


LD Jan/Feb Open Semi

A
1
① Saratoga SD vs. La Reina ES
Eng 107

B
11
② Milpitas SX vs. Lynbrook HW
~~③ Connor 107~~
Eng 107



LD Jan/Feb Novice

A Arts 133

Palo Alto CW vs Yang Gen AD

LD Mar/Apr Novice

B Arts 133

Westmont MN vs

Palo Alto R/C

3

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Palo Alto CA
Speaker: Chiragakella

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Lynbrook
Speaker: Emil Terpan

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:

- PFD
- ① I never really understood the neg terrorist argument, but the Aff civil war position was real clear.
 - ② Neg never really hit Aff's fracking arguments
 - ③ Neg didn't make much sense when he said "quality of life is easier to measure than life."

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014
SCU
April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: ~~Scot~~ Palo Alto
Speaker: Ching Akella

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Lynbrook
Speaker: Emil Itimpan

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

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

Signed: Felix Zull

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted for the negative
because he makes point about people in poverty
& if they die extinction will happen faster.
Neg wins on timeframe

B



Lyndbrook ~~Center~~ Young Center AffAg
E1 vs O'Connor 10-3

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Palo Alto CA
Speaker: Chirag Kicella

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Lyndbrook
Speaker: Emile Thompson

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

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

Signed: Vann Z

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

LD Mar/Apr Novice Quart

① Palo ~~Alto~~ Alto NT vs. ³⁻⁰ Young Genius CB
A
O'Connor 104

② Palo ³⁻⁰ Alto NL vs Young Genius AB
B
O'Connor 104

③ Leland OT vs Young Genius BM
A
O'Connor 105

④ Westmont MN vs Young Genius DB
B
O'Connor 105

O'Connor
105

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Westmont

Speaker: _____

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Young Genius

Speaker: _____

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: Tim Duck

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

A lot of passion was exhibited on both sides - the victor in this round was the person that best stayed cool in the heat of the debate. The neg was more effective at countering the aff contentions by pointing out flaws in the evidence.

O'Connor **SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014**
105 **SCU**

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 30

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 28

School: Westmont

School: Young Genius

Speaker: MN

Speaker: DB

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

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

Signed: St. Rose

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both AFF & NEG were a bit too hostile and not respectful of each other, especially during ex. Suggest having more sportsmanship and mutual respect towards each other. AFF spoke very clearly and at a good pace. NEG was a bit too fast - suggest slowing down a bit. Overall AFF's case was more convincing and supportive of the resolution value and value criteria. NEG said that political conditions don't have to work, but said she only needs to prove that they are just during ex. That is a bit too narrow interpretation of framework and conflicts with her "util" value criteria of "welfare society". NEG also didn't contend AFF's contention 2 → sub point b). Overall ~~AFF's case~~ AFF also did a good job showing differences between humanitarian intervention vs. humanitarian aid. NEG spent a lot of time talking about oppressive gov, but not enough time refuting AFF's contentions. Overall, AFF flowed better with his case and convinced me that his case best uphold the resolution. Therefore, I vote for AFF.

Westmont MN

5

Young Genius DB

B

O'Connor
105

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 24

School: Young Genius Westmont MN
Speaker: DB MN

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 29

School: Westmont MN Young Genius
Speaker: MA DB

The better debating was done by the

Aff
NEG
AFF or NEG

from

Westmont
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

adm

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Excellent choice of words
- Westmont won by seniority
- The young genius had a lot of potential, but she didn't present much confidence. Everything was well put together and nothing was out of the ordinary. The entire equation was entirely precise for the Westmont team.

Leland OT

VS

Young Genius BM

A

Room
O'Connor
105

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

Brandon

POINTS: _____

School: ~~Leland~~ Young Genius

Speaker: _____

NEGATIVE

Olivia
Leland

POINTS: _____

School: ~~Young Genius~~

Speaker: _____

The better debating was done by the

Aff

from

Young Genius

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

Signed: _____

Lin Zuehle

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The aff contentions held up better in light of the shared value of justice. The aff side effectively steered the debate to the more narrowly defined topic of emergency relief aid & turned in on the injustice of intentionally withholding aid thereby killing people.

Leland OT

5

Young Genius

A

O'Connor
105

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 28

School: Lela Young Genius

Speaker: BM

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 22.25

School: Leland

Speaker: OT

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: AM

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Good speech
- Overall good word choice
- Both humanitarian ideas are put together
- Affirmative side is extremely aggressive
- Good competition from both sides
- Excellent composition
- Everything is top notch
- Nothing was missed
- All very well put together

Leland OT
(NEG)

5

Young Genius BM
(AFF)

A

O'Connor
105

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 27

School: Young Genius BM

Speaker: BM

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 29

School: Leland OT

Speaker: OT

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: At. Rosai

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF spoke a bit too fast, which made it harder for judge to understand his case clearly. Consider slowing down a bit and pause betⁿ sentences. ~~While~~ AFF did a good job highlighting "long-term vs. short term" benefits issue and asking judge to discard "long-term" benefits argument of NEG, ~~the~~ ~~the~~ while NEG refuted this argument by clarifying the definition of humanitarian aid being relevant to during & aftermath of disaster, the AFF refuted it effectively by saying "aftermath" can't be forever or for very long time. So I give AFF the point for this. But AFF didn't refute NEG's first contention effectively of "conditions can prevent violence". So I give NEG a point for this. Overall, Neg did a better job refuting all AFF's arguments and clearly stating and defending her contentions ~~th~~ and demonstrated better upholding the value criteria. So I vote for NEG. NEG also spoke more clearly and at a good pace which made it easier for judge to understand her case.

B

5

Palo Alto ML vs Young Genius AB

O'Connor 104

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

Sania Bopai

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Palo Alto
Speaker: Max Lanail

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Young Genius
Speaker: Rita Bakaram

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: Jim B...

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both wasted a lot of time with the criterion debate. One or two sentences would have done the job but it was very dressed out.

Rita- you are one of the best speakers I have heard today. Your arguments ~~area~~ and delivery were very well created.

However, I voted aff because

1) Cost of 900,000 lives.

~~aff~~ ~~neg~~ briefly talked about peace but ~~neg~~ ^{neg} should have expanded on it by saying the missiles stopped WW3. ~~There were~~
The impact was not fleshed out enough for it to win either criterion

2) Cont. 4 about abusive relationships was mostly untouched so it still stood toward the end.

Otherwise it was very close and you are both great.

B

5

Palo Alto ML vs Young Genius AB
G Connor 104

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 27.00

School: Palo Alto ML

Speaker: Max Lenai

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 27.5

School: Young Genius AB

Speaker: Amritha Balaram

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

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

Signed: SHANTHARAM NEKKAR

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Very close debate!! Could have gone either way
- Neg did very well in x-ex asking for details and clarification
- Aff was won by tightening the story in the last 2 AR's.
- Neg also made a mistake by missing the citations

Suggestions of Aff

- get better at x-exchange
- present the evidence more clearly

Suggestions for Neg

- good x-exchange but should use that info to expand in speech



SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 29

School: Palo Alto NL

Speaker: Max leain

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 28

School: AMRITA BALARAM

Speaker: ↓

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: Sugar

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

With value criteria contested to be similar, id and minor differences in data quoted. It was a difficult judgement.

Both AFF and NEG presented good arguments and had great presentation style.

Neg did lag to define key terms during cross x like "human dignity and human rights".

A well Contentested debate.

A



Palo Alto NT vs Young Genius LB
O'Connor 104

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 27.5

School: PALO ALTO NT

Speaker: NEHA TALLAPRAGADA

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 28

School: YOUNG GENIUS LB

Speaker: LAKSHMI BALARAM

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: SHANTHARAM NEKKAR

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~Comments~~

neg won for following reasons:

- Better/tighter control of logic. The aff did not logically conclude the arguments.
- the aff was the much better speaker though

Suggestions to both

- have better evidence in the talk
- have better understanding of V and VS

Congrats to both for
breaking!

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 25

School: Pak Alto NT

Speaker: Neha Tallapragada

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 29

School: Young census

Speaker: Lakshmi Balaram

The better debating was done by the

Neg
AFF or NEG

from

YU
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Haleh Amiry

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative:

Neha - Very hard to understand & she rushed through the whole read up.

- Not convincing. She stalling at the wall was very disturbing.

- increasing the quality of life.

Negative:

Better presentation, Both reasoning!

point by point addressing the issues.

- well organized & well addressed.

~~Best~~: Neg - Was clearly the winner.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: 28

NEGATIVE

POINTS: 29

School: Palo Alto NT

School: Young Genius

Speaker: NEHA TALLAPRAGADA

Speaker: LAKSHMI BALARAM

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:

~~Opp: The value criteria of "Quality of Life" is a subjective and failure to establish "quality of life" is a defined outcome in debate.~~

Establishing a value criteria was key to this debate.

~~Opp~~ NEG had definitely won in value criteria.

AFF did fail to establish "quality of life" and its relevance to Humanitarian aid.

The Confidence in delivery of speech was remarkable for opp.
the clarity of thought and organization was good for opp.

~~Aff~~ AFF failed to show how tax collected from citizen given as an aid to different country help the original citizens.

LD Jan/Feb Novice Quant

① Young Genius ^ANA vs Palo Alto CW
O'Connor 102

② Young Genius ^BNA vs. Young Genius KL
O'Connor 102

③ Young Genius ^AAD vs. Young Genius Amba
O'Connor 103

④ Lynbrook ^BEI vs. Young Genius An Ag
O'Connor 103

Daly

7:30 PM

Young

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014
SCU
April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Young Genius
Speaker: Nicolas

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Young Genius
Speaker: Katrina

The better debating was done by the Aff from YG Nicolas
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:

Nicolas

- Good summary & end of IAC
- Nice way to assert that "Resources are finite" in ex

Katrina

- why keep asking @ whether he mentions the word "RSE". His points seem pretty directly tied to different types of "RSE"
- artificial mines, deforestation, burning ff, etc...
- focus early questions on getting him to admit to benefits of RSE (such as electricity / sci / sanitation)
- Great speaking pace/volume / unified in direction

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Young Genius ~~AD~~ AmWa
Speaker: Amisha

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Young Genius AD
Speaker: Andrew

The better debating was done by the Neg from YG AD
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:

Amisha

- good way 2 reject the counter-question
- dropped the neg case #2/3 → gives him too many impacts
- He does slight defense 2 your case w/ in the end, tips balance

both great / had quotes ☺

Andrew

- compelling slew of stats in the INK
- good rebuttals but get to #4 w/ more time
- response 2 Ukraine was new in INK
- good indite of Huff post ev.

- Neg wins b/c of immediate impacts + b/c he successfully suggests that dev. → future EP. Amisha: say ① how it'll be too late by then + ② the dev. of all countries is impossible b/c of corruption, mismanagement, + finite/ varying supplies of resources.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Young Genius NA

Speaker: Aji

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Palo Alto CW

Speaker: Wang

The better debating was done by the Neg. from Palo Alto CW
AFF & NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff needs to signpost her arguments better, avoid new arguments in her last speech & face the judges during C-X. Neg provides better evidence & reasoning & seems more polished; However Aff is a fighter & shows lots of promise.

A

5

Young Genius NA vs Palo Alto CW
O'Connor 102

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Young Genius
Speaker: Natasha Aji

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Palo Alto
Speaker: Cardace Wang

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

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

Signed: Tim Gill

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg wins this round because more
~~offense~~ offense came through. Good job by
neg. to mitigate contentions of Aff.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Young Genius
Speaker: Natasha Ali

NEGATIVE

POINTS: _____

School: Palo Alto
Speaker: Candace Wang

The better debating was done by the Neg from Palo Alto CWO
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 - Value: Social Welfare.

- Food Security
- Beneficial For Women

2. - Over Consumption of Resources.
+ growing Env/Econ loss

3. - Resource Extraction creates
harvest & Violence.

4. - Resource wealth $\neq$ Economic
Security

Neg - Utilitarianism

1 - Improves E

A = 1.2 bill from mines.

B = Directly Employed.