

Room: Loyola 153
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Mar/Apr Open

1

BD Kanekar, Bhus ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

Young Genius DJ

Deepankar Joshi

POINTS

27

NEGATIVE

Homestead EG

Erika Gutekunst

POINTS

28

The better debating was done by the

Neg
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

from

Homestead
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

[Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

A strong effort by a young and improving debater, but the neg presented the strongest effort overall. She pointed out that the aff. did not explain how people would get old in places where corruption exists.

Room: Loyola 153
Flight B: Start
LD Mar/Apr Open

1

BD Kanekar, Bhus ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Aptos AA

Leland AT

Antonio Anselmo

26

Adam Talaat

26

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Very difficult call with a
slight edge to the Aff on this one.
Neg expanded the debate to beyond
basic humanitarian aid and ~~neg~~
Aff did a good enough job
responding/attacking.

Room: O'Connor 102
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Mar/Apr Open

1

BE Kannappan, Ka ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius ShPe

Brooks MH

Shriya Perati

21

Michelle Huang

26

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: Joe Mja

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff presented a clear and concise argument.
Good speed & good organization.

Neg spoke much too fast. And her argument was confusing and not laid out very well. Even Aff had a hard time following your argument and trying to clarify in cross was even more confusing. You need a better argument or you need to organize & present it more clearly.

Room: O'Connor 102
Flight B: Start
LD Mar/Apr Open

1

BE Kannappan, Ka ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Homestead AV

Palo Alto HY

Amrita Venkatraman

21

Helen Yan

28

The better debating was done by the NEG 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:

Both were excellent speakers & had good arguments.

Neg gave a more organized & well thought out argument. Great Rebuttal speech.

Aff's argument was hard to follow - and final rebuttal was very weak and unconvincing.

Room: O'Connor 107
Flight B: Start
LD Mar/Apr Open

1

Dong, Jianming ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto RH

Evergreen RS

Ryan Huang

~~26.9~~ 27.0

Ramneek Singh

27.5

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

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

Signed: _____

Ramneek Singh

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Value Prop from both the contestant was same and agreed which was "maximize benefit and justice".

- Negative contestant was able summarize and prove how benefits of aids can be maximized by adding political conditions. He proved this by defining ~~to~~ NGo, Governments ... to be contributing the aid. He was able to summarize his all the points with example.

Room: O'Connor 104
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Mar/Apr Open

1

AB Ding, Young G ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto AnGi

Mountain View AS

Andy Gibson

28.5

Anushi Singhal

26.5

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

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

Signed: Patty Carr

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The affirmative had good evidence; he had specific data that was very compelling. The affirmative effectively cross-examined the negative. The affirmative was an extremely good speaker. The negative did a good job. The negative could have improved by having more evidence.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Aptos RF

Saratoga IM

Ryan Fotheringham

27.0

Isha Mangal

27.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from Isha Mangal
AFF of NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: R. Fotheringham

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Although, affirmative case was well defined and clearly articulated. Negative clearly ~~contested~~ contested the main points put together in affirmative. Further, negative had examples for each of the contestants.

(1.38) AFFIRMATIVE (4) arguments were given
+ well explained terms

① would kill people, if aids are removed, examples are given (2)

② unstable countries can be hurt might not be able to pay back as political rules.

③ humanitarianism:

- what are your statistics

- How many people died in Egypt?

② Afghanistan: women's rights → explained well

NEGATIVE

① aid to work & long last to work
= leadership to distribute food, aid

- Heidi example

② political conditions ensures goes to right people 'Turkey' what pol

③ make it work, → econ boost

→ it doesn't matter, gov. being selfish & harm the people - no. c.

→ sphere project

Room: O'Connor 105
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Mar/Apr Open

1

33, Leland Judge ✓

Harker Judge
- Ramachandran

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Westmont BY

Mountain View WA

Bruce Young

29

Will Alexander

28.9

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

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

Signed: Vijay Ramachandran

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative Comment

- * - good rebuttal
- * - need to be more clearer in speech & actions → during 6 min. affirmative speech
- * - need to stay calm.
- *** - more factual

Negative Comments.

- * - Giving clear topic.
- * good affirmative speech
- need to be louder
- * good cross-examination on negative.
- * More facts presented
- * Good show of emotions.

I voted for affirmative since the facts presented were more believable =

Both speakers were exceptional!

Room: O'Connor 105
Flight B: Start
LD Mar/Apr Open

1

33, Leland Judge ✓

Flarker Judge
"Ramachandran"

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

University Preparator GC

Homestead SA

Gulshan Chahal

29

Sahitya Atluri

28 7

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

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

Signed: Ujala Ramachandran

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland AL

Palo Alto WZ

Anthony Lin

27.1

Will Zhou

27.3

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

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

Signed: S. Raghun (RAGHU SAKLESHPUR) BROOKS ACAD

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The NEG ~~to debate~~ won this round because he was more convincing on the points why providing political conditions help in:

- 1) getting more bang for the buck as resources are limited.
- 2) Helps make the world better by discussing despotic and fascist regimes.

The aff made philosophical points but lacked enough evidence to show ~~that~~ how provided aid without political conditions can reach and benefit the people.

Room: O'Connor 103
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Mar/Apr Open

1

AU Reddy, Vasu ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU
April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Westmont DG

Daniel Gilchrist

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius EK

Eish Kapoor

27.4

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

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

Signed: [Signature] CRAGHU SAKLESHWAR) BROOKS ACAD

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The AFF team won this debate because they proved that it is not just to impose political sanctions on countries to provide humanitarian aid better with more context and examples.

The negative team (~~presented~~) focused more on certain cases rather than the criteria and value that was established.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Homestead TG

Leland SB

Tej Gokhale

29

Sarita Berigei

28.9

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

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

Signed: Patty Core

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This seemed like it should have been a tie. Both sides had effective presentations, data and rebuttals. The affirmative won because of the greater evidence for contention 1, a study involving 29 countries versus the negative supporting contention 1 with 3 countries. Also the negative could have done a better job with contention 2, showing more clearly the link between violence and increased poverty. The negative had excellent information and rebutted very effectively. It was a very hard choice to pick the winner.

Room: Loyola 138
Flight B: Start
LD Mar/Apr Open

1

AB Ghosh, Young

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Saratoga AV

Leland AH

Amulya Vadlakonda

25

Anna Houk

24

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

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

Signed: Alia Macdonald

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: good Q's during X-examin.

Neg: not clear; doesn't always finish her sentences, before jumping to the next one

Room: Loyola 138
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Mar/Apr Open

1

AB Ghosh, Young ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Evergreen TG

Homestead SS

Tanmay Ghai

26

Siraj Sodhi

22

The better debating was done by the Aff from Evergreen
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:

x-examinat. from Negative side was off the topic presented by Aff. position; was ineffective
Aff. had good examples to support his position

Neg. didn't provide definition for some of the terms used; while provided some facts, didn't do a good job extending them

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Mountain View AJ

Young Genius AY

Avery James

28

Albert Yang

27

The better debating was done by the Aff from Mountain View Avery James
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Mark G. Gehrke

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Genent: Both speakers clear and polite. listened to each other's arguments and responded to them.

~~Genent~~ Aff: Clear structure to arguments, with enumerated bullet items. Conditions do not and have not caused change. Countries can present facade of change, but nothing behind superficially appearances. Made case that in 62% of cases, conditionality fails to contribute to political change. Made important point that humanitarian aid is by definition impartial + neutral, therefore not tied to political conditions. Utilitarianism: do conditions increase/decrease political change: is this relevant?

Neg: Critique was utilitarianism. Made contentions that conditions needed to ensure that (a) condition necessary to make aid effective and (b) conditions necessary to reduce corruption.

Rebuttal: argued only necessary to show that sometimes conditions are effective.

Room: Kenna 310
Flight A: Start 10:00am
LD Mar/Apr Open

1

BA Yun, Xiaohan ✓

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius OZ

Leland KG

Oliver Zhao

27

Kashyap Garimella

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from ~~Leland~~ Kashyap Garimella
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Mark Gilbert

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

General: Both speakers were clear and polite. Agreed on Value of Trustee, though criteria were different (Aff: Legitimacy of government, Neg: Protecting human rights).

Aff: Contentions included: aid conditions increase corruption — evidence for this unconditional aid encourages good government — why, examples?

In cross-exam sought to distinguish between ends and means, and to ask for examples where political conditions ~~imposed~~ changed government. Spoke rather fast and monotonically.

Neg: ~~Can~~ Mark can around assertion that political conditions only are tool, and so only one example necessary. Asserted that HR forms basis for legitimate govt and hence better criteria.

Gave examples of political conditions used effectively: Zambia, Benin, Togo, and Niger