

Room: Arts Foyer B
Flight B: Start 9:30
Parliamentary Novice

4

Hansalia, Rakesh

DESAI, SANJAY
(Quarry Lane)

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Valey Christian GC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Ananya Gollapudi	30	1
2	Lia Cunningham	26	3

56

NEGATIVE

POS	Evergreen MS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Tejas Manjunath	28	2
1	Saniya Soni	25	4

53

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Tejas - Strong arguments

Saniya - Trade 200 Bln. Backlash

Ananya - net benefits

economic sanction - Taken away affordability

oil, Chinese military

Unity

Lia

Timing not clear

Funding?

Room: Arts Foyer B
Flight A: Start 8:30am
Parliamentary Novice

4

Hansalia, Rakesh

DESAI, SANJAY
(Cherry Lane)

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Homestead PM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Michelle Park	30	1
1	Yannah Melle	25	3

55

NEGATIVE

POS	Young Genius AK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Pranav Ahuja	25	4
1	Sathvik Kaliyur	27	2

52

The better debating was done by the AFF ~~NEG~~ from Michelle Park
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Desai, S. J.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I found ~~NEG~~ ^{AFF} team's arguments more logical & better presented.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

The Intl Criminal Court should Indict Bashar al-Assad for crimes against humanity

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Mission San Jose DZ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Sai Dwibhashyam	28	1
	Eric Zhu	27	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Young Genius GS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Sam Guo	28	2
	Roland Shen	27	3

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg did not argue Neg but accepted all of Aff + urged more punishment; - therefore Aff won.

Sai

- strong speaking
- good passion & structure
- good gestures

Roland

- Indict is pronounced "in dite"
- clearer structure of your arguments + rebuttals would be helpful
- strong speaking voice
- good pauses

Eric

- Good strong voice
- Slow down & focus on structure

Sam

- good speaking & eye contact
- some nice turns of phrase

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Saratoga SB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sanah Shah	27	2
2	Divya Bade	27	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Washington LR	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Cliff Liu	27	3
2	Vijay Raveendran	28	1

The better debating was done by the Neg from Washington LR
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 resolution is "The International Criminal court should indict Bashar al-Assad for crimes against humanity". I vote for the Negative team to win since I think the Affirmative team's argument is not strong enough and one of the points is not directly related. The Affirmative team's last point is to say Assad should be put into the harshest division of international criminal court for punishment. I would more expect it is a list of crime for Assad against humanity. One the other two points from the Affirmative team transform democracy to dictatorship and use chemical weapon. from the Neg team they argued from Assad rather it had been dictatorship (bad

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Saratoga CP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Candace Chiang	27	4
1	Trishla Pokharna	28	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Piedmont Hills HN	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Brian Hoang	28	1
2	Timothy Nguyen	27	2

The better debating was done by the NEG from Piedmont Hills HN
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 resolution is "The UN should intervene militarily in Syria".
The debate was a very close one and competitive.
I vote for the Negative team ~~was~~ since I think in general
their points are more convincing comparatively. Especially
the points regarding Russia/China and Iran's response
to the military action in Syria and military
action would cause more death especially
children and civil soldiers in Syria. The affirmative
team brought up two points that UN has to response
to the chemical weapons used by Syria and
people in Syria need UN help. But if they
were to have some arguments on ^{why} military action
is needed would be more convincing. ~~By~~ Also I
think the Neg team said the criteria should be to benefit
all people in the world is more reasonable.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Irvington LD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Sriya Lingampalli	28.5	1
1	Ishani Deshpande	27.5	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Evergreen NP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Anirudh Nandella	28.0	2
2	Karthik Pullela	27.0	4

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

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

Signed: Peter Shearer
(Crystal Springs)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both sides made thoughtful and creative arguments and all speakers have a real future in debate! Govt had some clever qualifications to their plan that dealt with the majority of the Opp's points. Detailed individual and overall comments were provided ~~to~~ after the round. Great job!! Keep it up!!

30 aff
27 neg

Room: Lib LC010
Flight B: Start 9:30
Parliamentary Novice

4

AB Tiruvur, Arat

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	TEAM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Valey Christian HM		
2	Stephanie Han	27	4
1	Ciara Moezidis	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	TEAM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Irvington CD		
2	Karthik Chetlapalli	27.5	3
1	Ahir Datta	29	1

The better debating was done by the AFF from Valey Christian HM
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: X
Signed: Pete Sheaver (Cory St. Springs)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Best pace and tone of speakers
I've judged this weekend! Arguments
were limited by obscure topic (primarily).
Aff. pinned Opp. down on "do nothing"
position ← key to Aff.'s narrow victory
Great Job and look forward
to seeing you in action again.
Provided detailed notes to all ~~at~~
at session's end

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

UN should Intervene Militarily in Syria

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Saratoga NL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Keshav Narayan	28	2
	Theo Luan	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Notre Dame San Jose AA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Sabreen Abdelrahman	24	4
	Likitha Aradhyula	24	3

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neither plan was entirely logical but since both were arguing for intervention & Aff was more detailed, I think they were more convincing. Neg did not convincingly explain why NATO was better

Keshav

- nice structure

~~Notre~~ Likitha

- would appreciate stronger counterarguments - a little more detailed
- good eye contact

Theo

- nice strong speaking; great structure

Sabreen

- strong voice
- appreciate a little more eye contact

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Evergreen BS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Tri Brian Nguyen	26	(4)
	Gaurav Sharma	26	(3)

NEGATIVE

POS	Bentley HS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Lucy Holt	28	(1)
	Katie Stamm-Kirk	27	(2)

The better debating was done by the NEG from Bentley HS (Lucy & Katie)
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 team should have done definitions & mandate of their plan
plus they should have cited some sources to support their contentions
- Neg team excellent & aggressive debating
→ Neg team better time keeping, both Lucy & Katie went over their allotted times.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Prospect KD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Meera Keskar	28	2
	Shravan Davaluri	29	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Homestead PA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Koodrut Panesar	28	3
	Nicolle Ayon-Campos	28	4

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative presented their contentions as follows

- a) better economy
- b) better jobs
- c) Increased well being

Neg team had only one argument

c) weak economy so we should wait

Neg team didn't respond to other contentions. This debate was won by Affirmative.

Suggestions:

a) Clearly rebut the points raised by the Affirmative team.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Team	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Evergreen SK		
	Kushal Sharma	29	1
	Sahil Kothari	28	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Team	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Leland YC		
	Bryan Yang	28	4
	Christopher Chen	28	2

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

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

Signed: BmRuy

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The biggest issue was to protect human lives.
Affirmative arguments on how AM-17 has failed or his promises
of not using chemical weapons convinced me that they had a better
facts. Neg team didn't have argument/predicted or how
they are going to help save lives.

This was a difficult topic for Neg team. They managed
their time well but didn't have enough arguments on
the main contentions by the Affirmative team.

Overall this was a very close call.

Room: Arts Foyer F
Flight B: Start 9:30
Parliamentary Novice

4

AC Chien, Arthur

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Mission San Jose WD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Max Wu	30	1
2	Anirban Datta	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga VL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Rishi Veerapaneni	30	2
2	Alexander Li	29	4

The better debating was done by the Aff. from Mission San Jose WD
AFF. or NEG. TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Suzanne Jewett

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams ~~are~~ are wonderful
speakers! Aff won major issues
in the debate. Neg ~~also~~ argued
against each other on chemical
weapons.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Evergreen MN	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Suman Modak	26	2
2	Jai Nekkileru	25	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Homestead BB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Shauli Bar-on	27	1
2	Ron Broner	25.5	3

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

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

Signed: Seema Rathi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

UN should intervene militarily in Syria.
Neg defined the resolution & provided a better
plan overall & explained how sanction
will help their case.

Aff. should have defined military action as being
humanitarian aid & supported with more
argument → Katrina was not a civil war
example. Also should have rebutted the
argument of Syria attacking since you are
only providing H.Aide → Also if you
Also how providing H.Aide you would help
population to ~~bring down~~ the Govt in Syria.
Also you could have defined UN → purpose etc.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Leland XX	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
①	Melissa Guo	26	3
②	Phoebe Yin	26	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Crystal Springs Upland GB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
②	Matthew Goldberg	27.5	1
①	Ebbie Banks	26	2

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

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

Signed: Sena Rellu

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~Aff.~~ Negative won the debate
they said syria is not part of ICC and
cannot be brought to trial at ICC without
UN vote where Russia will veto it.
Aff. ~~should have~~ ^{did not} provided a way how
Assad will be brought to trial at ICC

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Lynbrook RM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Karthik Ravikumar	29.1	4
	Srikar Mallipedi	29.2	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Irvington GD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Kanak Garg	29.5	1
	Aismit Das	29.4	2

The better debating was done by the NEG from Irvington GD
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTSTANT NAME

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

These teams were great and very objective, logical arguments. Good job!!
The UN should intervene militarily in Syria

Gov/Aff 1 - 1st gov graffiti - Injured by Govt. and people by shot by Govt.
2. Multiple citizens dying. 100,000 citizens dying.
3. 2 million people fled.
4. Immediate action
5. Broke law by using chemical weapons to torture citizens
6. Hence military intervention

Gov/Aff 2 1. Hard power is better
2. we had a civil war and 13th amendment & constitution was passed.
3. Soft power was tried & we need military intervention
4. Not fair to the people that they get more scared.
5. Government has led to citizen death
6. Used chemical weapons & broke a law. we need to get our countries back.

Opp/Neg 1. UN should intervene diplomatically to avoid more deaths.
2. Eye for eye makes world kind.
3. Less money used to solve the problem
4. Agree with the standard 2 points by Aff. But diplomacy will lead to less deaths.

Opp/Neg 2 1. Opponent said it was our moral obligation to save lives and they are suggesting losing lives.
2. Had might get meaningless
3. With military intervention some times agree war is necessary but Gandhi use of peace to get their freedom
4. If we always used war the world would be war all the time
5. Not chemical warfare that had used in civil war.
6. UN would also incur expenses
7. UN intervention may lead to more deaths.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Young Genius WD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Kyle Wang	28.9	1
	Anthony Ding	28.1	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Piedmont Hills WL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Michelle Wong	25	4
	Daniel Loi	28.3	2

The better debating was done by the AFF from Young Genius WD
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 International Criminal Court should indict Bashar al Assad for crimes against humanity.

Gov / Aff 1 - 1. Using International Law as well as my disadvantage. 2. Crimes against humanity. 3. Photos accepted by CNN of torture. 4. Attack on human dignity.

Opp / Neg 1 - 1. International Court should indict they (Aff) are making it a value debate. 2. Rebel leaders are with Al Qaeda shown by CNN - killed Americans. 3. Rebel leaders have used chemical warfare. 4. Path to peace - rebel leaders have to hold on civilians and our plan will break. 5. UN would do nothing in that big country supporting the rebel leader groups & lead to peace. UN would do nothing in that big country supporting the rebel leader groups & lead to peace.

Gov / Aff 2 1. Why do not indict rebel leaders. We are saying Indict Assad & rebel leaders. 2. So Opp counter plan does not make sense. 3. China will continue to export and they may export less. 4. Respect human rights. 5. Greater probability of Assad stepping down & getting peace and better leader.

Opp / Neg 2 1. If we indict both Assad & rebel leaders there will be a power vacuum. 2. Rebels get weapons from Al Qaeda.

Opp / Neg 1 - Transitional Govt does not work see Iran & Iraq like my proposition. 2. Indict rebel leaders then will be people.

Gov / Aff 1 - Our plan is more feasible than to indict all.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Leland XX	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Melissa Guo	29	1
2	Phoebe Yin	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Valey Christian HM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Stephanie Han	29	3
2	Ciara Moezidis	27	4

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: Verhel Edward R Kallu

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The 'AFF' team has clearly articulated their arguments to support the case and team has got excellent persuasive skills. The case has got good calculations and supporting arguments.

Melissa

Good Framework and delivery is excellent with all contentions. Excellent Rebuttal skills.

Phoebe Yin

Delivery: Very good persuasive and articulation of the case.

Ciara

presentation skills: ~~Average~~ Good
persuasive skills: Average

Stephanie

* presentation skills: Good
Rebuttal skills: good

Room: O Connor 209
Flight A: Start 12:30 pm
Parliamentary Novice

5

BG Srivastava, S

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Piedmont Hills WL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Michelle Wong	28.5	
2	Daniel Loi	27	

NEGATIVE

POS	Homestead BB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Shauli Bar-on	29	
2	Ron Broner	27	

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

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

Signed: Venkateswar R Kalluri

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The 'NEG' team is a clear winner with their framework, supporting arguments, to prove their point on this round. The team has excellent persuading skills.

Michelle

* Delivery: Very good
Rebuttal skills: Good

Daniel

* Delivery: Good
Refuting skills: Good

Shauli

* presentation skills: Excellent
Rebuttal skills: Very good
Reason

Ron

* Delivery: Very good
Refuting skills: Good

Room: Kenna 102
Flight ~~A~~ Start 12:30 pm ^B
Parliamentary Novice

5

BL Blong, Gisell

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Irvington GD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Kanak Garg	25	2
	Aismit Das (25)	25	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Young Genius GS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Sam Guo	25	4
	Roland Shen	25	1

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: Uman 7

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Leland LT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Isaac Lo	30	1
2	Andrew Tang	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Lynbrook RM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Karthik Ravikumar	29	3
2	Srikar Mallipedi	29	4

The better debating was done by the Aff from Leland
AFF / NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both Teams did well. Neg
did not defend their ~~their~~
argument. Aff gave stronger
evidence. Both teams cited
evidence - Very good.

Room: Kenna 102
Flight A: Start 12:30 pm
Parliamentary Novice

5

3, Homestead

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Crystal Springs Upland GB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Matthew Goldberg	25	2
	Ebbie Banks	25	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Washington LR	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Cliff Liu	23	4
	Vijay Raveendran	29	1

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

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

Signed: V. Arun

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Mission San Jose WD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Max Wu	28	1
2	Anirban Datta	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga CP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Candace Chiang	27	3
2	Trishla Pokharna	27	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Mission San Jose WD
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 team's contentions:

1. Minorities can feed their ~~family~~ families to gain our respect.
2. Increased chance of college education for minorities
3. Overall economic benefit via new jobs, GDP growth.

Neg. team could not successfully refute the above claims.
They should have attacked the Aff team's claims more directly and forcefully. For example, you cannot raise taxes to pay for min. wage, wouldn't that be like just giving free money to some people?

Neg. team could have also attacked the claim that ~~minorities~~ ~~we~~ "we will not look down upon minorities" after min wage hike. ~~That was~~ Should we really look down upon them now?

Since Aff team employed a clever ploy of including a tax hike with the min wage increase, ~~it they got away with~~ Neg team's contention that the companies will lay off people was weakened.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU
April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Evergreen BS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Tri Brian Nguyen	28	4
1	Gaurav Sharma	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Mission San Jose DZ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Sai Dwibhashyam	28	2
	Eric Zhu	28	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from Evergreen BS
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 contentions:

1. Unconstitutional, cruel & unusual
2. ^{over} Crowding in prison: 60% of people in jail are there for small crimes
3. Safety: Reduced sentences for ~~smaller~~ major crimes
4. Unfair: 10yr sentence for mailing a package [single mother of 4]

NEG ~~contentions~~: Neg team tried to refute the AFF contentions, but was not very convincing.

Neg team's counterplan lacked details. It was not clear how it could be implemented.

Neg team had one very good argument that the current law prevents corruption. ~~But~~ But it was not enough to sway the entire debate their way.

Neg team's argument that the aff. plan will let mass murderer walk was not very convincing since aff team wanted to remove minimum sentence for ~~crimes~~ less than 1 month sentence only.

Overall, it seemed like it was a hard rotation to argue against. Even though, neg team did a great job, they ~~were not~~ ~~could~~ not convince the judge.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Evergreen MS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Tejas Manjunath	28	1
1	Saniya Soni	28	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Homestead PA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Koodrut Panesar	28	2
2	Nicolle Ayon-Campos	27	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Evergreen MS
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 resolution is "USFG should eliminate the death penalty".
I vote for the affirmative team to win since in general
the arguments are more convincing. Overall this
is a very close debate. The affirmative has
better statistics and summary on the points of
death penalty not enough to deter crime, racism,
~~cost~~ cost and inefficiency especially example
of people being executed and then later
found innocent while the statistics show
the cost and process of death penalty
are high and long. On One week I think
for the Aff team on the racism is the argument
may be too strong saying all the jury
and the current judge system are biased.
For the Neg team I think they brought up good point
on statistics of death penalty deter
(back

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE


POS	Notre Dame San Jose AA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Sabreen Abdelrahman	28	1
1	Likitha Aradhyula	27	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Piedmont Hills HN	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Brian Hoang	27	3
1	Timothy Nguyen	27	2

The better debating was done by the AFF from Notre Dame San Jose AA
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 resolution is "The USFG should return the Fort Reno (and tract to the Cheyenne-Arapaho Native American Tribe". I vote for the affirmative team to win since their arguments are relatively more convincing. They brought up two main points, one is compensate for what USFG had been done to the native Indians historically and what native Indian had been suffered. The second is to help economy developing culture. The negative side ~~mention~~ rebuttal so has not provide more convincing argument like a better alternative to "compensate" rather than giving back money. The negative side had better prep on getting some statistics. The affirmative side could provide more detail how the land can be used by native more economically beneficial.

Room: O Connor 204
Flight A: Start 12:30 pm
Parliamentary Novice

5

BD Ong, Thomas

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Team	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Homestead PM		
	Michelle Park	30	1
2	Yannah Melle	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Team	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Evergreen MN		
2	Suman Modak	29	4
1	Jai Nekkileru	29	3

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

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

Signed: Suzanne Lewitt

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff. delivered stronger evidence.
Neg. plan not very different
from aff. plan.
Both teams did a great
job.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE


POS	Irvington CD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
PM	Karthik Chetlapalli	27	4
NEG	Ahir Datta	26	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland YC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
MO	Bryan Yang	27	3
LO	Christopher Chen	28	1

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:

Both teams gave good background + evid.
Neg needed a little work on organization
Affirm however gave less attention to a very
key point in the debate which finalized my
decision as it was not properly rebutted.

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Saratoga SB		
PM	Sanah Shah	28	1
MG	Divya Bade	27	4

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Young Genius WD		
LO	Kyle Wang	28	2
MO	Anthony Ding	27	3

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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirm gave good background and strong rebuttal.

Neg was also strong on rebuttal but Affirm made the stronger argument.

There was an overall issue on what the exact def. was by both teams.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Evergreen SK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Kushal Sharma	26	2
	Sahil Kothari	21	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Valey Christian GC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Ananya Gollapudi	26	3
	Lia Cunningham	26	4

The better debating was done by the AF from Evergreen SK
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Muhith Clark

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

USF6 Should eliminate mandatory minimum sentencing,

- Not Benefits
- ASAP
- Normal Funding

Affirmative
• Small time crime
• Vocab & Adment
• Finance
• HP 40% evidence
• Rehabilitation
• Influence from Safety

Negative
• argue against 1st Conviction
Not cruel & unusual
• Rehabilitation Center
NOT have God worked
• Influence should be
Regulate through
Placemat

Make
• Evidence
• Rehabilitation
• Not Benefits

MS
2480000

- 1) Eliminate liability
- 2) Make uniform
- 3) Prevents Crime
HP evidence
- 4) Leverage to secure
Prosecution
- 5) No proof that it
rehabilitates
- 6) More lives

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Notre Dame San Jose BT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Eshwari Bhide	24	3
	Michelle Taw	24	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga VL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Rishi Veerapaneni	28	2
	Alexander Li	29	1

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

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

Signed: Michael Clark

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

USFG Should adopt the Fair Minimum Wage Act.

Prose Minister
• Indifference

2999 • 10.10 per hour

Utilitarian

1. Benefit Economy
27-28 mils raise
Consumer Demand
Better Econ

2. People (education + family)
\$5K 90s

4/11

- Big Corporations
are helped

- 190 Argument
Cost of low wages

Negate

- Utilitarian

→ No Unemployment
1. Many consequences
devaluation of USD

→ lag off workers

1) Cause Higher Unemployment
Affordable Care Act

2) Small Business Impact

3) Increase Inflation

4) Communication
Trade Expansion

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Prospect KD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Meera Keskar	28	4
	Shravan Davaluri	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Valey Christian HR	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Brian Huang	29	3
	Dhilip Raman	29	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from Valey Christian HR
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

BD Ren

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I would like to open my comments congratulating both the teams. It was an excellent debate for a Novice track. There was some confusion as to whether VC is required for judging this. So I am not considering this even though Neg team raised some valid criticism points.

Affirmative team did fail to give counter arguments on

- (a) closure for families
- (b) overcrowding of jails
- (c) people escaping jails

It was a tough call for me. So keep up the good work. It was a great debate. (EXCELLENT!!!)

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Crystal Springs Upland HK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Jeremy Huang	27	4
	Stewart Kim	28	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Irvington LD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Sriya Lingampalli	28	2
	Ishani Deshpande	28	1

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative team failed to define the criteria and Negative team defined it as

(a) the punishment for serious crimes.

Affirmative team failed to address the Negative team's following contentions

(a) deterrent for crimes

(b) unbiased outcome than judges

(c) Trend showing crime is going down

Affirmative team countered many several of the arguments very well but couldn't have touched on serious crimes and presented data.

It was a close call. Keep up the good work.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

USFG should eliminate mandatory minimum sentencing.

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Bentley HS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Lucy Holt	29	3
3	Katie Stamm-Kirk	29.5	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Evergreen NP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Anirudh Nandella	29	2
4	Karthik Pullela	27.5	4

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

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

Signed: Keegan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- ① eliminate - outlaw
Mandatory - binding length
Weighting - net benefits to society
time line - 2015

Cont 1: \$200B cost
1/4 cases go to jail

Cont. 2: unfair

Cont. 3: crowded prisons
emotion effect

Cont 4: tax

[grace period] → time mgmt.??
✓ articulate
✓ good foundation
✓ good examples

- ③ ✓ good counter on neg pts
✓ minimum sent - explanation
✓ opp plans adds cost not doing
✓ powerfully
✓ rebuttals
high impact

- ② fear factor - crime sentencing
net benefits → more discretion of judge
adv 250K drug related
time in prison for rehab
y. walburg

✓ good counter, pt by pt
✓ good example scenarios
good time mgmt

- ④ ?? difficulty in understanding
resolution
?? unclear arguments - contradictory
aff or neg??

② ✓ step by step → scope of plan

- ① ✓ call out contradictions of neg
✓ negation agrees with aff
on several pts
✓ misunderstanding of resolution
✓ validation of weighting
cost & net benefits

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

USFG should eliminate the death penalty

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Saratoga NL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Keshav Narayan	28.5	4
3	Theo Luan	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Washington MR	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Lovish Mujral	29	3
2	Ganesh Ramakrishnan	29.5	1

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- 1 ① death penalty unconstitutional, cruel
- ② prison cheaper than death (economist)
- ③ immoral & unworthy?
- ④ Racism & classism
- Life Imprisonment better than death
- unfair access to representation
- [Clear & simple !!!]
- precise

- 13 - public defenders - unfair?
coz it's forced
- Contradiction fall out -
- scare vs. cruelty
- solitary to terrorists
- already painless & but painful
- [good flow]
- [some contradictions]

- 1 [Struggled to refute Neg's refutes]
- no new arguments

- 2 Better options for death - less cruel
- Life Impr is crueler than death
- costly
- death row
- public defender for equality
- Plan - quick & easy death
- ① public defenders
- & few of death - less crime
- [great counter points !!!]

- 4 moving target - deep.
- [good repetition for emphasis]
- 2 [good itemized arguments]

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

Mission San Jose WD (Max Wu & Anirban Datta) vs. Evergreen SK (Kushal Sharma & Sahil Kothari)

AFFIRMATIVE

Evergreen SK

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Mission San Jose WD

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from Mission San Jose WD
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: NSD

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams presented arguments clearly. Arguments clashed and NEG team clarified the difference bet'n their positions. AFF ~~are~~ ^{failed to} refute the arguments of NEG well, however, provide solid evidences to support their arguments.

NEG has effectively provided arguments which link to framework. Great job in LOC!

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL
SCU
April 12-13

Evergreen SK (Kushal Sharma & Sahil Kothari) vs. Mission San Jose WD (Max Wu & Anirban Datta)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Evergreen SK

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Mission San Jose WD

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

17th. Environmental
Economic
\$ 220,000,000 monthly profit
by 430,000 Deaths?
Public only?
We already said
Federal subsidy/Funding
to private corps?
—

Private corporations
Law suits?
No eminent domain?
Federally subsidized private
companies
speaking in circles
making no actual point
actually supporting AFF arguments
Failed to point out major flaws in
original argument

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL
SCU
April 12-13

Mission San Jose WD (Max Wu & Anirban Datta) vs. Evergreen SK (Kushal Sharma & Sahil Kothari)

AFFIRMATIVE

Evergreen


NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Mission

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both groups made excellent arguments and articulated their very eloquently. Aff did not respond to Neg's eminent domain arguments. Aff did not make their plan explicit enough to prevent confusion as to whether company-based plan is direct or indirect. Neg did not address Aff's contention that the federal government will have more power across state borders compared to companies working without a government partnership.

Room: O Connor 210
Flight A: Start ASAP
Parliamentary Novice

OCTA

BD Yang, Jim

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

Irvington GD (Kanak Garg & Aismit Das) vs. Prospect KD (Meera Keskar & Shravan Davaluri)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Irvington

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Prospect

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams make excellent arguments, well supported by evidence. Neg addressed all points raised by Aff, but Aff dropped many points made by Neg.

Room: O Connor 210
Flight A: Start ASAP
Parliamentary Novice

OCTA

AB Tiruvur, Arat
Chair

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL
SCU
April 12-13

Irvington GD (Kanak Garg & Aismit Das) vs. Prospect KD (Meera Keskar & Shravan Davaluri)

AFFIRMATIVE

Irvington GD

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Prospect KD

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the

NEG
AFF or NEG

from

Prospect KD
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Rohit

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF - No specifics as to where the funding would come from
AFF - No specifics as to what internet security is
NEG - was effectively refute all contentions

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

Winner

Irvington GD (Kanak Garg & Aismit Das) vs. Prospect KD (Meera Keskar & Shravan Davaluri)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Irvington GD
Kanak Garg & Aismit Das

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Prospect KD
Meera Keskar & Shravan

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Davaluri

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

Signed: NSD

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams presented arguments clearly. Arguments clashed and AFF clarify the differences between their positions. NEG team refuted the ~~argu~~ contentions of AFF well, however dropped one of AFF arguments which was an imp. point in the ~~speech~~ debate. Also, NEG never provided any counterplan. They spent most of the time refuting AFF.

~~So~~ AFF has effectively provided arguments which link back to framework.

Room: O Connor 207
Flight A: Start ASAP
Parliamentary Novice

OCTA

BG Grover, Pune
SHANTHARAM NEKKAR
(WESTMONT)

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

N2 N1 A2 A1
Irvington LD (Sriya Lingampalli & Ishani Deshpande) vs. Notre Dame San Jose AA (Sabreen Abdelrahman & Likitha Aradhyula)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

NOTRE DAME

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

IRVINGTON LD

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Shritha

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1) Both teams very good! It was a close debate.
→ AFF won str on the following grounds:
- better at logically exploring their positions.
- they used a cleaner set of contentions.

2 areas of improvements for Neg:-

- if suggesting alternatives, specify the ideas more clearly
- while using definitions, term quote them better

Areas of improvement for AFF:

- specify the VC!

- ~~define the buzzwords~~ use technical concepts more accurately
ex "Regression & covariance" - quote

General Comments:

- the resolution was "income funding". Both sides ignored the word "increased". What is the correct feeling? Is the ~~abolition~~ abolition top of what? Both sides lost an opportunity here

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

Irvington LD (Sriya Lingampalli & Ishani Deshpande) vs. Notre Dame San Jose AA (Sabreen Abdelrahman & Likitha Aradhyula)

AFFIRMATIVE

Notre Dame San Jose


NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Irvington

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from Notre Dame San Jose
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I felt the affirmative have their points clearly present and have the evidence and resource to support the points. The data and information is more relevant to be done. The US Government should invest more money to internet security.

The negative ~~not~~ represent their point but ~~not~~ the example and data ~~may not be~~ is not enough to believe the investment is useless. It will be better to focus the money should not directly go from government but some other resources.

Room: O Connor 207
Flight A: Start ASAP
Parliamentary Novice

OCTA
Chair

BD Pokharna, Ar
NANDALLA V RAO

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL
SCU
April 12-13

Notre Dame San Jose AA (Sabreen Abdelrahman & Likitha Aradhyula) vs. Irvington LD (Sriya Lingampalli & Ishani Deshpande)

AFFIRMATIVE

NOTRE DAME


NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

ILD

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from ILD (IRVINGTON LD)
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams presented very well. Really impressed with all 4 debaters about the speaking and presentation skills. The points raised by NEGATIVE team merits their case over AFFIRMATIVE for the fact that govt should not invest huge amounts of \$\$\$ in Internet security as the responsibility can be shifted to private sector. The govt should rather invest in other areas like Health care, education which would benefit the country well. Another salient point mentioned by NEG is the deep web which accounts for 99% of Internet and hard to trace, so a significant investment from govt will not cause much desired results.

Room: O Connor 207
Flight #: Start ASAP B
Parliamentary Novice

OCTA

37, Leland Judge

NANDELLA V RAO

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

Washington MR (Lovish Mujral & Ganesh Ramakrishnan) vs. Young Genius GS (Sam Guo & Roland Shen)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

YOUNG GENIUS

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

WASHINGTON MR

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The AFF team presented a good plan and looks like didn't mention the word "should" as it's a policy debate which is pointed out by NEG team. The NEG team had most of the time debated on technical issues rather than the meaningful debate and any alternate counter plan. The AFF team had provided good plan of increasing investment in telecom promotes growth, jobs and other economic benefits. Statistics and the growth of richest man from MEXICO (Carlos) had been cited as a positive impact of telecom potential. I vote for AFF team on merit of discussion & debate.

Room: O Connor 207
Flight ~~A~~ Start ASAP B
Parliamentary Novice

OCTA

CS Winnett, Carc
SHANTHARAM NEKKAR
(WESTMONT)

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

WFG ↑ INVESTMENT IN TELECOM
INFRA

N2

N1

Young Genius GS (Sam Guo & Roland Shen) vs. Washington MR (Lovish Mujral & Ganesh Ramakrishnan)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

YOUNG GENIUS (GS)
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

WASHINGTON
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Shantharam

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Couple of notes
x My team brought out our arguments / topics towards the end.
Neg could not really address that
x On the whole, the Aff team had more points; but the neg
had a stronger disc / discussions around it

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

Washington MR (Lovish Mujral & Ganesh Ramakrishnan) vs. Young Genius GS (Sam Guo & Roland Shen)

AFFIRMATIVE

Young Genius

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Washington

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Sam Guo

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The negative team clearly present their point and give counterpoint solution which can overcome the said purpose of industry directly on telecom infrastructure by government.

The affirmative give the benefit of investment on telecom industry, but the ~~entire~~ evidence is not enough to convince this is the way to go.

It would be better if team provide more detail on what and how the investment works, ~~not~~ beside the numbers.

Room: O Connor 215
Flight ~~A~~: Start ASAP
Parliamentary Novice

OCTA

BR Dandapani, S

LE NGUYEN

USFG should be a investment in telecom infra

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

Lynbrook RM (Karthik Ravikumar & Srikar Mallipedi) vs. Crystal Springs Upland HK (Jeremy Huang & Stewart Kim)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Crystal Springs

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Lynbrook

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the

NEG
AFF or NEG

from

Lynbrook
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Karthik and Srikar convince me on the argument about jobs loss due to new technology adaptation as well as ~~extra~~ premature expansion with outdated technology in the near term.

SCU PHILAETHIC INVITATIONAL

1. USF G should significantly inc.
in telecommunications infrastructure

SCU
April 12-13

Lynbrook RM (Karthik Ravikumar & Srikar Mallipedi) vs. Crystal Springs Upland HK (Jeremy Huang & Stewart Kim)

AFFIRMATIVE

Crystal Springs Upland HK

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Lynbrook RM

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- NEG did not refute 2nd contention of Aff
- NEG kept mentioning expenses
 - didn't provide a plan
- didn't address safety portion, which they agreed to
- Aff had good point on outdated always being outdated
- refuted all contentions of NEG
- had solid plan
- had good evidence and carried it throughout the round

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

USFG Should significantly increase investment in telecommunications infrastructure
Lynbrook RM (Karthik Ravikumar & Srikar Mallipedi) vs. Crystal Springs Upland HK (Jeremy Huang & Stewart Kim)

AFFIRMATIVE

Crystal Springs Upland
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Lynbrook
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Aff from Crystal Springs Upland
AFF OR NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Kurt Green

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Learn how to signpost - both sides
neg should just used a (P)

RFD: Aff ~~didn't~~ impacted arguments better.
both sides had iffy arguments
hard decision. very close debate

Room: O Connor 215
Flight A: Start ASAP
Parliamentary Novice

OCTA

BR Patel, ~~Sona~~

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

U.S.F.G should significantly increase
funding for internet security.

SCU
April 12-13

Mission San Jose DZ (Sai Dwibhashyam & Eric Zhu) vs. Bentley HS (Lucy Holt & Katie Stamm-Kirk)

AFFIRMATIVE

Bentley HS


NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Mission San Jose DZ

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- had stable plan and way to follow through
- turned NEG into AFF, argued well
- carried contentions all the way through
- caught that NEG didn't have a plan/agent of action

OCTA

AC Thai, Sean

USFG Should significantly increase funding for internet security

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

777755

SCU

April 12-13

Aff

neg

Bentley HS (Lucy Holt & Katie Stamm-Kirk) vs. Mission San Jose DZ (Sai Dwibhashyam & Eric Zhu)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Bentley

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Mission San Jose

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the

AFF & NEG

from

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed:

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Comments:

Neg should split prep tasks

Aff should use advantages, not contentions for policy round

Aff has no solvency on case with only \$7.82 mil

Aff member went way over time

Neg update OS systems plan is 100% permable

Neg Member needs to do speaking drills.

Aff needs to ask coach about how counterplans work

Neg should not take so many questions

Aff advantages are affects topicality

Neg ground shifts. vagueness procedural coulda' been run by aff

RFD: This round was a disaster but Aff kept their affects (T) arguments/impacts, so on ON util/Neg ben framework. (Aff also did much better)

Room: O Connor 215
Flight A: Start ASAP
Parliamentary Novice

OCTA

~~BP Nagakumar,~~

LEI NGUYEN

USFG should sig. of friends for late security

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

Bentley HS (Lucy Holt & Katie Stamm-Kirk) vs. Mission San Jose DZ (Sai Dwibhashyam & Eric Zhu)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Bentley Lucy & Katie

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Mission Sai & Eric


NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the

AFF
AFF or NEG

from

Bentley
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Lucy and Katie clearly convinced me that there is no cash
and the Neg's case is really supporting their AFF just by
redistributing funding to private company.



SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

Saratoga VL (Rishi Veerapaneni & Alexander Li) vs. Leland LT (Isaac Lo & Andrew Tang)

AFFIRMATIVE

Saratoga

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Leland

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: Topic: USFC should significantly increase funding for internet security.

Aff team proposed diverting \$90mil from defense budget to cyber security.

- Contentions:
1. Protect users from phishing
 2. ~~Get~~ Avoid cyberattacks (Heartbleed bug)
 3. Save lives (e.g. hospital patients)

Neg team tried to argue that

1. Govt will not find qualified white hat hackers to do the job
2. Govt agents could turn traitors & cause damage with private info
3. Cost is too high.

But Aff team successfully refuted neg team's arguments.

Neg team should have argued that private firms and open-source community is willing and able to ~~fight~~ take care of internet security. Companies like amazon, google already spend millions of dollars each year on internet security. So govt help is not needed here.

~~Aff team should have actually focused~~

Room: O Connor 209
Flight A: Start ASAP
Parliamentary Novice

OCTA

~~BG Davaluri, Sai~~

AK KRISHNA RAMAKRISHN

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

Leland LT (Isaac Lo & Andrew Tang) vs. Saratoga VL (Rishi Veerapaneni & Alexander Li)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Rishi Veerapaneni & Alexander Li

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from Rishi & Alexander Li
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: f. Ramakrishnan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

USFCA Shoud Increase Funding for Internet Security

4:55 AFF

5:02

NEG

HAD SOLID POINTS FOR FAVOUR

They didn't had enough
key points as to why
it should be negated.

- Cost factor

- Rish factor

- WHY and How

They were more
focused on
whitehackers
or Data mining

- had also lapsed in
response for how
to bring in Technical
Personnel

Failed to counter

- Defended well on
9/11 and cost effective
of \$10 million would
save 300 million and better for
economy.

Brought in 9/11 as a
cyber crime
- which is wrong

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL
SCU
April 12-13

Leland LT (Isaac Lo & Andrew Tang) vs. Saratoga VL (Rishi Veerapaneni & Alexander Li)

AFFIRMATIVE

Saratoga

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Leland

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Team didn't need papers to speak.
- They had a strong voice and a strong argument
- Very organized
- Has a lot of informations

Room: O Connor 209
Flight ~~A~~ B; Start ASAP
Parliamentary Novice

OCTA

Two, Aptos

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL
SCU
April 12-13

Valey Christian HR (Brian Huang & Dhillip Raman) vs. Saratoga NL (Keshav Narayan & Theo Luan)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Valey Christian

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Saratoga

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Saratoga team had great teamwork. They can answer questions and they have the right information to say. They were calm and patient while opponent were interrupting.

Room: O Connor 209
Flight A: Start ASAP B
Parliamentary Novice

OCTA

~~CS Furer, Alex~~

AK-KRISHNA
RAMAKRISHNAN

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL

SCU

April 12-13

Saratoga NL (Keshav Narayan & Theo Luan) vs. Valey Christian HR (Brian Huang & Dhillip Raman)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the

NEG
AFF or NEG

from

Brian Huang & Dhillip Raman
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed:

K. Ramakrishnan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF
USFG should significantly increase
investment
in High Speed Rail
AFF

Failed to provide why High Speed needed

NEG
investment
in High Speed Rail
NEG.

Please refer Back
of Page.
for comments

Failed to provide counter.
Lack of Planning.

NEG - Better
Presented
and won.
therefore.

Good Argument
key point

"NOT AFFORDABLE"

SCU PHILALETHIC INVITATIONAL
SCU
April 12-13

Saratoga NL (Keshav Narayan & Theo Luan) vs. Valey Christian HR (Brian Huang & Dhillip Raman)

AFFIRMATIVE

Saratoga NL

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Valey Christian HR

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from Valey christian HR
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

USF&E should significantly increase investments in high-speed rail.

Aff team proposed giving \$6B to Elon Musk to build a high speed rail.
~~Neg team state~~ Contentions

1. Env friendly
2. Reduce dependence on foreign oil
3. 500/600 mph
4. Prototype works
5. 80K jobs

Neg team stated:

1. Govt cannot give large sum of money to a single guy. what exactly is it going to buy us? How will the money be used?
2. Other benefits are not economic benefits.
3. Neg team proposed giving small amount of money to private industries to build high speed rail.

Overall it was a very very close debate. I felt that neg team had better arguments. Especailay I believed their contention that govt. cannot give 6B to a single guy.