

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Champion SD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Johar Samrao	28	1
2	Aneesh Dundigalla	27.5	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks MK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Soham Makani	27.5	4
3	Riya Kamboj	27.5	3

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

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

Signed: Russell Yin

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Resolved: Prioritizing economic development over environmental protection is in the best interest of the people of India

- ~~Aff: framework: long term, 620M people no health care~~
①

② ~~reduce poverty / China example~~

- 1A: good summary, points articulated (Aneesh)

1N: points laid out well with supporting evidence (Riya)

Crossfire: "over" vs "equal or not prioritizing economic" clarified: both A and N

- 2A: logic understood and stated well (even → income → living standards) long-term benefits EU example) Good (Johar)

2N: "over" vs "equal" rebuttal (Soham) - could state more clearly on US/India

CX Gs on "over" vs "equal" EU rebuttal - Did not fully use the time allotted

(over)

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius XX	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	Jason Yang	27.5	3
4	Nathan Zhang	27.5	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Lynbrook MK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Ashwin Muralidharan	28	1
2	Anshul Kale	28	2

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

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

Signed: Russell/Gin

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A: points laid out clearly
(Nathan) logic is understood
but poverty/child labor
part is questionable.

- Cx = Not enough question
for rebuttal

2A: A bit mixed on the relevance
(Jason) points and logic.
Evidence Not directly relevant

Cx = equal

RFD = I vote NEGATIVE because all the points laid out
are clear with good logic and effective/relevant
evidence. The Affirmative side made some good
points but not as clear logic and with evidence
NOT directly relevant to India (child labor) Pakistan/China/Western
NEGATIVE side does a better job in the persuasion (over)

1N: All 3 contentions
(Anshul) are clear with good
support and
Effective rebuttal
Cx: points are made
more clearly with evidence
better articulated

2N: All points made
(Ashwin) clear with good logic
and evidence.

clear summary

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Valey Christian BS		
1	Sinan Bayati	28	1
2	Dev Shah	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Harker BB		
1 & 2	Nakul Bajaj	26	3
	Christina Bettink	sick, did not come	

AFFERBYE

The better debating was done by the AFF from Valley Christian 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:

I voted AFF team because their case is well prepared and presented.
AFF team's case and arguments are stronger.
Comments to the team.

AFF Team:
You demonstrated good debating skills, very well prepared and presented your case. Keep up the good work and I believe you can do better job in crossfire sessions.

Neg Team:
You did a great solo job. under the condition the your partner is not available.
I wish you'll be more aggressive in crossfire sessions and refute your opponents' arguments in a more strong way.

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Silver Creek LT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Connie Lu	22	3
2	Anika Tyagi	21	4

NEGATIVE

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

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

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

Signed: Chy/L

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF team:

1. I would encourage AFF team to make better use of the time.
(1:02 left, not used in 2nd speaker round 8. 30 second left for 1st speaker round)
2. I hope AFF team will have more time to prepare for their case and speak with more confidence.

Neg team:

1. I voted Neg because their case is strong. They are very well prepared. ~~made~~ good use of their prep time and debate time.
2. Neg team both team members are very confident speakers. They have good skills to direct the cross fires.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Milpitas TB		
	Mihir Thummar	27	4
	Ryan Balaoing	27.5	2

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Miller/younggenius PC		
	Anya Poplavska	28.5	1
	Emily Chen	27.5	3

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

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

Signed: R. Padmanabhan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: Contentions

1. Keep the Population in check
2. Reduce Poverty
3. Poor don't have time for environment where they can't feed themselves.

Neg Contentions:

1. without environmental protection no economic development
2. Pollution directly affects health of people, costs \$80B in health costs, conflicts between countries because of resource constraints like water.
3. child mortality, natural disasters.

Neg one the debate because

1. They are able to successfully argue with evidence that costs of environmental protection are far less compared to the loss of GDP because of ~~the~~ environmental issues.
2. Economic development benefits rich more than the poor.
3. Aff team couldn't show any evidence that economic development leads to population control.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius KL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Sally Kim	27.5	1 1st
	Amber Lee	27.5	2 2nd

NEGATIVE

POS	Champion MH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Abhiraj Muhar	27	3 2nd.
	Rehan Haneef	27	4 1st

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: R. Padmanabhan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff Contentions:

1. Economic development reduces conflicts/wars, thus saving lives.
2. Improved infrastructure. ~~water~~ Reducing gap between rich & poor.
3. Reduce poverty with development.
4. Decrease child slavery.
5. Increase standard of living, women employment, women's rights.

Neg Contentions:

1. Saves lives - Lot of people die because of pollution.
2. Economic growth doesn't reduce poverty. Rich & Poor gap.
3. Environmental issues causing more reduction in GDP than what it forces to fix.

Aff team wins this debate because -

1. They are able to successfully argue economic development leads to innovation which in turn brings better solutions to environmental issues.
2. They showed that economic growth in India led to growing middle class and better infrastructure.
3. Improving quality of life for people is important than just saving life.

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius BM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Mythili Bhethanaabotla	27.5 28.6	3
	Rachana Muvvala	28 27.4	4

NEGATIVE

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

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

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

Signed: Doug Case

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

All contestants had excellent eye contact, and projected well.
All contestants were excellent, very well-prepared, good rebuttals.
Miller/Rachana ~~was~~ was slightly impolite in how she said "times up!".
Miller/Rachana seemed slightly rattled/unsettled/unsure how to respond to heart disease question.

Both teams had excellent presentation, made excellent points. NEG had slight edge.

This was a very tough call as all contestants did extremely well.

~~One contestant is disappointed because after the judge~~
AFF displayed a little poor sportsmanship by talking to each other next to judge saying they thought they should have won. after judge disclosed (but asking for feedback was totally fine and appropriate).

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius YZ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Angela Ye	28 29 ²⁷	4
	Yichen Zhu	29.0	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Amador Valley CP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Sean Cho	28.5 28.6	2
	Aditya Palapati	28.5 28.6	3

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: NO

Signed: Dorcy Cass

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

All contestants were Excellent - extremely close-tough call.

Aff/Kichen had excellent Rebuttal, very directly address points.
All Contestants has good volume/mannerisms - slight edge to NEG.
All had good eye contact, but edge to AFF.

AFF/Kichen - interrupted NEG a little too much.

Again - all were excellent

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Silver Creek QH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Ruby Qian Areeka	25 26	3 4
2	Stella He ADigireddy	23 24	4 5

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland YZ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	Andrew Yi	28	1
4	Eric Zuccherro	27.8	2

The better debating was done by the Negative from Leland YZ.
AFF OR NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A/ ~~Stella He~~ ADigireddy

provide evidence to support the affirmative.

clear voice, understandable the info point. use um, um a few time good eye contract.

rise strong point to support affirmative.

2A/ ~~Ruby Qian~~ Stella He

provide evidence to support their affirmative.

little eye contract,

use um, um a few time.

need prepare more evidence to argue with negative side.

1B/ Andrew Yi

clear, strong evidence to against the affirmat point, clear voice understandable the good use of time. well prepared, dominated crossfire.

give good evidence to support their negative point. ~~use um, um a few time~~

2B/ Eric Zuccherro

provide number and evidence to stagain the affirmative point. clear statement to support the info point, dominated ^{crossfire} give strong point to ~~argu~~ against the affirmative point, rise question to request the other team to ~~prove~~ their statement.

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Brooks SS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Michelle Song	28.5	1
2	Crystal Su	28.0	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Milpitas MT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	Ayush Maheshwari	22	4
4	Neel Thakkar	25	3

The better debating was done by the Affirmative 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:

Affirmative
1A) Michelle Song
good eye contract, well prepared.
evidence
clear statement to state the point
dominated crossfire.
provide strong (info point) to affirmative.
good use of time.

2A) Crystal Su
clear number and example
to prove the affirmative point.
dominated crossfire.
strong and firm information
to support their point.

Negative
1B) Ayush Maheshwari
little eye contract
need give explain to ~~the~~ against
the affirmative side point.
provided info to support / against
affirmative, use um, uh a few
~~should more too~~ time.
2B) Neel Thakkar
good eye contract.
clear statement to support their
info point.
need more info point to ~~off~~ against
the affirmative.
use um, uh, ~~off~~ a few time

Room: Sobrato C-B
Flight B: Start
Public Forum April Novice

4 BH Ramachandran,

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Bishop O'Dowd HP		
	Elliott Hunt	28	2
	Brandon Pang	28.5	1

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Washington KP		
	Mandeep Kaur	27.5	3
	Sonia Pathak	27.5	4

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

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

Signed: Hong Kew

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: Sobrato C-B
Flight A: Start ASAP
Public Forum April Novice

4 BH Ramachandran,

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Washington JD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Priya Jindal	26	2
	Dhanya Duraivelu	26.5	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Champion VT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Jai Vishwarupe	25.5	3
	Saumil Thakore	25	4

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

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

Signed: Hingh

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Harker PL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Jason Pan	28.5	3
2	Kyle Li	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Amador Valley MT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sasha Menezes	29	1
2	Richa Tenany	28	2

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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1. + thorough
- too fast
+ persistent in crossfire
+ challenges → can't prove point
+ good argument on link to Indian ppl
+ organized cont.
+ good persistent challenging

+ articulate
+ persuasive
+ good time mgmt

quality of logic
all of India
vs. economic
for rest of

+ prepared by today
why should we
+ last few yrs hasn't taken away poverty
+ great time mgmt

Economic dev.
+ dev & invest in economy

environment protection

AFF team made a better case for
econ. development. OPP counter was ~~weak~~
→ limited.

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Washington SW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Subreen Sandhu	29	1
1	Shani Williams	28	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Harker KJ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sejal Krishnan	28.5	2
2	Allison Jia	27.5	4

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

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

Signed: Ken

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1 + articulate
+ other strong examples were good
+ stats
+ time mgmt

2 + no education app
+ no open solution
+ good arguments

1 + stats
+ articulate
+ comprehensive

2 + quality of life
+ no plan (not needed)
- PF rules
+ impact on max population

AFF team made better argument for economic dev. Examples of other economies weighed in heavily.

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Harker ML	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Shomrik Mondal	26	3
2	Jeffrey Liu	25	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks NV	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Vinayak Nadig	28	1
2	Sahith Vaddi	27	2

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: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Vinayak and Sahith's clear plans to address EPA issues from air pollution to solid waste were most persuasive to me. Shomrik and Jeffrey can improve on addressing their opponents during crossfire.

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Brooks PS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Avi Patel	28	1
2	Abhishek Shah	27.5	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Harker JC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Annabelle Ju	27.5	2
2	Cynthia Chen	27	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Brooks
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:

Avi and Abhishek can demonstrate solvency of their population control through China example was the convincing evidence for my vote.

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	SURLI MK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Gaurav Mohan	28	3
2	Rahul Kumar	28	2

redwood middle school:

The better debating was done by the

AFF

from

Miller

Redwood

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Li Ming

NEGATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius DA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Jason Dong	28	1
1	Varun Agrawal	27	4

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1. No benefit in doing environment protection in India.
best interest of India.
 2. prioritize economic development ~ hurt the poor first when environment issues
root not branches.
 - 1-2 how: shoes → shoes. environmental resources.
economic development is pre-requisite for environmental protection.
 3. World bank. clean environment benefit rich more. priority is economy.
 4. Environmental affect health. contention 1. 2. 3. Without environmental protection,
the economy growth does not mean.
- 3-4:
1. prioritize economy.
 2. 3rd contention. economy depend on environment.
 3. no evidence on environment protecting as pre-requisite. rich poor & all class.
 - 4.

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Brooks LP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Yvette Lin	29	1
2	Julia Park	25	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Harker LT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Kenneth Luo	26	2
2	Michael Tang	24	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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Aff ^(Yvette) - very well constructed arguments well supported by evidence, excellent speaking skills. Excellent clash on most points, but dropped response to argument that increased economic growth leads to increased inflation, initially. (followed up later tangt)
- Aff ^(Julia) - Good speaking ability, good evidence, quick thoughtful responses to opponents, good clash
- Neg ^(Kenneth) - Excellent evidence, well-structured case, but changed standard in middle of debate (from # lives saved to this plus quality of life).
- Neg ^(Michael) - Good points and arguments but sometimes distorted points of opponents. Should speak slightly louder.
- Aff - Did not fully articulate how increased economic growth would positively affect the poor

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Washington LC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jennifer Luo	25	4
1	Brandon Chu	26	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius HN	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Adhiraj Hangal	28	2
2	Ashwin Nathan	29	1

The better debating was done by the

NEG
AFF or NEG

from

Miller/younggenius
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff 1 (Brandon): Excellent speaking skills, well structured initial argument and evidence, but could not fully support some points with evidence during cross-examination.

Aff 2 (Jennifer): Good clear speaking skills but should have spent more time clashing with opponents points - some drops and unnecessary admissions

Neg 1 (Adhiraj): Excellent speaking skills, arguments and evidence, forceful and persuasive articulation

Neg 2 (Ashwin): Outstanding speaking and argumentation and presentation, excellent improvisational responses to opponents points. Dropped one opportunity to respond to opponents' point that it is unfair to compare India to First World countries

Room: Mission G
Flight A: Start ASAP
Public Forum April Novice

4

BH Wang, Victor *de*

SCU PHILALETHIC
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	24	4
1	Jacqueline He	25	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks DS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Ajay Dulai	24	3
2	Rakesh Sudhakar	27	1

The better debating was done by the Neg from Rakesh Sudhakar
AFFIRMATIVE NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: asm

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Leland TA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Ken Tanaka	27.5	3
1	Akhil Aji	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Champion BL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Shubham Banerjee	26	4
2	Nathan Loi	28.5	1

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

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

Signed: M. Shal

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

IA:- Good content. contributions were evidence based

IIA:- made good argument & rebuttals especially about GDP & environmental pollution (eg Diesel emissions vehicles & how economic development can improve the pollution.

Neg

IN: Contributions were relevant with the resolution, however should have provided more evidence based studies

IIIN: Effective & powerful speaking skills. It would have been more effective, if had consolidated the contributions in the rebuttals.

I give my vote to PRO since they provided more evidence based studies to support their contribution. The Neg spent too much time on trying to make their argument about non prioritizing. I would have liked to hear more about how economic growth ^{may not} ~~does not~~ reduce poverty in the Neg contribution. And more evidence based studies about importance of pollution causing major issues in their argument.

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Washington JK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Kanika Janghala	29	1
2	Tannavee Kumar	28	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius XD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Cindy Xu	28	2
2	Audrey Ding	27.5	4

The better debating was done by the

AFF
AFF or NEG

from

Washington JK
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- utilization
- under-developed - ref w/ job.
- help social justice poverty.
- more efficient than environ.
- plan more to the env.

I vote AFF for they have stronger arg & back'g.
very good cross fire.
good evidence w/ contention
know your arg. very well

Both good debate

- long-term impact.
- sustainable environ.
- wider gap b/ rich & poor.
- pollution - lung cancer, 4 mechanical.
- climatic - biodiversity
- unsure of economy w/ people.

lots of attentions, but no
show more support
arg.

good speak

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Milpitas BP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Oishika Barat	28.5	1
2	Nisha Porchezhiyan	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Harker KC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Michelle Kwan	27.5	3
2	Amanda Cheung	27.5	4

The better debating was done by the

AFF
AFF or NEG

from

Milpitas BP.
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- GDP. Growth.
- who help people env. in long run.
- need more job protection attitude.
- benefit people & env. clean.
- moderate transportation
- poverty → air pollution → cost!

- pollution
- toxic effect.
- climate change.

2. please speak louder and slow down a little, avoidly put your paper in front of your face.

I note AFF- because they have stronger argument.

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius ZK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Matt Zhou	26.0	3
1	Brandon Kim	25.1	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Champion BB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jaydev Bhateja	27.2	1
1	Chetan Bhateja	26.5	2

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1st Speaker
did not tell the
topic
only talked about
India.
have good stats
lots of fumbles
Cross X
Summary
 $24.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$
24.5
 $0.1 + 0.1 \rightarrow 24.7$
 $0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 \rightarrow 25.1$

1st Speaker
very clear in
his speech
Presented very good
arguments
Good stats!
fumbles!
Cross X
of presented unwarranted
Economy is Env. protect.
Summary
 $24.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$
 $0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$
 $0.1 + 0.1 \rightarrow 25.6$
 $0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$
 $\rightarrow 26.3 + 0.1 + 0.1 \rightarrow 26.5$

Speaker
Good Speech
Clear with
stats!
Cross X
can't produce any
evidence against
question!
Summary
 $24.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$
 $0.1 + 0.1 \rightarrow 24.9$
 $0.1 + 0.1 \rightarrow 25.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$
 $\rightarrow 25.4 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$
 $+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$
 $\rightarrow 26.0$

2nd Speaker
Good Speech
Precise stats!
fumble
very good argument
Presented to counter
an analogy
Cross X
good argument
against a question
as prioritizing
Very convincing!!
 $24.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$
 $+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$
 $+ 0.1 \rightarrow 25.4$
 $0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$
 $+ 0.1 \rightarrow 26.0 + 0.1$
 $+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$
 $+ 0.1 + 0.1 \rightarrow 26.7 + 0.1$
 $+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$
 $\rightarrow 27.2$

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius HG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Shinda Huang	26.6	3
2	Tejasvi K Zachary George	28.7	1

10

55.3

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:

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks DP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	James Dang	27.6	2
2	Aman Prasad	25.5	4

[Handwritten signature]

537

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1st
Good speech! Fair linked economy
& Terrorism! good stats!
some fumbles!!

cross
to present & answer

~~unmy~~
1st Ward County are north
in Service rather than industry

~~$$\begin{array}{r} 24.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 \\ + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 \\ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 \\ 0.1 \rightarrow 25.0 \\ 6.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 \\ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 \end{array}$$~~

25.7
↓
0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
26.6 →

1st. Good speech. Talked affably
brillly. good stats presented.
Talked and linked agriculture
and economy. fir pol. in
India → stats! presented
and who!

Q Presentw & ambient

Scanning

fr next 15 yrs air pol.
will be out of control !!

$$\begin{array}{l} 24.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 \\ + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 \\ + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 \\ + 0.1 + 0.1 \rightarrow 25.6 + \\ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 \end{array}$$

25.9
↓
0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1
0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1

Good speech, clear & convincing
talked about "Go Green"
massive stats presented
good humor!

Big fumble → affirm!!

1055X 66 Terrorist group an
active in India!

$24 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 1$
 $+ 0 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 1$
 $+ 0 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 1$
 $+ 0 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 1$
 $25 \cdot 4 + 0 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 1$
 $+ 0 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 1$

$25.9 + 0.1$
 $0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$
 $0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$
 $+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$
 $+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$

$27.2 + 0.1$
 $+ 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$
 $+ 0.1 + 0.1$

$27.9 + 0.1$
 $0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$
 $+ 0.1 + 0.1$

28.

my OK speech! working
clean! poverty log, not
lead to terrorism!
was a fumble
stopped in the middle
completely
over time

Critique

Smug
fumbles! fumbles!
fumbles! was good!

$$24 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 1 + 9 \cdot 1$$

24.6 →

$0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$
 $0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$

25.2 →

$0.1 + 0.1 + 0.1$

25.5 →