

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto ET

Young Genius AnAg

Ethan Teo


27.3

Animesh Agrawal

27.5

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: NO.

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I would have voted for AFF except that AFF dropped NEG's cont III & IV.
In what was argued, AFF had made stronger points, but did not
do so across all contentions.

The value crit was supported well by AFF, as the linkage to ~~global~~ preserve
life globally, while NEG did not link local quality of life as
well ~~to~~ globally.

NEG did drop some minor points by AFF, but not as much as AFF
has dropped, thereby weakened AFF's argument as a whole,
which gave NEG the win.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius MA

Palo Alto CF

Mohul Aggarwal

26.5

Colin Fee

27.8

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: NO

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The win is for NEG because.

1. AFF did not address NEG's contentions I C & II. Dropped
2. AFF dropped NEG rebuttal regarding CO2 (global warming agent) actually produced more food.
3. NEG had a stronger closing argument/summary.

NEG side should time manage better. Ran out of time, thereby dropping AFF cont IV.

AFF should not use new argument. Try to spend time more efficiently. Instead of citing all examples of mining accidents, use the time to strengthen other points.

should try to distinguish between local vs global social welfare (value crit)
that mining accidents are local by nature.

Try not to be too emotional. Keep calm.

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

4

Alex Feerer Bent

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius RN

Harker CZ

Ram Nadula

27.1

Catherine Zhao

28.0

The better debating was done by the NEGATIVE from CATHERINE ZHAO
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

Harindu Pal Kan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: Nobili D
Flight A: Start 830
LD Jan/Feb Novice

4

Alex Feerer Bent

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius RC

Harker AM

Rohan Cutinha

29.1

Annie Ma

28.1

The better debating was done by the AFFIRMATIVE from ROHAN CUTINHA
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

Harinder Pal Kaur

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AS

Anish Sundar

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker AA

Arjun Akkiraju

27

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: Del Anitta Garguly

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF's ~~ba~~ ~~original~~ speech was more structured. And he more effectively argued against the NEG's contention.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Valey Christian EN

Eddy Nassif

29

Young Genius AD

Andrew Dong

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from Valey Christian
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:

AFF focused ~~on~~ ^{on} prioritization of Env. protection over res. extraction. By arguing that only when the two are in conflict Env. protection needs to be prioritized, he won the debate.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Oakwood AK

Young Genius BM

Abhi Karthikeyan

26

Benjamin Macdonald

24.50

The better debating was done by the AFF from Oakwood AK
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: improving quality life. disaice... provide more evidents provides drills; more values good arguement & strategies.
Country has hurt by resource

Cross-examination: ~~too little~~ Need more ~~research~~ refutation ^{of} the neg. ~~points~~ resource natural usage. strong and refutate the ~~point of~~ ~~for~~ ~~usage~~ for support his idea. Should not use the word "stupid" during the argumentation

Neg: Good arguement about the source. Negative case was asked developing country should priority the natural resource usages example south africa: provide more jobs. renewal energy. argument: money and save environment example, China, india ~~resource~~ resource can be hurt country - resource is out of date

Cross-examination: Strong evident Final rebuttal is good

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius RS

Radhika Shina

24.50

Palo Alto CW

Candace Wang

28.50

The better debating was done by the NEG from Palo Alto CW
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: developing country - natural Resource contention is clear.
economic grow vs. Natural Resource. Need more familiar
the materials. Four contentions were not very strong.
cross-examination: need more prep work. Improve the voice of
your deliver - need strong voice
argument of third contention.

NEG: value criteria environment protection should be prioritized.
excellent arguments with strong examples. explain how to
priority of what should do and shouldn't. for the resource
and policy, economic and GDP indicated.
restructure resource - very good point. extend the benefit
cross examination argument about resource was used - make
argument about aff's evidence and prove.
Finally re-reputation drills - one by one very
clear about all the points.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius SD

Saratoga GS

Sharanya Das

27

Genghis Shyy

28

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

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

Signed: _____

R. S. Lami

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted NEGATIVE because he had good point and gave proper evidence, like, Mahatma Gandhi (help ~~poor~~ poverty) died people because poverty. If reduce poverty, less violence, good education, which were good and strong point from neg. debater. He was saying that ^{first} we should protect and help poverty not environment pollution, I think it was strong point from his side.

NEGATIVE

Genghis Shyy.

He ~~is~~ is good speaker but still needs to improve his speaking ability, and clarity.
→ he gave good point that we should help poverty first, gave example, Zimbabwe, India.
→ died people from poverty.
→ basic needs food, cloth, shelter, a better life

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius TL

Ted Lee

26

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Lynbrook EI

Emil Irimpan

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from Lynbrook EI
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:

I have choosen NEGATIVE debatter to win this debate because he had good point and good argumen for this topic. his arguments were more conviniente he gave growth and development point, gave good point that economic ^{Resorges} decress Terrorist attack. Clearly NEGIVE debatter established his very more effective Evidence.

NEGATIVE -

Emil Irimpan - You ~~are~~ ^{are} good speaker, you

gave good and effective Evidence to win this debate. Still you have to work on your speech.

- ~~be~~ be more confident. next time

- gave effective Evidence about terrorist attack and net benife of the people.

Room: Benson 1d
Flight A: Start 830
LD Jan/Feb Novice

4

31, Leland Judge

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker AG

Young Genius ST

Avi Gulati

29

Soumya Turumella

27

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

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

Signed: Robbi Kaunke

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff refuted Neg points better.
Aff countered Neg rebuttals better.
Aff spoke clearly and projected voice.
Neg sometimes spoke softly.
Neg had good arguments too.

Room: Nobili F. Benson 1d
Flight # Start 830
LD Jan/Feb Novice

4

31, Leland Judge

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius JC

Young Genius VC

John Case

27

Vivian Chiang

27.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from Young Genius - Vivian Chiang
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Robbi Kaurhok

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG refuted Aff contentions better.

Neg and Aff both had good points

Neg spoke a bit monotone.

Aff spoke a bit softly.

Room: Benson 1h
Flight A: Start 830
LD Jan/Feb Novice

4

Rama Aysola

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014 ✓

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AW

Valey Christian OA

Austin Wang

26

Omeed Askary

28

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I chose Omeed because he had a great strong argument. He was confident and he was organized; Well respected to others. He asked good questions and had good answers from opponents questions

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

4

Rama Aysola

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Silver Creek BB

Young Genius AA

Bhargavi Bhatt

28

Abhay Aggarwal

27

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- great performance
- great information
- very confident
- Answers were great

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AK

Aparna Kumar

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Silver Creek DV

Deepthi Valliappan

30

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aparna started off well with her case but didn't make arguments convincing enough compared to her opponent. Deepthi started off well with her case and argued well in defending her case and counter-argued well against her opponent very well which was very convincing and impressive.

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

4

Partha Ray

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius KL

Harker AH

Katrina LE

29

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:

Katrina started off well with her case but didn't well her case compared to her opponent. Allan started well with his case and came strong in defending his case against Katrina and was very impressive and convincing compared to Katrina during rebuttals.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius RA

Rithvik Agastya

27

NEGATIVE

Palo Alto SY

Samuel Yun

POINTS

28

Winner ✓

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

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

Signed: NEG

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Framework! -

AFF argued for welfare and NEG argued for morality. NEG proved that ^{morality} is best achieved when we use the criterion of util. NEG had clear and consistent framework with the arguments that link back to the standard.

Case Analysis! -

Both AFF and NEG had well organized speeches in IAC/INC. The arguments were well supported by adequate evidences. However, arguments were all over the place by AFF. He could have used the ~~ex~~ strong evidences to refute NEG's case on contention basis - methodically. NEG addressed all important points in rebuttal. My vote is for ~~A~~ NEG based on framework debate and cx. Good off timer roadmap presentation. — by both.

AFF - Appropriate speaking pace, volume, inflection

NEG - Skillful use of language, Fluency of speech, composure, appearance, professional demeanor.

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

4

CM Young, Pete

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius SM

Satvik Mojnidar

no shaw

NEGATIVE

Harker SS

Sachin Shah

POINTS

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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Framework: -

NegBYE

Case Analysis: -

Presentation: -

Room: O'Connor 103
Flight B: Start
LD Mar/Apr Open

4

~~AB Dong. Young G~~

SANDEEP MANGAL

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Mountain View AJ

Avery James

No Show

Evergreen RS

Ramneek Singh

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Mountain view AJ did not show up
in Room until 10 mins wait -
This was the Flight B of the round,
thus, is a no show contestant.
No debate happened.

Room: Benson 1g
Flight A: Start 830
LD Jan/Feb Novice

4

~~Sid Askray~~

PUSH

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AZ

Allan Zhang

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius SP

Sohil Pokharna

28.5

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: _____

Dewi Huang

DEWI HUANG

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

calm ^{speaker} & well thought out case presented.

Good refutation

Neg

well articulated, confident speaker
passionate about topic
Need better credentials of sources of information.

good refutation
good summary of ~~the~~

I voted Neg because he offers a compelling case with good summary of points and refutation

Room: Nobili H
Flight A: Start 830
LD Jan/Feb Novice

4

LD Two, MVLA

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Milpitas AD

Aman Dosanjh

PRESENT

Young Genius AnCh

Angela Chu

NO SHOW

The better debating was done by the ASF 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:

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

4

LD Two, MVLA

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Lynbrook MD

Murugan Dhanushkodi

24 25

Young Genius NA

Natasha Aji

27

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:

AFF
1+1+1
1+1+1
NEG
1+1+1
1+1+1
1+1+1

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU
April 12-13th

Sunelar Ramamoorthy
Young Genius ✓

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto CA

Chirag Akella

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius NH

Nicolas Hernandez

27.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from Young Genius NH
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

- 6 min speech: Monotonous
Good rebuttal.

• (CrossEx: Could not pin NEG)

• Speech: Good points made.

5 min:

NEG

(CrossEx: some questions not relevant for argument.

7 min: Much better diction & stress on key points

Spent 1.5 min to respond to AFF statement - Good

NEG wins CrossEx with strong response

6 min: Impactful responses with clatipant

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU
April 12-13th

Sunday Ramamoorthy
Young Genius

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Silver Creek RK

Ryan Karim

26.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AmWa

Amisha Wadhwa

27.5



The better debating was done by the NEG from Young Genius AmWa
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
Speech: Monotonous
Weak rebuttal.

(CROSS EX): Not strong on questions, had
some good points but be more
precise on 'pinning' the opponent

3min: You forgot opp 3rd contention!!

NEG.

(CROSS EX): Pinned AFF with good questions
speech: 7min:
Well read, clear

6min: Strong rebuttal on points & fact
that opponent did not address 2
contentions, & did not have more than
1 data source