Benson 1a
Flight A: Start 430
LD Jan/Feb Novice

3

LD Two, MVLA

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

✓

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Silver Creek DV

Young Genius SM

Deepti Valliappan

24

Satvik Mojnidar

25

The better debating was done by the

NEG
AFF or NEG

from

Young Genius SM
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AA

Abhay Aggarwal

27.5

Young Genius AW

Austin Wang

27.2

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative

- Good tone of voice
- Great ideas/examples for argument
- strong arguments
- Good analysis

Negative

- Confident
- good eye contact
- Organize
- Debriefed the arguments very naturally.

I voted Affirmative because overall he showed a stronger argument, gave good analysis, and was able to pick up and questioned the "Negative" team, and made some stronger points.

Room: Benson 1d
Flight A: Start 430
LD Jan/Feb Novice

3

BP Wang, Shih-Ta

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius ST

Soumya Turumella

25

Young Genius RC


Rohan Cutinha

26

The better debating was done by the Neg from 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:

Neg has a stronger argument & is speaks with more confidence.

Room: Benson 1c
Flight A: Start 430
LD Jan/Feb Novice

3

2, Notre Dame

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014 ✓

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius SP

Sohil Pokharna

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius JC

John Case

_____ *No show*

The better debating was done by the

Aff
AFF or NEG

from

Young Genies
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

mm

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

No show

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014 ✓

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto CW

Young Genius RN

Candace Wang

28.1

Ram Nadula

27.3

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

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

Signed: _____

(Jianming Dong) ~~young genius~~

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative side outlined the value & criteria for environmental protection especially applicable for developing countries. Negative side cited resource extraction is key to growing economy and green technology. The affirmative did a good job emphasizing the concept of prioritization, which the negative side was a bit weaker by pointing out the importance of employment for minors.

Room: Benson 1h
Flight B: Start
LD Jan/Feb Novice

3

BW 2, FHS Debate

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014



SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker SS

Young Genius TL

Sachin Shah

27

Ted Lee

26

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:

Oral - Aff wins b/c neg fails to
clash w/ Aff case. Aff shows more
lives saved via environmental prot.

Both - work on contentions & organization
Use a world comparison.

Directly clash more!

Room: Nobili D
Flight A: Start 430
LD Jan/Feb Novice

3

BD Kanekar, Bhus

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Harker AM

Annie Ma

28.3

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AK

Aparna Kumar

28.4

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

weak cross ex

making hybrid

Neg wins thro

better

exam at the beginning

- climate change has happened
so what is the point?
- good cross ex.

- electricity / Energy

= US economy growth.

Room: Nobili I
Flight A: Start 430
LD Jan/Feb Novice

3

Jack Zhang

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker CZ

Catherine Zhao

Young Genius AG

Anusha Ghosh

The better debating was done by the

AFF
AFF or NEG

from

HARKER
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

FORFEIT —

NO SHOW.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius NH

Nicolas Hernandez

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Silver Creek RK

Ryan Karim

26

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: HyPalm

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Disclosed after round, but basically:

- Watch for dropped arguments.
 - If ~~as~~ your opponent makes an argument, be sure to go over it & have a response.
 - Aff: if your opponent does drop arguments, make sure to mention it!
- I would have liked to see more analysis of values, value criteria, and tie arguments back into values. (Both sides)

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

3

CM Nekkar, Shant

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker AA

Young Genius RA

Arjun Akkiraju

28

Rithvik Agastya

25.5

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Disclosed in round but again:

- Make sure to respond to all arguments
- Cross-examinations are definitely important. They are difficult but it really shows who is prepared, ~~one~~ ~~the~~
- Make sure to tie case back to value criteria and values!

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AD

Palo Alto ET

Andrew Dong

29.5

Ethan Teo

27.

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

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

Signed: Vandana Sheel

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Envir protection over resource extraction.

Affirmative - Yes

Quality of life is value statement
Very adequate data
Good eg's planting trees

Negative - No

Utilitarianism
- shifts thesis statement.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AmWa

Milpitas AD

Amisha Wadhwa

29.5

Aman Dosanjh

28

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

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

Signed: Vandane Sheel

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative - yes
excellent convincing points and examples.
gestures & manners excellent
examines well.

Negative - no
money needed for environment protection.
Good point that Resource Alloc generates money.
Resource extraction produces money.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Harker AH

Alan Hughes

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AS

Anish Sundar

27

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:

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| - Res Extra damages GDP. | - name 1 developing country benefitted from E.P. |
| - Govt Corrupt | - other cross-ex questions can be better framed. |
| - violence & Death. | |
| - slave / human rights. | 'rare earth need' |
| Does not | does not have good answers. |
| Strong X Ex | |

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AnCh

Harker AG

Angela Chu

28

Avi Gulati

28

The better debating was done by the APF from Young Genius [Angela]
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:

AP / V1 Sustainability, Preservation

① Does not relieve poverty. EX countries

② Resource Curse. A) strong currency
B) unemployment C) Move to Poverty

③ Risk of extinction. A) climate change B) Animal Extinction.

CE / Good cross on limited Resources

RB / Poverty Rates are going up
[new evidence] What about
Renewable Resources?

CE / weak cross

NS / utilitarian

RS is good for economy, starts on
SAUDI ARABIA

2. pollution drops as income increases
improved econ. health
Same?

③ Econ growth is vital.

R / Not enough research / Examples
to back up points. organized thinking!

Angela had more facts &
points.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius VC

Lynbrook MD

Vivian Chiang

27.5

Murugan Dhanushkodi

27.5

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

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

Signed: Sid Aslam

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AP V:30
C: enduring sustainability

- ① Increase human health. Using china as an example.
- ② Ending global warming.
- ③ Hazardous to workers using US as example?

CE Not good. Did not Ask about evidence

RB New Evidence Brazil? Iraq? Good point about RB leads to violence - 11:30 AM left!

CE Good cross. Asked about what leads to econ growth? No Answer. Asked about GDP No. Funding EPA?

A V: until. Gov. Legitimacy.

- ① Econ growth ② Mining is important to dev. country.
- ③ Local & Natural resources is critical to growth.
- ④ Many benefits to the world: reduced Aggression. Reduction in Terrorism.

RB Good counter points for refuting AFF.

better points & better cross

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Lynbrook EI

Young Genius SD

Emil Irimpan

27

Sharanya Das

26

The better debating was done by the AFF from 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:

Aff - great talking points - good speed of talking; clear & concise argument. Excellent Rebuttals - systematically took down each of Neg's contention.

Neg - you must slow down & speak more clearly; you need more info to support your case rather than just repeating the same points over & over again. Your arguments were very hard to follow - you need more organization & clearer explanations.

This room is unacceptable - I had to ask both participants multiple times to repeat what they said because I couldn't hear them.