

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU  
April 12-13th

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Brooks RB

Rishi Balakrishnan

27.8

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

University Preparator CM

Cameron McElroy

28.9

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- 1) Justice, police → gov. facilitate  
Principle of independence  
humanity
- 2) humanity not political  
Need, aid is human
- 3) morally good  
bad  
shallow probe moral values  
aid facilitate need  
minimize influence.
- 4) Military Tools. of armed  
Talib.

Conditions  
definition right  
condition

aid conflict  
good supporting  
detail when  
rebuttle.

- 1) political condition → conflict
- 2) agency / policy → economy conflict
- 3) Occupation, limitation of government

Rebuttal:

- too confirmative, supporting details not
- aid many variables what variables
- Value judges.

Good

- Very logical, great supporting details and flow.
- clear voice & good pace.
- very structural & logic in rebuttle

Improvement

- maturity! eye contact confidence.
- Affirmative final case to make more convincing
- Repeat case

Suggestions

- Might add 1. 2. 3 points.
- Give your position upfront
- High level points very clear. not big chunks of data

Good

- Good questions.
- Very good eye contact & maturity
- Conversational and convincing

Improvement areas:

- deeper understanding of each data, what/why/how
- more examples - year, event, why support your
- logical.

Suggestions

Rebuttal:

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

2

Teo, Daniel ✓  
Wu, Helen  
(Kau'i, Jr)

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland RE

Ramin Egtesadi

9th

~~27.0~~ 27.5

Brooks GD

Gaurisha Dewan

8th

~~27.0~~ 28.0

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Humint and definition...
- objection
- contention 1.
- poverty → fairness... good
- pitcher

- Contention of each main idea of affirmative.

Contention - morale.

and constraints, monitoring

Good

- Very good logic. structure contention 1-2-3
- good pace, good supporting example.
- with good pause to emphasize.
- Don't complain, sportsmanship - fun.
- Good questions.

Improvement

- good example to make good use.
- make each example to drill down.
- More aggressive

- eye contact. confirmative & ambition, natural conversational
- good rebuttle,
- polite

- Use the time waiting to prepare rebuttled back
- Start main sentence w/ 1.2.3
- Need examples

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto NT

Young Genius DB

Neha Tallapragada

26.5

Divija Bhimaraju

27.5

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

*CJH*

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both the aff. and neg. did a good job, but I vote for the neg. because:

- ① The neg. performed better in the cross exam and rebuttals; the aff. was a little bit slow;
- ② The neg. used a very strong argument that she only needed to provide a counter example; while the aff. had to prove her statement always hold true. — good strategy.
- ③ The neg. had better eye contacts & gestures.

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Notre Dame San Jose MY

Young Genius LB

Mallika Yeleswarapu 26.5

Lakshmi Balram 27

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: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- ① Both the aff. and neg. were good debaters; they were able to present their arguments almost equally well;
- ② I voted for the neg. because of the following
  - A) She clearly specified the sources of her data;
  - B) Her questions during cross exam. were more to the point and thus more powerful;
  - C) The aff. did not refute all the arguments the neg. made during the last aff. rebuttal. (e.g. that she only used one country (N.K.) to support her entire statements, which was wrong.)

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius VL

Brooks BS

Victor Liu

28.3

Brendan Shih

28.5

The better debating was done by the Wag from Brendan (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:

Gave definitions 24.1  
Good clear speech 0.1+0.1  
excellent clarification 0.1+0.1  
of humanitarian aid  
used lots of quotes 0.1+0.1  
Good stats given 0.1+0.1  
talked about  
macro ~~economics~~ 0.1+0.1  
economics  
talked about IMF -0.1  
over time

Reverence  
how it is related?  
0.1  
25.3

Cross exam  
about justice  
Richard-P.  
Something!  
0.1+0.1  
25.5+0.1  
to.1+0.1+0.1  
25.9+0.1  
26.0+0.1  
to.1 to.1

26.3+0.1+0.1+0.1  
26.6+0.1+0.1+0.1+0.1  
27.1+0.1+0.1+0.1+0.1  
27.5+0.1+0.1+0.1+0.1  
27.9+0.1+0.1+0.1  
28.3

hidden  
agenda  
about  
corrupt  
govt

Cross exam 0.1+0.1  
Benevolence!  
how is it related 0.1+0.1  
to current topic 0.1+0.1  
how kindness  
related to justice → 0.1+0.1  
Very good question

Speech → 24.1  
counter a 0.1+0.1  
more persuas 0.1+0.1  
fully → very good 0.1+0.1  
Good stats! 0.1+0.1  
about aid 0.1+0.1  
workers 0.1+0.1  
talked about  
hostility and  
good gov. to  
prevent fur  
aid to distribute  
to proper people 0.1+0.1

unconditional aid can  
be used by corrupt  
govt. 0.1+0.1  
26.7  
0.1+0.1  
26.9+0.1  
to.1  
27.1+0.1  
27.2+0.1+0.1  
0.1+0.1+0.1  
27.7+0.1+0.1+0.1+0.1  
to.1 28.2+0.1+0.1  
to.1 28.5

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AmSa

Westmont MN

Amudha Sairam

25.5

Madhav Nekkar

28.2

The better debating was done by the Neg from Madhav (Westmont)  
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:

- Not very clear  
+ Definition given  
- fumbles

24.1 + 0.1

0.1 + 0.1

0.1 + 0.1

0.1 + 0.1

- 0.1 - 0.1

- 0.1 - 0.1

+ 0.1

Can't answer  
any of the  
cross exam  
properly except  
one about 5

24.5

Asked a very good  
question about  
humanitarian aid

0.1 + 0.1

lots of fumbles!!  
good point about  
unconditional aid vs  
conditional aid

24.7

0.1 + 0.1

0.1 + 0.1

0.1 + 0.1

25.3 + 0.1

0.1 + 0.1

25.5

Talked a lot  
about morality w/o  
actually hold will  
to going forward.

Cross Exam

good question 0.1 + 0.1  
opponent can't answer 0.1 + 0.1  
disappointed her 0.1 + 0.1  
what she was talking about which is 0.1 + 0.1  
commanding 0.1 +  
speech → 24.1  
Good statistics 0.1 + 0.1  
are given about 0.1 + 0.1  
LTTE in Sri Lanka 0.1 + 0.1  
word banks gave 0.1 + 0.1  
them moral? 0.1 + 0.1  
established his 0.1 + 0.1  
argument!! 0.1 + 0.1  
misuse of 0.1 +  
humanitarian 0.1 +  
aid!!

Gave a lot of  
examples!

26.5 + 0.1

26.6 + 0.1

0.1 + 0.1

impressive  
example about  
knife can be  
used to kill vs  
can be used for  
surgery!

0.1 + 0.1

0.1 + 0.1

0.1 + 0.1

0.1 + 0.1

0.1

28.2

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

2

Dawson, Stacy ✓

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Brooks VA

Vikshar Athreya

\_\_\_\_\_

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland JG

Jasper Gan

\_\_\_\_\_

The better debating was done by the

NEG  
AFF or NEG

from

Leland JG  
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF not show up

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto ML

Max Lenail

28.5

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brooks EH

Eric Han

28

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmation: Peace conditionality donor's foreign country and domination compares  
No general agenda agree example: China, human right  
violation

abuse of the right

I clear state the opposite to affirmations. all the evidence poses  
3 evidence research

Negative:

country to country to interaction. Just by nationality  
very clear defect the ~~ex~~ contentions. Policy at the  
different time period and different policy condition benefit  
different. ~~can~~ No agree the tie first contention.

One by one contention evidence and explain his position  
donor interest

All cost of death. No value examples v.s evidence

Cross-examination. affirmation v.s. Negative

aff. rebuttal:

generally well-afford Human aid value critical  
value of Humanity aid North Korean - starving  
poorest country not donor country

Room: Benson 1g  
Flight A: Start 2:30  
LD Mar/Apr Novice

2

AB Ghosh, Young

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014 ✓

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Brooks AM

Anish Maram

\_\_\_\_\_

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Mission San Jose AK

Armaan Kalyanpur

\_\_\_\_\_

The better debating was done by the Neg from Mission San Jose AK  
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 no show.

Room: Nobili B  
Flight A: Start 2:30  
LD Mar/Apr Novice

2

CJ Manga, Radhak

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Mission San Jose HM

Young Genius RiNa

Humdaan Mustafa

Rishi Nair

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NO SHOW.

Both debaters did not come till 4:25 pm

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

2

CJ Manga, Radhak ✓

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Malika Yeleswarapul

NO SHOW

Malika Yeleswarapul

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland EN

Emery Nguyen

The better debating was done by the

Neg  
AFF or NEG

from

Leland  
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Emery did show up but Malika did  
not show up till 4:30 pm

Room: Benson 1d  
Flight A: Start 2:30  
LD Mar/Apr Novice

2

CM Young, Pete

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brooks KA

Young Genius AB

Kartikeya Agrawal

26.9

Amrita Balram

28.0

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG team won this debate because the team has laid out concrete arguments of the political condition can help more effective humanitarian aid. Example given are North Korean & US. Aid condition, Aids to corrupted governments.

Aff team can do more counter in the contention points presented from the NEG side, more research should help.

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

2

46 LE, NGUYEN  
~~Gao, Dawn~~ ✓

# SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Saratoga KK

Brooks RR

Kunal Kanekar

28.5

Ria Reddy

28

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Kunal has a strong case with multiple good contentions that Ria cannot refute convincingly to me.  
Ria case can be improved with more contention points. I am impressed with Ria's original idea to present justice on behalf of the state, but it's not ~~over~~ convincing to me in the end.

Room: Benson 1f  
Flight A: Start 2:30  
LD Mar/Apr Novice

2

~~Cao, Dawn~~

YG LE, NGUYEN

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland PS

University Preparator RA

Pranav Suppal

28

Rohit Anand-Kumar

27

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Pravna presents a strong case with good supporting evidence. Rohit puts forth good arguments but his case can be better supported through empirical evidence.

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

2

CM Young, Pete

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014 ✓

SCU

April 12-13th

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius FC

Fiorella Chen

26.8

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brooks SS

Sonia Sakleshpur

28.0

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG won this round because this team established a unique value system that 95% aids are from government and as a healthy government needs to impose political condition to avoid aiding enemies.

Aff can do more research so this team can counter the opposing points more convincingly.

Room: Benson 1c  
Flight A: Start 2:30  
LD Mar/Apr Novice

2

Das, Sagorika

# SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Aptos IK

Brooks NM

Isabel Kornberg

26

Neval Mulaomerovic

25

The better debating was done by the Aff from Aptos  
AFF & NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Alla MacDonald

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg: Asked to repeat all the contentions,  
value & value criterion during X-exam,  
appeared not listening

Aff: Used clear, easy understood examples

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

2

Das, Sagorika

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014



SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brooks DR

Leland SL

Debasmita Ray

24

Sherri Li

25

The better debating was done by the

NEG  
AFF or NEG

from

Leland  
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Alla MacDonald

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brooks TH

Leland HC

Tejas Harith

27.5

Hannah Cai

27.4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Tejas Harith (Brooks TH)  
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 debaters are very solid w/ sufficient preparation. The affirmative established that Justice was the value and reducing arbitrary limitation being the value criteria. The negative stressed that posing necessary condition will serve the value of justice. Short term alleviation may introduce long-term issues with ~~the~~ indiscriminative aids. Overall, the affirmative was able to formulate arguments more targeted ~~to~~ to the opponent. I vote affirmative win @ small margin.

SLIGHTLY

Room: Nobili A  
Flight A: Start 2:30  
LD Mar/Apr Novice

2

10, Homestead

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU  
April 12-13th

26.1-28.1



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

SURLI JC

Young Genius JS

Jason Chang

26.1

Josh Si

27.1

The better debating was done by the NEG from Josh Si, Young Genius JS  
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 case strengthened the definition of humanitarian aid which should not have political conditions. Negative case was established based on ~~humanitarianism~~ utilitarianism & justice behind it. Overall the negative side provided a more structured argument establishing condition is critical for aid to succeed. Thus I wrote negative win the debate. The affirmative should be prepared with more evidence & be more familiarized with the materials.

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland SE

Young Genius ZV

Samar Elahi

28.5

Zohaib Valani

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from Leland SE [Samar]  
AFF & NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Sid Aslam

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AS A-Dictionary:

Value: Human rights [society welfare]

1. Political Aid is ineffective. Local relationship (unfamiliar)

2. Countries that don't change, won't get Aid. (3) Aid is more important than politics. (4) No state right to interfere.

CE Aid = helping people

Ref left time 1:30  
refuted points

CE questions value.

Why point 1 leads to Human Aid?

Neg speech political cond:

① conditions on Aid help reform bad Government; eg. Libya Syria

② Bosnia with no conditionality. Poverty reduction scale. Aid conditionality linking in Serbia

③ Peace Negotiations brings Money. counterpoints weak!

Ref left time 1:30

Refuted opponents points. worked on ..

Samar had better points with more evidence.

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU  
April 12-13th

✓

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Leland OT

Olivia Thai

28

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius BrMa

Brandon Ma

28

The better debating was done by the Neg from Brandon [Young Genius]  
AFF. or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Sid Askang

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: V: Human life

- AP Justice:
- ① Political Goals corrupt Aid
  - ② Pol Conditions leads to Corruption.  
eg: Moz, Tanzania.
  - ③ produces conflicting interests

E Asked for ex. in ①. No eg. given.

Reb ok.

Morality → help.

CE: Good. Managed to get a concession on: Pol. Goals.  
Asked for Evidence & Examples

V: Human rights

- ① Aid is not effective.
- ② conditionality brings peace
- ③ Allows to fight corruption.

Reb ok. restated Ethiopia eg.

Brandon could counter better and think on his feet.