

109 **Jordyn Alexis - ELAC**

Open Public Forum R6 - 3:30

Room: E3 5212018 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Only
Tournament**Round Start: ASAP****Ballot Due: ASAP!****Flip for sides:** Kudos College of Youth
Leadership SSEJ**Flip for sides:** Academy of Higher Learning
JPSJ

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
1 <u>N</u>	Sunny Sun	<u>1</u>	<u>24</u>
2 <u>N</u>	Ellie Jiang	<u>3</u>	<u>13</u>

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
1 <u>A</u>	Jun-Woo Pak	<u>4</u>	<u>22</u>
2 <u>A</u>	Soren Jensen	<u>2</u>	<u>25</u>

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

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Neg 59 sec prep

- State what issue is before making a point
- Good job knowing subject

ELACAff

- Hard to understand what is being said... improve pronunciation. Become more familiar with subject

107 Dionne McNeff - Emerson

Open Public Forum R6 - 3:30

Room: E3 553

2018 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP!

Flip for sides: Flintridge Preparatory GVDC

Flip for sides: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership AYHZ

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
Aff	Gabi Varga	1	29	NEG	Ava Ye	3	25
	Daniel Choi	- Not Present		NEG	Helaine Zhao	2	26

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

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Gabi: opioid pts well made + skipping meds as a result of cost
 "Drugs don't work for patients who don't take them" - nice line
 Good at refuting points but be mindful of sounding sarcastic.
 Good job w/ innovation arguments + pharma revenue
 Shouldn't say "Europe" - too many countries w/ differing systems. Would be better to use one country w/ stats to show how price controls have been success.

Helaine*: BAD for economy... would have been better to slow down. You covered a lot of info but didn't always drive home pt. Doctors can't make as much line of argument ~~but~~ you didn't explicitly say how that is similar to effects on pharma industry.

Ava*: "shots" made by innovation, promising innovations good pts.
 good pt. on price controls hasn't worked in '60s but simply mentioning price controls in other industries doesn't drive home the pt.
 - U.K. + Canada's economies' ~~are~~ similarities w/ U.S. wasn't well made pt.

* You both misunderstood her pt on opioids - she was talking about an antidote to prevent overdose. You both said Babylonian Code of Hammurabi but no explanation and so it goes nowhere.

106

Driel Jimenez Cholula

~~Rachel Galvan~~ - ELAC

Open Public Forum R6 - 3:30

Room: E3 557

2018 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP!

Flip for sides: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership TLCLFlip for sides: Emerson Community Charter
School MRKC

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

Neg	Tony Lu 2	2	28
-----	-----------	---	----

Neg	Clinton Lau 2	4	26
-----	---------------	---	----

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

App	Marcus Razo 1	3	27
-----	---------------	---	----

App	Katie Cohen 1	1	29
-----	---------------	---	----

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

Low Point Win? ____

Driel Jimenez
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

ELAC
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Neg

Clinton: - When speaking make sure you pronounce.
- When you started 2nd argument do not spread.
- When making your arguments ~~do~~ allow yourself to think ahead to allow your flow of your argument to be smoother.
- Don't be so nervous

Tony: - When flowing your arguments do your best to relax so your flow becomes a bit clearer.

App

Katie: - Try to not just read off your screen for so long.

Marcus: - When speaking try to use less hand movement
- Try to say uhk a bit less.
- Allow your opponent to finish his/her sentence.
- Don't be so nervous.

AFP

• Framework of lines = agree (all)

~~not~~ 5 responses:

- ① no resources not being paid off; resell product
- ② don't need revenue. Excess revenue; bring back
- ③ None innovation in the world w/ price controls.
- ④ Access medicines by increasing public research
- ⑤ Higher prices & costs are not related.

- ① Shouldn't be supply in demand argument.
- ② Recognize don't use economic theory since we're in a monopoly. not right at all.
- ③ Argument non-unique
- ④ Shortages happen w/c market. ~~people~~ can't keep up
- ⑤ Production is increased

CROSS X

- same impact.
- Run off by diff. govt. systems.
- ~~not~~ ~~sub~~ adapting, not adopting
- why wouldn't it work in America.
- haven't regarded rebuffs.

- human life is more imp. thing. *(don't why should they adhere to others' constraints?)*
- Affordability: while not overpriced here, they're overpriced in other places.
- can help US make it more affordable. Never mentioned Russia, but they used it.
- pharm market is diff from reg. market.

- repeat 4th argument.

- ~~not~~ increased innovation. More affordable drugs = more innovation.
- less money to invest.

NEG

- Agree w/ def. but cost analysis benefit.
- Each & every benefit
- Affordability → overpriced.
- ↳ pharma agent overpriced to begin with.
- ~~that's~~
- Same system diff. ^{outcomes} ~~results~~
- ~~economic~~ economic matters
- diff. poli party running the system.
- ↳ will not produce the same impact.
- Price controls are unamerican.
- infringing rights on the system.
- Lot of money & time.
- ↳ cost & make & profit (make the argument twice).
- can't predict what will happen.
- As we save lives → they win.

CROSS X

- Never said Russia. why comparing?
- ~~shouldn't use a specific~~
- why are impacts the same
- How should we adapt.
- Evidence.
- can't compare to other countries regardless.
- learning from economy.

- Money not being used by the proposer.
- Limit innovation.
- If we don't earn money, then why work (motivation will decrease).
- jobs lost & lives being lost.
- supply in demand doesn't exist.
- 1970's ~~gas~~ example.
- dropped 4th argument being unamerican.

- explained

- claim that supply remains same then demand is then its good.
- who's gonna make the meds?

108 Kaitlyn Gonzalez - ELAC

Open Public Forum R6 - 3:30

Room: E3 517

2018 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP!

Flip for sides: Flintridge Preparatory WFBK

Flip for sides: Wilshire Academy ALKA

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
<u>Aff</u>	Wyatt Fishman	<u>3</u>	<u>28</u>
<u>Aff</u>	Bryce Kim	<u>34</u>	<u>27</u>

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
<u>Neg</u>	Alex Lee	<u>1</u>	<u>30</u>
<u>Neg</u>	Kriste An	<u>2</u>	<u>29</u>

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

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

AFF

- quality of life = equality for all.
- In demand vs. quality (worth)
- intern. experience
- private sector can't be counted on.
- Negotiating → private health providers
- Adapting to ~~outside~~ outside countries (how they do it).
- → Effective; if US adapts, problem would be helped out.
- used variety of payment (outside U.S.)
- Prices in advanced country = 50% cheaper

CROSS X

- both economic issues.
- → win debate w/o 1st argument
- Accessibility & Affordability.
- Pharm. market mfg, only markets?
- ~~constantly mentioned Japan adapt, not learn?~~
- talking abstract way.
- summary didn't regard framework.
- asked to see card.

NEG

- disrupt by putting price cap.
- halting innovation.
- → infringe capt. rights
- 4.5 mill jobs @ risk
- destroy incentive to work.
- → work & kill people
- → global economy & lives at risk.
- 60 bil research lost.
- losing investment.
- less investment = less research.
- still a problem regardless.
- Supply in demand.
- → sudden rush. Not everyone would be able to buy one.
- Fed govt. sets \$ & equilibrium.

CROSS X

- Australia, Britain, Canada; but diff. economic systems.
- by not imposing price controls = win debate
- ~~adapting.~~
- Canada = no correlation.
- constantly mentioned Canada.
- China saved lives but never mentioned WHO marker.

Abigail Fong
105 ~~Alex Fu~~ - Kudos Leadershi

Open Public Forum R6 - 3:30

Room: E3 508

2018 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP!

Aff
Flip for sides: Flintridge Preparatory LKEG

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
1	Lauren Kim	2 3	28.9
2	Eliza Gunter	1	29.1

neg
Flip for sides: Wilshire Academy CSCL

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-1)
2	Clara Son	1 2	29
1	Christine Lee	2 4	28.8

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

Low Point Win? ____

[Signature]
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

KUDOS
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Both constructives were really strong and had a variety of points. The Aff rebuttal was really solid, there were good link turns, which Neg didn't respond to enough. Neg rebuttal ~~wasn't~~ focused a lot on fallacies and applied a lot of their off case arguments, which is good but I think the link to it actually being a response needs to be clearer. When Neg responded to Aff's rebuttals, I think a lot of arguments were misinterpreted, so I couldn't really take those into account. (also, you should probably explain the fallacies more, especially when they say it's N/A). The Aff final focus should have had better time allocation, bc they didn't get to the majority of their own offense and mainly went defense. The Neg final focus weighed impacts well, but they kept emphasizing jobs and money, which confused me bc I thought their criteria was on saving lives.

The abuse argument is true, but it was also made by the Aff in their last speech, which I also think is kind of abusive (you should bring it up in summary or something.)

I voted Aff off of their ~~op~~ opioid arg. and link turns. also cross could've been friendlier on both sides :)