

**NEWARK INVITATIONAL**  
**Science Park HS**  
**Feb 3-4, 2012**

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Regis FK**

Max = 30

**Hunter College US**

Max = 30

Frederick Kauber

28

Upasna Saha

26

The better debating was done by the AFF from Regis FK  
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
- Attacked opponent's points well
  - Showed confidence
  - Points were easy to understand; coherent
  - Hand movements were good
  - Improvement - eye contact

- Neg
- Started off weak, improved at the end
  - Improved at the end
  - Improvement - Voice - more understandable

Room: Aud E  
Flight A: Start 7:00  
Novice LD

2

Lantigua, Lucian

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

### AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Montville AV

Max = 30

Scarsdale GT

Max = 30

Adin Vashi

27

Garrett Tanzer

27

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

*Lucanny Lantigua*

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg was able to disclose the warrants from Aff. Neg was able to construct his argument clashing the Aff. contentions. Aff. needed more evidence to clash Neg contentions str. more strongly.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

### AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis CH

Max = 30

Montville KX


Max = 30

Christopher Hillebrand 25

Kelly Xiang 24

The better debating was done by the AFF from Regis CH  
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:

- Was able to refute the negative's argument, leading to the negative fitting under his framework. Affirmative picked up on the negative's contradiction.
- Needs to be more confident in the argument that he's trying to make.

#### Negative:

- Didn't realize that she contradicted herself, when it came to self defense and it being the basis of deadly force.
- Was unable to prove to me why Domestic Violence doesn't meet the criteria for self defense. And therefore <sup>why</sup> deadly force cannot be used.
- Was very good at standing behind what she thought was correct.

Room: Library B  
Flight A: Start 7:00  
Novice LD

2

~~Bloomfield, Nike~~

Walker, Rachelle

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

### AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science CL

Max = 30

Scarsdale TC

Max = 30

Carolyn Lau

27.5

Tomer Cherki

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from Scarsdale TC  
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:

Carolyn: I think you need to do some more topic research because proportionality is a very common argument you should know.

Tomer: I don't really see the need for your overview because your offense and NC are sufficient ~~for you to win the round.~~

RFD: I negate because of the extension of the evidence that says that we must look to reciprocity. Carolyn drops this and ~~is not able to access impacts to her standard.~~

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Ridge YP

Max = 30

Hunter College EZ

Max = 30

Young Park

28

Elvan Ziyalan

26

The better debating was done by the AFF from (Ridge) Young Park  
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:

**AFF:**

- Opponent made precise points and was able to rebuttle whenever questioned.
- Speak more clearly when making arguing so that opponent can properly respond.

**NEG**

- Answering the <sup>questions</sup> ~~questions~~ ~~acknowledged~~ was a problem for the opponent
- When warranting a claim stand by it as opposed to ~~going~~ going to another point.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Hunter College JC

Max = 30

Freehold Township SS

Max = 30

Joanna Cohen

27

Simran Shah

25

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

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

Signed: Carla M. Zurita

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The affirmative won this round because she clashed most if not all the neg's cont. thoroughly. She answered all of the crosser's well as well. The negative lost because she seemed to struggle during crosser's and did not thoroughly support some of her clashes.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

### AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis AK

Max = 30

Ridge RK

Max = 30

Alexander Koniuta

26

Raina Karia

27

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

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

Signed: Ysamerlyn Gonzalez

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

- spreading caused me to not fully understand
- attacks all contentions and states that opponent didn't address
- doesn't address own burden
- addresses lethal force, not opponent's argument "deadly force"
- eye contact

NEG

- addressed all contentions
- clearly justified why burden was unjust to prove
- no framework
- argue that abuser doesn't violate social contract or right to life if victim is still alive.
- lethal force doesn't mean deadly force.
- spoke clearly
- eye contact.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science AF

Max = 30

Hunter College SC

Max = 30

Aeshah Farrouq

24

Serina Chang

27

The better debating was done by the NEG from SERINA CHANG  
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:

AFF

NEG

Great argument supported by statistics

Good correlation of facts

Rebuttal Could not support logical argument for does deadly actions set an example for children to become abusive later in life?

Rebuttal Answers were thoughtful and direct

Questions require more validity & clarity

~~the~~ Good try to defend arguments imposed by ~~an~~ opponent

Rebuttal went off track

Good logical explanation

good correlation of facts

Great tone and pace

Rebuttal: ~~Questions require more validity and clarity~~ Answers were thoughtful & direct.

Effortless arguments.

Refuted the rebuttal very well with logic and clear explanation

Great relation to a story

Assertive arguments

Room: Library C  
Flight A: Start 7:00  
Novice LD

2

Vatsa, Rekha

**NEWARK INVITATIONAL**  
**Science Park HS**  
Feb 3-4, 2012

<b>AFFIRMATIVE</b>	POINTS	<b>NEGATIVE</b>	POINTS
<b>Ridge YK</b>	Max = 30	<b>Hunter College SE</b>	Max = 30
Yana Kropotova	_____	Stephanie Evinshteyn	_____

The better debating was done by the Aff from Ridge YK  
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:

Neg Forfeit