

133

Israel Beltran - Wilshire

Open Public Forum - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 6 - 6:30PM

Room: E3 559

2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament

ASAP

Flip for Sides: ModernBrain DG & JK

Flip for Sides: Nova 42 Academy JL & DZ

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
N	Dea Gupta	1	100
N	Jenny Kim	3	98

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
A	Justin Liao	2	99
A	Daniel Zheng	4	97

De-A
Funny

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

28 country
Chinese
152 country
recession
2nd decade
900 mill
1. Trade EU
Belgium

300 billie
depth
BRI

China EU influence
2014 rule industrial china EU

Cases
80% in
90 mill pov
Debt
trans
BRI fund
"Some"
ev HRY
China
pays
back
loans
help
US

Def Value
view
cost
Yale 126 - BRI global emissions
China Global warming
no transparency
economically
ecch survival
BRI depend on China
corruption
human rights

3 points agree corrup
EU - Den BRI - not help

AFF

Overall great job
Ultimately Neg had
answer q-w/q II

Attack 8 billie
harm

BRI

Status Quo already harms

Volume (+)

help economy

Pro china (No)

HRA

Co-op > conflict

70% recess
prevent

trade EU

EU influence China

helps w/ ports

BRI - coal ~~etc~~ Status
economy overlook

from all 4 of you
more confidence

NEG

RFD BRI tool EU
countries

answers questions more
than asks

Long term ours
next yr

china pro china

BRI ~~debt~~ ~~debt~~
debt

Dead Planet Cycle (?)

Genemi 1st time

Union failed

china ctrl acquire

** China 13 ports **

agree quality
inevitable 100 mill. 2024

Trilateral

Stick w/ each other
don't ~~be~~ make your
partner look bad

~~White Yates~~ ~~AofHL~~ ~~Eric Strauss~~ ~~ETAC~~

130 **Tiya Basilio - AofHL**
 Open Public Forum - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 6 - 6:30PM
 Room: E3 553 2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament
 ASAP **Aff 2nd** **Neg 1st**
Flip for Sides: Wilshire Academy AL & RK **Flip for Sides:** Kudos College of Youth Leadership AC & CL

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
4	Alex Lee	1	99	3	Andy Chen	2	93
2	Rich Kang	3	92	1	Claire Liu	4	89

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate. Low Point Win? **Yes**
 JUDGE'S SIGNATURE Philharmonic JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

EU is Not a Country!

"Aff outweighs the enjiv on" is not an answer to a 9.

Both teams do a good job in the constructives of "Flowpacting," or impacting how the judge ought link various warrants and impacts to FW to determine the round.

@ Andy: Excellent Xtending FW in the rebuttal!
 @andy: Great job addressing the jobs question in the NR
 Page 8/8 - Oct-26 07:52 pm

@ Rich: use cross for Quest and answers, not to make arguments
 @ Rich: conceding the jobs an chinese means it has no impact under either FW!
 strong impacting! Your FW is EU CBA

@ Alex
 @ Rich: none of those things were stated

wow, what an impactful
Grand cross! I think
Negs + stole this round.

@Alex: you just conceded
CC kills more.
And in your AR, you
answered Neg
environ. args
with "Aff impacts
outweigh enviro.
damages." This
means you are
conceding all the
impacts neg claims.

aff's
a
wash

extending
saving
lives
hurts

you here, @Alex

131

Arthur Kozloyan - ModernBrain

Open Public Forum - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 6 - 6:30PM

Room: E3 568 A

2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament

ASAP

Flip for Sides: Kudos College of Youth Leadership SD & MY

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
2	Sophia Dai	3	96
1	Meiody Yu	4	95

Flip for Sides: Wilshire Academy KA & BA

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
2	Kriste An	1	99
1	Brandon An	2	97

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Modern Brain

NEC

- 900 nil
- Mumbling over words
- Analogy of "Debt trap" is good but too fast
- Easier access via trade routes
- Please learn to say Myanmar / opoids too
- 900 nil out of poverty

AE

- 32 nil out of
- 900 nil pro r/e but w/ BPI
- CBT
 - trade growth 3 states on adds to trade 2 internet trade w/ BPI
 - EU benefits 3 US not attracted trader
 - Dis not with
- Don throw shots @ me but you need to contextualize them for me & the international's further options

CR

Not cohesive on both sides w/ too much back & forth, arguing over strength of EU & other nations' capability of handling BPI in regards to Debt traps

- EU can apply ideas to BPI but China steals ideas & cause total loss of money
- Good examination of welfare of workers
- Not clear this doesn't go through workers are not protected
- Rep of EU damaged if EU gives money by not engaging but I don't know how trade becomes cheaper

- China is in open trade agreement
- Not clear how environment will not be as affected as expected
- Compelling point how China is better off w/o stealing ideas but trade record seems otherwise
- EU sees greentech in GDP & unemployment
- Not sure why their combined being so strong matters, there needs to be a reason

CA
• Terrorist cells can utilize roads
• Not ~~clear~~ clear on question of internet theft

• Should any be frontloading will ~~there~~ be law
des to roads being new? monitored
• This question should've been shut down earlier

• Lost potential of stunning CBFA w/ boss
• Good on labour law violations & Sri Lanka's
lease taken by China
• A little vague for reaching @ end of speech

• Not creating a presence when addressing chamber
• Not detailing how Eilat will not fall into Debt Traps
• There is US pushing Eilat away, no evidence
proposed our attorneys at all during of past evidence

CA
• BFA already rejected once
• Just cause China shouldn't be
doesn't mean the don't, they do A LOT
• Like you saw when asked not say
"you can find it if you look it up"


• Should've used this as an opportunity to
amend proposal, could've saved the BFA as a whole,
this was a huge blow to your case & well ignored
• Good job holding composure

• Didn't fully develop human trafficking
point
• QOD not doesn't mean that none of
them can't be in poverty, that's not
how poverty works, poverty occurs from
inaction at such a large scale & not a
single detail of who or why was clearly
stated

• CBFA brought up again way too late, you
need to keep it @ the forefront
• Good, at least recognizes some level of job
creation
• Not enough detail on ~~economic~~ environmental harm
• But can he just ignore Middle East losing money

AFD
NEla had the more directed
ideas & choices of thought, AFF
knew what they wanted too but had
trouble keeping pace & adapting.
NEla took lead & made AFF follow
and unfortunately gave them more
control of the conversation

Richard Hu - ELAC

132		Miyoung Yoo - AofHL		Open Public Forum - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 6 - 6:30PM			
Room: E3 568 B				2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament			
ASAP							
Flip for Sides: Kudos College of Youth Leadership SH & MA			Flip for Sides: ModernBrain IG & MG				
Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
N1	Shirlyn Huang	2	100 99	A1	Isabel Gan	1	100
N2	Madeline Ang	4	97	A2	Meghana Gunturi	3	100 98
Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.				Low Point Win? _____			
 JUDGE'S SIGNATURE				ELAC JUDGE'S AFFILIATION			

Neg comments

- * Great voice, tone, and speed
- * Great point 1
- * Not sure I buy argument #2 and #3 - I see what you are saying w/ the authoritarian and Huawei argument but what's the link? Isn't agreements like the BRI contingent on terms, agreements, etc? It does not seem unique to me, rather just a problem w/ China, but not unique to the BRI deal
- * Careful w/ the US link - it's an EU res
- * Elaborate more in your rebuttal speech - basically your whole speech should be just addressing your opponents arguments, rather than re-phrasing yours; that's what 3rd and 4th speeches are for

* Remember to tell me

1. Why they are wrong, 2. what that means

Aff comments (maybe don't say, "judge, earlier you said.")

- * First Halloween sentence was not needed
- * Great point 1
- * Condense your definition: HS long
- * I am not sure I get the point 2 and point 3 - I would rather that you, as the affirmative, provide me an offensive argument, rather than defensive. Incorporate themes of the defensive argument, but you need to as the aff, prove that the BRI makes something better, that's your burden as aff.
- * Good handling of CX (first speaker and second)
- * Beginning of the rebuttal is not necessary
- * "creating jobs is solving poverty" - I want the summary
- I think you mean reducing poverty
- * Elaborate more in your rebuttal - you do a lot of rebuttals - but a lot of them do not elaborate on why your response is true, or why it matters: tell me:
 1. why they are wrong, 2. what that really means

Both sides

* Both sides need clear signposting and rebuttals.

For instance: use exact language similar to:

"My opponent's first argument was _____." They're saying that
bc _____, then _____. ~~That's~~ That's not true, we have 3 responses

✓ ^{the} First, ^{the} argument because _____,"

Second, the argument is misleading because _____."

Third, their link ~~isn't~~ doesn't prove anything since _____."

- Using clear language helps me alot: especially on a topic like the BZE.
- Both summaries need a little work

For Neg: treat it (moduh) like a summary of the round

- tell me what your arguments were, how your opponent responded, and why your arguments still flew through

Ex: "our first arg was _____, we talked about how _____. our opponent's response was, _____. But judge, remember that my partner already stated _____, meaning that _____."

For Aff: you have the structure down ↗ just give more specifics!

→ Don't say, "It's not specific," tell me EXACTLY what your responses on the flow were → it's a summary, not a rebuttal

* Both teams were active ~~and~~ during ground cross - good job

- Don't focus on small things in your final focus speech - focus on VOTERS

* Both final focus: structure and specificity!

- Tell me your 2 or 3 voters: then tell me what you have said on these voters - weigh it, impact calc, etc. (very similar to summarize summary speech, but less summary and ~~more~~ more weighing)

- Pick your most important voters to talk about!

- Aff could be on econ benefits and partnership

- Neg could be debt and authoritarian

- Not. Everything is Sacred: Pick your fights wisely and smart