

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland AT

Adam Talaat

27

Young Genius EK

Eish Kapoor

28

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

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

Signed: _____

Alex Ferrer

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Great opening w/ good
FACTS, points & EVIDENCE.

Cross-Exam was weaker
not clear some answers.

Second speech had
some inconsistencies,
leading the NEG to
TAKE CONTROL AFTER.

Last speech was good,
but not strong enough
to "change" or turn it
around.

Overall, very good
debate.

The speech was too fast
to follow easily and
really comprehend.

Cross-Exam was handled
much better and answers
were clear & efficient.

Second speech greatly
improved NEG position
and made its case
more understandable.

The EVID. was clearly
explained and the
points made sense.

Great debate.

NEG wins this debate due to more efficient
clear & convincing arguments, facts & evidence.

Room: O'Connor 103
Flight A: Start 430
LD Mar/Apr Open

3

AB Bhimaraju, Yo

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto HY

Westmont DG

Helen Yan

29.7

Daniel Gilchrist

29.2

The better debating was done by the AFF from Palo Alto
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- * AFF was able to ~~convincingly~~ ^{convincingly} explain that 'how many lives' saved is important and not just whether placing conditions CAN work.
- * NEG was very convincing in explaining that short-term benefit is not sufficient.
- * But AFF countered it well ~~that~~ ^{with} analytical/theoretical future possibility is not good enough and that historic proof is necessary.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Homestead EG

Saratoga IM

Erika Gutekunst

29.8

Isha Mangal

29.2

The better debating was done by the AFF from Homestead
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 was very convincing with the value criterion that the end does not justify the means and was ^{able to} drive this point with many examples.
- * NEG argued well that 'Greater good in the long run' was more important but ~~did~~ was not able to respond to AFF's question about whether it is OK to lose lives in the short-term.
- * AFF was also very good with responding back to all of NEG's cross X and rebuttal points.

Room: Kenna 310
Flight A: Start 430
LD Mar/Apr Open

3

31, Leland Judge

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014 ✓

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Homestead AV

Young Genius OZ

Amrita Venkatraman 28

Oliver Zhao 29

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

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

Signed: Deb Dutta Ganguly

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG showed better evidence for his arguments.

Room: Kenna 310
Flight B: Start
LD Mar/Apr Open

3

31, Leland Judge

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius DJ

Deepankar Joshi

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Aptos RF

Ryan Fotheringham

29

The better debating was done by the NEG from Aptos RF
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

Deb Dutta Ganguly

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: Started very well but the rebuttal was not strong enough.

Neg: Can improve by doing more research.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius ShPe

Palo Alto AnGi

Shriya Perati

27.9

Andy Gibson

28.2

The better debating was done by the Neg from Andy Gibson, CA n Gi
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:

- Stumbling in answering 2-Exa. question
- Building Syria to provide aid will delay delivering of aid.
- Dozen countries around Russia.
- By placing political condition. Syria to build delays aid del. & does not save life.

- Trying to refute value crit. cos of if broad based objn of unconditional humanitarian aid.
- Agrees with aff's value. Crit however unconditional is not the way.
- Good policy leads to higher economic growth.
- Unconditional aid has failed in past. Ex Ethiopia.
- Need to apply political reform along with aid for successful outcome.
- 55 countries example.

Decision basis: Negative side made strong argument. I was refuting points with data & evidence. The argument also made sound sense of winning again this round.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto RH

Ryan Huang

26.7


Mountain View AS

Anushi Singhal

26.2

The better debating was done by the Neg from Anushi Singhal.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Political condition delay in del. of aid, equal waste time & energy & impacts human suffering
- > Compliance success in 80% with political condition.
- > Value Criterion: maximizing net effectiveness
- > Value: Justice
- >

- > Without basic guidelines the aid will not be used for right purpose
- > Agree with opponents value & value criterion.
- > Opponent agreed with neg on having a political cond is required & not just.
- > Political condition decrease poverty
- > African dictator using aid money for his personal jet & not looking out for best interest of it's people.

Decision Basis: Negative was able to justify the impact of political condition to humanitarian aid, is necessary for successful delivery of implementation.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland AH

Mountain View WA

Anna Houk

28

Will Alexander

29

The better debating was done by the NEG from Will Alexander
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Stacy Dawson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both AFF & NEG did a great job w/ CX, so I give you equal points there. Both of you had same framework, so I weighted your contentions and evidences more than framework to make decision. While AFF showed some impacts w/ statistics about children & women, AFF failed to demonstrate how "unconditional" aid would solve those problems. Also, AFF failed to demonstrate that the aid ~~is~~ and specifically "humanitarian" aid was part of the Iraq example. AFF also introduced new evidences e.g. Syria, Haiti etc. in 2AR which is not allowed per debate rule as it doesn't give opportunity to Neg. to ~~counter~~ counter them.

Overall, Neg. did a great job presenting clear contentions with specific and relevant examples. Especially the North Korea & Sudan examples and convinced us that they ~~are~~ would better uphold the framework and value criteria. Neg. also spoke more clearly and a good pace. Suggest AFF to speak a bit more slowly especially against the patient judges like me. With some improvement in vocal pace and solid contentions ~~and~~ with relevant examples, I am sure AFF will ~~not~~ be more effective debater going forward. All the best!

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Westmont BY

Aptos AA

Bruce Young

29

Antonio Arselmo

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from Bruce Young.
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 did a great job laying out observations - Political conditions, humanitarian aid, unjust - in the beginning of the debate and thus set the context and framework. He convinced me that humanitarian aid ~~is needed for~~ ^{is required} in conditions require "immediate" response and political conditions delays the response. Overall, Aff did an effective job in upholding ^{his} value criteria. Neg didn't respond to Aff's ~~core~~ ^{core} argument of ~~time~~ ^{time} for "immediate response".

Both Aff and Neg. can do better job with clearly stating contentions and offering "relevant" examples. Neg. can also do a better job in speaking quality by speaking a bit more loudly and confidently.

~~All~~ All The Best!

Alex Ferrer
Bentley
✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Evergreen RS

Ramneek Singh

26

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland KG

Kashyap Garimella

27

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

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

Signed: Alex Ferrer

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The opening speech was confusing in the beginning but later improved and went back on-track.

Cross-ex was nice, improved AFF position a little.

The last two speeches could have been more aggressive, but both were weak, ~~to~~ mostly repeating the same points over & over. But good job overall.

The first speech was good, but few points were confusing and some were contradicting themselves. Cross-ex was good, used wisely w/ good Q&A.

Rebuttal speech was structured even better than the first one. Clear & strong points, presented in effective way. Great debate overall.

NEG team wins this debate due to stronger case presentation & better delivery.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland SB

Sarita Berigei

26

Homestead SS

Siraj Sodhi

28

The better debating was done by the NUEVA from HOMESTEAD
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- STAND DURING IRRC ~~GOOD EVIDENCE~~
- ~~CROSS - GOOD POINT~~ ~~WHICH HAS~~ ~~IMPROVE UNCONDITIONAL AID WORKED~~
- CROSS - YOU NEED TO ATTACK ~~OPONENTS~~ CONTENTIONS
- NEED TO BE MORE CONFIDENT. YOUR CROSS IS HESITANT, STILTED.
- SYRIA - GOOD ARGUMENT.
- NEED TO IMPROVE DELIVERY, CLARITY
- HOMELANDS MAN DRUG ANALOGY IS BAD - DOES NOT MAKE YOUR POINT
- PRACTICE FEWER POINTS & SMOOTHER DELIVERY

- ~~GOOD EVIDENCE FOR~~ UNCONDITIONAL AID WORKING (GOOD CROSS)
- NEED TO ORGANIZE NEW POINTS BETTER. START HIGH LEVEL THEN DIG DOWN
- ~~YOU~~ YOU NEED TO NOT MAKE FACIAL EXPRESSIONS WHEN OPPONENT IS SPEAKING.
- YOU DID NOT REFUTE OPPONENT SYRIA ARGUMENT.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland AL

Anthony Lin

28/30

Young Genius AY

Albert Yang

25/30

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

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

Conditional
Aid vs
Humanitarian Need/Aid.

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff Democrat Humanitarian Aid
Conclusion

Value: Justice + moral obligations.
What
VC: Not brought conditions and
CP: Political Aid does not create
Reason outcomes. Aid + Assistance
Nations failed to meet conditions
to get Aid. C2: People die due to
rural cond.
C3: Conditional Aid vs. Undermines
Humanitarian needs. →
Given to meet the needs as
needs/demands not met by lack of
C2: Ordinance/legislation impacted by lack of
govt. resources

Not was not able to defend
strongly.

Rebuttal (Aff → Neg)

Aid is to political conditions
will at least get some more
help to folks/poorly.

Neg (light on conditions)
(light on substance)
X Urban
Not strong.

Construction
Dyn political cond.
Utilitarianism → Maximize benefits
Prime political conditions are
just
C1 Targeted aid w/ political conditions
that make use of funds.
C2 Financial & technical assistance needed for
predebtary govt to be set right.
Opp's case Value same as Aff's.

Rebuttal

Aff → Neg → Summary.
2 out of multiple countries is
not a good data point (X) → weak
Aff does not substantiate its
benefits.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE UPA

POINTS

University Preparator GC

Gulshan Chahal

28/30

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Saratoga AV

Amulya Vadlakonda

24/30

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff (21:28)

Objection should be based on
compassion for humanitarian
aid - should be based on
needs of recipients.

VC: maximize free
outcomes

Data: MK of Christ et.

Emphasis on advantage.

Political and economic
poverty.

Donors should not control
how aid is to be used

Too long

Cross X

Sudan has been reformed
not poor people.

Bosnia 2003

Rebuttal Neg → Neg

Evidence being questioned for
Neg.

Neg (21:50)

XB2am

Aff challenges not wholly rebutted. To
Aff's goals were questioned strongly + sharply.
Constructive (7 min)

Neg → Aff.

Political condition help country
Constitutional aid is more just

phases Aff's C1 and political
condition not helpful

Strongly debated Aff's ex example.

Negates Aff's neg on Sudan

some political conditions are put
needs to be proved that's goal.

Rebuttal

Agrees on VC.

Solvency. Unwound aid given to
countries that promote solvency.
Aff's Sudan does not prove solvency

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Homestead SA

Brooks MH

Sahitya Atluri

28.0

Michelle Huang

27.9

The better debating was done by the AFF from Homestead SA
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF won this ~~case~~ debate because this side presented a well structured contention points. The rebuttal from this side was also very to the point. The arguments were stronger in supporting her case that it is unjust to have political condition on aid.

~~AFF~~ NEG side also did well, but there were too many materials prepare and didn't focus on the main case. The argument can be more direct to the opposing side.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Evergreen TG

Homestead TG

Tanmay Ghai

28

Tej Gokhale

27.8

The better debating was done by the AFF from Evergreen TG
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

Nice L. G.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF won this round because the arguments were clearly elaborated and reinforced during the rebuttal. AFF managed to build on the argument point that human right is universal therefore human should not be the beginning chip.

NEG team can do better on solid examples that can support his case. More research can help.

Room: Loyola 153
Flight B: Start
LD Mar/Apr Open

3

~~BP Mathews, Irim~~

RAMA AYSO LA

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

✓

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto WZ

Mountain View AJ

Will Zhou

Avery James

The better debating was done by the

~~WZ~~
AFF or NEG

from

~~AJ~~
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

[Signature]

NUEVA

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*AVERY JAMES ~~RESCHED~~
NEED TO RESCHED, VAL
★ HIS PREVIOUS ROUND ENDED
60+ MINS LATE*