

Diana Laureano - ELAC

124

~~Taehyun Kim - PSA~~

Open Public Forum - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 5 - 5:00PM

Room: E3 568 A

2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament

ASAP Neg Aff

Flip for Sides: Nova 42 Academy JL & DZ				Flip for Sides: ModernBrain RA & AR			
Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
2	Justin Liao	1	93	2	Ryan Aminloo	2	97
1	Daniel Zheng	3	95	1	Aryan Ray	1	98

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate. Low Point Win?

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE \_\_\_\_\_ JUDGE'S AFFILIATION ELAC

All contentions

Two contentions were given that were strong; however the arguments of the neg on them were dropped throughout the round. Aff tried to address it once, but there wasn't sufficient arguments on it for aff to access the impact to these contentions.


Neg contentions

- both teams argue that carbon emissions will continue; however, neg says by the EU joining the BRI the emissions will ↑ leading to more poverty & deaths.
- Aff: tries to delink them w/ better tech in the future but says emissions will ↑ throughout those years. You say EU is in support of green tech. You could've had used this argument to your favor by saying the emissions would not ↑ drastically in those 11 years b/c they (EU) would not allow the use of F.F. or work to ↓ in those 11 years however you concede to the ↑, leaving me to look more on which impacts are probable. The response to this - impacts were it won't happen b/c delink, but needed more offense arguments & show how they won't garner those impact; however Neg: it was also said that their impacts will happen.

good job highlighting impact at the end, could improve on voters.

arguments on neg could have been stronger. They said emissions will ↑, capitalize on it! Bill's done towards the end of new earth may end by 2030, make this stronger. We're at the point of no return on climate change. Also, others are working on reducing emissions & it's worse.

RPD: you neg b/c all contentions were dropped & on neg I'm forced to look at impacts & neg brings up 20 years of ↑ in emissions cannot be reversed & impacts outweigh w/ 900 million ppl in poverty & ↑



122

# Natalie Yates - AofHL

Open Public Forum - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 5 - 5:00PM

Room: E3 568 B

2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament

ASAP

**Flip for Sides:** ModernBrain IG & MG

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
<u>1</u>	Isabel Gan	1	99
<u>2</u>	Meghana Gunturi	2	98

**Flip for Sides:** Kudos College of Youth Leadership SH & MA

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
<u>3</u>	Shirlyn Huang	3	97
<u>4</u>	Madeline Ang	4	96

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


Low Point Win? \_\_\_\_\_

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Excellent round! Both teams had strong cases. I sided w/ Aff based on strong points ~~and~~ re EU focus w/ vsecution and framework CBA supported.

My great case but aff ~~had~~ reputation of debt trap and eu different countries sold me wonderful job!



**120** **Fidi Jimenez - ModernBrain**  
 Open Public Forum - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 5 - 5:00PM  
**Room: E3 508** 2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament  
**ASAP**

<b>Flip for Sides:</b> Kudos College of Youth Leadership KH & SG <i>CON</i>				<b>Flip for Sides:</b> Wilshire Academy AL & RK <i>AFF</i>			
Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
<i>Con</i>	Kaitlyn Huang	<u>3</u>	<u>97</u>	<i>Pro</i>	Alex Lee	<u>1</u>	<u>100</u>
<i>Con</i>	Susie Gu	<u>4</u>	<u>96</u>	<i>Pro</i>	Rich Kang	<u>2</u>	<u>99</u>

**Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.** Low Point Win? *NO*

*[Signature]*  
 JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

*ModernBrain*  
 JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Susie  
 • EU should join OBI

Utilitarianism

1) Global structure

- land prospects
- lacks transparency, can allow EU to join
- would allow china to gain global hegemony
- would propose/establish totalitarianism

2) Globalization

- colonizing nations stay for profit
- use ~~perfect~~ unsafe conditions
- Africa can become the norm

*Rich*  
 Joining BRI - consequence & benefits

- would increase infrastructure investment
- BRI reduced shipping cost 25%
- economic benefit for e.d. &

BRI

2) More job opportunity

- If EU joins BRI, unemployment ↓
- will help 32 million out of poverty
- 200,000,000 new jobs ↑ *create more jobs* than US population
- helps EU economy to be stimulated

3) Block leverage

- By joining OBRI, EU will give agency to the project

3) Climate change  
 - habitat loss can occur with the BRI  
 - 2080 - Coastal property will be below sea level

- 1.3 billion live in deteriorating lands  
 - 22.4% of population in EU are in poverty & would only perpetuate inequality  
 ↑ good on environmental harm

• looking on minimal benefit in global population  
 • BRI effect on millions will cause poverty shade

~~Climate change is already bad, infrastructure is harmful so product is FIVED - not addressing the card directly, about "clean infrastructure"~~

- Will protect from debt trap  
 - does not mention environmental friendliness  
 friendly infrastructure (look at green infrastructure)

Alex  
 • Criticism should be dropped b/c it does not provide 0 net benefit  
 - Sub 1/2 - China has debt trapped underdeveloped countries, never held on further as large as the EU  
 ex. ~~Sri Lanka~~ Sri Lanka  
 hegemonic power is not stable but transmitted

Clean air out - Sustainable infrastructure  
 Card → • Japan → economic ↑  
 Criticism is outdated

This argument is in status quo world when opposing side discussed benefits seen in its change. Did not see a link to justify this claim.  
 EU has no choice in policy including climate change - will lose leverage - GDP change?

RFD: The Aft countered environmental argument with green infrastructure card, which gave option to not only access their own benefits but also yours. Furthermore, the impact on 115 million people was possible, but as the Aft described, since developed nation, won't fail in relationship. Did not see strong enough rebuttal to defend these arguments.

Naren Borjigin


<b>119</b>	<del>Tiya Bastie</del> - AofHL																								
Open Public Forum - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 5 - 5:00PM																									
<b>Room: E3 507</b>	2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament																								
<b>ASAP</b>																									
<b>Flip for Sides: Wilshire Academy KA &amp; BA</b>	<b>Flip for Sides: ModernBrain DG &amp; JK</b>																								
<table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Pos</th><th>Name</th><th>RK (1-4)</th><th>PTS (100-70)</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>A</td><td>Kriste An</td><td>4</td><td>92</td></tr><tr><td>A</td><td>Brandon An</td><td>2</td><td>94</td></tr></tbody></table>	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)	A	Kriste An	4	92	A	Brandon An	2	94	<table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Pos</th><th>Name</th><th>RK (1-4)</th><th>PTS (100-70)</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>N</td><td>Dea Gupta</td><td>3</td><td>93</td></tr><tr><td>N</td><td>Jenny Kim</td><td>1</td><td>95</td></tr></tbody></table>	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)	N	Dea Gupta	3	93	N	Jenny Kim	1	95
Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)																						
A	Kriste An	4	92																						
A	Brandon An	2	94																						
Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)																						
N	Dea Gupta	3	93																						
N	Jenny Kim	1	95																						
<b>Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.</b>																									
Low Point Win? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																									
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE	JUDGE'S AFFILIATION																								

Aff.

Thorough case with convincing support and clear impact shown

N.

~~ETA~~  
have strong arguments  
one important card does not have credible source






<b>121</b>		<b>Matt Conrad - La Reina</b>	
		Open Public Forum - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 5 - 5:00PM	
<b>Room: E3 553</b>		2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament	
<b>ASAP</b>			
<b>Flip for Sides:</b> Kudos College of Youth Leadership AC & CL <i>Neg</i>		<b>Flip for Sides:</b> Perfect Score Academy JK & DH <i>Pos</i>	
<u>Pos</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>RK (1-4)</u>	<u>PTS (100-70)</u>
<i>2N</i>	Andy Chen	<i>1</i>	<i>92</i>
<i>3N</i>	Claire Liu	<i>2</i>	<i>90</i>
<u>Pos</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>RK (1-4)</u>	<u>PTS (100-70)</u>
<i>2A</i>	Joseph Kim	<i>3</i>	<i>88</i>
<i>3A</i>	Danny Hong	<i>4</i>	<i>87</i>
<b>Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate</b>			Low Point Win? _____
<i>Matt Conrad</i>		<i>La Reina</i>	
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE		JUDGE'S AFFILIATION	

*Speak Second*

- ① Oral critique
- ② I buy neg arg about 2.5 billion affected by climate change over 32 million out of poverty - biggest impact in round
- ③ Good neg args about Huawei spying & military bases but need to be extended earlier.
- ④ Neg FW of EU best interests makes more sense & is given more warrants than aff's net ben framework.
- ⑤ Would like to see more impact cards in rebuttals. Weighing is good but need cards to seal the deal.
- ⑥ Very good round for middle school! 😊



Eunice Kay - Wilshire

123

~~Collin Ho - Nova 42~~

Open Public Forum - Sat 10/26 Pattern A Round 5 - 5:00PM

Room: E3 559

2019 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only Tournament

ASAP

Flip for Sides: ModernBrain ST & VS

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

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
2N	Sabrina Tang	4	90
1N	Vismaya Sista	3	91

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
1A	Sophia Dai	1	93
2A	Melody Yu	2	92

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

Low Point Win? \_\_\_\_\_

[Signature]  
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Wilshire  
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Kudos won this round because in the end, they had stronger impacts. In the final focus, Modern Brain just restated their arguments instead of really highlighting their impacts and stating voters. Overall, it was a great round.

