

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AmSa

Brooks DR

Amudha Sairam

27.9

Debasmita Ray

26.8

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

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

Signed: Giselle Blong

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF proved that the maximum alleviation of suffering is the most just action/policy to take.

Neg. used ~~e~~ states instead of countries, should have stayed with countries

Neg. did not have any examples of countries where unconditional humanitarian aid hurt that country

AFF used an example from 2004, then Neg. said you can only consider recent humanitarian aid cases, but did not make the case of why. AFF countered that humanitarian aid now is the same as in 2004

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brooks EH

Young Genius ZV

Eric Han

27.1

Zohaib Valani

25.6

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

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

Signed: Jesselle Blong

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg. constantly said that status quo was not known so it could not be used and <sup>therefore</sup> thrown out. But AFF explained his definition of status quo, which used in this context cannot be strictly defined - it is the status quo in each country.

Neg. gave many countries as examples of how placing political conditions on humanitarian aid to these countries has worked, but gave no details of how it has helped those countries - so he never proved his contention.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014 ✓

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brooks KA

Young Genius RiNa

Kartikeya Agrawal

25.5

Rishi Nair

25

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

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

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

Samin Molchani Leland HS

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF.

Kartikeya - You have very good points in your argument. Value & value Criteria clearly stated. you referred to a couple of studies, but more research will be helpful. You speak at a good pace, but when you read, you are too fast - please slow down!

NEG.

Rishi - your use of data and examples was very good. value and criteria well stated. But, you need to show you are in charge of your speech.

I voted for AFF. His arguments were more convincing in support of the Topic.

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

3

BH Zhao, George

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland SE

Young Genius JS

Samar Elahi

28

Josh Si

27

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

CON won the value debate & impacted.

neg is SPAL.

Room: Benson 1i  
Flight A: Start 430  
LD Mar/Apr Novice

3

BH Zhao, George

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius LB

Lakshmi Balram

27

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto AG

Ahana Ganguly

27

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: \_\_\_\_\_

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I vote pro because I was convinced that political conditions minimizes the quality of life... but I don't believe that corruption is good.

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

3

BA Lenail, Ben

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland HC

Young Genius DB

Hannah Cai

21

Divija Bhimaraju

22

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

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

Signed: K Ramakrishnan Washington High

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

6:02  
more theory and  
no presentation skills.

Good and clear  
presentation

not clear and confident

Clear presentation skills  
but reading out of  
computer Doc.

Good presentation

Late arrival (20 min)  
no valid reason

Room: Nobili A  
Flight A: Start 430  
LD Mar/Apr Novice

3

BA Lenail, Ben

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Brooks NM

Neval Mulaomerovic

22

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius BrMa

Brandon Ma

23

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

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

Signed: K. Pandeshina Washington High

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

5.10.

5.27 (sub Exam

↑ ↔ ↔

5.30

Had only one contention

Less cross Exam

Too much

Cross Exam

5.15

5.20.

↓ ↔ ↔

Too many Data Points

more Cross Exam

Too much speed.!

Room: Benson 1f  
Flight A: Start 430  
LD Mar/Apr Novice

3

~~AB Desai, Young~~  
LE, NGUYEN

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto ML

Leland EN

Max Lenail

24

Emery Nguyen

27

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

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

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

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:



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

3

~~AB Desai, Young~~

LE, NGUYEN

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brooks RR

Leland SL

Ria Reddy

28

Sherri Li

28.5

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

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

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

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Sherri has more convincing evidence. Sherri can improve on her delivery skill.

Ria has good communication skill, but more contentwise points and stronger supporting evidence will help her case a lot.

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

Placing Political Conditions SCU on humanitarian aid is unjust  
April 12-13th

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

University Preparator RA

Rohit Anand-Kumar

24.9

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AB

Amrita Balram

28.2

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: Sriram Dandapani

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Amrita was much better prepared than Rohit. Rohit had a tendency to read notes which at times had the effect of "losing the audience". Amrita had clear and sufficient examples for all the contentions. (e.g. aid to Somalia going to corrupt regime)

Amrita's rebuttal was very effective. There were quite a few for which Rohit had no answer or could not clearly explain the reasons for the.

Amrita had the tendency to ~~so~~ talk fast (a minor negative, but ~~did~~ had no negative impact on the debate).

Rohit's rebuttal focused mostly on the definition of "humanitarian aid" instead of relying on examples to substantiate arguments.

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014



## SCU

April 12-13th

Placing Political Conditions on Humanitarian aid is unjust

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brooks TH

Tejas Harith

28.5

Young Genius FC

Fiorella Chen

24.1

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

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

Signed: Sriram Pandapani.

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Tejas was very clear and un-ambiguous in his presentation. Every point put forth was clearly explained. In contrast, Fiorella did not seem prepared for the topic. The points were read out from notes without explanation. This was evident during Tejas' rebuttal of Fiorella's points.

Fiorella needs to understand and elaborate every sentence read/spoken to effectively conduct the debate.

Tejas ~~was~~ accurately pointed contradictions in Fiorella's contentions without any refutations.

Room: Nobili G  
Flight A: Start 430  
LD Mar/Apr Novice

3

AB Dong, Young G

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland PS

SURLI JC

Pranav Suppal

30

Jason Chang

28

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

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

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

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Pranav started case strongly and defended his case very well. Jason didn't have a strong case to counter his opponent but fought well. Overall Pranav defended his case well and Jason couldn't counter it strongly.

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th



AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Notre Dame San Jose MY

Aptos IK

Mallika Yeleswarapu 29

Isabel Kornberg 30

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Mallika started her case strongly but couldn't do strong cross-examination. Isabel did a great job in presenting her case and was very impressive and convincing compared to her opponent both while defending her case as well as rebutting her opponent with great examples done impressively.

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU  
April 12-13th



## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Brooks AM

Anish Maram

26

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

University Preparator CM

Cameron McElroy

28

The better debating was done by the neg from Univ Prep. CM  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

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

Simin Mokhtari, Apr. 12, Leland HS.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF.

Anish - very good presentation. Good voice and clear statement of value & Criteria. But, you need more real world data & examples to back up your arguments.

Cameron - Excellent arguments. very clear statements of value & Criteria. Very good examples. you are also very good in X exam. Excellent presentation.

I voted for neg. He did have a strong argument and was more convincing in his arguments against the topic.

Room: Benson 1e  
Flight A: Start 430  
LD Mar/Apr Novice

3

9, Homestead

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014 ✓

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Saratoga KK

Young Genius VL

Kunal Kanekar

29

Victor Liu

28

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

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

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

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- CONTENTIONS WERE NOT REFUTED BY NEG
- NEG WON THE FRAMEWORK BY CLEARLY LINKING UTILITARIANISM TO LIFE → LIBERTY → HAPPY

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

3

9, Homestead

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brooks SS

Palo Alto NT

Sonia Sakleshpur

29.5

Neha Tallapragada

29

The better debating was done by the AFF 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:

AFF 2<sup>nd</sup> CONTENTION - INTERNATIONAL LAW, SUB POINTS WERE NOT  
REFUTED

AFF DID NOT REFUTE THE CHARGE THAT AFF CONTRADICTED ON  
HAITI IN THE NEXT ROUND. IT WAS RAISED LATER

NEA APOLOGIZED INDICATING TO THE NOVICE JUDGE  
THAT SHE MADE A MISTAKE. IT MAY GO UNNOTICED  
IF IT IS EXPLAINED WITH LOT OF VERBAGE.



Room: Sobrato C-A  
Flight B: Start  
LD Mar/Apr Novice

3

AB Balemurughan, ✓

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Brooks RB

Rishi Balakrishnan

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Malika Yeleswarapul

Malika Yeleswarapul

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

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

Signed: Aida Trujillo 6:05 PM

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

FORFEIT -

MALIKA DID NOT SHOW.

Room: Sobrato C-A  
Flight A: Start 430  
LD Mar/Apr Novice

3

AB Balemurughan, ✓

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brooks GD

Leland OT

Gaurisha Dewan

28

Olivia Thai

26

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

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

Signed: Alela Trump

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

MORE EN POINTE WITH FOCUS OF DEBATE FROM  
A MORAL STANDPOINT. → AND SHORT TERM PURPOSE OF AIDE  
ENOUGH CONNECTION BETWEEN POLITICS AND HUMANITARIAN  
AIDE.  
NEG DIDN'T MAKE STRONG

Room: Benson 1j  
Flight A: Start 430  
LD Mar/Apr Novice

3

AB Ding, Young G ✓

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Brooks VA

Vikshar Athreya

*NO Show*

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Westmont MN

Madhav Nekkar

29

The better debating was done by the

*Neg*  
AFF or NEG

from

*Westmont*  
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

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

*[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Affirmative team did not show up, & therefore forfeited. Negation team presented their speech anyway. The negation did a good job understanding the topic, and laying out several points why ~~the resolution~~ it is important to place conditions on humanitarian aid for the greater good. They especially did a good job ~~ext~~ giving examples and showing how the examples were valid. One comment/critique I have is that they could work on their transitions & rate of speech. It was a bit too fast.

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

3

AB Ding, Young G

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Mission San Jose AK

Leland RE

Armaan Kalyanpur

26

Ramin Eghtesadi

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: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted for negative because they were more clear about the benefits of their contentions. The affirmative team made good contentions, ~~to~~ but failed to back it up with evidence that was explained. In addition, the neg. did a better job at showing why the Aff. team's contentions were not valid.

Room: Benson 1g  
Flight A: Start 430  
LD Mar/Apr Novice

3

Cao, Dawn

Parmar, Pradeep

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

(Mountain View Los  
Altos).

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Mission San Jose HM

Humdaan Mustafa

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland JG

Jasper Gan

The better debating was done by the

NEG

AFF or NEG

from

JASPER GAN.

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed:

Pradeep Singh Parmar

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Dropped Humdaan Mustafa  
because he was a no-show.