

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science SS

Max = 30

Byram Hills OD

Max = 30

Sorana Selegan

25

Ofir Dinstein

26

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

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

Signed: Steven Chamba

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- spoke clear, but very low; mumbling at times
- numerous pauses - 2 to 3 seconds long
- improvement: speak louder, attack more, eye contact

NEG

- spoke clear
- flew, but long pauses - between 5 to 10 secs.
- attacked well, solid points
- improvements: eye contact, no pauses;

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Byram Hills JS	Max = 30	Regis DS	Max = 30
Josh Spingarn	<u>28</u>	Daniel Sullivan	<u>26</u>

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- AC: Incredibly disorganized. Your standard should be an achievable thing. Your case tries to do too much in not enough time, lots of bitips. Decide on one argument and spend 6 mins on it. Also, slow down for tags, I couldn't hear a few of them.
- CX: Good on self-defense/deadly force distinction.
- NC: Good NC, VC might not be appropriate to case. Second contention makes no sense.
- CX: Thank you for going on the subjective def arg, you use CX well.
- IAR: Good big picture debating. I like SC analysis on NC. Summarize args when you extend them. Give me warrants!
- 2NR: The "not always self defense" arg is well extended, but I'm really ~~not~~ not seeing anything extended well other than these def args. You only need to make responses to the two contentions he extended, save time and put more analysis
- 2AR:

RFID: I buy common usage args on definitions. Standards debate is messy and nothing really links in. I vote off of aff defending right or innocent, links into both standards. No clear responses extended.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Ridge AR

Max = 30

Randolph AS

Max = 30

Avani Rao

28

Aaron Sorrin

28

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

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

Signed: Nana B. Agyemang

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- Spoke strongly
- Structured argument more carefully and addressed points
- Could have allotted time more precisely
- Case could use a few warrants to support strong claims

Neq

- Could have allotted time more carefully
- Made sound arguments but did not carry them through
- Prepped multiple arguments that he could not prove

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Princeton RD

Max = 30

Randolph NC

Max = 30

Rishi Datt

28

Nathan Cha

30

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

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

Signed: Nana B. Agyemang

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- Did not use time wisely
- Dropped entire neg case
- Spoke strongly
- Had good points in argument that could have been carried

Neg

- Spoke confidently and addressed
- Addressed all points and refuted any new claims
- Was able to make the most of his time
- Asked pretty strong questions in Cross X
- Could have been able to warrant first contention a little more

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Princeton DE

Max = 30

Hunter College BL

Max = 30

Daniel Edelberg

28

Ben Laufer

26

The better debating was done by the AFF from Princeton DE
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:

- Stood behind his value and it's criteria
- Believed in preserving the right to self defense
- Clearly refuted the negative's rebuttal on how deadly force is always an option in all cases
- Proved why killing needs to be done
- Emphasize why there's a right to kill if someone else is trying to kill another

Negative

- Insisted on knowing why deadly force was an option in all cases, when the question was already answered
- Didn't offer other options, if not deadly force
- Focused too much on the laws when he should've focused on other options.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science ID

Max = 30

Monticello PM

Max = 30

Isis Davis-Marks

26

Patrick Miraglia

27

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

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

Signed: Lucanny Lantigua

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Aff. was able to disprove the Neg. warrant (worry card) of spontaneaus and not deliberate) because the resolution specifically states deliberately. Aff. lost speaker points because of spreading (I specifically said no spreading). The Neg. team was not able to rebut efficiently the rebut made by the Aff. of the Neg. contention. Overall it was a great case represented by both parties.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science BA

Max = 30

Ridge KS

Max = 30

Benjamin Adegbite

27

Kaitlin Smalling

28

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

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

Signed: Lisa Mammola Dias

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Negative was without a doubt more aggressive throughout the debate. Good speaking and she continuously attacked certain points in the Aff argument. If Neg did not counter any Aff arguments, she did it in her next speech (ex: "max" - "moral law").

Aff's essential value was using the "category comparative test" which is to consider the value of others. However Neg made a strong argument that debunked Aff's value. If max is universal then equality must be universal to the victim and abuser. If Aff only wants to consider the life of the victim then it is not universal. Neg made simplistic attack against this.

Neg should work on clarity and structure of speech as well.

Overall it was a tight round, but the Neg was stronger in clear and universal ideas of morals that produce laws and the consideration of both sides.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College SaCo

Max = 30

Sarah Cogan

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills CB

Max = 30

Caleb Brown

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: Ysamer Gonzalez

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

- doesn't address all cases of D. Abortion only women and children.
- listed no alternatives
- stated why self defense was wrong, not why it was wrong
- organized
- rebutted against all contentions.
- impacted opponents contentions.
- responds to all contentions

NEG

- no cards
- makes clear points as to why self defense is immoral.
- doesn't mention victims.
- no legitimate arguments directing opponents contention.
- wasn't attentive when opponent's argument.
- vague
- unorganized
- contradicts own case against morality in rebuttal by saying it was okay if police kills abuser, not if actin does.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Freehold Township CC

Max = 30

Regis WF

Max = 30

Craig Chikis

27

William Ford

20

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

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

Signed: Carla Zurita

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I believe the affirmative won because they thoroughly clashed the negatives points. Cross ex was also answered in detail. Negative lost because he didn't fully clash all of the aff's argument thoroughly.

Room: Library B
Flight B: Start 7:45
Novice LD

2

Bloomfield, Nike
Walker, Rachelle

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College TW

Max = 30

Montville LH

Max = 30

Tiffany Wang

28

Lawrence Hong

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from Tiffany Wang
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:

RFD: I affirm because Lawrence makes the conclusion
in ex that attackers are a danger to society. This is 100%
link to Tiffany's standard because she protects the
rights of more members of society by not letting
the abuser to run rampant.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~
Gustavo Martinez
Martinez, Jacob

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science DM

Max = 30

Regis RH

Max = 30

Daiya Massac

28

Ryan Hall

26

The better debating was done by the Aff from Bronx Science DM
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 -

- Clearly presented argument and supported it
- Attacked Neg. with no real response to it
- Could take more time, slow down in reading

Neg -

- lost because he didn't support his argument
- Had no comeback to Aff
- No solid warrants
- Use up more time to explain arguments.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

~~Kristina~~
~~Giulio, Maria~~
Martinez, Jacob

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Freehold Township SV

Max = 30

Scarsdale AY

Max = 30

Sonika Vatsa

28

Adam Young

29

The better debating was done by the Neg from Scarsdale AY
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.

- Had a good case but didn't support it well
- Could have more warrants and explained it more detail.
- Lost because her argument failed when she agreed to other alternatives.

Neg.

- Great argument
- Attacked well
- Supported argument well
- Should speak slower and take time in expressing ideas.
- Won because he gave great warrants and had minimal flaws in argument.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Monticello BS

Max = 30

Scarsdale ER

Max = 30

Brittany Stein

27

Emerson Riback

26

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

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

Signed: Stephen Fisher

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both debaters did not obtain much substance in their arguments. Affirmative made more precise arguments as to why it is ok. Negative was ~~not~~ ^{not} clear on the points being made.

Affirmative did a nice job of exposing the Neg. lack of supported evidence.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale MB

Max = 30

Regis BB

Max = 30

Michael Bogaty

26

Brandon Baldovin

27

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

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

Signed: Lisa Maria Dias

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff and Neg both present one particular argument that was carried out throughout the debate

Aff - contract that is broken when there is violence*

Neg - human failure, justifications and prevent the future of violent action!

However, I felt that the whole question that the abuser is somewhat rational was reoccurring.

Aff was a bit insecure with the idea of who is rational and who is not (copin/loss) - But he is growing (claims)

Neg seemed very much grounded w/ his position. He attacked the Aff multiple times (where are the warrant-son rationality-)

Aff and Neg both had good arguments that were growing but they came work on being clearer and louder.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Ridge SY	Max = 30	Byram Hills DS	Max = 30
Sophia Yan	<u>28.5</u>	Daniel Spingarn	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the Aff from Ridge
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:

- AC: Good case, I don't think VC is appropriate to both Contentions. If you have consequentialism as a standard, you need to justify it and clarify what counts as a "good result" for people. You also need analysis for why no alts = aff.
- CX: Neg: Too much clarification! Get into the assumptions of the case. I like the point about women in C2, but you need to go further.
- NC: Don't say you have to defend all three forms of the CI, then if she takes out one, you loose. 1NR: Don't respond to parts of the AC you don't need to respond to, you run out of time. Focus on what is important, like C2.
- CX: Keep going on points where he doesn't have good answers. You started to do that towards the end, but you should leave out the clarification for prep. You ask for his case, its not worth your CX time.
- 1AR: Kant is a bit confusing, yes, but I don't see very clear responses. Cross-application - restate what you're crossapplying, it helps. Make extensions!!! Good weighing, though.
- 2NR: Good job; extensions should have claim, warrant + impact. Give me weighing!!!
- 2AR: Good ~~link~~ link into M, but still no conflict btwn VC's.

RFD: I end up affirming off of the turn on the NC. I look to NC standard b/c no clear standards debate. Aff says no autonomy for abuser, that affirms.