

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Bronx Science LY Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Waylon Lai 1
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Victor Yeung 2

Team: Montville LM Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Reza Lofti 2
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Marcelle Mathews 1

29-30 Outstanding
 27-28 Above Average
 24-26 Average
 22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Bronx Science LY representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

CON

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

PRO

Comments to Debaters:

First speaker = look up during constructive, you have an audience! Good ex, you were very polite. Good summary.

Second speaker = your rebuttal was great. I loved the energy! Good final focus, but try to slow down. You had a lot to cover, I get it, but if you speak more fluently you'll find you have plenty of time.

These are the reasons for my decision:

I ended up voting con off a couple of arg.
 ① abolishment not supported by public - lots of time was wasted by both sides talking about changing the amendment but the major impact of this point was it just the constitution, but how public want to change the consti. In the us is a demo cracy, this has a lot of weight. ② 85% v 15% -> diminishes all pro impacts b/c not a significant amount of ppl actually come for BRC. Pro's 2/3 of Calif: kids & taking American jobs, etc -> Pro did not sufficiently link to BRC. Just b/c illegals have kids doesn't mean they did b/c of BRC. Voting pro does not solve these problems. ③ At this point, have to vote con b/c they have larger impacts (cost of implementation, etc) and more offense left standing.

Comments to Debaters:

First speaker = good constructive, it ran a little short though. It's good to be assertive in CX, but you still have to be courteous. Good summary but use all your time - you had 30 sec left

Second speaker = good rebuttal, you covered a lot in your final focus, good work here

* It is not easy to change an amendment. To have won that arg. you needed to prove that us v. Ark did not bar Congress from changing the amend, and you didn't. Supreme court interpre the constitution. So we need to look to it.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

Speaker 1	4 min
Speaker 2	4 min
Crossfire (1&2)	3 min
Speaker 3	4 min
Speaker 4	4 min
Crossfire (3&4)	3 min
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min
Grand Crossfire (All)	3 min
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min
2 minutes prep time per side	

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: Nancy Lee - Ridge

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
 Feb 3-4, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Delbarton BT Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for John Beatty
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Harry Townsend

Team: Princeton CW Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Jennie Chen
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Eliza Wright

29-30 Outstanding	22-23 Below Average
27-28 Above Average	
24-26 Average	

The team that won this debate is Princeton CW representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Con Comments to Debaters: Speaker 1: Eliza
 • summarizing all your arguments only lead to 1 contribution → economic impact
 • excellent summary to focus & put strength all in ur contributions

Speaker 2: Jennie
 • argument about \$600 for birth registry very assumptive & a long shot to withstand contribution
 • clarified all arguments during QCF
 • reinforcing the concept of exclusion strengthen
 These are the reasons for my decision: rebuttal

Pro Comments to Debaters: Speaker 2: John
 • so what's the impact of all your cited quotes & stats → needs to correlate them with critical analyses to your contributions.
 • need to substantiate why US has to follow other countries who abolished birthright citizenship → can be interpreted that US just a follower (blind)

Speaker 4: Harry
 • stats & quotes very substantial to evidence
 • team's argument & refute opponents' very Cartesian in his defensive rebuttal

Although the Con began contributions with weak & fragmented arguments, this summary & final focus provided sharper analyses & logical as well as stats to clarify contributions & weaken opponent's defensive arguments. Con win this round

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min
Speaker 2	4 min
Crossfire (1&2)	3 min
Speaker 3	4 min
Speaker 4	4 min
Crossfire (3&4)	3 min
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min
Grand Crossfire (All)	3 min
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min
2 minutes prep time per side	

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: Kathleen [Signature]

Room: 353

Start: 1:00

Novice Public Forum (Bronx Science BD vs. Regis HT)

5

Klitzman, Larry

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Bronx Science BD Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Julia Bittencourt
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Miranda Ditmore

Team: Regis HT Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Matthew Hilado
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Joe Taglic

29-30 Outstanding	22-23 Below Average
27-28 Above Average	
24-26 Average	

The team that won this debate is Regis HT representing the PRO CON

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Comments to Debaters:

See Below

See Below

These are the reasons for my decision:

I gave this round to Con because among other things Pro represented both during and after the round that the effect on US Economy of illegal immigrants was \$304 Billion. After checking his source, the number was \$100 Billion. \$354 Billion toward all means entitlement. You need to present evidence accurately.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min
Speaker 2	4 min
Crossfire (1&2)	3 min
Speaker 3	4 min
Speaker 4	4 min
Crossfire (3&4)	3 min
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min
Grand Crossfire (All)	3 min
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min
2 minutes prep time per side	

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

[Signature] *Chris Bay*

Room: 355
Start: 1:00
Novice Public Forum (Montville MP vs. Princeton AO)

5

Leong, William

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Montville MP Circle Side: Pro **Con**
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for James Min
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Christine Park

Team: Princeton AO Circle Side: **Pro** Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Lila Abreu
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Sinan Ozbay

29-30 Outstanding 22-23 Below Average
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

The team that won this debate is Montville MP representing the PRO **CON**
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Comments to Debaters:

*Good debate by both sides.
Try to follow through each contention - explore the links and downstream consequences.
Watch out for correlation vs causation aspects.*

These are the reasons for my decision:

*Montville / Con won for a better/stronger constructed framework.
Pro took on the cost-benefit analysis well. However the cost aspects was largely concentrated on families being separated.
Con questioned the direct correlation between deportations and families being separated. This lessened the cost-benefit impact.*

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min
Speaker 2	4 min
Crossfire (1&2)	3 min
Speaker 3	4 min
Speaker 4	4 min
Crossfire (3&4)	3 min
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min
Grand Crossfire (All)	3 min
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min
2 minutes prep time per side	

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: William Regis Parent

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Montville SS Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con	Team: Freehold Got Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u> 2
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Jay Sirot	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Gotham Bogga
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Daniel Shafir	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for "

29-30 Outstanding	22-23 Below Average
27-28 Above Average	
24-26 Average	

The team that won this debate is Freehold Got representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)
Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

There was significant debate over whether to reward criminals. Question to reflect on - who is the criminal - parents or children? Are children criminals or just caught in middle? Even possible victims? The card on 90% illegal aliens not having babies in the first year was not used effectively by con and misunderstood by pro. Could have used grand crossfire to sort these issues out. Good effort by both sides.

Comments to Debaters:

These are the reasons for my decision:

Close debate but I give the win to Freehold Got for a con framework that resonated with me. Pro did not crystallize their case as concisely at the end as they could have.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min
Speaker 2	4 min
Crossfire (1&2)	3 min
Speaker 3	4 min
Speaker 4	4 min
Crossfire (3&4)	3 min
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min
Grand Crossfire (All)	3 min
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min
2 minutes prep time per side	

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: William Regis Parent

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
 Feb 3-4, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Regis DP Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Colin Donnelly 2
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29.5 for Brendan Powell 4

Team: Montville HW Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Minki Hong 1
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Matthew Weiss 3

29-30 Outstanding	22-23 Below Average
27-28 Above Average	
24-26 Average	

The team that won this debate is Regis DP representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)
 Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Colin: Very Good case reading. Try to know your case better for crossfire.
Brendan: heally good rebuttal and Q&A's in crossfire.
Colin: Very good summary. You very clearly boiled down the round
Brendan: Thank you for weighing! This was a really good speech.

Comments to Debaters:

Minki: Good job. Try to read a little louder.
Matthew: Try to spend more time on their case.
Minki: Try to crystalize the round more as opposed to restating your point.
Matthew: Be more confident in this speech. Also try to focus on a few main issues as opposed to the whole case

These are the reasons for my decision:

I think that the Pro was winning constitutionality, the rising # of births, and outweighed on monetary impacts of the welfare point.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min
Speaker 2	4 min
Crossfire (1&2)	3 min
Speaker 3	4 min
Speaker 4	4 min
Crossfire (3&4)	3 min
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min
Grand Crossfire (All)	3 min
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min
2 minutes prep time per side	

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: Daniel Messner / Bronx Science / Student.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Ridge WT Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Christine Wang 2 Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Oliver Tang 4	Team: Regis BP Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u> Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Liam Brozen 3 Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>25</u> for Luke Powers 1
---	--

29-30 Outstanding	22-23 Below Average
27-28 Above Average	
24-26 Average	

The team that won this debate is Ridge WT representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)
 Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Christine: You read very fast but it was very clear.

Oliver: Very good rebuttal. Try not to speak so ~~loudly~~ loudly throughout the round.

Briefs are legit if ~~they have~~ they have proper citations.

Oliver: ~~Wagner~~

Comments to Debaters:

Luke: Nice case reading.

Liam: Try to use more evidence and cite it when you do.

Luke: Don't argue about a decision right outside the room when the judge is inside. Also don't call for the judges flow. Also if you bring something up in summary I can't accept it if it is

Liam: Weigh more in the final focus.

These are the reasons for my decision:

I voted off of the cost ben. analysis. I think that when the numbers are added up the pro proves larger numbers.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min
Speaker 2	4 min
Crossfire (1&2)	3 min
Speaker 3	4 min
Speaker 4	4 min
Crossfire (3&4)	3 min
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min
Grand Crossfire (All)	3 min
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min
2 minutes prep time per side	

a new argument that is why I didn't flow your new impact

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: Daniel Messner / Bronx Science / Student

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
 Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Resolution: Birthright Citizenship should be abolished in the US.

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) of the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Randolph FL Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>	Team: Delbarton HY Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Justin Fizer 3	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Justin Hsieh 4
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for Joshua Leopold 1	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Derrick Yao 2

29-30 Outstanding	22-23 Below Average
27-28 Above Average	
24-26 Average	

The team that won this debate is Randolph FL representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Sp. 1 Delivered a very compelling and great point in that American Indians are just the true Americans and everyone is B/R citizen. very effective. in his argument that B/R citizens help in the economic growth & provided states to support.
 Sp. 3 - Excellent in pointing out the contradictions in the Pro position on their stats. Was very persuasive in his argument on perceived B/R citizen security in the system. Agreeing to Pro argument that B/R citizens will not be deported is wrong & so this argument will not be disputed is wrong & so this argument.

Comments to Debaters:

Sp. 2 - Made a good point in that the framers of the 14th Amendment did not anticipate the changing times but you have to establish what these changes in times that need to have the B/R citizenship abolished.
 Sp. 4 - You cannot argue based on hypothetical states without providing accurate & convincing evidence. You can not argue that the rights of B/R citizens can not be deported. You can not make this sweeping statement without stat.

These are the reasons for my decision:

I found the CON speakers very impressive in being very powerful & compelling arguments. The PRO made good points that need to provide more convincing statistics and study to win.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min
Speaker 2	4 min
Crossfire (1&2)	3 min
Speaker 3	4 min
Speaker 4	4 min
Crossfire (3&4)	3 min
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min
Grand Crossfire (All)	3 min
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min
2 minutes prep time per side	

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: [Signature] PROFS 3/4/2012

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
 Feb 3-4, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Ridge LM Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con	Team: Regis HS Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>25</u> for Sohyun Lee	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Jonathan Hall
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>26</u> for Sushma Manimalla	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Sean Singleton

29-30 Outstanding	22-23 Below Average
27-28 Above Average	
24-26 Average	

The team that won this debate is Regis HS representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Comments to Debaters:

Sushma - You need to understand your context. Much time was wasted on Deposition on bee. you did not understand that under the Family Split. If abolition that issue does not exist.
Sohyun - You are a good speaker but you have gestures while speaking is distracting. With experience you will learn to relax.

Jon - This was clearest case for Con I have heard today. Good case but did not agree with your flipping of Deposition issue but your opponent did not refute. You were lucky. You also came off a little too "cocky" for my taste.
Sean - I liked the way you handled yourself.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Decision to Con - because:

- Pro never addressed bureaucracy overload issue.
- Con won economics impact argument & 24 Bill. U.S. 9/30 Bill.
- Con showed immigrants not coming primarily to have kids which defeats the whole "leeching" argument.
- Pro had no response to "Spammy" argument.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min
Speaker 2	4 min
Crossfire (1&2)	3 min
Speaker 3	4 min
Speaker 4	4 min
Crossfire (3&4)	3 min
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min
Grand Crossfire (All)	3 min
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min
2 minutes prep time per side	

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

[Signature] Clayton Bay

Deposition - even if properly presented was not significant enough to carry much weight - only 5,000 cases.