

Room: Leavey West B
Flight B: Start
Public Forum April Novice

2

~~BH Jin, Shu~~

Emiliano
Adams

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A



AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius HN	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Adhiraj Hangal	29	2
2	Ashwin Nathan	30	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks SS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Michelle Song	27	4
2	Crystal Su	28	3

The better debating was done by the

AFF
AFF or NEG

from

Miller/younggenius HN
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

Emiliano Adams

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Good Luck All

Adhiraj AFF

- Burden: Prefer econ dev.
- environment should be after econ.
- ob
- Econ increase safety
- reduces terrorist
- fights crime
- will discourage terrorist
- reduces slavery?
- 32.7% below International poverty line.
- econ. dev. will help women
- econ dev. increase global power

Michelle Neg

- environment helps better
- Pollution is ~~not~~ awful
- 600K death by poor water
- no city provides water
- (impact) water / air is bad
- 72% is rural areas
- poor management
- Health and livelihood most important
- will make pollution worse with econ dev.

410 Ashwin AFF

- Neg did provide evidence ^(good) that econ. growth cause pd.
- econ. help environ. good job talking about (green)
- Thanks for showing me how econ will help improve create \$ and ~~make~~ make water better. refuted Neg's case
- econ dev. will help public health.
- NO money ← Great
- air problems of Neg's case

Crystal Neg

- Sept. 11th had a dev. econ least attacks still here.
- good connection of how econ doesn't end slavery only improve
- True they never really linked the improvement of water
- 72% of ppl. rely on Agriculture
- toxic water children dying

Neg
good job calling him out
about saying hopefully (Michelle)

- Talk about How (Crystal)

AFF

- dev. economy = more \$\$\$
- good job forcing her to
defend her case (Adhiraj)
- good questions (Adhiraj)

- IF opp. keeps repeating self
MOVE ON.

Adhiraj AFF

- econ. dev. helps ag.
- good job talking how there's
no money.

Michelle Neg

- short term is more important

Didn't give a lot of how

Room: Leavey West B
Flight A: Start ASAP
Public Forum April Novice

2

BH Jin, Shu

Emilia Adams

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE (15)

POS	Brooks LP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Yvette Lin	27	4/3
2	Julia Park	24 27	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Champion BL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Shubham Banerjee	28	1
2	Nathan Loi	26.00	4

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

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

Signed: Emilia Adams

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Good luck All

(11)

SCU PHILAETHIC
 Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Brooks DS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Ajay Dulai	26.5	2
2	Rakesh Sudhakar	27	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Washington SD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Ria Sodha	25	4
2	Ekta Dadlani	26	3

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

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

~~AA~~ ~~HH~~ RS ~~HH~~ || Signed: [Signature] RS ~~ED~~ ~~HH~~ |

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~AD~~ - POINTS SHOULD BE MADE STRUCTURED
 HIGH POINTS FIRST - DETAIL LATER
~~RS~~ RS - TERROR ARGUMENT NOT
 WELL INTRODUCED
 RS - CROSS - NOT A GOOD ARGUMENT
 ABOUT TERROR BEING CAUSED DUE
 TO ECONOMIC PROBLEMS.
 AD - NEED TO ADDRESS OPPONENTS
 MORE DIRECTLY
~~AD~~ - AD -

~~ED~~ - USA/CHINA SEEM IRRELEVANT
 TO THE RESOLUTION
 ED - GOOD CROSS - VALUE OF ECONOMY
 RS* GOOD REBUTTAL ON CRIME -
 RS - NEED TO BE BETTER FLOW
 LOTS OF HESITATION PAUSES ETC.
 RS - DID NOT MAKE GOOD COUNTER
 ARGUMENTS.
 RS - CONTENTIONS NOT WELL
 PRESENTED, NEEDS MORE PREP
 TOO MANY PAUSES/ACCESSING PC
~~ED~~ ED - WELL ORGANIZED POINTS.
 RS - FINAL - CRIME ALWAYS EXISTING NOT
 A GOOD ARGUMENT
 - MORE \$\$\$ DOES NOT CAUSE CORRUPTION
 RICHER COUNTRIES HAVE LESS CORR
 RS - FINAL - NEEDS SMOTHER DEBILITY

SCU PHILAETHIC
 Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Champion SD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	Johar Samrao	26.5	2
1	Aneesh Dundigalla	27.5	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Bishop O'Dowd HP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Elliott Hunt	26	4
4	Brandon Pang	26.5	3

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- AD HHH 1*
CHAMPION SD JS HHH 1
- COMPARING A/CAL VS D TO INDIA IS A POOR COMPARISON
 - GOOD POINT TABLETS SAVES DIARRHEA PROBS
 - ECONOMIC IMPROVEMENT
 - JOHAR - NOT SPEAKING CLEARLY & HESITATING. POOR STRUCTURE NEED TO OUTLINE HIGHLIGHTS
 - GOOD CROSS POINT IF PEOPLE HAVE ST THGWILL INSTALL TABLET
 - JS - FIRMAL -

- LEW BISHOP SD HHH*
- BP MORE POWER THAN CONGRESS TALKING
 - BP MORE STRUCTURED IN PRESENTING HIGH LEVEL POINT FIRST THEN GO TO DETAIL
 - GOOD REBUTTAL RE DIARRHEA REDUCED BY CLEAN WATER
 - SOLID DEBATE POINT - GOOD POINT
 - BA - 1111*
 - BP - NEED TO BE MORE ORGANIZED YOU SPEAK W LOW CONFIDENCE
 - BP - GOOD SINGAPORE SMALL - INDIA BTH
 - GOOD POINT - AIR POLLUTION GOES EVERYWHERE.
 - EH GOOD REBUT - ON AIR POLLUTION
 - BP - WHATS THIS NEW POINT INFRASTRUCTURE DEGRADATION??

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Champion

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Amador Valley MT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sasha Menezes	28.5	2
2	Richa Tenany	28.0	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Washington JD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Priya Jindal	27.5	4
3	Dhanya Duraivelu	27.0	3

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

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

Signed: Bibbe Jammer

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A - Positive
 1. Econ Pre req
 2. Eliminate Poverty
 3. Environment
 (CF) Air water (+)
 2. Improper Educatn

2A - Econ Growth + Quality vs Econ Clean Environ +
 Environ under funded + Air water cost off
 T.O Climate Change + Education

(CF) Flood vs Econ +
 Air + water (-)
 Eliminate Poverty

1A - Quality of life vs # of life
 People of India
 Flood of poor Econ uses
 Evidence 9 / Two family vs whole.
 1C, 2C = Evidence. 3C dropped.

(CF) Env vs Quality life +
 80 Pollution +
 Econ growth + Evidence
 Freedom (-)

2A - Quality of life +
 Has more direct +
 Stable Econ +
 Evidence +.
 Climate chge
 3C. - No Refute +

3N - Environment - Pollution;
 4S - 1. Air & water Pollution
 2. Pollution Econ develop.
 T+ 3. Climate change.
 (CF) What causes of Air pollution (+)
 overbuild +

4N - Quality of life - Econ not means +
 stable Enviro. + Flood Econ develop +
 Climate chge. Effect Econ +
 Air pollution. Econ Help Eliminate Poverty.
 (CF) Environ stability needed to +
 Environment Loss (-)

3N - Pollution life. vs quality.
 Pollution Econ. Environment +
 1C. Evidence?
 Poverty (High)

(CF) 800 +
 Econ. Quality of life. + +
 Poverty +

4N. (-)
 Quality of life - Enviro life
 GDP level
 3C. Refute.
 Low Help Enviro.
 Econ.

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Team	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Leland KL		
	Rohil Kulkarni	28.5	1
	Kyung Lee	27.5	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Team	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Miller/younggenius YZ		
	Angela Ye	28.1	2
	Yichen Zhu	28.0	3

The better debating was done by the AFFIRMATIVE from LELAND KL
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Alenak Mahul

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Two contentions from each team remained un-contested. However the affirmative team had better evidence and were able to refute the contention around ~~the~~ climate change ~~and~~.

COMMENTS

FOR AFFIRMATIVE TEAM: MAKE SURE YOU CONTEST ALL CONTENTIONS, YOU DID NOT CONTEST ① ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES LEAD TO WAR ② ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ARE HARD TO ROLL BACK.

FOR NEGATIVE TEAM: YOU TRIED TOO HARD TO REFUTE "CLIMATE CHANGE" WHICH WAS A LOST CASE. HOWEVER YOU DID A GOOD JOB REFUTING THE "CLIMATE CHANGE" CONTENTION. ARGUMENT WITH EVIDENCE OF UN-EQUAL DEVELOPMENT.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius DA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Jason Dong	29	1
2	Varun Agrawal	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Milpitas BP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Oishika Barat	26	2/4
3	Nisha Porchezhiyan	27	4/3

The better debating was done by the Aff from Jason Dong - Varun Agrawal
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: RSalanki

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFFIRMATIVE

I have chosen affirmative team to win because they gave good arguments of growth of economy is necessity for india.

Jason Dong -

- Good speaker and easy to understand.
- gave financial contention, helps women, good point
- good argument in crossfire round.

Varun Agrawal

- good speaker - you should improve speaking ability more
- gave - reduce mass poverty - good point
- slave population, which was good point
- still needs proper evidence

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE


POS	Washington SW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Subreen Sandhu	28	2
1	Shani Williams	27	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Harker JC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Annabelle Ju	26	4
1	Cynthia Chen	29	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from Harker JC
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-AFF
 Economy growth, needed
 Agriculture
 Poverty problem - solves?

2-AFF
 India (not the world)
 Issues: Inflation
 Poor education
 Poor infrastructure

SUM-AFF
 Suffering economy
 Low skilled workers

EW-AFF
 Slow down in growth

1-NEG
 - Air pollution - CO₂
 Environmental protection
 - Impact eco-system
 - Solve toxic water problem - quotes (How?)

2-NEG
 Env. protection to help economic devel.
 Sustainable growth
 Damage earth & ecosystem.

SUM-NEG
 Global warming vs air pollution

EW-NEG

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

No Show

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Cabin John Middle HH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Adlee Heshmat		
	Rohit Harapanhalli		

NEGATIVE

POS	Harker ML	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Shomrik Mondal		
	Jeffrey Liu		

The better debating was done by the NEG from Harker ML
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:

1-AFF

1-NEG

2-AFF

2-NEG

Sum-AFF

Sum-NEG

FIN-AFF

FIN-NEG

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Champion VT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jai Vishwarupe	26	2
1	Saumil Thakore	25	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius BM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Mythili Bhethanaabotla	25.5	3
1	Rachana Muvvala	26.5	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from Mythili/Rachana
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Saumil:
speech: very logic, it is better not to shake body during speech.
cross-fire: ~~raising question well~~ calm.

Jai:
speech: delivers speech smoothly.
cross-fire: ~~didn't answer question well~~ it is better to control your emotion during cross-fire.

Rachana:
speech: arguments are clear.
cross-fire: raising question well and answer questions well

Mythili:
speech: volume is properly and is confident.
cross-fire: didn't answer question well

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A →

AFFIRMATIVE


POS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
Brooks MK		
2	Soham Makani	
1	Riya Kamboj	

NEGATIVE

POS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
Pinewood GS		
	Jaspaul Ghumman	
	George Shi	

The better debating was done by the AFF from Soham/Riya
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

"Negative" team didn't show up.

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius PC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Anya Poplavska	25 23	1
	Emily Chen	25 23	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Washington KP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Mandeep Kaur	25 23	2
	Sonia Pathak	23 21	4

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

8-14% Wood point growth happens every year
 Allowed opponent to interrupt their
 Point on terrorism good poverty going
 D Anya Health good down Mandeep + Economy
 environment money needed to improve
 Mandeep pesticides point good sewage
 point good Bad Environment prevents economic growth
 point good
 Emily wood points Economy will help environment
 cleaning Now needs money Health improved by
 a money Economy
 Sonia Hesitant point about terrorism in America also good
 point to fix environment first
 good before economy point about America
 not using economic money on environment
 good Environment cannot save food a

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius XX	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Jason Yang	25 23	①
	Nathan Zhang	24 22	2

NEGATIVE

POS	SURLI LS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	William Liu	23 21	4
	Justin Sun	24 22	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from MILLER
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:

point about competition
 Good points from foreeign companies
 Nathan Poverty will end by economy growing good
 point about ~~visitors~~ visitors vs poor people food
 Justin ~~economic~~ pollution point good
 other countries will not start businesses
 port
 in India good
 Taylor point about waste cleaner is
 cheap is good point about prioritizing the
 poor messer good over visitors and point
 or polio eradication good
 William point about children too sick
 and so cannot learn well good

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Brooks DC		
	Nataraj Datta		
	Sanil Chawla		

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Harker LT		
	Kenneth Luo		1
	Michael Tang		1

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

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

Signed: Joon J L

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Affirmative Team did not show up

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Washington JK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Kanika Janghala	29.8	1
1	Tannavee Kumar	29.5	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Lynbrook MK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Ashwin Muralidharan	29.7	2
1	Anshul Kale	29.6	3

The better debating was done by the NEG from Lynbrook MK
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 team's claim that environment degradation harms economy was convincing
- AFF team needed more evidence that security service industry ~~economy~~ is not enough (esp of service industry?)
- everyone did great job.
- I wish I did not have to rank.

SCU PHILALETHIC
 Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Harker PL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1st	Jason Pan	27.6	1
2nd	Kyle Li	26.4	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Champion BB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2nd	Jaydev Bhateja		
1st	Chetan Bhateja	27.4	2

2nd Jaydev. 26.8 →

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

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

Signed: Allen Wang (result on opposite page)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF 1: read economic ✓
 prorp =
 Ob 1: not govt
 2: most beneficial
 Con I: no need for protecting environment
 pressing need, unemployment ↑
 infrastructure, ppl quality
 economic success, pay off debt
 Con II: decrease mortality rate,
 eco success
 Con III: poverty, → slavery.

NEG 1: environ
 Def: ppl, not gov.
 Ob 1: cost little,
 Con I: save life, improve life quality
 environ improvement
 disaster, air pollution,
 Con II: economic no guarantee
 distribution income, reduce poverty,
 pattern no improvement
 III: affordable,
 most affordable for environment
 not economy, protect

ask for concession?
 attack can't eliminate.
 Sum 1
 not no solid ground to eliminate poverty.

attack.
 Sum NEG 1

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius HG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1st	Shinda Huang	26.8	3
2nd	Zacahry George Tejasvi	27.2	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Silver Creek LT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1st	Connie Lu	27.6	1
2nd	Anika Tyagi	26.6	4

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

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

Signed: Aileen Wang

(decision on opposite side)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF | Economic.
 Con I: reduce terrorism.
~~discourage~~ how to benefit all?
 Con II: reduce poverty
~~freedom~~ ↑ freedom, reduce poverty
 etc.
 II: attain both benefit for environments,
 by focusing econ. high income level
 1st would → less pollution.
 IV: help women right, women workforce

NEG |
 pollution → alarm severity.
 air pollution, evidence,
~~pressing need~~ pressing need, immediate.
 → no
 1849: CA, gold rush, bad result,
 Water:
~~potential health~~ potential health, mutated DNA,
 safe, human life over \$\$,
 not at risk,
 helping environment cost affordable.
 ~ .4% GDP.

like chosen
 Kill pollution source, wood burning C/F
 gas burning.

pollution source from econo develop
 how to distribute income properly.

Sum 1

Sum 2
 effective attack.

CA

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE


POS	Harker BB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Nakul Bajaj	26.5	3
2	Christina Bettink Chandan Aggarwal	27	1

NEGATIVE

POS	SURLI MK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Gaurav Mohan	27.0	2
2	Rahul Kumar	26.5	4

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

2A Your contentions were delivered in a very organized and confident manner.

1N Your contentions were well thought through with substance.

2A You are a very confident speaker and quick on your feet.

2N You have a very calm but convincing way of conveying your points.

Both teams did a good job with presenting their contentions. All the speakers did very well with their delivery as seen in the speaker points. However, I was more convinced with the arguments presented by the Neg. They were able to make more connections and refute the opponents points.

SCU PHILAETHIC
 Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE


POS	Brooks DP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	James Dang	25.5	1
2	Aman Prasad	24	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Silver Creek QH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Ruby Qian Aneeka #10172eddy	23	4
	Stella He	25	2

The better debating was done by the Aff from Dang + Prasad.
AFF/NEG TEAM OF CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A - Good Contentions, well delivered.
 Very good reasoning put forth during Gov Fire

2A You were strong on your rebuttle and refuted all the opponent arguments.
 You were quick at catching on the points made by Neg.

1N Contentions could be stronger. ~~You addressed only 1 aspect~~
 - ~~of gov~~ You can spend less time in delivering statistics.

2N - Very well done on presenting your case. Good statistics put forth.
 - You brought up a new argument during the final focus which was a good one had it been presented earlier.

I vote for Aff as they presented strong contentions with which the opponents could not refute. Also they agreed to some points that the opponent missed the opportunity to attack the comments of the Aff about mis-interpretation of the Neg stats of 74% of Economic Growth.

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

start = 4:05pm.
end = 5pm.

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Champion MH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Abhiraj Muhar	28	1
2	Rehan Haneef	26.5	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Washington LC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jennifer Luo	26	4
1	Brandon Chu	27.5	2

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

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

Signed: Debbie Zhang/Miller - Young Grenias.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

It is an excellent debate from both sides. Each side has fully built cases with clear contentions and supporting evidences.

cross fires are also meaningfully and relevant.

However I decide NEG has slight advantage as one of ^{their key} contentions: CO2 emission cause ir-revertable effect to environment is not fully refuted by AFF side, and successfully cause doubt in judge's mind.

Comments:

AFF-1: Abhiraj - excellent presentation skills; need better time management as your first speech is well over time limit.

AFF-2: Rehan - need stronger voice, and better use your speech. It seems your speech is more of repeat same contents and evidence. It should further build on the cases.

NEG-1: Brandon - excellent debater. But first speech you speak too fast in mono-tone. Communicate and convincing judge is more important than push more information.

NEG-2: Jennifer - Good crossing skills. You can continue work on presentation skills by eliminating pause during speech.

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

start = 3:10 pm.
end = 3:55 pm.

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Harker KC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Michelle Kwan	25.5	3
2	Amanda Cheung	25	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Milpitas TB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Mihir Thummar	27	1
2	Ryan Balaoing	27.5	2

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

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

Signed: Debbie Zheng / Miller - young Gemini.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG present a stronger case with clear structure of contentions → warrants → supporting facts and summary. NEG side also refute well on most of AFF's side contentions.

AFF side second speech is only 1 minute 48 seconds, which can be better utilized to develop their contentions. And most of rebuttle is only asking to clarify evidence source which lost opportunity of "fire back".

comment on speaker:

AFF-1: Michelle — can use more confident voice.

AFF-2: Amanda — try to read less, have eye contact with judge.

NEG-1: Mihir — great speaker, but need better time control. Both speeches are over time and cannot finish.

NEG-2: Ryan — good voice! and summary skills. also tone management as your final summary is over limit.

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Valey Christian BS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sinan Bayati	27	4
3	Dev Shah	20.5	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius ZK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Matt Zhou	28.7	1
2	Brandon Kim	27	3

The better debating was done by the NEG from Miller/young
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:

1A
good eye contact
Simple and clear debating!

Work on:
more evidence against Neg

3A
Very strong speaker
great eye contact
good points
prepared

Work on:
more evidence against Neg

2N
good debating, prepared

Work on:
voice volume, confidence in debate
4N

good arguments
good evidence
good debate when needed
good preparation

Work on:
Starting off as strong as you finished!
eye contact.

Decision: 1 Vote For Negative for this debate. They were challenged by the affirmative team and built a strong argument against the main point that "protection" would not help the environment. Negative provided clarity & support for their

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius KH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Rhee Kang	29.2	1
1	Jacqueline He	29.5	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Milpitas MT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Ayush Maheshwari	28	3
3	Neel Thakkar	27.5	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Miller/Young
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:

1A
 good info well prepared
 good arguments
 work on slowing down speech &
 eye contact

3N
 clear words. Simple and easy
 to understand.
 work on raising the volume
 of your voice
 work on

2A
 clear speech. Great eye contact
 Well supported arguments

4N
 great eye contact
 Clear speech
 work on

Decision: I voted for the affirmative team.
 Well support debater by the affirmative team, where the negative
 team did not battle the points when pressed. Affirmative had
 data & detailed information & used the debate time very
 effectively. They also prepared very well before & during the
 debate.

Vivek Singhal
Mountain View

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Leland YZ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1A	Andrew Yi	27	4
2A	Eric Zucchero	27	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks PS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2N	Avi Patel	28	2
1A	Abhishek Shah	29	1

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: Not applicable

Signed: Victor Wang

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative's case only discussed possible economic development activities. It didn't explain why these activities were more important than environmental development.

Affirmative did not rebut the negative's arguments:
 that ~~economic~~ pollution causes death
 that environment is valuable

The affirmative should have pointed out that poverty causes death too!

Negative did good job of refuting the points of affirmative.

Both sides should have challenged evidence of opponent.

Negative tended to do better during cross examinations.

Both teams show great potential. I appreciate all of your hard work!

Viviek Singhal
Mountain View

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Amador Valley CP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1A	Sean Cho	28	1
2A	Aditya Palapati	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius XD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2N	Cindy Xu	27	4
3N	Audrey Ding	27	3

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: Not applicable

Signed: Viviek Singhal

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative did a better job of making logical arguments. I found the argument that environmental improvements will eventually follow from economic development was persuasive. The negative's evidence about the 27% of Indians who were against economic development was confusing and did not support their case.

Affirmative did a great job of linking the rich-poor gap to the caste system, turning a negative contention into an Affirmative contention.

Negative presented too many contentions, leaving too little time to elaborate and defend them.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Hassan
Yaghoobi

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius KL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sally Kim	28	(2)
2	Amber Lee	29	(1)

NEGATIVE

POS	Harker KJ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sejal Krishnan	27.5	(3)
2	Allison Jia	27	(4)

The better debating was done by the AFF from Miller/Younggenius KL
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: H. Yaghoobi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Primarily
- The AFF team won because of better ability of rebuttal.
 - The NEG team lost because they were not able to defend their reasonings in some case deferred an answer that required reasoning to a reference.

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Hassan
Yaghoobi

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Amador Valley BW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Preetham Bachina	28.5	(3)
2	Peter Wang	28.5	(1)

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland TA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Ken Tanaka	28.5	(4)
1	Akhil Aji	28.5	(2)

The better debating was done by the AFF from Amador Valley BW
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: H. Yaghoobi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This debate was practically a tie. ^{and rebutting}
Both teams ~~were~~ were good in analysing the opponent reasoning. The were accurate as to the point ~~is~~ very specific. Very good attitude!
Congratulations to both teams