

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	SURLI LS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	William Liu	27	3
4	Justin Sun	27	1

NEGATIVE

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

The better debating was done by the NEG from MILPITAS BP
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:

VERY SLIM WIN
A TOSSUP

48 Nov 06 May

① 1.2B use 1.9B for Air quality
To convert to billion every
money is needed

② India is globally liked
my needs

③ Better ones of tech to China
India
eco degraded quality of life
in India

is terrible economy with
a better env?

70% of India is polluted
No water for water related
m. live impacts

① low is top priority
water & food become fertilizer
93% of renewable water used for ag
under control
India's env is not
env protection creates eco benefits

②

③

Air Pollution

4.16 not finished like
no people → no need for
money

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Champion BL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Shubham Banerjee <i>6.11</i>	29	2
	Nathan Loi	29	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Silver Creek QH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Ruby Qian <i>ANITA 6.1</i>	28	3
	Stella He	28	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Champion BL
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*
- 1) eco → env* *← business → poor health*
- one health care/loss of life approx*
- they will implement*
- 2) eco won't reduce poverty*
- will be implement*
- but to improve?*
- 3) primary eco → primary env*
-
- Rebuttal*
- Health care are sanitation problem*
- low 16% years able compared to USA*
- a 20% vs Japan*
- NEG*
- health care*
- 1) poor air quality*
- is better under best in the quality*
- Global problems not under*
- 2) Climate Change*

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE - ED

POS	Amador Valley BW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Preetham Bachina	27	3
2	Peter Wang	27	1

NEGATIVE - EP

POS	Washington SW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Subreen Sandhu	27	2
1	Shani Williams	27	4

The better debating was done by the ~~INDIA~~ ^{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: James A. All

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF 1 - 4 -

NEG 1 - 4

AFF 2 - 4

NEG - 2

ED - New technologies

- EP ~~Reverize~~ later
- ENV. DAMAGE REDUCED

- Get \$, then get EP

- 1984 < \$1.25/d in CHN

- Poverty declining in India (statistics)

- Vio & w / UP

X-EXAM

What is burden: to prio ED over EP
IND 8% BUT NOW 5%

Peter / Rotate AFF 2

ZC Rotate - ED helps health of Indians
e.g. Rotavirus, so \$ Helps!

ZC AP goes down w/ greater \$

IC 5% GDP impact due to EP

Our ZC Poverty & 15%

Decrease poverty

NEG 2 4:41

EP Definitions

Reading too fast vs. presenting cases smoothly

\$3.75 Trillion 5% GDP

Producing lots of medicines - INNOCENTS DYING

3C - AP - 3rd Leading cause of death

RANK 125/132 for Pollution

NEG 2

- No Def's offered

- Rising is growing 5% GDP

- ETHNIC GROUPS - NOT GERMANE

IC - INDIA'S ED GROWTH \$80B USD

Rx Pollution IN ENVIR.

ZC EP extends lives in INDIA

3C AP leading cause of death...

Later clarified
ETHNIC
Violence

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

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

NEGATIVE

POS	Milpitas TB - EP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Mihir Thummar	28	1
2	Ryan Balaoing	28	the 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: James A. [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

SEJAL: Net benefit scale - AFF

AFF C1 - Job opps

Green jobs & deals w/ poverty

AFF C2 - Prevents premature deaths ~~lifesaver~~
Poverty — Due to lack of ED

X-FIRE

ALLISON - ED - \$10-11M Can Join Job Market

EP - Characterize how bad it is in C2

but no solutions

Can't prioritize w/o a plan...

C2 - Thailand/Malaysia models for India (e.g.)

More live saved by ED vs. EP - 11M?

Mihir - NEG

"PRIORITIZING" Key Issue

NEG C1

ED & EP ARE NOT MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE

EP CRISIS MIGHT CUT 4% FROM GDP

C2 - Needs ATTN ON EP

C2a - ~~WATER~~ ^{EVIDENCE} H2O QUALITY BAD

C2b INDIA'S AP IS BAD/WORST

FINE PM - Lung Issues

Numerous deaths

Ranked 125/132

RYAN NEG 2

Neg C1 - unspecific on jobs

EP - 0% of GDP \$80 BN

- APC ISSUES - MINOR IMPACT ON ED

0.04% IMPACT ON GDP

- BANG FOR BUCK ARGUMENT

- ED WILL INC. DISTRIBUTION GAP

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Brooks DP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	James Dang	27.8	2
2	Aman Prasad	27.7	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Washington LC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jennifer Luo	27.8	3
1	Brandon Chu	28.9	1

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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

pro^{1st}: defined the priority first. povity, inflation, conspiracy.

Con^{1st}: air pollution, used a lot of data statistics. live longer and healthy life.

x fire: pro ~~stated~~ economic growth will help solving air pollution.

pro 2nd: det expensive cure for env. pollution. people will be happier ~~that spend~~ if having more money. Not

Con 2nd: ① support at the same time. ④ corruption not applicable.

② Viet not applicable.

x fire: ③ majority of money goes to company.

con answered the question very well for the opponent's question.

pro. 1st sum: • mis-used funds
• without enough money, not able to do env. development.
• Conspiracy?

Con 1st sum: Grand x fire: - people will have better env. if economy is improved.

pro 2nd sum: improvig economy will solve corruption.

Con 2nd sum: opponent's statements focus.

I felt Neg presented their evidents more consisely and firmly. Their presentation is more confidently delivered. Good job on both teams

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Amador Valley MT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sasha Menezes	26.5	3
2	Richa Tenany	27.0	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius KH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Rhee Kang	29	1
2	Jacqueline He	26.0	3

The better debating was done by the Neg 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:

- ① large economic growth has had negative impact on economy
- ② economically skewed corrupt - top 10% rich, missed opportunities for Aff.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Harker LT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Kenneth Luo	26.0	3
2	Michael Tang	25.0	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Silver Creek LT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Connie Lu	28.0	1
2	Anika Tyagi	27.0	2

The better debating was done by the NEG from Silver Creek -
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

A
I felt the aff had a
good sustainable
argument about -
economic loadings -
but did not
follow thru on
this contention -

Clear multi tiered
argument with statistics
and - standing in good
balance.

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Lynbrook MK Ashwin Muralidharan	27.8	3
1	Anshul Kale	27.5	4

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Miller/younggenius BM Mythili Bhethanaabotla	28.1	2
1	Rachana Muvvala	28.1	1

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

pro 1st: good presentation on stating priority.
Con 1st: good data statistics. clear speech.
X fire: both team answered the questions well and explained well.
pro 2nd:
Con 2nd: - net benefits, - rich-poor gap
- prioritize env.
X fire: pro 2nd did a good job explaining their arguments.
pro 1st sum: economy improvement will help env.
Con 1st sum: - good arguments
- ~~the~~ over time
grand X fire: -
pro 2nd ~~sum~~ focus: - logic, clear speech.
Con 2nd ~~sum~~ focus: - clear. as

Both teams delivered good arguments of their sides. I felt the Neg side particularly impressed me with their strong and clear statements.

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

3

AK 2, WHS PF

Reena Tangco

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Harker BB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Nakul Bajaj	29	3
2	Christina Bettink	29	2

Champion Aggarwal

NEGATIVE

POS	Champion SD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Johar Samrao	29	4
1	Aneesh Dundigalla	30	1

The better debating was done by the neg from Champion SD
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Reena Tangco

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg provided better evidence and statistics. Better delivery and skill in analysis of the debate.

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

3

AK 2, WHS PF

Reena Tangco

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Champion VT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jai Vishwarupe	4	27
1	Saumil Thakore	3	28

NEGATIVE

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

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

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

Signed: Reena Thoreke

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

provided stronger arguments and clear understanding of opposing sides.

AFF 2 — a little rude, interrupts too much

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Champion BB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2, 11, 4	Jaydev Bhateja	26.5	3
11, 3	Chetan Bhateja	26.5	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius YZ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Angela Ye	27.1	2
2	Yichen Zhu	29.1	1

The better debating was done by the NEG 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:

The Neg showed more harm for ~~the~~ not improving econ than Aff showed benefits.

A close look at stats & how they were found is important, suffering life expectancy means very little to me.

Aff should further work on their speaking skills, specifically standing in place

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Brooks MK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Soham Makani	27	4
1	Riya Kamboj	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Bishop O'Dowd HP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Elliott Hunt	29	1
2	Brandon Pang	28	3

The better debating was done by the NEG from Bishop O'Dowd HP
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:

Definitions
Lack of innovations
Social justice - education
sanitation
electricity
cannot afford quality of life

2-AFF

Cost of emissions control
tourism is little impact to Indian
develop economy while keeping env

SUM-AFF:

Jobs, salaries

FIN-AFF

1-NEG:

definition correction
pollution affects children,
lower poor nutrition
Compare with China's econ. growth

2-NEG:

5th leading cause of deaths
env. protection will help sanitation
food security

SUM-NEG:

env. protection saves life,
protects soil

FIN-NEG:

life > innovation,

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius DA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jason Dong	29	2
1	Varun Agrawal	27	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks SS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Michelle Song	28	3
2	Crystal Su	29	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from Brooks SS
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:
eco. growth is good for people
will help solve env. issues
reduce mass poverty

2-Aff:
sustainable growth
help women in India
ppl want economic growth

Sum-Aff:
improve economy
pre req. for env. improvements

Fin-Aff:
Necessary to stop poverty
provide jobs
recent data 2013, 2014

1-NEG:
definition - best interest
env. issues are bad for humans
air/water
economy growth over env. hurts people
soil degradation

2-NEG:
4 of 5 contentions not addressed by Aff
deaths due to env.
agriculture.

Sum-NEG:
Agriculture at risk
people's livelihood impacted

Fin-NEG:
Pollution causes deaths.
72% people rely on agriculture.

SCU PHILALETHIC
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	27	2
2	Ashwin Nathan	27	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Harker PL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Jason Pan	26.5	3
2	Kyle Li	26	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from MILLER/YOUNGGENIUS.
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
~~AFF~~ challenged NEG contentions effectively.
Adhiraj doesn't need to mention his name 3 times during debate. ~~Adhiraj's name~~
Once is enough.
AFF was addressing judge too many times.
AFF had better contentions and won crossfire.

NEG
NEG couldn't back up their contentions.
NEG was not good ~~at~~ in questioning AFF.
NEG global warming contention was out of place.
NEG ~~was~~ was missing points.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

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

NEGATIVE

POS	SURLI MK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Gaurav Mohan	26	1
2	Rahul Kumar	26	2

The better debating was done by the NEG from SURLI MK.
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

- CON 1) POWER
- CON 2) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
- CON 3) ELECTRICITY

AFF case was weak.
not able to defend their
contentions.
AFF was not challenging NEG
contentions.
AFF couldn't stand the
ground.
AFF needs to improve speaking
and better prepare the
whole case.

NEG

- CON 1) POLLUTION
- CON 2) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION IS PROFOUND FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
- CON 3) AGRICULTURE

NEG was not much stronger in
~~but~~ ~~was~~ their presentation, ~~but~~
~~AFF was~~
NEG won the debate because
AFF was very weak.
NEG needs to work on speaking
skills.

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Leland YZ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1/2	Andrew Yi	28	3
2/4	Eric Zuccherro	28	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Washington JD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1/2	Priya Jindal	28.5	2
2/4	Dhanya Duraivelu	28.5	1

The better debating was done by the

NEG

from

Washington JD.

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Preservation res
1. resource extract. - Indian mine
2. poverty reduction - export.
3. building new road - transportation

new road decrease pollution? → mine → pollution.

contesting ← only rich get job?

OECD

- air water pollution
- protected econ. develop. (cause lives)
- climate change. - harm Agr.

I vote for NEG for they are stronger with their cross fire questions and ability to arg. opponents points are bad. arguments

AFF have good points on their, but would have room to grow on answering opponents attack. (Don't let opponents ask you a question, avoid it and use opportunity to make your own arg.)

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Milpitas MT		
2	Ayush Maheshwari		
1	Neel Thakkar		

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Valey Christian BS		
	Sinan Bayati		
	Dev Shah		

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

No Show

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius PC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Anya Poplavska	2	28.6 29
	Emily Chen	1	28.7 29

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks LP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Yvette Lin	4	28.3 28.5
	Julia Park	3	28.4 28.5

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: Heidi Miller

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

THE PRO (AFF) TEAM DID A BETTER JOB OF RECONNECTING EVIDENCE TO THEIR CONTENTION. IT WAS A CLOSE MATCH AND THE NEG TEAM DID A GOOD JOB ON REBUTAL BUT NEEDED STRONGER EVIDENCE. BOTH SIDES MISSED SOME KEY REBUTALS. FOR EXAMPLE THE AFF SIDE SHOULD HAVE CHALLENGED THE 'CLIMATE EFFECT' AS THAT EFFECT IS GLOBAL, NOT SOMETHING INDIA CAN CONTROL BY ITSELF. THE NEG TEAM MISSED THE REBUTAL ON THE CONTENTION FOR AFF ON THE LINK BETWEEN ECONOMIC DEV. TO TERRORISM.

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Brooks NV	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Vinayak Nadig	28.0	4
	Sahith Vaddi	28.9 29	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius ZK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Matt Zhou	28.5	3
	Brandon Kim	28.8	2

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

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

Signed: Henry Miller

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

IT WAS A CLOSE MATCH, BUT THE NEG TEAM HAD CONTENTION WHICH WERE ^{NOT} EFFECTIVELY REBUTED BY AFF TEAM. FOR EXAMPLE THEIR POINT OR EFFECTIVE MEASUREMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SHOULD INCLUDE ENVIRONMENTAL GAINS OR THEIR POINT THAT ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS IS PRE-REQUISITE TO ECONOMIC GROWTH. BOTH TEAMS SHOULD LINK THEIR EVIDENCE MORE STRONGLY TO THEIR CONTENTION. FOR EXAMPLE. HOW WILL ~~POPULATION~~ ECONOMIC ~~DEVELOPMENT~~ LEAD TO ~~ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT~~ BETTER POPULATION GROWTH. CONTROL DEVELOPMENT

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius XD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Cindy Xu		
	Audrey Ding		

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks PS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Avi Patel		
1	Abhishek Shah		

The better debating was done by the

NEG
AFF or NEG

from

Brooks PS.
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative No show!

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Amador Valley CP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sean Cho	26.5	3
2	Aditya Palapati	26	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland TA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Ken Tanaka	26.9	2
1	Akhil Aji	27	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from AF (Leland TA)
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: 1 economic grow v.s. happy lives. Prioritize the economic grow
protect environment education for boy and girls equity pollution
increase ability to improve the environments
- 2 Majority india benefit from economic. Fix the pollution cost huge
No worth. Over population cost more pollution.
provide example to support the point.

- NEG 1. ① Drought in India protect water sewing is not clean water is
not treated rapid industry increase more pollution
better pollution control ② Air pollution → increase disease
③ Agriculture decrease better policy and standard control
2. Address population. diseases, policy and laws. water system

Cross fire: NEG: better argument evident

Aff: No related the topic

economic increase can't equise the citizen. Air and land protection.
Catholic System

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Brooks DS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Ajay Dulai	30	1
2	Rakesh Sudhakar	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Washington JK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Kanika Janghala	30	1
2	Tannavee Kumar	29	2

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: _____

Signed: Ujale Ramachandran

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both sides were good!
Affirm was more convincing
due to facts presented!

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

3 BH Ramachandran,

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

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

NEGATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius HG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Shinda Huang		
	Zacahry George		

The better debating was done by the

Neg
AFF or NEG

from

Miller/younggenius HG
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Bala Ramachandran

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Automatic Win -
Affirmative didn't show!

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Harker JC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Annabelle Ju	28	2
2	Cynthia Chen	29	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius XX	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jason Yang	25	4
1	Nathan Zhang	26	3

The better debating was done by the AF 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:

AF's contentions stood through the round. Contention 2 (a priori) was particularly effective. Rebuttal was impeccable; Ms. Chen is ready to advance to Open Debate.
Neg did not provide any links through any of their speeches.
Contention 1 - no impacts or constructive speech
2 - doesn't do anything through the round except read the card
Devaluation of ropes and cash crops never proven relevant
Neg's rebuttal speech consisted entirely of reading cards. No clash, no links.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Washington KP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Mandeep Kaur	26	2
2	Sonia Pathak	26	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Harker ML	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Shomrik Mondal	25	3
2	Jeffrey Liu	25	4

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AF accessed all of Neg's impacts ~~in~~ in Contention 2, economic development leads to environmental protection.
Virtually no clash in this debate; debaters re-read their own cases instead for much of their speaking time.
Teams spent too much time talking about funding. These are Value rounds, not Policy rounds. Unless there is a long term fiscal impact, funding of purely hypothetical regulations is not an issue.
AF needs to yield to Neg questions; Neg needs to be more assertive in Crossfire.
AF provides no links in first contention until second Crossfire.
AF's third contention unconvincing — they cite historic economic growth, but do not link to the future and how prioritizing the environment would be a harm.
Neg has a good case, but does not get to third contention.
Neither side provides concrete Voter Issues in final focus.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Leland KL		
	Rohil Kulkarni	28	1
	Kyung Lee	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Washington SD		
	Ria Sodha	25	3
	Ekta Dadlani	24	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: Alia MacDonalot

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: Good Quest. during X-exoem.

Neg: "There has to be some pollution coming from India"; It's just an opinion; strong facts or arguments weren't provided