

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 27

School: Young Genius NH

Speaker: Nicholas Hernandez

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 29

School: Palo Alto CW

Speaker: Candace Wang

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Aff case could use more stats / organization
- good debate overall
- try not to drop points
- neg won a time frame (pretty, happening now)

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Young Genius AD

Speaker: _____

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Lynbrook

Speaker: _____

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

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

Signed: MMK

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff showed that the environment could be preserved with only limited resource extraction and still give jobs and economic development. Both Aff and Neg provide economic development but only Aff ensures the quality of life by reducing disease and contamination, which fulfills Neg's value of morality and criterion of net benefits. Also Aff never claimed eliminating extraction entirely, just when in conflict with environmental protection.

A

1

Final
Arts 133

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

Young Genius AD POINTS: _____

School: Palo Alto CW

Speaker: _____

NEGATIVE

Palo Alto CW

POINTS: _____

School: Young Gen. AD

Speaker: _____

The better debating was done by the

neg
AFF or NEG

from

Palo Alto
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

neg compares
her args
slightly more

A

1

Final
Arts 133

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: _____

Palo Alto CW

Speaker: _____

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: _____

Young Gen 4D

Speaker: _____

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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

A

1

Final
Apts 133

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

FLIP

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Palo Alto CW

Speaker: _____

School: Young Men AD

Speaker: _____

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: _____

Felix Dell

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Oral

RTD

A

1 Paro Aito CWO vs Young Genies NVF
O'Connor 1c3

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 26.5

School: Paro Aito Young Genies
Speaker: Candace Nikhil T.

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 27.5

School: Paro Aito
Speaker: Candace Wang

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

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

Signed: Shantaram Nekkar

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

p neg lost the V/VC discussion. Basically he dropped it

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU
April 12-13th

1 Palo Alto CW vs Young Genius NH
G'Connor 103

Nate Clark, Paid

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Young Genius NH

Speaker: _____

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Palo Alto CW

Speaker: _____

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: MMK

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted ^{Neg} on the argument that environmental protection in developing countries can not be enforced which Aff did not ^{give my} respond to. The Neg argument of resource extraction helping developing nations flawed the value debate to the Negative.

B

1 Young Genius AD vs Lynbrook EI
O'Connor 103

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 28

School: Young Genius AD

Speaker: Andrew Dong

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 29

School: Lynbrook EI

Speaker: Emil Arimpar

The better debating was done by the

Neg
AFF or NEG

from

Lynbrook EI
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Nisij

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Aff needs to do more work on the neg case
 - line to line, turns → just claiming a lack of a link isn't going to cut it // strategy thing.
- spent way too much time on framework/observations when case was more important
- really good round though. from both speakers

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 27.0

School: Young Genius AD

Speaker: Andrew Dong

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 27.0

School: Lynbrook

Speaker: Emil Irinpan

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

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

Signed: SHANTHARAM NEKKAR

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

VERY CLOSE DEBATE!

- x) Aff wins due to:
- tighter logic across the board
 - good tying of env. benefits + economic benefits
 - consistency of points made