

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker AH

Young Genius AmWa

Alan Hughes


28.1

Amisha Wadhwa

28.3

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: NO

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Each side supported their own value criteria well and I do not see a conflicting issue between both sides.

For each rebuttal, I am looking at not only how well the arguments are presented, but how each arguments are supported by convincing citations.

It is best to have good argument supported by good citation, followed by good argument with no citation.

It is also good to reiterate points opponent missed or did not argue well in addition to present the attacking argument.

Example, each sides have opposite points, oppressed locals in poverty vs dev country benefiting locals with infrastructure build up, etc.

Neg argued the case with newer citation, overriding the older citation.

It is good to say that again in the closing speech, as AFF did not address that well.

It is better if NEG can expand just a little other than just saying "my I & II obviously refutes my opponent's I". The judge might not remember what your I & II points are.

It was a close match. Counting the argument points NEG had a slight advantage, giving NEG the win.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto SY

Young Genius AK

Samuel Yun


28.6

Aparna Kumar

26.7

The better debating was done by the AFF from Palo Alto SY
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:

Win goes to AFF because of better supporting evidence and delivery.

NEG dropped AFF's I, IV cont.

NEG had a good start, but should prepare more, cross reference evidence in anticipation of opponents response and questioning.

remember to repeat points and reinforce concepts, points against your opponent, and try to have a good closing argument by repeat your points so the judge can be reminded of why the need to vote for you.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU
April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Silver Creek DV		Young Genius VC	
Deepti Valliappan	<u>27</u>	Vivian Chiang	<u>28</u>

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

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

Signed: Curt

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted the Neg side because Neg's case is strong and it was well presented. Neg side also did a good job in cross fire sessions, asked good questions and responded well to opponent's questions.

Both presenters demonstrated good presentation skills and are well prepared. Keep up with the good work.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014
SCU
April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker CZ

Young Genius RS

Catherine Zhao

27.5

Radhika Shina

27.3

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

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

Signed: S. Rayan (RAGHU SAKLESHWAR) BROOK ACADEMY

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- The AFF won this round narrowly due to the following reasons:
- 1) The NEG debater did not show that human life extinction could be avoided by not prioritizing Env. priority over resource extraction.
 - 2) Human welfare was established as the value criteria and NEG did not show that by prioritizing RE over EP they could still ensure human welfare.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Lynbrook MD

Young Genius SP

Murugan Dhanushkodi 26.9

Sohil Pokharna 26.5

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

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

Signed: S. Raghun (RAGHU SAKLESHPUR) BROOK ACADEMY

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The debater won for the following reasons:

Both debaters were close at skillsets however ~~neg~~ aff won this round due to the following reasons:

- 1) The neg failed to show how prioritizing resource extraction over environment ~~de~~ protection in developing countries improved life expectancies. The data was compared between ~~de~~ life expectancy in developed countries vs that of developing countries.
- 2) NEG did not show that green technology can be completely renewable without depending on fossil fuels.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius BM

Harker AM

Benjamin Macdonald

28.9

Annie Ma

28.5

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

A). Benjamin Macdonald provide evidence to support the affirmative point, confident voice, fluent speech, good eye contact
need more on time ~~management~~ ^{control}
strong statement to prove the info point.
rise question to negative side to ~~argue~~ argue the negative point
give strong statement, and ~~question~~ evidence to disagree the opint from negative side.

B). Annie Ma give question for affirmative party to request the ~~prove~~ prove of her's affirmative point.
provide strong evidence to support the negative point
good eye contract
confident voice, and strong ^{point,} statement
the statements are clear and ~~easy~~ ^{easy} understand
use em. in a few time.
missing ^{one} specific evidence to the question from affirmative side.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto CW

Young Genius SD

Candace Wang

29

Sharanya Das

25

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: KS

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

A) Candace Wang
 good eye contract.
 provide strong evidence to support the affirmative point
 confident voice.
 answer the question from negative side, explain ^{point} clearly and...
 the speech is clear and easy to understand.
 answer the question clearly
 dominated crossfire.
 well prepared and performance during debate.

B) Sharanya Das
 provide evidence to support the negative point.
 rise question to affirmative side to question the affirmative statement
 need speak more clear and have a better eye contract.
 no special number and example to support her question to affirmative side.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto CA

Chirag Akella

28.3

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius KL

Katrina LE

28.

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

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

Signed: Rekhi Kaumthar

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This is difficult to judge as both debaters did well and refuted well.
Neg spoke well ^{very} good intonation and volume
Aff sometimes ~~did~~ spoke too fast and sometime slurred in opening, but better in rebuttal

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius RA

Palo Alto ET

Rithvik Agastya

26

Ethan Teo

28

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

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

Signed: Robbi Kaunhik

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg refuted Aff better.

Neg spoke clearly + good intonation

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Saratoga GS

Young Genius RN

Genghis Shyy

28

Ram Nadula

26

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

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

Signed: _____

Poonam Yadav

[Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFFIRMATIVE:

- well prepared speech, with clearly defined contentions
- speech was timed well.
- During cross-examination round, all points addressed well.

NEGATIVE:

- case was prepared well, & timed well too.
- speaker didn't sound confident about his debate
- He had 2 contentions, during cross-fire round speaker was unable to answer opponent questions for 2nd contention.
- I would advice to prepare contentions better with more facts.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius NA

Natasha Aji

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Milpitas AD

Aman Dosanjh

27.2

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

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

Signed: _____

R. J. ...

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This was an interesting debate where Affirmative really contended well in the last round of debate & cross-fire round.

Both affirmative and negative had good cases.

Negative

- well prepared debate with good timing.
- had good facts for her contentions
- could have done better if she have used some of her facts against opponent like 1 trillion rev., 13 country pollution

Affirmative

- well prepared & presented debate
- contested her opponent well in cross-fire with good facts.
- could have done better for her own facts for 2 contentions she has like GDP. She got lucky opponent didn't raise questions during cross-fire.

14 - Flight B

LD JanFeb
NOVILE

Judge:
Khan, Hamda

Aff	Neg
Omeed Askary Valley Christian GA	Yang Genius AA Abhay Agornal
pts Ball	pts
<u>29.5</u>	<u>30</u>

Ballot given to: Neg, Youngs AA

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius NH

Oakwood AK

Nicolas Hernandez

28.5

Abhi Karthikeyan

28.4

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

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

Signed: [Signature] (LYNBROOK WANG)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative:

(IAC): Resolutions were given by contentions. Analysis, reasoning and evidence were given through contentions.

(CR): Requested to clarify the criteria with good reply.

(IAR): Refutation against opponent were comprehensive and general.

(2NR): Argumentation about the example summary was given impressively.

Negative:

(1NR): The value (resolution) was given by criteria, which are reasonable with evidence.

Rebuttal against opponent with acceptable reasons.

(CX): Questions were asked without any directions.

(2NR): Rebuttals against opponent repeated contentions with evidence and reasonings.

Decision: I voted AFFIRMATIVE, Young Genius NH, to have better debate.

The reasons: Overall both sides gave good analysis evidence and reasoning.

However negative side gave and insisted the resolutions (values) presented. The logic and persuasion were not strong enough to support it. Affirmative side gave general and clear resolution and summary.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius ST

Harker AA

Soumya Turumella

27.5

Arjun Akkiraju

28.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from HARKER AA
AFF of NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: [Signature] (SHIH-TAY WANG)
LYNBROOK HS

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative:

(1) Definitions were given acceptably.
(AC) Contentions outlined were comprehensive.
Cross Exam: Requested by opponent was not replied clearly.
Explained to questions were not confident.

(2) Rebuttal against opponent with reasonings.
(1AR) Repeated resolution (contentions) with reasonings were not strong enough.

(2AR) Rebuttal against opponent's contentions without strong reasoning.
Summary about resolution offered was given unimpressively.

Negative:

(1) Obligation was the points to priority. Contentions with evidence and reasonings were given acceptably.
The logic and analysis presented were impressive.

Cross Exam: Questions asked by opponent were answered acceptably. Resolutions offered were also reasonable.

(2NR): Analysis and refutation provided were impressive.

Decision:

I voted NEGATIVE, HARKER AA, to have better debating because the analysis, evidence reasoning and refutation were better. The way to delivery the contentions was also impressive to support the case.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AnAg

Palo Alto CF

Animesh Agrawal

29

Colin Fee

28

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both debaters did a great job with the research and preparations. The points and contentions were clearly articulated. The speed of the speeches were a little off the faster side for me but overall they did a good job considering that I had requested them to slow down up front. All in all, a close competition but I am voting "Aff" because of the contentions and value. From a delivery perspective, both debaters did well and were loud, clear, with good hand gestures and eye contact. Good luck to you both.
Great job!!!

Room: Benson 1d
Flight A: Start 1230
LD Jan/Feb Novice

5

BA Huang, Ben

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius SM

Satvik Mojnidar

no show

Young Genius TL

Ted Lee

The better debating was done by the Nee from Young Genius TL
AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Hong Kin - Miller Young Genius

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Silver Creek BB

Young Genius RC

Bhargavi Bhatt

29

Rohan Cutinha

28

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

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

Signed: TSolanki

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted AFFIRMATIVE debater to win because she gave very strong point and good arguments, like value of morality, stop air pollution, water, people died for air pollution. Also she gave good point about raising atmosphere, like, flooding, sea level, so, her arguments and points were more convincing one. so I have chosen Aff. debater to win.

* Bhargavi Bhatt :

> She is good speaker and looks like she is more confident in her speaking ability but still she should work hard.

> She gave good answer in cross-examination round she strongly think that developing country should prioritize environmental protection

> neg debater wanted more evidence so, please next time prepare more with evidences, which ever you

PUSH

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius JC

Young Genius MA

John Case

26.3

Mohul Aggarwal

27.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from Mohul Aggarwal
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 resource extraction won over
 environmental protection as all the ~~and~~ contentions
 put by ~~the~~ environment protection is rebutted
 by resource extraction. Examples are as follows:

1. Economy Impact - China is in top 20 economies which is a resource extraction.
2. Society Impact - poverty - hunger - No proper evidence as #1 disproved the rebuttal by Affirmative.
3. However Affirmative gave good impact on water/air pollution but ~~was~~ this was not shown how impacts economy/social welfare which was debated with minimal affirmative ~~and~~ debate.

Room: Benson 1a
Flight A: Start 1230
LD Jan/Feb Novice

6373463

5

Botsch-McGuhn, S

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

4

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Lynbrook EI

Young Genius AD

Emil Irimpan

28

Andrew Dong

27

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFD: (3) Resource extraction hurts econ
resource curse
Nigeria card

Learn how to flow

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

5

Botsch-McGuhn, S

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014
SCU
April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius GH
Grace Huang

26 

Valey Christian EN
Eddy Nassif

29 

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:

RFD: won on every single issue

Room: Benson 1c
Flight A: Start 1230
LD Jan/Feb Novice

5

Raghu Sakleshpur

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014
SCU
April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Silver Creek RK

Young Genius AnCh

Ryan Karim

30


Angela Chu

0

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

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

Signed: _____



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Angela Chu didn't show up.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AW

Austin Wang

30

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker AG

Avi Gulati

29

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Austin started off well with his case and did a good job in defending his arguments. Avi also started off well with his case but didn't have a strong rebuttal which was needed to overcome his opponent. Austin defended his case overall well compared to his opponent and Avi didn't argue overall strong enough.

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

5

~~GM Nekkar, Shant~~

Miller

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker SS

Young Genius AS

Sachin Shah

27

Anish Sundar

28

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: Wump

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This is a very close debate. Both AFF and Neg demonstrated good preparation and did a good job to present their cases. I voted the Neg side as the Neg side's debating technique is slightly better than AFF side. Both side debaters are ~~confident~~ confident speakers.