

Room: Loyola 153  
Flight A: Start 2:30  
LD Mar/Apr Open

2

BA Ganguly, DD  
BEN LENAZ

# SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Homestead SS

Siraj Sodhi

27  
7/10

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Westmont DG

Daniel Gilchrist

26  
6/10

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

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

Signed: Ben Lenz BEN LENAZ, Palo Alto High School

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Comments given

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

2

BA Ganguly, DD  
BEN LENAIL

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Saratoga IM

Isha Mangal

~~28~~ 28  
~~8/10~~

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Mountain View AJ

Avery James

~~26~~ 26  
~~6/10~~

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: Ben Ganguly Parsons High School

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

extensive feedback given

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

2

~~AB Dong, Young G~~

WINSTON ANAND-KORNER, UPA  
✓

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto WZ

Aptos AA

Will Zhou

30

Antonio Anselmo

27

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

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

Signed: WZ

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

V-  
✓- Saving lives

V- Equilibria

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

+ Presented his case well  
+ Very passionate in his presentation  
+ Good response to cross ex  
+ Good cross examination  
+ Presented more data, evidence & examples.  
+ Good eye contact

- No example of political candidate worked  
+ Has example of failure in the political candidate.  
- Was not convincing  
- Did not give very specific data or examples

AFFIR

NEG

Def +

Speed +++

Crosses ++

Defend. ++

+

+

Room: O'Connor 103  
Flight B: Start  
LD Mar/Apr Open

2

9, Homestead

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014 ✓

SCU

April 12-13th

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Young Genius EK

Eish Kapoor

Leland AL

Anthony Lin

22

23

AFF  
Eish Kapoor

The better debating was done by the AFF from EISH KAPOOR  
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:

3:48

Good data collection.

5/3 (answered)

Cross Exam ↑

4:11

3:59

→ Good data

⚠ Cross Exam Good

Answers ↓

Room: O'Connor 103  
Flight A: Start 2:30  
LD Mar/Apr Open

2

9, Homestead

# SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

Palo Alto HY

Helen Yan

POINTS

23

23

NEGATIVE

Saratoga AV

Amulya Vadlakonda

POINTS

21

The better debating was done by the FFF from HELEN YAN  
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:

Political condition On Humanitarian aid is unjust

2:49 - 8

cross ex well answered

Rapid Answer.  
5/4 (8)

3:15 -

well pointed and taken notes

3:29

Very good summarizing.

2:49 - 7  
Good questions 5/3  
Wellman 7

3:02 - 7  
Stumbled on question  
Rapid question 5/3  
5/4

3:21

(7)

Room: O'Connor 102  
Flight A: Start 2:30  
LD Mar/Apr Open

2

BA Huang, Ben

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Brooks MH

Michelle Huang

30

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius DJ

Deepankar Joshi

29

The better debating was done by the AFF from Michelle Huang  
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 Contenders are really good and both had good presentations and counter arguments. Overall Michelle had a strong case compared to Deepankar and also had defended her case very well and also had strong counter arguments.

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

2

BA Huang, Ben

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU  
April 12-13th

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Mountain View AS

Anushi Singhal

30

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius ShPe

Shriya Perati

29

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

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

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

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Anushi started strong with her case and had good arguments with her opponent defending her case. Shriya overall did a good job in presenting her case and did counter-argue well but was overdone well by Anushi with her strong arguments in defending her case.

Room: Kenna 310  
Flight B: Start  
LD Mar/Apr Open

2

Three, Aptos

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Mountain View WA

Will Alexander

28

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Homestead TG

Tej Gokhale

27.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from Will Alexander  
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:

Will, on the affirmative side, had nice, strong and well represented case. He was able to explain all of his contentions against his value prop.

Tej had 4 contentions out of which 2 were analytical but no real example presented.

Room: Kenna 310  
Flight A: Start 2:30  
LD Mar/Apr Open

2

Three, Aptos ✓

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Homestead EG

Young Genius OZ

Erika Gutekunst

26

Oliver Zhao

25.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from Erika Gutekunst  
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:

Both the speaker were very fast, I gave the feed back in between. But their goal was to cover as much as possible.

Erika had good evidences to support her points and contentions. she repetitively emphasized deny

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU  
April 12-13th

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland AT

Evergreen TG

Adam Talaat

27

Tanmay Ghai

28

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

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

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

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Adam: Affirmative - ~~morality to help other~~  
~~aid benefited to those in~~  
argued about peace conditions in Bosnia.  
- military intervention  
- corruption is the result of political conditions  
- example of Mozambique where corruption resulted because of political conditions

Tanmay - made claims that all countries have political agenda. Hence, they will want something in return for their aid. Hence 70% of all aid will end.

Adam's cross exam was not very effective. He did not directly address the points raised by Tanmay. He gave a strong rebuttal with example of Afghanistan where 48% of the aid did not reach the right population because of political conditions. And aid fell after the Soviet withdrawal.

Tanmay rebuttal → gave examples of aid workers being killed in Afghanistan.

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014 ✓

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Evergreen RS

University Preparator GC

Ramneek Singh

28

Gulshan Chahal

27

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

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

Signed: SMG

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Ramneek gave extensive example of Syria and compared to Jordan. pointed to Germany's aid as successful while Syria is not. His argument the Syria conditions were imposed by the recipient country, not the donor country. He made the point that Libya rejected aid because of conditions.

Gulshan counters with the argument that aid increases dependency. He said the 96% of the aid goes to governments & incentivizes them to keep the country poor. He makes the argument that IMF routinely places conditions on aid & that has worked well. Ramneek makes the argument the conditions are unjust with the example of Uganda where aid was withheld because of views on same sex marriage. He claims that IMF argument is not valid since it is not humanitarian aid.

Room: Loyola 138  
Flight A: Start 2:30  
LD Mar/Apr Open

2

BW 2, FHS Debate

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland AH

Homestead AV

Anna Houk

27

Amrita Venkatraman

29

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

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

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

Saravoga High

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Amrita is a strong speaker. Better organized, good research. Did a better job in stating her case and effectively refuting Anna's points.

Anna needs to improve her delivery & better preparation. Her final argument was done better. She should be used it earlier.

Neg won because she refuted her opponents points & presented her points better. Neg framed the value proposition better and had more convincing proofs.

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

2

BW 2, FHS Debate

# SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

✓

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Young Genius AY

Albert Yang

26

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Aptos RF

Ryan Fotheringham

26

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

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

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

Saratoga High.

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both speakers R ~~new~~ novice and should improve with more participation and experience.

Aff won because they framed the contentions to be more topical and their contention of not using people as means to achieve political condition ends was not ~~not~~ refuted and that moral argument was effective.

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU

April 12-13th

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland SB

Westmont BY

Sarita Berigei

26 1/2

Bruce Young

26

The better debating was done by the AFF from SARITA BERIGEI  
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

Good presentation

skills

Weak Crosses

Provide stronger connection of  
your evidence to value criterion

Violence versus help was a  
good question to pursue strongly

Main arguments around helping  
people, saving life.

Focus on Afghanistan

Stronger ethical argument,  
connected with core Value

Don't bring new evidence in  
2AR

Neg

Good targeted questions in  
Cross fire.

Better definitions

Good counter arguments

Questioned source of evidence

Weak contentions

Core contention is around  
unconditional aid will cause  
more deaths.

Focus on Ethiopia, North Korea

Core focus on misuse of  
aid. No mention of proper  
use of aid

Result Neg had excellent counter argument but weak  
contentions. Close debate. Aff won based  
on her better link with morality and saving  
life.

# SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014

SCU  
April 12-13th

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Homestead SA

Sahitya Atluri

27

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto AnGi

Andy Gibson

26 1/2

The better debating was done by the AFF from SAHITYA ATLURI  
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*  
Good speaker, nice voice projection  
In cross fire don't look towards the opponent  
Unconditional aid in South Korea was more successful  
In cross fire don't bring new evidence, ask questions  
'Delay in aid' good argument  
Don't bring new evidence in 2AR  
'Aid is for people who are suffering not for rulers' good counter argument

*Neg*  
Cross fire big chunk used to force an answer on how he can win  
Good speaker, articulate  
Agreed with Aff's framework  
Linked economic reform as the way to judge debate  
Less focus on humanitarianism, humanitarian emergency

Result Neg tried to debate around economic reform rather than humanitarian aid.  
Aff had better framework debate

Room: O'Connor 107  
Flight A: Start 2:30  
LD Mar/Apr Open

2

~~AB Dong, Young G~~

WINSTON ANAND-KUMAR, ✓

# SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL 2014 UPA

SCU

April 12-13th

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Leland KG

Kashyap Garimella

27

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto RH

Ryan Huang

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from Ryan Huang (Palo Alto RH)  
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:

VC- Maxi Well ben  
- Maximizing net benefit

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

+ Presented his case well  
- Presented new evidence during closing remarks which the opponent could not defend.

+ Presented his case well  
- He read his speech  
+ Able to defend his case well

|          | AFFIR | NEG |
|----------|-------|-----|
| Defi     | +     | +   |
| speech   | ++    | +   |
| cross-ex | +     | +   |
| Defense  | +     | +   |