

Johnson

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Hunter College EZ	Max = 30	Montville KX	Max = 30
Elvan Ziyalan	<u>27</u>	Kelly Xiang	<u>27</u>

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

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

Signed: Mufarrah Johnson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- Monotone voice
- Was able to point out opponents weakness in arguments
- Was able to support argument through the case ^{no support} & her evidence

Neg.

- Voice grabbed and kept attention
- Wasn't able to ~~clearly~~ clearly answer all questions during cross ex.
- No real evidence was given although five points were well thought out

Room: Aud B
Flight A: Start 10:30
Novice LD

4

Shah, Sangeev
Johnson

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Randolph AS	Max = 30	Regis WF	Max = 30
Aaron Sorrin	<u>27</u>	William Ford	<u>28</u>

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

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

Signed: Melvin Johnson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

APP.

- There was a little contradiction between definition and explanation of the hypothetical
- Mentioned some vocabulary that wasn't elaborated and explained further, e.g. like *ult. utilitarianism*

Neg.

- Was able to effectively use the opponents argument to build his own by using the value
- Gave more eye contact

Room: 148
Flight B: Start 11:15
Novice LD

4

~~Patel, Shivam~~
Monica Magalhaes

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science DM

Max = 30

Byram Hills DS

Max = 30

Daiya Massac

~~26~~ 28

Daniel Spingarn

~~28~~ 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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The negative drops several points and sticks to only defending categorical imperatives, The negative did not show much clash at all while the affirmative attacked all points including the main one the focus was on.

Room: Library C
Flight B: Start 11:15
Novice LD

4

Cha, Kayla
Zurita, Carla

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Bronx Science BA	Max = 30	Freehold Township SV	Max = 30
Benjamin Adegbite	<u>27</u>	Sonika Vatsa	<u>25</u>

The better debating was done by the Aff from Benjamin Adegbite.
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 most of his arguments ~~was~~ remained standing until the end of the round due to his constant clashing

The negative lost because she failed to address many of the aff's responses to the negative ~~arg~~ and had a weaker set of argumentative material.

Room: Aud F
Flight B: Start 11:15
Novice LD

4

Agyemang, Nana

Dias, Lisa

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Sorry for the crossing out, I by mistake wrote Flight A on this sheet. Just clarification

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Montville AV

Max = 30

Freehold Township CC

Max = 30

Adin Vashi

~~27~~ 27

Craig Chikis

~~28~~ 28

The better debating was done by the

Neg
~~Montville AV~~
AFF OF NEG

from

~~Freehold Township CC~~
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both sides made good claims according to the resolution. ~~It~~ It was a very close debate since both Neg and Aff clashed and questioned each other arguments. However Negative continuously directly implicated — he linked all his minor claims, body, implications with his value criteria. This essentially won him the debate since Neg's claims were always ~~linked~~ tied back into his major claim of justice.

Room: Aud E
Flight B: Start 11:15
Novice LD

4


Oke, Damilola

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Ridge KS	Max = 30	Princeton RD	Max = 30
Kaitlin Smalling	<u>28</u>	Rishi Datt	<u>25</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Ridge KS
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:
(Judicial ethicist)
- Excelled in projecting justice (law) is morally permissible.
- Also how it's proportional; how the state of the person being abused is already in the state of death, therefore the abuser deserves death

Negative: - His value criteria was promoting non-violence, but this failed to be upheld in his case. This was due to the fact that he offered no alternatives. Also when making the "NR", his last statement was very confusing and he failed to elaborate on it.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL


Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Hunter College BL	Max = 30	Scarsdale AY	Max = 30
Ben Laufer	<u>28</u>	Adam Young	<u>30</u>

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Needs to be more efficient with the time economizing.
- Get to the point and articulate words
- ~~Stop~~ AFF continued to be repetitive in argument.

- Slowdown and make clear points when speaking

Room: Aud C
Flight B: Start 11:15
Novice LD

4

Gonzalez, Ysamer

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Hunter College SC	Max = 30	Bronx Science ID	Max = 30
Serina Chang	<u>29</u>	Isis Davis-Marks	<u>29</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: Ysamerlyn Gonzalez

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

- utilitarianism = greatest good for greatest amount of people
- if this means eliminating something moral, it can be justified that using a deadly fire is moral.
- good speaker
- addressed question directly and actually got points acrossed. left no room for assumption

NEG

- doesn't take into consideration that it's not only vic. vs abuser children are involved
- complicated maxim caused confusion and led NEG to contradict herself at one point.
- good speakers
- left room for assumption because value was complicated, therefore would be difficult to evaluate ~~good~~ or justify whether using a deadly force is permissible

Room: Aud A
Flight B: Start 11:15
Novice LD

4

Silva, Daniel

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Ridge YK

Max = 30

Regis DS

Max = 30

Yana Kropotova

28

Daniel Sullivan

26

The better debating was done by the AFF from Yana
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:

AFF

Was clear

Won because she was able to defend her points and attack effectively

Did well

NEG

Stuttering a lot

Lost because despite the fact he did a good job defending/attacking he was attacked on in a few occasions he didn't give answer right away

Good job

Needs to be more calm

Room: 147
Flight B: Start 11:15
Novice LD

4

Ruela, Andreia

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Byram Hills OD	Max = 30	Hunter College TW	Max = 30
Ofir Dinstein	<u>28</u>	Tiffany Wang	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the Aff from Ofir Dinstein
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:

I vote Aff because his arguments were stronger and better supported compared to the Neg. The Neg. argued violence in response to violence would create a cycle of violence but that is a assumption that was only proven during the rebuttal. The Neg also argued that the legal system is here to provide safety and help victims of domestic violence but the Aff. found a flaw in the legal system.

Room: Library B
Flight B: Start 11:15
Novice LD

4

GRILLO
~~Jackson, Monet~~

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Regis AK	Max = 30	Hunter College US	Max = 30
Alexander Koniuta	<u>30</u>	Upasna Saha	<u>29</u>

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: Maria White

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF
- Fast reading.
- ~~argument~~
- "and stuff"

Value: Aff morality vs neg morality.

contended by both:
[permissible vs impermissible]

- lack of arbitrary standards:
law of society = social contract.
self defence is a right.

legality ≠ moral.

NEG
- Stern Reading. Hand gestures effective.
- great eyecontact.
- "and" hand gestures = GREAT.
- No new arguments in NR.
- Dropped Aff. case.

- Abuser is still a human being.
"Neg gives outlet, Aff just kills everyone off."
- Last resort ≠ morally permissible
- Real problem refuses to be solved.
NEG = security.

weighed against Neg, aff was stronger

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Ridge AR	Max = 30	Randolph NC	Max = 30
Avani Rao	<u>29</u>	Nathan Cha	<u>29</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from Randolph
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

- Clearly Disposition
- Great argument
- used supports to counter Neg and support her claims
- lost only because the argument was a little flawed at points and
- work on argument and support a little better

Neg

- Attacked the argument of the Aff greatly found flaws
- Supported the argument as well
- Used cards to help argument
- Won because he was able to use Excusable and Permissible.
- Framework great
- take more time to explain calm down when speaking

Room: Library A
Flight B: Start 11:15
Novice LD

4

Pastrano, Freddy

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Scarsdale MB	Max = 30	Regis RH	Max = 30
Michael Bogaty	<u>28</u>	Ryan Hall	<u>26</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Scarsdale MB
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 won because he explained his argument further, spoke with authority, and also persuaded more. Negative has lost because he failed to construct a strong argument, he failed to extend or address the affirmative's arguments. He however spoke well.

Room: 148
Flight A: Start 10:30
Novice LD

4

Patel, Shivam
monica magalhaes

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Scarsdale ER	Max = 30	Hunter College JC	Max = 30
Emerson Riback	<u>27</u>	Joanna Cohen	<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the Neg from Hunter College JC
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:

Both sides used misstatements when saying the opponent did not have warrants. But the negative targeted all arguments while the affirmative focused on some. Speaking was very strong on both sides except for when spreading.

Room: Aud A
Flight A: Start 10:30
Novice LD

4

Silva, Daniel

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Princeton DE

Max = 30

Montville LH

Max = 30

Daniel Edelberg

29

Lawrence Hong

29

The better debating was done by the NEG from Lawrence
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:

AFF

Good criteria
His speech was clear
Lost only because his
attacks weren't as effective

NEG

Good criteria
His speech was clear
Won because he attacked his
opponent well in CX

Room: Library E
Flight A: Start 10:30
Novice LD

4

~~Lee, Joanna~~
Martinez, Jacob

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Monticello BS	Max = 30	Regis FK	Max = 30
Brittany Stein	<u>29</u>	Frederick Kauber	<u>28</u>

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: *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff.

- Supported argument
- Had good cards or support
- Used Locke's
- Universal Law
- Lost only because he failed to use the universal law to show that both of them are valid the victim and aggressor.

Neg.

- Good at pointing flaws in argument
- Supported her ideas
- Used cards effectively
- Won because she was able to use her opponents warrants to support her argument.