

Room: Eng 107
Flight A: Start 1230
LD Mar/Apr Novice

5

Yg Le, Nguyen

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE *inst*

20 POINTS / 30

Brooks GD

Gaurisha Dewan

NEGATIVE *inst*

POINTS 25 / 30

Young Genius DB

Divija Bhimaraju

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

as discussed with the contestants, the affirmative presentation had good points to discuss however they were given too fast, and too stumbled.

The negative was able to present and rebut well and organized.

convincing me that the premise was not accurate.

The fit-4-fat on time issues and apparent hostile between the debater was difficult to experience.

Room: Eng 107
Flight B: Start
LD Mar/Apr Novice

5

Yg Le, Nguyen

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius RiNa

SURLI JC

Rishi Nair

25
30

• Jason Chang

25
30

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

the affirmative had good points, presented reasonably well and would be the winners. However, negative pointed out the debate rules - not able to bring up new points, and not being allowed to change the wording premise of the statement. Clearly the negative used more procedural tactics and affirmatives weakness instead of presenting a strong case for his side of the issue.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius VL

Victor Liu

25

Brooks AM

Anish Maram

27

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- It's a low point win because after the first speech by the AFF & NEG teams they resorted to merely restating what they said in their first speech & said that the opponent was wrong.
- It was hard for me to understand a lot of what the AFF team was saying since he was mostly looking at his laptop while speaking.
- NEG team's argument of nation states having the acting interest to maximize their self-interest was not well refuted by the AFF team. AFF team said talked about 'Deontology as an alternative position but went little beyond defining what Deontology is.
- AFF team was also not able to refute NEG team's position that this debate was about how countries should act and not how individuals must.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland SL

Sherri Li

25

Brooks TH

Tejas Harith

28.5

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: NO

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Aff conceded during cross-examination that placing political conditions on humanitarian aid is 'just'.
 - Neg defined the value of 'justice' as one wherein the nation's rights are maximized. Aff defined the value of justice as maximizing welfare for the most citizens. However, Aff was not able to attack NEG's contention.
 - Aff also conceded NEG's analysis and the value of contention of maximizing a nation's self-interest as being acceptable.
- AFF

 - Good analysis, if good composure throughout debate.
 - You articulated your points well.
 - You forgot to stand-up for your last speech.
- NEG

 - Good job with cross-examination.
 - Good job with analysis of the Aff positions & highlighting shortcomings.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland RE

Young Genius AB

Ramin Eghtesadi

26

Amrita Balram

27

Both of you
mispronounced
names of countries
and other words.
Need to watch
this

The better debating was done by the

Neg
AFF or NEG

from

Young Genius
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed:

Karen Kenyon

Good
potential
by both
debaters.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

Speech organized. Good analysis. I think you needed to look for a few more current examples to support points (i.e. Russia in Cold War and Germany/ Nazis.) When answering C-X questions, be more confident.

Rebuttal 1: You had some good analysis but you jumped around. Also you need to show the impact of your argument on the case/resolution. Remember you can have more than one answer/response to an argument.

Neg. You had some good questions but don't hammer on one point too long. It limits the information you get. Talking a little fast. Watch how you spend your time - you ran out of time to discuss Aff's complete case. When setting up your case, consider using subpoints (A, B) - it was difficult to follow as written.

Both teams - last rebuttal should focus on voting issues a bit more

Both teams got a little short and snappy with one another. This is not needed in the debate. This was a very close debate - Aff wins arguments. ① on political conditions leading them to turn down aid and ② political conditions lead to deaths - Neg wins arguments that political conditions can lead to reform - i.e. North Korea and ② political conditions can increase chance of peace, thus leading to greater good. In the end, I give it to Negative because she argues that aid can come first conditions second. Aff. does not respond to this

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland PS

Westmont MN

Pranav Suppal

27

Madhav Nekkar

28

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: Karen Kenyon

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Pranav Like your intro. Well-structured. Good speed. When you answer questions, be a bit more forceful, dynamic. Good questions asked in CX.

Rebuttal - jumped around in handling his case. Go straight down his case. Also as you argue a point, show the impact and relationship to the resolution.

Closing Speech - In final speech, really come back to your value criterion for the judge.

Madhav Well-organized. Remember when responding you can have more than one response. Good speed of delivery. Good direct clash and good extension of arguments. Don't get upset on timing - you over-reacted a little. I would also like to see you make the argument and then show its impact on your case. You didn't really come back at end to discuss how utilitarianism is best achieved by your case, thus you should win. ~~Massive~~ Look at opponent for questions, then direct answer to judge.

Just this was a very close debate. I thought both debaters showed great potential and were well-versed in the subject. I give this debate to Neg. because (1) Neg. shows that humanitarian aid ends up in wrong hands, that (2) setting political conditions can improve somewhat the abuses that occur. (3) That even food/water can be sold/stolen, thus aiding in starvation and prolonging negative conditions.

Room: Benson 1j
Flight B: Start 1:20
LD Mar/Apr Novice

5

AB Balemurughan,

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brooks KA

Leland SE

Kartikeya Agrawal

27.1

Samar Elahi

27.8

The better debating was done by the Neg. from Leland - Samar Elahi.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Allesha

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative

Negative

value ~~given~~ criteria.
Limiting arbitrary conditions.

- * Donors use punitive conditionality
- * Conditionality violates neutrality.
- * Baby drowning example.
- * Soup kitchen example - limit the amount of soup but give it.
- * Humanitarian aid given to Afghan.
- long lasting emergency?
- * North Korea need aid in condition that they don't advance nuclear program but they didn't
- * Typhoon Haiyan - condition wouldn't stop violence

- * humanitarian aid -?
- aid in general.
- Afghanistan - not humanitarian aid
- * Taliban was given money as a result of no condition.
- * value maintaining gov. stability.
- * gives extremists more power.
- * aid w/o conditions can support violent militant groups.
- * If aid went to Taliban in Afghanistan which would not happen if there was condition.

Comments -

- * speak slowly and more clearly.
- * need more examples of how conditionality did not help.

Comments -

- * good contentions → and examples.
- *

Room: Benson 1j
Flight A: Start 1230
LD Mar/Apr Novice

5 AB Balemurugan,

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

University Preparator RA

Rohit Anand-Kumar

Brooks VA

Vikshar Athreya

waited for 20 min.
Did not show
up.

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: _____

Allesha

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

No show

Room: Nobili B
Flight A: Start 1230
LD Mar/Apr Novice

5

Partha Ray

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Leland JG

Jasper Gan

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brooks RR

Ria Reddy

26

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: _____

Signed: Partha Ray

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*The AFF took more control over debate, more examples
Better reasoned argument.*

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

5

Partha Ray

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Mission San Jose AK

Leland EN

Armaan Kalyanpur

29

Emery Nguyen

24

The better debating was done by the

AFF

from

Mission San Jose

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

Partha Ray

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF took much better control of the debate, provided much clearer examples and better reasoning.

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

5 Harker Ramachand

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brooks EH

Eric Han

27

Young Genius JS

Josh Si

28

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: _____

Signed: _____

[Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG:

The point for "greatest good to greatest number of people"
was the tipping point.

Debate was well balanced.

Room: Nobile A
Flight A: Start 1230
LD Mar/Apr Novice

5 Harker Ramachand

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brooks SS

Young Genius BrMa

Sonia Sakleshpur

28

Brandon Ma

27

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

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

Signed: Jury

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1. Cross examination brought out conflicting thoughts and information in NEG.
2. Good delivery of points with good logical organization.
Transition from one value to another.

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

5

Le, Nguyen

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brooks DR

Notre Dame San Jose MY

Debasmita Ray

27

Mallika Yeleswarapu

28

The better debating was done by the

NEG
AFF or NEG

from

Mallika

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

AM

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius FC

Fiorella Chen

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland HC

Hannah Cai

28

The better debating was done by the Neg from Leland HC
AFF & NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: you need to do a better job of explaining your case. You extend taglines and authors but don't explain how you uphold your value criterion. I think the negative does a better job explaining why the conditions are more effective at achieving their value and value criterion. You ~~need~~ both need to distinguish between human dignity and deontological because it seems you both agree with each other and then try to disagree and show a difference. In the end I vote neg because I believe she did a better job of explaining why conditions are effective at achieving democratic reforms and thus upholding justice for those in undemocratic countries.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius LB

Saratoga KK

Lakshmi Balram

28.5

Kunal Kanekar

28

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:

Neg does not address the last two contentions of Aff and despite the lack of explanation earlier in the debate its enough for me to vote Aff. The fact that political conditions fail and with humanitarian crisis being immediate emergencies we need to give aid w/o conditions. I think ~~it goes to~~ neg if you knew more on Sudan and why P.C. could solve for root cause of conflict, then you could win. Aff, you need to also extend and point out again why his evidence is talking about development aid not humanitarian aid. I think ~~it goes to~~ the Neg talked more about misallocation of Aid by government and even NGOs, that would have compelled me more to probably vote Neg. Or talk about your two last contentions which you don't really extend.

Room: Nobili C
Flight A: Start 1230
LD Mar/Apr Novice

5

BP Wang, Shih-Ta

NANDAKUMAR SHANMUGAM, LYNNBROOK

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto NT

Young Genius ZV

Neha Tallapragada

27.8

Zohaib Valani

28.0

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

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

Signed: Alankumar Shayan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The negative mentioned humanitarian aid also includes military aid. This precludes the topic on humanitarian aid. The negative stood by the point that the donor country must coerce the receiving country to do what it wants to do without providing any counter argument that such coercion would improve justice, reduce poverty or increase the quality of life.

While the affirmative did not provide convincing argument that the receiving country would manage the funds effectively without corruption, it proved the non-intervention by the donor country would provide much needed freedom to the receiving country to improve the quality of life.

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

5

BP Wang, Shih-Ta

ZYNBROOK — N/ANDAKUMAR SHANMUGAM

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland OT

Brooks NM

Olivia Thai

28.4

Neval Mulaomerovic

28.0

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

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

Signed: Nandakumar Shanmugam

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Affirmative had proved well that the political intervention would impact increases the rate of corruption in the receiving country; and when the political condition changes in the receiving country, the aid stops that puts the people in the receiving country in a much more dire condition than the original condition before the aid was started.

The negative argued that the country ^{down} ~~have self~~ must have self interest in providing the humanitarian aid, and countries come just before the people of the country. The argument did not include how the self interest by the donor countries would help to improve justice and peace in the receiving country.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

University Preparator CM

Palo Alto ML

Cameron McElroy

27.8

Max Lenail

27.5

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

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

Signed: _____

Atale

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

equality.

Aff - Humanitarian aid is doing justice. U.S., Canada, Mexico's aid to Africa is limited due to political conditions. While aid by China to Africa (without political conditions) is more effective & unlimited. China is more recent example. Not much progress in Africa (after western aid with political conditions)

Neg - ~~Mozambique~~ ~~Somalia~~ ~~Bosnia~~ ~~Mozambique~~ condition worsened as no political condition. In ~~Mozambique~~ ~~Bosnia~~ aid helped, some exceptions when there is failure. ~~growing~~ economy & ~~improve~~ remove poverty (Political conditions). Rebel groups may take aid and worsen situation.

I voted for Aff, as it emphasized recent China example and mentioned that aid in Africa by Western countries has failed in past.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AmSa

Brooks RB

Amudha Sairam

27.0

Rishi Balakrishnan

27.6

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

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

Signed: _____

Akale

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Placing Political conditions on humanitarian Aid to foreign countries is unjust.

Aff - One (Donor) cannot force political will. Political conditions ^{may} delay aid, causing suffering. In Africa, situation has not improved.

Negative - No political conditions may aid extremists. Usually Donors have self-interest. ^{Ex.} Rwanda example - problem continued.

I voted for Neg, as it emphasized donors have some self-interest, to get stability, remove poverty etc in country being helped, so it won over Aff action. Also aid may go to extremists, if no political condition.