

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius ZV

Zohaib Valani

28

Brooks KA

Kartikeya Agrawal

27

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

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

Signed: _____

Glaum

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

* Affirmative:

You have detailed facts supporting your stand.

You ask your opponent good questions.

You are able to maintain eye contact and make the debate more engaging.

Although you have strong points, but you said "therefore I should be the winner of this debate" too many times.
Try to slow down a little. You speak a little too fast.

* Negative.

You have detailed facts supporting your stand.

You are able to answer your opponents questions in ease and you remained calm through out the debate.

Try to make contacts and speak a little louder.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AB

Brooks TH

Amrita Balram

27

Tejas Harith

28

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

* Affirmative

You have detailed facts supporting your opinion.

You are able to answer your opponent's questions & ease.

You remained calm throughout your debate. You speak ~~loud~~ loud & clear.

Try to slow down. A little too fast.

negative

* negative

good

you

~~you~~ make eye contact during the debate ~~and~~ speak ~~clearly~~ clearly. very clear and persuasive. ~~you have~~

You have strong evidence supporting your case.

Overall, you gave a good debate. ~~ask your~~

Both of you did a good job!

Room: Benson 1g
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Mar/Apr Novice

1

Three, Aptos ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brooks GD

Leland PS

Gaurisha Dewan


28.3

Pranav Suppal

27.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from GAURISHA / Brooks
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 addressed each of the NEG's contentions and was able to question how to validate whether political conditions work. NEG did not respond to that.
- * NEG did not address the topic of morality

Room: Nobili B
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Mar/Apr Novice

1

AJ Soni, Mankamalak

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius RiNa

Rishi Nair

24.0

Brooks AM

Anish Maram

~~26.5~~ 26.5

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

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

Signed: Mankamalak

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg had a better presentation skills and argued the case more confidently.

Aff:- The presentation needs work as you were just reading it out with no eye contact.

Neg wins as they have better argument points and aff was not able to provide good rebuttals.

Room: Nobili B
Flight B: Start
LD Mar/Apr Novice

1

AJ Soni, Mankamal ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brooks EH

SURLI JC

Eric Han

26.9

Jason Chang

24.5

The better debating was done by the Aff from Eric Han.
AFF NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Nkama

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff presented arguments, contention and rebuttal in more organised way and was able to counter all questions raised by Neg.

Neg: You have to organise your presentation and thoughts little bit more so you don't lose the flow and momentum in the way.

Aff wins by better presentation.

Room: Benson 1f
Flight B: Start
LD Mar/Apr Novice

1

AU Ray, Partha ✓

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

University Preparator RA

Leland RE

Rohit Anand-Kumar

26

Ramin Egtesadi

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from Leland RE
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: Missing Value Criterion
Missing Contention 3
Improve Structure by calling out sub-points.

Neg: Strong Value Criterion
~~After~~ Expected ~~core contention~~ contention related to corruption of politicians
linked to ~~Value~~ Value of politicians

Room: Benson 1a
Flight B: Start
LD Mar/Apr Novice

1

BH Zhao, George ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Leland HC

Hannah Cai

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Malika Yeleswarapul

Malika Yeleswarapul

The better debating was done by the

AFF
AFF or NEG

from

Hannah Cai

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Malika did not show up. Thus Hannah Cai wins.

Judge: Jianming Dong (Young Gerius)

317

Room: Benson 1d
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Mar/Apr Novice

1

AB Gnanansekhar, ✓

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brooks BS

Brendan Shih

24

Palo Alto NT

Neha Tallapragada

27

The better debating was done by the

Neg
AFF or NEG

from

Palo Alto
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: Benson 1i
Flight B: Start
LD Mar/Apr Novice

1

BH Wang, David ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland JG

Palo Alto ML

Jasper Gan

29

Max Lenail

30

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

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

Signed: Manuel Rodri

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

great debaters with very strong points and this is a low point win. Both provided good evidences and arguments points.

The negative is a winner because the debater was consistent in speech, did not use rep ~~ex~~ evidences repeatedly and ~~bo~~ gave good examples of countries that used a did not use political conditions

Room: Benson 1i
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Mar/Apr Novice

1

BH Wang, David ✓

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius BrMa

Notre Dame San Jose MY

Brandon Ma

25

Mallika Yeleswarapu

24

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

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

Signed: Mervin Laddie

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The affirmative made strong points in spite of not being able to provide evidence for the second condition. The speaker needs to go slow while speaking. Negative needs to state her points more strongly & refute affirmative with more evidence.

Room: Benson 1j
Flight B: Start
LD Mar/Apr Novice

1

BD Mangal, Sande ✓
Young Genius.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

Westmont MN

Madhav Nekkar

POINTS

29.5

NEGATIVE

Brooks RB

Rishi Balakrishnan

POINTS

28.

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- save life,
- protect human right, dignity
- violate humanitarian aid
- political cond. not effective.
- unconditional aids works
- ✓ good speech, clear points w/ supported evidence.
- rebuttal
- 11 countries provide 90%.

90%
country to country donation.
justices.

state not certain of intention of other state.
focus on country over individuals
maximize self-interest.

Good presentation & debate.
more eye contact

I vote AFF because he has stronger arg. w/ lots evidence.
good at argue against opponent.

Would like to see neg w/ more arg. & evidence.

Room: Benson 1j
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Mar/Apr Novice

1

BD Mangal, Sande ✓

Young Grews

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

Brooks RR

Ria Reddy

POINTS

28

NEGATIVE

Aptos IK

Isabel Kornberg

POINTS

27.5

The better debating was done by the

AFF

from

Brooks RR.

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

arbitrary limitation
- deferat. crisis

cross exam: good questions

social welfare

- gain too much dependency on aol.

- worse condition.

- money get abused.

good clear speech on your points.

is new evidence allowed at rebuttal.

I vote AFF for showing her argument w/ good
Bother support evidence.

Neg did good job w/ arguments but evidence
not too strong (maybe more research)

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius JS

Josh Si

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto AG

Ahana Ganguly

28

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

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

Signed: _____

jack zhang

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

def.

Value: mor.

1. unethical
2. ineffective world bank study.
government.
3. commitment.
Source, Afghanistan

Question:

defend: denies people in needs

AFF.

need more sources to support
good argument.

Neg.

Question:

1. Commitment weak?

def.

1. condition. stop corruption
2. reduce poverty. source. U.S. aid.
poverty kills.
3. works.

AFF's case.

North Korea.

defend.

good writing and resources.

Room: Benson 1h
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Mar/Apr Novice

Jack Zhang 1

~~32, Leland Judge~~ ✓

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Evergreen UT

Young Genius FC

Umesh Tanniru

Fiorella Chen

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

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

Signed: _____

Jack Zhang

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

UT no show

wait till 11:46 AM.

Room: Benson 1f
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Mar/Apr Novice

1

AU Ray, Partha

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius LB

Lakshmi Balram

29

Mission San Jose HM

Humdaan Mustafa

—

The better debating was done by the AFF from Young Genius LB
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:

Humdaan Mustafa did not show up.

Room: Benson 1c
Flight B: Start
LD Mar/Apr Novice

1

~~BK Tangco, Reena~~ ✓

WENDY GRAN

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

University Preparator CM

Brooks DR

Cameron McElroy

28

Debasmita Ray

26

The better debating was done by the AFF from ~~Brooks DR~~
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both debator argued for placing condon on humanitarian aid to foreign countries. The affirmative proved the value is unjust. Both had the good targeting issues and contention. Affirmative had very good support to his standards.

Aff: Very firm tone and eye contact. great job on CX & 1AR. provided more logic reason & contention.

Neg: Good eye contact, Nice job on NC but not clear response to aff on CX.

The affirmative was better defended the resolution through effective analysis.

Room: Benson 1c
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Mar/Apr Novice

1

BK Tangco, Reena ✓
WENDY GAN

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Brooks NM

Neval Mulaomerovic

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AmSa

Amudha Sairam

26

The better debating was done by the Affirmative from TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME
AFF. OR NEG.

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both did a good debate on placing conditions on humanitarian aid to foreign countries.

As you both engaged in the theory debate, standards, were better defined by the affirmative.

Aff: AC period should slow. A little bit of speaking. She provided good logic reason & contention.
Good rebuttal on CX. Effective AR strategy and argument selection.

Neg: Need more eye contact to the judge, voice should be a little louder & clearer voice.
on CX should be more clear of questions.

The affirmative was better defended the resolution.

Room: Benson 1b
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Mar/Apr Novice

1

~~BA Zou, Joe~~ ✓
Daniel Tes

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius DB

Saratoga KK

Divija Bhimaraju

Kunal Kanekar

28.0

26.0

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Divija (Aff) was clearly the more articulate of the two. She reads extremely well off a prepared text and displayed a maturity beyond her years in her rebuttals.

In cross-X, Aff correctly pointed out the subtle difference between humanitarian aid and development aid, effectively nullifying a number of her opponents examples. In general though, both Aff & Neg ~~very~~ articulated their positions from prepared ~~texts~~ texts, but could have addressed and rebutted each others contention better.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Leland SL

Sherri Li

27.0

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius VL

Victor Liu

26.0

The better debating was done by the Aff from Leland SL (Sherri Li)
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 spoke slowly but confidently, while she had a script, what won her speaker points ~~was~~ how she was able to elaborate on her contentions off-script, making her a more persuasive & genius debater. Both Aff + Neg could benefit from more practice & familiarity with the content though.

On the substantive content, Aff plainly delivered her 3 contentions that political considerations in aid lead to pursuit of conflicting self-interests, obstructs the actual delivery of the aid, and to corruption. While Neg referred casually to these, the rebuttals ~~could have been more~~ ~~could have been more~~ robustness and in greater depth.

Neg in turn, delivered his 3 contentions on how political considerations lead to better government, alleviation of poverty & better accountability and hence - the end result, but was unable to cite specific examples. On the framework, Neg tried to argue that its job was the merely show the political considerations were not always unjust, but Aff missed opportunity to point out the resolution did not call for 100% ~~to be~~ ~~just~~ the cases to be unjust.

Room: Benson 1d
Flight B: Start
LD Mar/Apr Novice

1

AB Gnanansekhar, ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

Brooks SS

Sonia Sakleshpur

POINTS

27

NEGATIVE

Leland SE

Samar Elahi

POINTS

25

The better debating was done by the

Aff
AFF or NEG

from

Brooks

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

[Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: Benson 1a
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Mar/Apr Novice

1

BH Zhao, George ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Leland EN

Emery Nguyen

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brooks VA

Vikshar Athreya

The better debating was done by the

AFF
AFF or NEG

from

Emery Nguyen

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Vikshar Athreya didn't show up. Thus Emery Nguyen
wins this round.

Judged by: Jianming Dong (Young Genius)

317