

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL


Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Hunter College SaCo	Max = 30	Ridge AR	Max = 30
Sarah Cogan	<u>29</u>	Avani Rao	<u>28</u>

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: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Sarah presented her ~~aff~~ view with great clarity and cited excellent research/statistics

Avani did well but could have done better on challenging some views. She also assumed that AFF would make ~~certain~~ new points during 2nd AR ~~but~~ and seemed convinced (repeated 3 times) But overall both candidates did well on their cross-exams. Good luck to both as they progress along. go

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Regis DS	Max = 30	Ridge KS	Max = 30
Daniel Sullivan	<u>27</u>	Kaitlin Smalling	<u>28</u>

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: *Sangeev Shah*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both sides showed high level of energy and good competitive spirit.

Daniel was dynamic in his presentation of research and made excellent use of follow-up.

Kaitlin was consistent throughout the debate and was good with her time keeping.

This was a close decision but I believe Kaitlin made very credible points that took her across the winning line.

Room: 147  
Flight A: Start 8:00  
Novice LD

3

Lee, Joanna

Ferreira, Jagger

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

### AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Freehold Township SV

Max = 30

Ridge YK

Max = 30

Sonika Vatsa

27

Yana Kropotova

28

The better debating was done by the neg from Ridge  
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

- Organized and clear
- made some good arguments, but didn't answer all of the opposition's questions toward her argument
- Good incorporation of statistics.
- Could talk in a stronger voice

#### Negative

- Well organized and clear
- Strong voice and hand movements
- Brought up really good questions about her opponent's arguments in her claims
- Good eye contact
- could slow down at times

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Randolph NC

Max = 30

Byram Hills OD

Max = 30

Nathan Cha

28

Ofir Dinstein

27

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

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

Signed: Lisa M. Dias

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative essentially won the debate through his clash. Yes, he did base most of his arguments on observation 1 and colonialism, however he extended this through public views of who is usually the abuser and who is the victim. His use of John Locke gave him an edge, but he never warranted how the court/judge is lacking in our society.

Neg presented very good arguments like his use of definitions and proportionality but he made new argument in NP and said that Aff did not list all the ~~possible~~ victim's attempts in a certain situation.

Aff clearly clashed more and was stronger. It was a close debate, but the Aff won due to his universal view of women being the essential victim in most instances.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Ridge YP	Max = 30	Regis BB	Max = 30
Young Park	<u>28</u>	Brandon Baldovin	<u>29</u>

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: Maria Grillo

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- great Eye contact!
- prep time  $\frac{1}{2}$ , speech length were perfect. (great voices)
- Didn't prove value. - until 2:15
- moral permissibility  $\neq$  moral.   
lowest form.

[Justice vs. morality.]

~~morality~~ morality  $\neq$  justice  
(proved by Neg)

• mental & physical health completely dropped by neg. (pleading irrationality).

• necessary  $\neq$  moral.

Neg:

- Great reading voice.
- work on eye contact.
- hand gestures accurate with speech.
- Dropped too many of Aff's args.
- Arguing not that using deadly force is good rather, arguing that it still remains immoral.
- Allowing it, just not ~~justification~~ endorsing it.



Room: Library B  
Flight A: Start 8:00  
Novice LD

3

~~Isabelle Tirado~~  
~~Cha, Kayla~~

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

3.05 left	POINTS	NEGATIVE	2.30 left	POINTS
<b>AFFIRMATIVE</b>				
<b>Hunter College US</b>	Max = 30	<b>Bronx Science BA</b>		Max = 30
Upasna Saha	<u>30</u>	Benjamin Adegbite	<u>29</u>	

The better debating was done by the AFF from Hunter College US  
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:

*[Handwritten notes and diagrams]*

1. Conviction to H&I if people of race I know to show to space their

2. Option of work

3. Conviction that on a day to day basis

4. Rights to protect from other laws

5. Conviction that no member should know that all other options has been killing and

6. Conviction that no member should know that all other options has been killing and

7. Conviction that no member should know that all other options has been killing and

8. Conviction that no member should know that all other options has been killing and

9. Conviction that no member should know that all other options has been killing and

10. Conviction that no member should know that all other options has been killing and

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Montville LH	Max = 30	Scarsdale ER	Max = 30
Lawrence Hong	<u>28</u>	Emerson Riback	<u>28</u>

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

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

Signed: Brianna Robinson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative

- did well at presenting argument
- attacked opponents argument well
- clearly warranted every contention
- ~~speak a little more~~
- speak a little slower

Negative

- clearly presented argument
- attacked opponent's argument well
- needs to be able to warrant and impact every contention better

Room: Aud C  
Flight A: Start 8:00  
Novice LD

3

Velastegui, K

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

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
<b>Bronx Science ID</b>	Max = 30	<b>Scarsdale TC</b>	Max = 30
Isis Davis-Marks	<u>28</u>	Tomer Cherki	<u>28</u>

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

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

Signed: Karina Velastegui

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff was able to adhere to moral guidelines and presented case well  
Neg was able to defend case well too but ~~the~~ <sup>did so by attacking opponent's case</sup> ~~was~~ <sup>(most of time)</sup>  
Both sides did very well

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Scarsdale AY	Max = 30	Ridge RK	Max = 30
Adam Young	<u>27</u>	Raina Karia	<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from Ridge RK  
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

- Good spreading and was able to stand one's own ground
- ~~You had good reason~~  
↳ You gave good reasoning about preserving rationality, ~~but it was~~ behind the morality of a deadly force
- ↳ You stood behind ~~you~~ preserving rationality, but at one point you contradicted yourself and I think you should have been careful with what you stated.
- You listened careful ~~and~~ and were respectful

NEG

- very confident and clear, so you were able to clearly explain reasoning
- good during rebuttals because you listened careful.
- Your burden based argument was really good because you explained the reasoning.
- You were able to rebut the AFF on their rationality
- You were respectful.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Montville KX**

Max = 30

**Bronx Science DM**

Max = 30

Kelly Xiang

28


Daiya Massac

28.5

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: \_\_\_\_\_



**COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:**

Aff: Although you weren't spreading as your opponents your speed complimented your case and was extremely coherent. Be sure that you don't violate your own standard.

Neg: Speed was great and didn't jeopardize the coherence of your arguments. Great Job! Your arguments were a bit extreme in the assumptions that they alluded to.

RFD: Because of the lack of warrants posed by the affirmative it was fairly easy for her opponent to refute. Moreover, at the point where aff says that individuals circumstances are variables in deciding whether the abuser and or victim is responsible, she advocates that either with everyone's circumstances being taken account everyone isn't responsible or if her they aren't, we are. The round came to who achieved their ~~though~~ framework, standard better, which the Neg did.

Room: Library B  
Flight B: Start 8:45  
Novice LD

3

*Intissa Tirodo*  
**Cha, Kayla**

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE** ~~28~~

POINTS

**Regis RH**

Max = 30

**Bronx Science CL**

Max = 30

Ryan Hall

28

Carolyn Lau

29

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

*Oral critiques given*

*Neg failed to show how deadly force is not a type of self defense*

Room: Library E  
Flight B: Start 8:45  
Novice LD

3

Lantigua, Lucian

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Regis FK**

Max = 30

**Bronx Science IM**

Max = 30

Frederick Kauber

28

Ismini Mangafas

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: \_\_\_\_\_

*Rueann Railis*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Aff. was able to directly clash the Neg contentions and subpoints. The Neg. was not able to strongly rebut the Aff. extension or cant. Overall it was ~~the~~ both parties. The Neg. was contentions ~~well~~ were not well warranted.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Freehold Township SS	Max = 30	Regis AK	Max = 30
Simran Shah	<u>27</u>	Alexander Koniuta	<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from Regis AK  
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

- Sdey calm, ~~and~~ so you can speak clearer.
- You contradicted your value ~~exat~~ ble of the direct link between justice and moral, which was stated.
- ~~Make~~ Make sure to rebuttal against NEG's rebuttals.
- You need to make your goal more clearly.

NEG

- You spoke clearer and explained reasons clearer.
- The facts used backed up your reasoning and helped in contradicting AFF.
- You backed up yourself efficiently and stood behind your reasoning.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Ridge SY	Max = 30	Hunter College SC	Max = 30
Sophia Yan	<u>29</u>	Serina Chang	<u>30</u>

The better debating was done by the Neg. from Hunter College SC.  
AFF/NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Maria Grillo

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- definition of justice should be more than "just" for more
- ↳ clarification → difference between right and wrong. justice enforces morality.
- 45 secs. left on IAC.
- define rational better to get what you wanted on cross ex.
- Aggressive speaking! (keep it up!)
- voice extremely clear and speeches written with flow.
- "women are dependent" might have some issues with future judges if they are feminists or something along those lines.

NEG.

Aff justice vs morality.

→ both had similar criteria.

Aff → morally permissible ≠ moral.

Aff doesn't fully link justice to morality.

→ until 2AR. } strongest link. more direct = more effective.

- Aff's Government does not respond.

Neg

- asked for proof (police not reliable for domestic violence)
- great reading voice.
- a little more eye contact (no biggie!) → (reading IAC)
- great answers to aff's quest.
- speaking with hands! (GOOD!)
- Dropped sub. point @ 1/2 second cont.
- be careful and don't get tongue tied & contradict yourself (almost did on IAC)

• social contract  
→ good point → 2 wrongs don't make a right.  
↳ Dropped by neg. aff