

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis WF

Max = 30

Bronx Science CL

Max = 30

William Ford

26

Carolyn Lau

24+1=25

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

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

Signed: _____

Rekha Vatsa

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

William Ford

- Good Supporting argument
- Good Statistics
- Too fast, a bit monotonous
- Good defense argument

- Logical explanation as good
- Impressive command of topic

Carolyn Lau

- Good questions during Q+A
- Good argument against opponent
- The logic needs to be explained
- Flow is abrupt sometimes
- Need better supporting statistics
- ~~Co-state~~ Reasoning about self defence was strong

Room: Library B
Flight B: Start 5:45
Novice LD

1

Pastrano, Freddy

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Montville LH

Max = 30

Regis AK

Max = 30

Lawrence Hong

26

Alexander Koniuta

27

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

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

Signed: Freddy Pastrano

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative won because, he built a very strong argument. He spoke well, however he should clarify more.

Negative failed because his argument was flawed, he did fail to address many points. However, he built his argument well as the debate went on, and also spoke with much authority.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Ridge KS

Max = 30

Bronx Science ID

Max = 30

Kaitlin Smalling

28

Isis Davis-Marks

29

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

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

Signed: Jacob Martinez

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

aff.

- Supported argument but lacked the way to support it.
- Lost because she didn't try to attack the negative point of new

Neg.

- won because great attacks on Aff.
- Great support.

Room: Aud E
Flight A: Start 5:00
Novice LD

1

Patel, Shivam
Grillo, Maria Sojia

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

Scarsdale GT
Randolph AS
Garret Panzer
Aaron Sorrin

POINTS

Max = 30

28

NEGATIVE

Regis FK
Bronx Science BA
Frederick Kauber
Benjamin Adegbite

POINTS

Max = 30

27

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

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

Signed: Maria Sojia

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff →

• Clashed all of opponents arguments & counterarguments effectively.

re

• Slow down!

NEG →

• Spoke clearly and cohesively.

• Dropped a lot of Affs arguments or clashed with ~~poor~~ weak arguments.

• Don't let him ~~just~~ ~~just~~ trust your words.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Montville KX	Max = 30	Freehold Township SV	Max = 30
Kelly Xiang	<u>28</u>	Sonika Vatsa	<u>27</u>

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

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

Signed: Daniel Silva

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both provided sources whether it was quotes or facts
Both clashed each other with good statements
Though I felt AFF provided more solid statements to attack/the
Neg to defend her point

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis RH

Max = 30

Ridge AR

Max = 30

Ryan Hall

26

Avani Rao

30

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

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

Signed: Bronna Robinson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative

- clearly presented argument
 - was not able to clearly ~~rebut~~ argue
refute
 - was able to defend argument when saying that there are other alternatives but was not able to defend
- Overall during cross-ex
- ↳ no specific examples of ~~alternatives~~ other situations said that if only one could be proven that was enough
 - Be more relaxed

Negative

- ~~was~~ clearly able to present argument
- clearly able to defend argument
- was able to prove why non-vidence is justified
- needs to be more organized and ~~clearer~~ in terms of being more aware of time
- speak more slowly

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis DS

Max = 30

Bronx Science IM

Max = 30

Daniel Sullivan

25

Ismini Mangafas

26

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

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

Signed: AS

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The negative uses misevidence when saying her opponent had not said something when he had. The negative uses many scenerios ~~on~~ without evidence. The negative does not attack several arguments. The affirmative shows great direct clash on every point. He warrants with evidence and shows the impact.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College SE

Max = 30

Princeton DE

Max = 30

Stephanie Evinshteyn

20

Daniel Edelberg

29.5

The better debating was done by the

NEG
AFF or NEG

from

Princeton DE
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

Daniel Walker

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Daniel: Try not to assume that the victim is female
you can substitute other terms in evidence. Also, I think
that you don't need to say that her contentions aren't
permitted because all of her arguments are
reasonable why we permit it.

RFD: I regret because he was a better link to the
defensive framework by eliminating one harm to the victim. Also,
there are numerous arguments that occur when we use
self-defense. Also, Stephanie fails to give me ~~any~~ analysis
as to why all her behavior means we allow deadly force

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale ER

Max = 30

Montville AV

Max = 30

Emerson Riback

28

Adin Vashi

27

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

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

Signed: Jacob Martinez

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff -

- Clear argument
- Great support
- knocked the Negative made his argument void
- Need to work on clearer voice production

Neg

- Lost because they failed to uphold their side, proved to help affi, by using ^{social} contract.
- Needs better argument.
- Cards supported some of aff. claims as well.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College SC

Max = 30

Regis CH

Max = 30

Serina Chang

28

Christopher Hillebrand

26

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

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

Signed: Karina Ustategui

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

- supports + defends case
- refuted opponent well

NEG

- insufficient supporting details (e.g. warrants)

- Speak up and speak clearly