

Christopher Uhler - Aveson

Room: E3 425

2018 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45

Ballot Due: 3:45

Side 1: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
RGAT

Side 2: Magnet Academy GSCS

Pos	Name	Neg	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)	Pos	Name	Aff	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
1	Ryan Geng	✓	4	26	1	Gyan Shrivastava	✓	1	28
2	Alan Tan	✓	3	26	2	Chris Song	✓	2	27

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

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

~~8:00~~ Less sources (or at least doesn't state them)
2 min.

~~8:00~~
~~8:00~~

~~8:00~~
1:30

✓4
✓4
✓3
✓4
✓4
✓3
✓2
✓2
✓3
✓2
✓3

Room: E3 421

2018 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45

Ballot Due: 3:45

Side 1: Wilshire Academy DHJJ

Side 2: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
AZJM

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
3	Darren Hwang		26	1	Alen Zhang	26	
4	Janice Jin		24	2	Jevon Mao	27	

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

Low Point Win? ____

Aff 2nd. JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Kudos.
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION reg 1st

Jevon	Alan	Darren Daniel	Darwin Danner
	- good answers on cross - don't say they "lied" - try and say "the were incorrect when they said" - Be polite to your opponents	- nice roundmap. - try and provide more specific examples for rather than saying there is no evidence.	- good questions on cross

For all: Aff - framework - more clash

- Don't accuse each other of being liars, just say "X" is incorrect.

Decision Aff: Reasunny

- 1) Aff wins framework debate b/c neg ~~was~~ concedes that "cost to U.S." is included in cost benefit analysis. In final focus, neg uses affs framework, which tells me I can weigh this round using cost benefit.
- 2) Economic arguments (cost vs moral rights) were a tie, neither side convinced me whether or not A) U.S. keeps chilling with no law suits or B) U.S. ~~loses~~ loses access from ~~signed~~ treaty
- 3) Neg does not substitute claim about "transfer of tech"

- and therefore loses that point
- Aff narrowly wins South China sea point.
 - reg made good case that the U.S joining treaty would not make big difference
 - But Aff convinced me that the treaty would slightly reduce chance of war by improving U.S ~~chance~~ soft power

Room: E3 557

2018 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45

Ballot Due: 3:45

Side 1: Emerson Community Charter School
MRKC

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
-----	------	----------	---------------

F	Marcus Razo	2	29
---	-------------	---	----

F	Katie Cohen	4	25
---	-------------	---	----

Side 2: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
KGJW

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
-----	------	----------	---------------

A	Katelyn Gan ¹	3	26
---	--------------------------	---	----

A	Julianne Wu ²	1	28
---	--------------------------	---	----

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

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

ELAC Speech Team

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

APP

3:48^{MR} Katie:

- 1st speaker
- Need more voice projection and voice inflection
- Try to enunciate a little bit more

3:09 Marcus: 2nd speaker

- Great voice projection and inflection!
- Try to be more selective with hand gestures (right hand occasionally rising is a little distracting)

1:58 Katie:

- You need emphasize important aspects of your argument - currently your argument is monotone and not as strong as it could be

4:49 Marcus:

- Sound more confident before beginning arguments
- Very strong argument overall

* Julianne: 1st speaker, 4:32

- Good voice projection
- Sound more confident when answering questions ~~you need to sound more confident in what you are saying (you did well for the most part!)~~

30 sec prep
Katelyn: 2nd speaker, 4:01

- Good strong voice and projection

~~Katelyn~~ Julianne: 1:24

- Try to have your thoughts more together when heading up there the second time

• When saying your source is from "professionals" you should probably say who and where they're from - otherwise source may seem questionable

Katelyn: 2:04

- Try to prepare your thoughts better before going up to speak again

Room: E3 521

2018 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45

Ballot Due: 3:45

^{AFF}
Side 1: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
AYHZ

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
2	Ava Ye	1	29
1	Helaine Zhao	3	28

^{NEG}
Side 2: Nova 42 Academy AKRC

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
2	Andrew Kim	2	29
1	Ryan Choi	4	28

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

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

RACIT

IAC - MY ONLY COMMENT IS THE LINE OF QUESTIONING ABOUT METHANE. THE NEG RESPONDED WITH THE FACT THAT METHANE USAGE CAN BE RAMPED UP, ~~WHICH~~ AVOID QUESTIONS THAT PRESUME IMPACTS DON'T EXIST ON A ~~SEA~~ SCALE AND ASSUME THEY CAN BE SWITCHED ON OR OFF.

ZAC - YOU NEED MORE RESPONSES! ATTACK THE UNIQUENESS, LINK, AND IMPACT OF AN ARGUMENT. YOUR TWO RESPONSES MITIGATE THE ARGUMENT B/C TREATIES DON'T STOP ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE OFFSHORE DRILLING ALTOGETHER. YOU NEED TO DE-LINK THE ARGUMENT BY SAYING THE TREATIES OVERRIDE UNCLUS ALTOGETHER, PROVING THAT THERE WOULDN'T BE ANY CHANGE IN DRILLING IF WE AFFIRM. HOWEVER, B/C YOU SAY ARCTIC RESOURCES WILL BE GAINED I HAVE TO ASSUME THE TREATY DOESN'T STOP DRILLING.

ZAR - INSTEAD OF LISTING RESPONSES OR IMPACTS, EXPLAIN WHAT THEY MEAN AND COMPARE THEM.

However, the rebuttals by Neg were mostly untested

INC - GOOD CLARANCE & PROJECTION YOUR CASE FOLLOWS A SOLID CLIMATE CHANGE NARRATIVE W/ SOLID WARRANTIES AND IMPACTS, I SUGGEST YOU CHANGE THE LAST IMPACT UP C2 W/ THE 5125 billion impact you read in rebuttal.

ZNC - Great responses, just remember to extend them into FF.

INR - GOOD BLOCK TO ENVIRO. BLOCK FROM AFF WHEN YOU SAY COMPANIES SPEAK AROUND REGULATIONS

ZNR (FF) - NEXT TIME, WEIGH YOUR IMPACTS AGAINST YOUR OPPONENT'S.

RFD: Because the neg responded to the two environmental responses w/ the response that companies circumvent laws like these, I have to weigh a small economic gain against a large economic loss and a worsening of climate change b/c of drilling. However, an explanation and comparison of the impacts of reducing trafficking ~~and~~ and increasing global leadership would've won ~~the~~ the round.

METHANE ISN'T ALL OR NOTHING!

ASK WHY a's

FW a wasn't very good

How does this refute?

Room: E3 508

2018 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45

Ballot Due: 3:45

Side 1: Alex Lee

~~ALEX~~

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
1	Alex Lee	1	30

Side 2: Kudos College of Youth Leadership

JLLW

~~NEA~~

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
1	Jeffrey Liu	3	27
2	Luke Wu	2	24

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

Low Point Win? ____

[Signature]
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Hired
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Alex,

I appreciate the puns! comy + cheesy, but totally awesome!

This was such a spectacular round from both the AFF + NEG.

You are so clean + clear, it's amazing. You have a very structured + understandable approach to your contentions. Great use of your study + resources and being able to turn around the opponent's arguments. I can definitely follow your logic.

Jeff + Luke,

What a dynamic duo! You two are phenomenal + it was a pleasure judging this round.

Your contentions were so clear + constructive, but I was hoping to hear more substantial impacts!

I would also like to ask if you can elaborate the benefits of mining REMs.

Wonderful job!

APPE NEE

UAT

saves most \$

enviro

① Climate losses
climate lawsuits.

Impact → air pollution \$ + lawsuits.

b) donations ⇒ money loss

Donate \$ to oils

resources go to other countries.

↑ 1% → 7%

② ↑ conflict.

South China sea settle conflict thru laws.

China breaks int'l law → no consequences.

No accountability ⇒ climate losses.

REMs → mining ⇒ climate loss?

Ratifying limits mining.

U.S. currently has more access already.

< REMS.

APF
① use of exotic metals → rare + more \$
mine air REMS Econ + environment

② world peace / ~~Econ~~ / ~~environment~~ benefit.

No sources of lawsuits
warrantless claim.

won't lose \$ b/c U.S. isn't doing anything wrong.

U.S. is physically large.

\$ % goes to developing countries.

→ conflict existed w/4.
post regulations + embargoes.
UAT has better solutions.

mine mine REM.

Selling for oils ..

U.S. has a moral + cannot force China which
is right/wrong.

Any country whose pollution leaves country +
affects another country can be sued.

Room: E3 517

2018 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45

Ballot Due: 3:45

Side 1: Aveson Global Leadership Academy
CWLFSide 2: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
CSSC

Key

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
2	Cooper Westphal	11	26
1	Luca Fassi	3	27

Key

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
1	Cloris Shi	1	29
2	Seth Chang	2	28

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

Low Point Win? No

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

US ~~needs~~ from United Nations of Sec
cheers

(S1)

Key

* did not define clearly until halfway into speech

* good point to policy on waters

* not sure how drilling relates to being able to watch over your own seas

- assert yourself more in ex., your question got dragged out (1800s treaty seemed like a filler question)

CX CX

(S1)

Key

* being fast is a skill but practice more precision & enumeration

* started w/ definitions but did not fully explore defs

* good econ impacts of fiber cable losses

* excellent treaty ref on fiber cable auto

- ~~also~~ concisely addressed all questions and addressing own questions

(S2)

Key

* struggling to follow up on partner's 1st speech

* spent too much time trying to follow up on a single treaty reference

* repeating partner's points too late into speech

* ancient treaties are not opened exclusively by drilling permit

(S2)

((used 1 in prep))

* good point on limitations of distance but lack of explanation implies you're budging on the topic

* prep was not fully ready & still required partner to assist

* never stop or let opponents distract you

* poor elaboration on fiber cables

Neg (45 sec prep w/2)

- * good rep vs safety question but could've followed up w/ more specific questions
- what ~~was~~ measures? "Impress?"
- keep running diff elements in regards to permafrost drilling

CX²

CX²

AFF

- dragging out answers, it's okay to give straight answers

- needed to shut down the permafrost discussion
- = if there is little benefit & little access, there is little drilling, but maintaining both angles of our arguments

Summ¹ * you're distracting yourself w/ your buttons.

- * let partner speak for help; it's your speech
- * did not re-touch on biggest angle you posed for the whole debate → permafrost, and if I missed it, there ~~was~~ little mentioned & it

Summ¹ ((used 30 sec prep))

- * while yes they didn't "attude" they also did try to discuss the treaty; but still, true
- * good tie-in of their failure of attitude w/ also repeating your own points

- don't answer your partners question!!!

- convoluted answers and ducking questions, very improper use of CX time

GCT

GCT

- ~~- don't try to touch on permafrost, it is too hypothetical and you're spending too much time on it~~

AFF IGNORE THIS

- good protection of fiber cables point

Summ² ((time 1:15 prep)) * nevermind - you don't believe you're on?

be assertive, take control but maintain control of your self

- * they had some of the clearest points & gave an example & treaty involved

- * you'll really need more time to prep beforehand

Summ² ((last 30 sec prep))

- * the energy you had now is that you needed earlier (but better now than never)

- * good follow up on their point of lack of evidence

- * Cost-Benefit Analysis was rough

AFF

AFF simply had the sources & defined their side and reasoning much more efficiently. Neg struggled w/ believing & deciding where to place their resources which created a difficult to follow speech & CX.

Room: E3 511

2018 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45

Ballot Due: 3:45

Side 1: Magnet Academy AHBF

Aff

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
2	Aditya Hari	1	30
1	Benjamin Fan	2	29

Side 2: Kudos College of Youth Leadership

DWCL

Neg

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
1	Danielle Workman	3	27
2	Chloe Leong	4	26

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

Low Point Win? ☒

William H. Hunk

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

ELAC

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

The US should accede to UNCLOS without reservations

This debate was heated from the very first crossfire. So, ignoring the attitude issues I addressed after the round, my judgment comes down to the value and criteria presented by the affirmative (quality of life; on balance), which was not disputed by the negation.

The negation presented three arguments: 1) submarine efficiency; 2) hegemony; 3) terrorism. All three presented problems of signing UNCLOS. These points were established in a decent fashion until challenged by the affirmative. When it comes to submarines, the aff's response with satellites seems to be better tailored for the debate; however, each one was proven to be effective in some type of detection BUT neither team told me why that goes with the quality of life value. This argument, from both sides, doesn't present itself well and drops for both sides. The hegemony argument, in my opinion, is won by the affirmative. Near the end of the debate, the negator mentions "more allies are better/necessary" while previously saying "allies with small countries aren't great." This is a contradiction and supports the affirmative who argued that a multilateral agreement increases the ally count. The terrorism point found confusion with the social concerns point in the sense that each side failed to show how they correlate as refutations. The negation didn't provide significant evidence for it; neither did the aff - but both do fulfill quality of life, so both stand.

When it comes to aff's claim on the environment, the neg misses the aff's point on regulation. The neg says UNCLOS will allow dangerous drilling but the aff has said that drilling happens anyways without the US, commissioned by the US. I uphold the aff's environmental standard/benefit point. I also uphold the aff's economic point. The neg questions why would the US & China ever go to war if their trading partners, but never responded the aff's question of "if the US & China are trading partners, why do they have a trade war?" - I side with the aff on that. Also, if the Neg claims something is common knowledge, I'll accept it; BUT, if the Aff provides a source that says otherwise, and present it to the Neg, the burden of proof falls on the Neg - claiming common knowledge isn't helpful against a source - if it is common knowledge for your case, then surely you must have one. I vote for the affirmative on better counter-claims and reasoning.

Neg 1
UNCLOS
shouldn't obligation

1. submarines
↳ required to show flag under UNCLOS
2. hegemony
↳ U.S. gives leverage to prevent states from doing provocative action
↳ America alliance accounts for 60-80%
3. terrorism
↳ reduction in ability to safely transfer weapons
↳ UNCLOS allows the transportation of dangerous items;
↳ allows any ship to carry nuclear explosives intended for nuclear activity

Att 1
value: equality of life
~~criteria on balance~~

- no UNCLOS leads US to be an aggressor
 - 1. increase global security
↳ decrease tension in int. community
↳ S. China sea is volatile
↳ Brookings- China Pacific Expansion
↳ WWII
 - 2. environment
↳ prevent US from polluting ocean
↳ requirements help keep ecosystems
↳ heritage - US is main polluter - UNCLOS doesn't allow
 - 3. financial benefits
↳ extends 200 mi Exclusive Economic Zones
 - 4. social concerns
↳ decreases exploitation of other countries
↳ decrease human trafficking
 - 5. soft power
↳ demonstrates renewed interests in int. affairs
↳ befriended other countries
- we can still mine without UNCLOS - signing increases regulation on it
↳ deep sea drilling happens anyway ✓

- Neg 2
- C1. global security
↳ only example is Chinese islands
↳ but that's allowed under UNCLOS
 - C2. environment
↳ oil spills are bad
↳ oil drilling allowed by UNCLOS
 - C3. economic benefit
↳ do we want to put money over lives
↳ same retaliation as C2
 - C4. ~~unintentional~~ social concerns
↳ UNCLOS allows terrorism - but ^{strategic}
↳ cargo can create more risks under UNCLOS
↳ examples?
 - C5. soft power
↳ US already has great influence - so allies with small countries aren't great

- Att 2
- C1. submarines
↳ many other effective alternatives to submarines
↳ satellites more effective
 - C2. hegemony
↳ unilateral treaty is better than multilateral
↳ but US is afraid of war with China - US cannot simply out-might China
↳ China can't monopolize
 - C3. terrorism
↳ a UN based law would never allow terrorists to transfer nuclear weapons nor leave them unprotected
↳ UNCLOS gives rights to check if countries are harboring slavery and other HRVs.
 - C4. economic
↳ US would gain because of their access to rare earth metals
↳ UNCLOS ensures a higher quality of life
 - ↳ terrorism retaliation
↳ it seems illogical that UNCLOS leaves cargo unsupervised
↳ smuggling of nuclear weapons is highly improbable
↳ satellite counter seems better in long run - if US is most advanced

- Neg 1
- CC1. satellites
submarines are better for urgent issues
 - CC2. hegemony
↳ more allies are always necessary
↳ sounds pretty multilateral
 - CC3. slavery
has never mentioned
↳ cause it's a neg arg...
 - CC4 - China
↳ US would never go to war with China
- ↳ ignoring the factor on US-China trade war
↳ all is asking, if China is our trade partner, why would we get into a trade war with them?
↳ NO card
↳ common knowledge
↳ if it is common knowledge, then having a source on it should be easy to have

- Att 2
- CC1. global security
China's plane example
↳ China has violated the treaty before
 - CC2. environment
↳ causes regulation which is good
 - CC3. financial
 - CC4. social concerns
↳ UNCLOS would never allowed terrorism
↳ Coast Guard superiority
 - ↳ card on China having largest economy

Room: E3 455

2018 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45

Ballot Due: 3:45

Side 1: Kudos College of Youth Leadership JKSL

Side 2: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
DWML

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
3	Justin Kung	3	27
1	Stephanie Jing	1	29

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
4	Daniel Wu	4	26
2	Michael Lee	2	28

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

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

CSULA
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Stephanie - great clarity, very good speaker. ~~you speak faster than ever~~
 - good articulation on your points & providing good impacts.
 - give a number to your impacts. You talk about how many gallons are spilled but how many people & animals ~~are~~ are affected.
 - good questions. - providing a number to those arguments gives you more magnitude.

Michael - ~~love that~~ - good analysis on China!
 - impact out what happens w/ China -

- good logic - good point about environment, but you did not complete this argument.
 - "the advantage of oil & benefit economy" needs to be more specific. How much will it help economy?

Justin - good rebuttal arguments & confidence.

- Very good analysis on oil drilling. very convincing & persuasive.
 - be specific w/ impacts
 - ~~How does~~ good clash
 - Don't repeat yourself - extend your arguments

* Idea for neg. Talk about how world is moving away from oil & we won't need oil eventually bc renewable energy.

Daniel -

- good organization
 - good delivery. you have a good speaking voice, but don't stand behind your chair.
 - need to link your arguments to criteria. All arguments. ~~start to~~
 - good rebuttal in cross X
 - good logic!
 - be strategic in cross X. You focus on these rules too much. wastes a lot of time.
-

Room: E3 553

2018 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45

Ballot Due: 3:45

Side 1: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
AJIG 36 sec**Side 2:** Nova 42 Academy ZSAP 24 sec
48 sec

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
Aff	Annie Jiang	1	25
Aff	Isabel Gan	4	25

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
Neg	Zahmen Siyed	3	26
Neg	Andy Pan	2	27

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

Low Point Win? /

N/A

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Sp 1 4 zahmen
Sp 2 4 Andy Isabel
Cross 3
Sp 3 4 Andy
Sp 4 4 Annie
Cross 3
Sp 1 2 zahmen
Sp 2 2 Isabel
Cross 3
Sp 3 2 Andy
Sp 4 2 Annie

Zahmen
• Global warming
• destroy enviro.
• the more we deep sea mine the more we tap methane.
results in the melting of permafrost
• natural disaster.

economic expense of natural disaster

Andy
• we cannot afford to ↑ carbon emission
Flood, food shortage, etc as a result of a very small adjust.
irreversible change by 2030.
• No evidence shows foreign maritime claims
• simply puts us at risk
Nothing gained

• carbon methane
• claims that their contradiction is irrelevant
• economic element

Isabel
• weighs pros vs cons.
• \$\$\$ focused (gas + oil) economy
• China argument about island off South China Sea (tension)
• US will have stronger position to stop Chinese aggression

Grandcross
methane deep sea mining

Annie
• claims they've contradicted themselves
• don't know that they're the only holder of Arctic drilling
• US doesn't need to sign to deep sea mine
• methane has nothing to do w/ deep sea mining
How will CO₂ be released from drilling?
Economic argument

CROSS 1

• we can't solve south China sea controversy
I: stronger position
How do you know this will result drilling?
Global warming heats permafrost

CROSS 2

→ How do you know unclos is only one for arctic drilling
• companies cannot drill w/out unclos backing it.
→ Should I explain how CO₂ will be released?
• Methane rises to the air as a result of drill
→ How and why does methane release?

Room: E3 431

2018 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45

Ballot Due: 3:45

Side 1: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
AHDZSide 2: Aveson Global Leadership Academy
APKE

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
aff	Austin Hong ^{aff}	4	23

aff	Daniel Zheng ^{neg}	2	20
-----	-----------------------------	---	----

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
neg	Amelia Pinto ^{aff}	3	22

neg	Katie Evenfield ^{aff}	1	25
-----	--------------------------------	---	----

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

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

DANIEL: COULD BE MORE
FIRM WITH CROSS-EXKATIE: ~~ASSERTIVE~~ ASSERTIVE APPROACH
TO POINTS AND ARGUMENTSAUSTIN: COULD ~~THE~~ USE
MORE ORGANIZATION
IN ~~POINTS~~ POINTS
~~PRESENTATION~~ FOR
A SMOOTHER PRESENTATIONAMELIA: ~~PRESENT~~ PRESENTATION
OF POINTS

Room: E3 507

2018 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45

Ballot Due: 3:45

Side 1: Nova 42 Academy NCBC

2nd Neg

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
-----	------	----------	---------------

2	Nathan Chu	2	28
---	------------	---	----

1	Brian Chen	4	26
---	------------	---	----

Side 2: Kudos College of Youth Leadership

SSEJ

Aff

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
-----	------	----------	---------------

1	Sunny Sun	3	27
---	-----------	---	----

2	Ellie Jiang	1	29
---	-------------	---	----

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

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

- framework: cost-benefit
- arctic drilling releases ~~the~~ gases
- climate change
- deepsea mining effects
- permafrost
- resolution is US-specific
- probability of nuclear war
- US unable to stop China
 - aff has no evidence
- mutual destruction prevents war
- climate change → natural disasters → disaster costs
- US joining further releases gas
- Other countries are limited in drilling space

- Conflict with China
 - affects region, war → nuclear → extinction
- economy will fall drastically
- control of resources for US
- national security
- drug and human trafficking
 - working with other countries to prevent
- framework of cost benefit
- drilling will happen by other countries
- impact is unchanged in terms of harm
 - US will receive no benefit
- China is militarizing
- neg card not US-specific
- global warming is inevitable
- US drilling tech environmentally-sound
 - complying with int. law
- neg missing drilling stats
 - aff has saving numbers

- aff arg is immoral
- aff didn't quantify trade
- USA does not regulate against human trafficking
- regulations are irrelevant because of inevitability
- no argument against mutual destruction
- 7 billion lives vs boost in economy

- China problem not solved because US not in
- trade money stays in US
- war, dominance, leadership
 - ↑ decrease ↗ increase
- — — —
- foreign monopoly, boost economy, trafficking

Final Notes: This was an extremely hard decision to make. Both teams were amazing. However, and this breaks me, cl can only let one win. Neg did a great job demonstrating the cost of climate change and the issues of morality involved with making further impacts. However, aff had bigger economic numbers and showed the inevitability of global warming. The inevitability and numbers, in a cost-benefit framework, is my RFD.

Room: E3 457

2018 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45

Ballot Due: 3:45

Side 1: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
JSZXSide 2: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
AASG

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
-----	------	----------	---------------

Neg	Joy Sun	2	29
-----	---------	---	----

Neg	Zhian Xu	1	29
-----	----------	---	----

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
-----	------	----------	---------------

Aff	Alan Alexander	3	29
-----	----------------	---	----

Aff	Susie Gu	4	27
-----	----------	---	----

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

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Great Job! excellent speakers on both sides
The neg really argued their case well.
not only did you support your criteria
but your rebuttal was spot on in the
marine life argument of aff.
Aff was correct on one point that
you inferred the cost breakdown of
terrorism but didn't give any #'s to support.
excellent debate. It was a joy to watch.
Judge

Room: E3 451

2018 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45

Ballot Due: 3:45

Side 1: Wilshire Academy CSA

Side 2: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
CLTL

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
2	Clara Son	2	29
1	Kriste An	1	30

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
1	Clinton Lau	3	27
2	Tony Lu	4	26

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

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

ELAC
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

1 Aff con abusive
• Criteria - economic benefit
• Greater resources / land
• Greater land ownership
• Sovereignty of Carbon rights impact effects - social security?
Ship/cargo
Panama canal
\$ billions lost
Preserved - fulfilled
Trade smoother / small shipping
Increased trade
Cut fees, ↑ trade
Trade is smoother & cheaper
Increased security from unclear

1 neg con whose lives?
• Criteria - saving life / stabilization
- loss of presence mid 1972
- warship navigation
- Control over passage
• harm security of US
- Documented 18 incidents of death
- Russian national
• Successfully proved heavy
- US can secure threats heavy / power
- marine environment
- State compliance & security in UNCLOS
- Partner already abusing how does it fail, save / lose lives?
Save \$ = save lives???

2 Aff
• Criteria - security - canal
- US will not lose
- Shared gas / resources with ↓ countries
- royalties = \$ for US
- not effective, safety & regime provided to US.
- Better relationship US & gov.
- enjoyment of ↑ resources
- ↑ land
- marine environment & better condition
↑ not mentioned
human lives - saved
security

2 neg
• legal boost
• Not needed
• already have minerals
- Destroying eco system
- Quality of life ↑ = detriments
- loss of hard power
- can do so if we invade the peace
- nuclear academy
↑
Russia - new not in construction
- less money

Room: E3 525

2018 SCJFL 1st Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 3:45

Ballot Due: 3:45

Side 1: Ethan Liu

Side 2: Wilshire Academy RKDN

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
1.	Ethan Liu		25

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
1.	Roy Kim		24

			23
--	--	--	----

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

Low Point Win? ____

Galvan
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

East Los Angeles College
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

NEG

~~PRO~~ PRO

- You gave a criteria after ~~if~~ you already agreed to pros

- Try not to interrupt during CROSS X
- Shorten answers