

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Randolph NC

Max = 30

Hunter College JC

Max = 30

Nathan Cha

27 + 11

Joanna Cohen

27

AFF ~~NEG~~ ~~BOTH~~

The better debating was done by the AFF from Hunter College JC

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

Signed: Rekha Vatsa

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

- Clear definitions
- Good Energy
- Good pace and modulation of tone
- Good statistics & supporting examples
- Proved resolution well.
- Good response to rebuttal
- ~~Good~~ ~~Passionate~~ ~~argument~~ & proves all argument
- Good sound.

NEG

- Good argument
- Good definitions
- Too fast, less eye contact
- The argument could be made more logical supported by examples.
- Good conduct overall
- Great argument and proved all rebuttals with validity
- Proved all negative argument well with grace.

Room: 147
Flight B: Start 5:45
Novice LD

1

Ruela, Andreia

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Byram Hills DS	Max = 30	Freehold Township CC	Max = 30
Daniel Spingarn	<u>28</u>	Craig Chikis	<u>27</u>

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

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

Signed: Andreia Ruela

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Comments:

Aff

· can improve on speaking louder and clearer

Neg

· very good speaker
· good eye contact

Reason for Decision:

The Aff won this round because although he did misinterpret the Tassel Doctrine his arguments were stronger and he rebutted the Neg arguments of lying on a slippery slope because we cannot see into the future and also not life threatening abuses can eventually lead up to mental impairment causing victims to be afraid to call the police, another argument the Aff took down. The Aff won by slightly better and stronger arguments.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Scarsdale TC	Max = 30	Bronx Science DM	Max = 30
Tomer Cherki	<u>29</u>	Daiya Massac	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Tomer
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:

NEG was somewhat studdering
Both said their values / burdens
Both good contentions and criteria

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College BL

Max = 30

Ben Laufer

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale MB

Max = 30

Michael Bogaty

28

The better debating was done by the aff from Ben Laufer
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Andreia Ruela

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative was a great speaker

Negative needs to improve on eye contact & speaking skills
both were very well presented

Reason for decision was that Aff. better supported and proved Neg. argument wrong. For example, the argument the Aff. made about how abusers have been proven to abuse again in the future supported by Robert Paula. Neg. used the example of water bottles & J-walking which Aff proved to support his arguments of human rights. Aff arguments were overall a bit stronger. Well done debate.

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

1

Magalhes, Monica

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Freehold Township SS

Max = 30

Hunter College SaCo

Max = 30

Simran Shah

26

Sarah Cogan

27

The better debating was done by the NEG from Hunter College SaCo
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 negative showed more direct clash. The affirmative dropped many cases and when trying to clash, did not directly attack the argument, dealing with considering the abuser. The negative warranted every argument and stated impact. The affirmative did not define important terms used and contradicted her argument when deontology was said. Both spoke clearly and stated arguments clearly, with warrants.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Ridge RK

Max = 30

Monticello BS

Max = 30

Raina Karia

28

Brittany Stein

27

The better debating was done by the APP from Raina Karia
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Mufasa Johnson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

APP
Clearly spoken
point by point
at back from
cross ex
~~voice didn't~~ Voice didn't
Didn't give a proper
example of what iminte
dancer would be.
to grab
as much
attention
as the
opponent

Negative

- Personal
- Hypothetical
- didn't give clear example of what kind of proof is needed
- I's able to clearly summarize the meaning of warrants
- Shows interest in the arguments
- voice grabs your attention

Room: Library B
Flight A: Start 5:00
Novice LD

1

Pastrano, Freddy

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale AY

Max = 30

Ridge YK

Max = 30

Adam Young

28

Yana Kropotova

26

The better debating was done by the AFF from Scarsdale AY
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 has ~~so~~ done the better debating because he addressed all negative arguments, as well as having a very strong voice and argument.

Negative has lost, despite building a stronger argument, all arguments lacked a strong support or warrant. ~~Arg~~ Argument built well, ~~to~~ must have a stronger voice.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills OD

Max = 30

Ridge YP

Max = 30

Ofir Dinstein

20

Young Park

18

The better debating was done by the AFF from Byram Hills OD
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Rachelle Walker

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Yng: Try to have more variety in your responses

Ofir: Try to ask more probing questions during CX.

RFD: I affirm off of the evidence that says that we value the rights of these victims more ~~and that~~ because they bear default to WC standard which

Room: Library D
Flight A: Start 5:00
Novice LD

1

~~Way, Eshani~~

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Brionna
Robinson

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis BB

Max = 30

Princeton RD

Max = 30

Brandon Baldwin

23

Rishi Datt

26

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

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

Signed: Brionna Robinson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative

- speak more clearly
- give ^{more} clear evidence ~~and~~ to support the argument
- was able to counterargue on opponents claims but could not adequately ^{argue} ~~support~~ some rebuttals
- Be more specific with evidence

Negative

- speak more clearly
- refuted opponents argument well
- gave clear justification for own argument
- ~~Pace time~~ Needs to be able to pace time more

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Monticello PM	Max = 30	Byram Hills JS	Max = 30
Patrick Miraglia	<u>26</u>	Josh Spingarn	<u>27</u>

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

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

Signed: Jagger Ferreira

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative

- Good use of statistics
- Jumped around questions that were imposed by the neg. side
- Should be more clear, and directly clash with opponents arguments.

Negative

- Spoke clearly, well organized
- Directly countered the opposition's claims
- Wasn't clear towards the end, restated several claims

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

Hunter College US

Upasna Saha

POINTS

Max = 30

27

NEGATIVE

Ridge SY

Sophia Yan

POINTS

Max = 30

28

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

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

Signed: Jagger Ferreira

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative

- Questions toward opponent's arguments were good, however did not directly answer some of the opponent's arguments
- Should speak more clearly
- Picked up at the end, arguments became stronger

Negative

- Strong voice, organized, a lot of eye contact
- Strong claims, and good attack on opponent was good
- Restated several claims at the end.

Room: Aud D
Flight B: Start 5:45
Novice LD

1

Johnson, Mufasa

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills CB

Max = 30

Hunter College TW

Max = 30

Caleb Brown

23

Tiffany Wang

29

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

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

Signed: _____

Mufasa Johnson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

~~Didnt~~ didn't provide any definitions when asked by the negative.

Cross ex was off topic, sounded like little attention was paid to the negative the some of the speaking was unclear at the beginning

Negative

Was able to effectively attack the aff.

Speak very clearly was able to create hypotheticals and apply arguments to real-life situations,

Room: Aud E
Flight ~~B~~: Start ~~5:45~~ 5:00
Novice LD

1

~~Patel, Shivam~~
Grillo, Maria Sofia

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

~~Randolph AS~~
~~Scarsdale GT~~
Araron Sorrin
Garrett Tanzer

POINTS

Max = 30

29

NEGATIVE

~~Bronx Science BA~~
~~Regis FK~~
Benjamin Adegbite
Frederick Kauber

POINTS

Max = 30

26

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

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

Signed: Maria Grillo

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AC →

- Extended ~~all~~ extremely well.
- Attacked everything neg said.
- ~~neg~~ Disproved all of neg's args.

→ next time ~~recommend~~

NC →

- Counter arguments well thought-out → tried looking for loopholes.
- Debating was effective.

→ Next time you should not drop so many of AC cases.