

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Silver Creek LT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Connie Lu	28	1 1st
	Anika Tyagi	27	3 2nd

NEGATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius ZK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Matt Zhou	28	2 2nd
	Brandon Kim	27	4 1st

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

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

Signed: R. Padmell

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff! contributions:

1. Key to Reduce Poverty. China Example
2. Necessary pre-requisite for environmental protection.
3. Growth can be done with environment in mind
4. Child Slavery. People sell their kids because of Poverty
5. More jobs. Better technology comes from economic development.

Neg Contributions:

1. Environmental Protection is a pre-condition for economic dev.
2. Pollution leads to deaths.
3. People prefer environment over economic development.
4. Economic development doesn't work.

Aff team wins Debate because

1. Development can be done with Environment in mind.
2. Technology can be used to tackle environmental issues.
3. Development is needed to bring people out of Poverty.
4. More deaths due to Poverty than environmental issues.

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	28	2 2nd.
	Audrey Ding	28	1 1st

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks DP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	James Dang	27.5	3 1st
	Aman Prasad	27	4 2nd.

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

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

Signed: A. Paduveyh

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- AFF contentions:
1. Reduce Poverty - prevent deaths.
 2. Improves rights, reduce child labor, better woman rights.
 3. Leads to better technology.
 4. Improved living standards.
 5. Eco development tackle population growth.

- Neg contentions:
1. Environmental protection can be done at low cost 0.04/GDP
 2. Should act now, After 15 ^{years} the effects are irreversible.
 3. Most people live in rural areas. depends on environment.
 4. People are getting sick because of food they are eating.
 5. Very bad air pollution.

- AFF team wins the debate because
1. They are able to convince feeding starving child is priority
 2. Better technology that comes with development solves environment issues.
 3. Development reduces poverty and empowers people (women).

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Harker LT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Kenneth Luo (28)	28	2
	Michael Tang (28)	28	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks MK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Soham Makani	26	4
	Riya Kamboj	28	1

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

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

Signed: P. Harker

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

① NEG won because their convinced that ~~through~~ ~~environment~~ by balancing environmental protection and ~~economy~~ ^{Sustainable} economy, a long term solution can be achieved. More over environmental degradation leads to loss of GDP (economy) and loss of life due to respiratory issue which is more valuable. Improving environmd & health do ^{save health} ~~save~~ care cost.

② AFF had good argumnt about depth and importance of economy, but, it didn't defeat the argumnt of achiving both.

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Brooks NV	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Vinayak Nadig	25	3
	Sahith Vaddi	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland YZ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Andrew Yi	25	4
	Eric Zucchero	29	1

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

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

Signed: D Sheeppery

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- * AFF agreed that fixing economy and controlling climate degradation is high priority, ~~and~~ which kind of agrees with NEG's proposal of improving economy through environmental protection.
- * AFF argued population control (like china's single baby per dm) important - but, NEG ~~argued that~~ ~~argued~~ and convinced that it's against ~~the~~ the interest of people.
- * NEG didn't have a plan & time line for their contention - 3, but AFF didn't know how long it would take to fix the economy per their proposal.

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Harker JC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Annabelle Ju	27	4
1	Cynthia Chen	27	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius KH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Rhee Kang	28	1
1	Jacqueline He	28	2

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

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

Signed: Miranda Lo

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1 vote con because: long term benefit encompasses net benefits
- environment degradation costs 80 billion annually
- skewed economy

BTW: CON Team: you contradict yourself when you say we have to look at long-term... and then later on say that we can't predict future at all... but that didn't affect my decision because pro didn't catch it.

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius KL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sally Kim	27	2
2	Amber Lee	27	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Amador Valley BW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Preetham Bachina	26	4
2	Peter Wang	26	3

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

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

Signed: Miranda

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1 vote can because:

- ① they convinced me that there is no link between poverty and women getting educated so that they can be paid more. and the link between how poverty causes child slavery
- ② resource wars aren't actual wars where people fight over political issues & that a depletion of resources needs to be addressed ASAP
- ③ Health concerns
- ④ trickle down doesn't work.

Both teams need to remember to address conflicting definitions (i.e. prioritize) & framework. There's no point in setting a standard if you're not going to stick to it.

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	28.5	1
2	Richa Tenany	28.5	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Washington JK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	Kanika Janghala	26.5	3
4	Tannavee Kumar	26.5	4

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

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

Signed: Bobbie Janner

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A - Econ. is Pre Reg -
 GS Eliminate Poverty -
 TG Environment Loss -
 CF - How to fix it, +
 Law - Results +
 Renewal Program +
 Climate Change +
 2A - Quality of life
 GS Allied?
 Green? Regard Envy?
 Investment?
 IC - IC Refute?
 CF - Evidence, Rich people? +
 Environment? +
 1A - # of lives & quality of life
 Poverty Improve
 Allied vs Government
 IC, IC.
 CF - Private co. - ? +
 Duty of nation? +
 Resource?
 2A - Benefit of people -
 Private?
 IC.
 IC.

Good Speakers

3N - 1. Health
 GS 2. Renew Energy
 3. Environmental Protection
 CF - A - + + A+, A+, +
 Laws -
 No Question Ask -
 4N - Defund?
 IC Oppose?
 PS 22 " ? 3C?
 TU 3C -
 CF - + money? -
 Responsible Law +?
 GCP Evidence?
 Exisen?
 3A - Eliminate of Poverty?
 Money?
 TO, PS Allied - Private Enrich + other
 CF - Private co. + (-)
 Duty of state -? (-)
 Resource (-)
 4N - Econ Policy - Money?
 TO even Jobs +
 Health Issue +

Spoke covered but pauses.

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Milpitas MT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Ayush Maheshwari	27.5	1
1	Neel Thakkar	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Silver Creek QH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	Anzeeka Ruby Qian, Aigireddy	26.5	3
4	Stella He	26	4

The better debating was done by the AEF from Milpitas MT
AFF OR NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Bobbie Sina

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A - Early Envir. 1
 2. Poverty
 3. Inflation

CF - India high pollution -
 IC Reped
 Climate change (+) Cto

2A - Climate change + Money +
 Poverty Rate -

CF - TED speak - Evidence?
 Poverty A +
 Fix Poverty +
 Clean water
 Money +

1A - Poverty

Money - Tree +
 have to plant +
 How the water
 purification +

? Did not ask questions due to time left
 Evidence not substantial +
 of opponent.

2A - Environet Monre comes from
 IA. Extra not
 speeches - Under timed

3N - 1. Air Pollution
 2. Health Climate change
 3. Food shortage

CF - Poverty Rate + 28.5 +
 Help Increase? (-) NR
 2C - ?

4N - Poverty Rate?
 DS - Envir issue, management
 TG - Agriculture, Rain Feed Vi
 Health.

CF - Poverty Rate. Desagration
 Trash (-) - NR (-) (-)

3N - Climate change
 TO - Preventive Pollution

CF - Breathe the Air +
 Fix (-)
 Owner of Earth - Breathe
 Environ +
 Earn Money -

3N - Death
 TO

Did not focus on
 opponent points

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius HG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Shinda Huang	28	4
	Zacahry George	29	2

TOJASUI K 1

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland TA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Ken Tanaka	29.5	1
	Akhil Aji	29	3

The better debating was done by the NEL from LELAND
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:

THE NEL TEAM WON THE DEBATE AS THEY WERE BETTER ABLE TO REPUTE AFF TEAM CONTENTION WHILE HOLDING ONTO TO THEIR OWN. THE AFF TEAM HAD SOME WEAK CONTENTION LIKE THEIR CONTENTION ON HOW DEVELOPMENT HELPS WOMEN. SIMILARLY THE NEL TEAM HAD TOO FEW CONTENTIONS AS THEY ROLLED LOT OF THEIR SUB-ARGUMENT INTO ONE CONTENTION. THE AFF TEAM HAD A GOOD CONTENTION WHICH STATED THAT ROBUST DEV. WOULD LEAD TO IMPROVE ENV. BUT THEY WERE UNABLE TO CAPITALIZE ON IT.

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Brooks LP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Yvette Lin	29.0	2
	Julia Park	28	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius YZ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Angela Ye	28.5	3
	Yichen Zhu	29.5	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: Henry M...

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

THIS WAS THE BEST DEBATE I JUDGED (AMONG 6) IN THE LAST TWO DAYS, AND THE NEG TEAM JUST LEDGED OUT THE AFF TEAM. IT WAS A CLOSE MATCH. AFF TEAM STARTED WELL AND HAD STRONG CONTENTION BUT WERE UNABLE TO DEFEND THEM AT THE END. THE REBUTTAL STRENGTH OF THE 'NEG' TEAM WON THEM THE DEBATE.

SCU PHILALETHIC
 Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius BM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Mythili Bhethanaabotla	28.5	4
1	Rachana Muvvala	28.5	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland KL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Rohil Kulkarni	28.5	3
1	Kyung Lee	28.5	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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

- benefit people, the most
- economic develop. help. health issue
- improve environ.
- help solve insecurity
- beneficial felt by people.
- heart disease

NEG.

- agricul. tax
- environ. effect agriculture.
- pollution
- climate
- danger to people health
- but it doesn't mean improving poverty.
- NEG 2: very good @ crossfire question, but really AFF question

I vote for Neg for they seems have stronger arg.

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	TEAM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Harker KJ		
1	Sejal Krishnan	28.5	1
	Allison Jia	28	3

NEGATIVE

POS	TEAM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	SURLI LS		
	William Liu	28.5	2
	Justin Sun	27.5	4

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG

- air pollution, clean water.
- health issue.
- economic develop.
- polluted country prevent companies to invest in India.

good job at great crossfire

I vote for AFF for they have better arg.

AFF

- best interest of people
- 1. job opportunity
- job created by green. env. program.
- life saver.
- poverty caused. 1:100

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

5

Schletzbaum, Jam

LE, NGUYEN

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Harker ML	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Shomrik Mondal	28	1
2	Jeffrey Liu	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Washington SD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Ria Sodha	26	3
1	Ekta Dadlani	25.5	4

The better debating was done by the AFF 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:

Shomrik and Jeffrey did a great job convincing me the AFF world vision to start with economic development and achieve environment protection at a later stage.

Ria and Ekta almost conceded to their opponent by agreeing that equal emphasis be given to EPA vs. economic development.

LE, NGUYEN

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Lynbrook MK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Ashwin Muralidharan	26.5	2
1	Anshul Kale	27	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Brooks SS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Michelle Song	26	3
2	Crystal Su	25.5	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Lynbrook
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:

Anshul and Ashwin team has a good argument to convince me of ~~a~~ an AFF world, where they can achieve the good jobs, better environment for the people through economic development first.

Michelle and Crystal can deliver a more ~~int~~ convincing case with clear path to solve the EPA issues they've raised.

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A



AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Brooks PS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Avi Patel	4	24
1	Abhishek Shah	3	25

NEGATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius PC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Anya Poplavska	1	28
2	Emily Chen	2	27

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: [Signature] MYERS

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Michael (4:00) ①
ECO > ENV
 * CLEAR + WELL-SPOKEN
 ② showed education impacts economy, but doesn't show it better advantage over ENVIRONMENTAL.

* ASKING NEG TO OUTLINE HOW TO SOLVE PROBLEMS OUTSIDE SCOPE OF RESOLUTIONS
 OK to show how solving these problems results in debated outcomes

AVI (4:00) ①
 economic definition + returning GDP as a measure not compelling. GDP is a standard measure of economy

~ MATH INCORRECT ON INFLATION EXAMPLE

~~DEF~~ DEFENDED ECONOMIC GROWTH BUT NOT PROVE PREFERABLE TO ENVIRONMENTAL

Anya (4:00)
ENV DEC
 were argued impact of environment on GDP in India
 impact of environment on mortality impactful argument
 EXCELLENT & ENGAGING SPEAKER

EMILY (4:00) 2
 Good speaker, well-structured in presentation

TEAM EFFECTUALLY DEFENDED THEIR CONTENTIONS

WOULD LIKE TO HAVE SEEN HISTORICAL EXAMPLE WHERE ENVIRONMENT IMPACTS QUALITY OF LIFE - THERE ARE MANY!

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Milpitas TB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Mihir Thummar	25	2
1	Ryan Balaoing	22	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Amador Valley CP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sean Cho	23	3
2	Aditya Palapati	27	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from Aditya #2 Palapati
AFF OR NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: [Signature] MYERS

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: ECO > ENV

RYAN #1 (4:00)

- Eco growth eventually leads to ENV growth is persuasive
- Eco growth ↓ population + secondary improves ENVIRONMENTAL is persuasive
- Good speaker - could read less AND ENGAGE judge & opponents

CLOSURE

- water impacting wealthy not answering since large # of India is poor.
- Eco development of the rich ARGUMENT IS counterintuitive for value

Mihir (4:00) ⊕

- MAKING POINT THAT RICH OF INDIA NEGATIVE LARGER POINT NOT compelling
- PRESIDENT + EFFECTIVE SPEAKER

WAY OVER TIME ON FINAL FOCUS = 2:15

SINKING OUT LACK OF EFFECT ON RICH NOT EFFECTIVE

DON'T KNOW 1st CONTENTION OF NEG! BAD FORM

Sean #1 (3:21)

ENV > ECO

- preference of Indians for one or the other is not persuasive as to which should be preserved
- Access to water as link to Eco development persuasive
- Good speaker: speeded look up from paper occasionally

CLOSURE

MORE EFFECTIVE IN THIS SESSION & RELATED TO QUESTIONS + ANSWERS

Aditya #2 ⊕

- ① • EFFECTIVE + ENGAGING SPEAKER
- LINK OF ENVIRONMENT TO DISCORD NOT WELL-ESTABLISHED

WHAT "PEOPLE WANT" NOT COMPELLING FOR WHAT IS OPTIMAL

SCU PHILAETHIC
 Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Washington SW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	Subreen Sandhu	27	4
1	Shani Williams	29.5	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Champion BL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Shubham Banerjee	28	3
4	Nathan Loi	29.5	29.5

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

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

Signed: Rajal Ramachandran


COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirm
 1) Economy → downwards
 I had → need better growth rate
 → popular
 2) Invest in Ag. Sector
 ↳ 4th largest Ag sector
 3) Employment → poverty
 4) Too many more focused questions in rebuttal
 1) Neg
 1) No evidence to back-up for Aff
 2) Good support by contention 3
 3) Good
 Economy - Inflation affects?
 - Education standards
 No long term evidence on Env. prioritization
Good Rebuttal on prioritization
 Poverty will not be decreased?
 - No reason to prioritize Econ Dev?
 - Smoother flow !!

What's good for people of India

Negative env. (equally or one)
 1) Investing in Env → lives saved
 2) Econ does not guarantee poverty removal
 Dev. Good
 3) Invest in Env. affordable
Good on both Env + Econ.
Good Definition.
Good Rebuttal on poverty
Good on investing lives saved
 VS. infrastructure
 Did not state how Invest in Env affordable
Good Rebuttal → on saving lives.
Good Relation from their Contention 1 to your Contention 3
Good on their Contention 3 to yours.
Good Relation from Contention 3 to yours.
 - need more evidence etc.
 (citations)
 Crossfire Neg - prioritization -
 - affirm → cannot go hand in hand (Econ + Env) claimers.
 can be same → either? → need more research

Final Focus



can be same → either? → need more research

SCU PHILALETHIC
 Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Champion SD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	Johar Samrao	28.1	3
1	Aneesh Dundigalla	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius XX	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Jason Yang	29.5	1
2	Nathan Zhang	28	4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

-2
-2

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

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

Signed: Ujala Ramachandran

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative
 - definitions.
 1) Econ pre-Env.
 * image.
 2) Econ → poverty
 Env. doesn't remove poverty
 * good citations
 - china
 - deaths.
 3) Econ → environment
 - lives saved/poverty

Negative ENV over Econ
 1) Pollution
 2) Econ development skewed
 3) cutting jobs → why suicides?
 Farmer suicides. Is it Env or Econ related?
 - Need to speak clearer.
 * good rebuttal

1) Pollution - Econ pre-require
 (1) (2)
 * Good Relation.
 2) * Good
 3) * Good Affirmative Contention
 1) Need more.
 2) *
 3) *
 Impacts → need some facts/citations.
 how??

* ENV → WWF
 - urbanization
 - biofuels - (2) poverty
 - development -
 * Nice speech though.
 Rebuttal → Affirmative
 * latrine
 * skewed
 Affirm. Summarization
 *
 Negative: did not relate to the contentions on Affirmative side.
 * Affirmative
 * needs to answer questions.
 Negative Summarization
 *

Crossfire
 Affirmative * (prioritizing)
 Negative ***

summary - Johar
 Affirmative →
 Negative →

SCU PHILAETHIC
Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Washington KP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Mandeep Kaur	27	1
2	Sonia Pathak	25	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Champion VT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jai Vishwarupe	26.5	2
1	Saumil Thakore	26	3

The better debating was done by the Neg 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:

Really ragged debate. Voting neg, although overall, feel the round devolved into a shouting match lacking any strong argumentation. Aff hits neg w/ when neg cannot propose any specific policy to or timetable to save lives. However, aff jumps this. Neg scores must be decreased during period of econ growth → cuts off aff access to these benefits. Voting on the do both since aff never pulls through on the econ growth. ~~It~~ pulls through on the econ growth. ~~enc.~~ protect or does much on this really unwarranted neg claim

SCU PHILALETHIC
Santa Clara University
 April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE


POS	Washington LC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jennifer Luo	26.5	2
1	Brandon Chu	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Milpitas BP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Oishika Barat	24.5	3
2	Nisha Porchezhiyan	20 21	4

The better debating was done by the Aff from WASH
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 issue of money becomes non-unique in this round ~~since~~ and neg loses access to this argument b/c of the ~~is~~ lack of consideration given to the cost of ~~env~~ environmental protection. Kind of a messy round, but i do vote on aff's argument that infrastructure saves more lives. Neg could have put forth a cost-benefit analysis between costs of econ dev v. env. protect, but never does this. Aff vote.

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	27	24
2	Rakesh Sudhakar	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius HN	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Adhiraj Hangal	27.5	3
2	Ashwin Nathan	28.5	1

The better debating was done by the Nea from Miller/Genius
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:

First Crossfire: Ajay - be more confident. Back up the point that India has not prioritized enough → get evidence, Adhiraj - very dominant
 second Crossfire: Rakesh - good answer to asymmetric question → cut off Ashwin's lengthy questions. Ashwin - great questions/answer well done.
 Third Crossfire - try not to read specific words in CX → especially new things
 Ajay - good refutation of wish you would have extended your refutation to their first contention that you need money from the economy first. You didn't refute their second contention about change of benefits or their third contention. extend Ajay's refutations
 Rakesh - effective case delivery & don't just repeat your case in the second speech.
 Adhiraj - Ashwin - great refutations to their case? Tipped the point that environmental protection is not the only method of adjustment. Also, the term is "alternate causality" not "alternate causality".
 Adhiraj: keep on points you're winning. Don't steal prep time.
 Bash: crystallize & really try to drive the points you're winning home. I voted Nea because I agreed with their cycle of poverty & environmental protection increases corruption.

SCU PHILAETHIC

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	2
2	Rahul Kumar	28.5	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Harker PL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Jason Pan	27	3
2	Kyle Li	26	4

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

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

Signed: *Rahul Kumar*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

First Crossfire: Gaurav: excellent. Jason: don't call for irrelevant pieces of evidence like how fast India's growth, trade in

Note: Jason & Kyle: You whisper very loudly.

second Crossfire: Kyle: "Why do you need evidence" - don't be rude. flw, Jason & Kyle - just give them the card Lisa. Rahul: good job!

third Crossfire: Aff's well-handled question of what India is doing now.

Gaurav: effective speech delivery - have more on monetary benefits from economic development will help environment as well.

Kyle: be more specific on loans to fund environmental protection & good reputation about how corruption will harm economic protection as well. I felt you were a bit rude.

Rahul: great refutations - don't reiterate your case at the end of your speech. I know what it is already. Good job - bringing up money from economic development will help environment.

Jason: quantify your dramatic impacts of everyone dying from polar ice caps melting. I'm not buying your vague time frame of "everyone will die by the end of the century".

3OTH: need to crystallize & keep on points you're winning. I voted Aff because I believe the money gained from the economy can help the environment. This "loans for environment" would only exacerbate worst poverty problems.

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Champion BB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Jaydev Bhateja ②	28	②
	Chetan Bhateja ①	26	④

NEGATIVE

POS	Washington JD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Priya Jindal ②	29	①
	Dhanya Duraivelu ①	27	③

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:

- ① LONG TERM IMPACT ↑↓
- ② COST OF GAS
- ③ SUN ↑
- ④ BUKDOM of POWER NOT ↓

- ① Def ENV PROTECTION ↓
- ② ENV IMPACT VIEW ↓
- ③ HEAT ↑ POWER ↓ ← ENV ↑
- ④ GREEN CAR ⇒ ENV ↑
- ⑤

SCU PHILAETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Champion MH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Abhiraj Muhar ①	26	③
	Rehan Haneef ②	24	④

NEGATIVE

POS	Valey Christian BS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Sinan Bayati ①	27	②
	Dev Shah ②	29	①

The better debating was done by the NEG from VALEY CHRISTIAN BS
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: NFA

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

[Large handwritten mark, possibly a signature or scribble, extending from the signed line down the page.]

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

But they then went to maverick

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Harker BB		
122	Nakul Bajaj		
	Christina Bettink		

NEGATIVE

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

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

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

Signed: *Peter R. Rathmann*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Note: Nakul Bajaj debated both positions 122 for his team, due to partner being ill.

*Neg had not arrived at 120 so
Went with Flight B*

SCU PHILALETHIC

Santa Clara University

April 12-13, 2014

Flight B starts after Flight A

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Bishop O'Dowd HP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Elliott Hunt	28	2
1	Brandon Pang	27.5	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Miller/younggenius DA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jason Dong	27.5	4
1	Varun Agrawal	29	1

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

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

Signed: Peter X. Rathmann

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Thanks to both teams for a good & spirited debate.

Some issues went back & forth, each team tried to argue that addressing environ/econ 1st would ultimately be better for both.

Negative's justice argument - that development benefits flow only to a few, while all/much feel pain of environmental degradation was both telling & not ^{well} answered by affirmative

The Los Angeles crime rates evidence was not clearly connected to the ~~the~~ issue under debate. Good questioning on this by Brandon Pang. At least for me

B Pang - good strategy to define as benefit for people of India, largely heading off global warming. (Neg disputed this, of course)

V Agrawal good case that environment is more fundamental than econ.

E Hunt - good to talk about warming as a global issue, not solvable by India alone

J Dong - liked he bolstering on the social groups issue, not well answered by Aff