

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Hunter College BL	Max = 30	Freehold Township CC	Max = 30
Ben Laufer	<u>28</u>	Craig Chikis	<u>29</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from Craig Chikis  
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

- ~~You have good confidence and are able to relax, so you are able to better explain yourself.~~
- Have confidence and relax, so you are able to better explain yourself.
- You made good points, but must be careful when speaking so your point comes out across.
- You brought up good statistics, elaborate on your points, you didn't explain you just made statements.

NEG

- ~~You have good confidence and are able to articulate yourself effectively.~~
- You have good confidence and are able to articulate yourself effectively.
- You brought up good points and brought up good explanation facts to back your statement, but there were some.
- You contradicted yourself with "the past" because you used due process (which was established in the past) (be careful, yo)
- ~~There were some points that you repeated yourself and didn't address the points at times.~~
- you repeated yourself and didn't address the points at times.

You guys were both really good.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Regis AK**

Max = 30

**Hunter College JC**

Max = 30

Alexander Koniuta

28

Joanna Cohen

29

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: Lisa M. Mulvihill

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff proposed an extremely well case for the first AK, especially his equal distribution of worth of self worth, defense and liberty & pursuit of happiness. Neg continuously attacked Aff's argument - all except the social contract that must be upheld in a marriage. Neg claimed that equal distribution of these pre-requisite needs ~~are~~ (critiria) are needed to preserve life - "Opportunity cost." Both sides counter argued each other they questioned each other's points. Very good Debate. Therefore, I had to fall back on the rationality / logic of their claims and claims of the opposing side dropped. Neg stated that the Aff's pre requisits of life do not matter when ~~you~~ you are not alive. True. Therefore debunking Aff's value critiria. Neg did not warrant her claim on extinction, but Aff failed to question Neg's claim of using less violent actions, killing is immoral. morality comes from life.

The only criticism I have is listen to your judge. If the judge says no spreading - Don't spread.

Room: Aud B  
Flight A: Start 1:00  
Novice LD

5

Oke, Damilola

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

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Bronx Science DM**

Max = 30

**Ridge YK**

Max = 30

Daiya Massac

26


Yana Kropotova

27

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

- Only focused on autonomy of the victims, and failed to identify why abuser's wasn't important.
- Didn't identify any alternative forms in which he has warrants for

Negative:

- Was unable to catch the aff. on his ability to answer why killing is morally permissible. Also how he failed to identify why alternatives fail. (No warrants) Also identified why self defense is malice.

Room: Aud A  
Flight A: Start 1:00  
Novice LD

5

Walker, Rachelle

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Hunter College US	Max = 30	Regis DS	Max = 30
Upasna Saha	<u>29</u>	Daniel Sullivan	<u>29</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from Regis Daniel Sullivan  
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:

Both: very interesting + strategic definition of victim  
+ also link to perception argument

Upasna: if think your case is framework heavy but you're  
not extend it and that would be very beneficial

Both: more variety in your responses, please!

RFD: I negate because Upasna drops the perception argument  
which means she cannot access any of of impacts insofar as they  
are reliant on her winning the standard of self defense. self defense  
is proved false by perception.

Room: Aud D  
Flight A: Start 1:00  
Novice LD

5

Ruela, Andreia

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

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
<b>Regis BB</b>	Max = 30	<b>Scarsdale AY</b>	Max = 30
Brandon Baldovin	<u>28</u>	Adam Young	<u>29</u>

The better debating was done by the Neg from Adam Young  
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:

The Neg speaker was a great speaker and made great eye contact. He was consistent with his arguments with solid warrants and his overview on how morality is decided by people was very strong.

Room: Aud F  
Flight A: Start 1:00  
Novice LD

5

Robinson, Brionn

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

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Byram Hills JS	Max = 30	Scarsdale TC	Max = 30
Josh Spingarn	<u>27</u>	Tomer Cherki	<u>29</u>

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: Brionna Robinson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative

- clearly presented argument
- some arguments seemed contradictory
- was able to warrant every argument
- didn't seem to understand opponents value contention fully so argument did not seem to be as strong

Negative

- clearly presented argument
- was able to warrant every argument
- was able to attack ~~opponent's~~ opponent's argument well
- spoke well just needs to be a little clearer
- clearly defended value and value contention

Room: Aud E  
Flight A: Start 1:00  
Novice LD

5

Johnson, Mufasa

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

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Bronx Science ID	Max = 30	Byram Hills OD	Max = 30
Isis Davis-Marks	<u>30</u>	Ofir Dinstein	<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the Aff from Isis Davis Marks  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Mufasa Johnson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- ~~Aff~~ Neg.
- Very well spoken
  - Let's opponent create a window and has "uh-oh" moments ~~why~~ when this happens
  - Clashed well with opponent

- ~~Neg~~ Aff.
- Very well spoken
  - Was able to effectively create a claim, warrant, and impact
  - Clashed well with opponent.

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

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

Scarsdale GT

Max = 30

Garrett Tanzer

27

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Randolph NC

Max = 30

Nathan Cha

28

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: Steven Chamba

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- well organized
- constant eye contact
- good points, but didn't really argue much against opponent

Neg

- constant eye contact
- proved points, argued well
- a little more organization

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

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
<b>Monticello BS</b>	Max = 30	<b>Hunter College SaCo</b>	Max = 30
Brittany Stein	<u>28</u>	Sarah Cogan	<del>28</del> 27

The better debating was done by the Aff from Brittany Stein  
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:

The affirmative won this round because she strategically asked and answered her cross-ex. as well as <sup>successfully</sup> clashed most of her's statements.

The neg lost because her cross-ex was not strong and she was ~~over~~ strongly attacked ~~with~~ by the aff in some of her statements but provided insufficient clash to the <sup>aff's</sup> response.

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

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
<b>Bronx Science AF</b>	Max = 30	<b>Ridge AR</b>	Max = 30
Aeshah Farrouq	<u>27</u>	Avani Rao	<u>07</u>

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:

Extremely close, as both debaters performed well. However the victory goes to the Negative side. The Negative side was:

- well spoken
- made good eye contact
- effectively countered opposition's arguments

The affirmative side was:

- also well spoken and organized, but could be louder
- brought up several good answers to opposition's questions.
- ~~last~~ During 2AR, her ideas were disorganized and unclear.

Room: Library C  
Flight A: Start 1:00  
Novice LD

5

Lantigua, Lucian

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Freehold Township SS**

Max = 30

**Byram Hills CB**

Max = 30

Simran Shah

~~27~~ 27

Caleb Brown

26

The better debating was done by the AFF from Freehold Township SS  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

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

*Lucian Lantigua*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*Aff*  
↳ was able to stick through and defend her value  
↳ rebut the Neg. contentions well

*Neg*  
↳ needs to improve on warranting his contentions (so it would not be solely based on definitions)  
↳ needed to directly clash the contentions of the Aff.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
<b>Regis WF</b>	Max = 30	<b>Hunter College TW</b>	Max = 30
William Ford	<u>28</u>	Tiffany Wang	<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the neg from Hunter  
AFF & NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed:  

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- AC: Revise your standard, it's not the best wording for your case. Also, clarify impacts at the end of each contention. Why are you achieving your VC?
- CX: Look at me, not your opponent. Press when he concedes something! Catch him on contradictions. Thank you for not asking clarification!
- NC: Good NC, put more justification for standard, it seems unwarranted. You're skilled on the line by line. Weigh more, <sup>especially</sup> between your contentions and the AC.
- CX: ... You don't always need a quote. Logic is great too. After you point out the no warrants, don't ask for the warrant, it's already clear, ~~then~~ continuing to ask makes you sound annoying.
- (AR): Don't throw stats around w/o weighing, tell me why to prefer yours! Don't spend so much time with defense on the NC, it's not necessary unless you make turns. Also, don't extend without telling me the implications of arguments
- 2 NR: Use the word "extend"! Good job covering the flow. VC isn't a voter, it's a way to evaluate other args. Make impacts! Tell me what to evaluate
- 2 AR: Don't extend anything you don't need, prioritize to prevent running out of time

---

RFD: I negate off of subpoint 2 of C1. The aff is arguing that killing the abuser ~~is~~ shows message, "rights can't be violated," but I buy neg turn that we will end up violating anyone's rights w/ slippery slope. Messy round.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Bronx Science IM	Max = 30	Scarsdale ER	Max = 30
Ismini Mangafas	<u>29</u>	Emerson Riback	<u>29</u>

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

- Clear speaking.
- In need of ~~more~~ more justifications for value criterion.
- Let neg extend too many of his cases. (proportionality).
- responded to negs arguments attemptively.

Domestic violence = death = kill  
↑  
But, not always  
So is it immoral for the other 70%?

Value

Aff Morality vs. Neg- morality  
↑  
proportionality.

Neg

- more eye contact, please!
- Good use of cross-ex-time (actual questions)
- case presented was ~~firm~~ firm and almost unarguable.

- Extended value criterion of proportionality.
- Extended contentions 1, 2 & 3.
  - ① Death is ultimate punishment.
  - ② could retaliate to death w/ death.
  - ③ repeated & escalated.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

### AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills DS

Max = 30

Scarsdale MB

Max = 30

Daniel Spingarn

28

Michael Bogaty

29

The better debating was done by the Neg. from Scarsdale MB.  
AFF OF NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: [Signature]

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- Clear & cohesive speaking.
- Speech was extremely long.
- Did not extend any contentions on 1AR. Few subpoints.
- ~~extended observation in 2AR.~~

Neg.

- Clear & cohesive reading.
- Speech was extremely long.
- Beat down all of Aff's points.
- Slow down a little bit when speaking.
- analytical warrants.

Value  
morality vs justice  
both agreed interchangeable.

PRO proportionality

Tough one, but Neg was better because he managed to beat down ~~my~~ Aff more than ~~my~~ Aff to Neg.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL


## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Princeton DE	Max = 30	Regis CH	Max = 30
Daniel Edelberg	<u>28.5</u>	Christopher Hillebrand	<u>25</u>

The better debating was done by the Aff from Princeton  
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: Well constructed case, don't define terms unless you need to.
  - CX: Don't take so much empty time. Go into CX with a plan to win!
  - NC: Write blocks, you shouldn't be pausing for so long. Try to be more relaxed.
  - CX: Nice job, "deliberate" issue is well handled by aff. Neg, learn your case better, don't make concessions he wants!
  - 1AR: Well covered, you're using the observations well, but give me in-round implications, like which parts of the NC they exclude. Compare evidence on the police/nonlethal force issue, this is just assertion.
  - 2NR: Don't make new args! Signpost, I have no idea what you're doing. Give me voting issues, stop at the end of the NR + tell me what you've won.
  - 2AR: Nice job, give me a summary of the round, a "weather map", to tell me what matters. VC isn't a voter, neither are Obs.
- 
- RFD: Aff shows imminence, premeditation doesn't make it less proportional + aff shows alts don't work. Aff meets side constraint + VC, aff wins.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

### AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Montville KX

Max = 30

Bronx Science BA

Max = 30

Kelly Xiang

28

Benjamin Adegbite

27

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

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

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

*Lucian Lantigua*

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

Neg

\* was able to use her cards more efficiently defending her contentions (wright (walker?))

\* was not able to drop the aff<sup>m</sup> case on oppression and morality

\* needed to be able to defend more efficiently his card on the doppler effect (to make his contention stronger).

\* Improvement - on the last statement was based on theory (Voting Neg b/c, then I would be ~~comp~~ accepting D.V.)

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

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Montville AV	Max = 30	Bronx Science CL	Max = 30
Adin Vashi	<u>28</u>	Carolyn Lau	<u>26</u>

The better debating was done by the Aff from Adin Vashi  
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 aff won because he responded to most of the negative's arguments and successfully clarified the neg's clashes bringing them back to his favor.

The neg lost because she did not successfully clash a significant amount of the aff's arguments, with enough support.

~~She also did not use all of her~~

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

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Regis FK**

Max = 30

**Hunter College EZ**

Max = 30

Frederick Kauber

26

Elvan Ziyalan

27

The better debating was done by the Neg from Hunter College EZ  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: W. Manuella Dias

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative and Negative positions are growth. There were good/well claims presented but they were not the best. Aff used quotes and sufficient sources during CX and in his rebutles. His claims were linked back to his value criteria of Thomas' Hobbs ideas. Aff did well when he used - "Give me Liberty or Give me Death" because there is no point in living without civil liberties. Neg was right on how life is more important than morality and that all people are equal, but there was no body to support these contentions.

Overall, good Debate!

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Freehold Township SV

Max = 30

Monticello PM

Max = 30

Sonika Vatsa

25


Patrick Miraglia

27

The better debating was done by the NEG from Monticello  
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:

- Missed the negative's point of picking the value criteria he used.
- Continued to say the abuser has no way out.

Negative:

- Value Criteria of minimizing authority rights violations; most unique value criterion I've heard this far
- Stats were persuasive

Room: Aud A  
Flight B: Start 1:45  
Novice LD

5

Walker, Rachelle

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

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Bronx Science SS	2:02 Max = 30	Ridge SY 2:31 Max = 30	
Sorana Selegan	<u>27.5</u>	Sophia Yan	<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from Ridge Sophia Yan  
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:

Sophia: you should slow down in the INK because for 1:30 mins you just restated arguments and then you still had 30 seconds left.

RAD: I negate because Sophia wins the framework debate and Sorana cannot link any of her impacts. The specific standard. Also, Sophia outweighs her arguments as they apply to mere of society.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Randolph AS**

Max = 30

**Regis RH**

Max = 30

Aaron Sorrin

28

Ryan Hall

26

The better debating was done by the AFF from Randolph AS  
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

- clear, good points
- easy to comprehend
- attacked effectively

Neg

- Started off weak
- did not answer all of opponent's questions clearly
- argument grew stranger towards the end

Room: Aud E  
Flight B: Start 1:45  
Novice LD

5

Johnson, Mufasa

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Ridge YP	Max = 30	Princeton RD	Max = 30
Young Park	<u>29</u>	Rishi Datt	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the APP from Young Park  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Mufasa Johnson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

APP

- Clearly spoken
- Was able to keep attention
- Attacked the opponent's arguments and was able to build own argument by doing so.

Neg.

- Voice was dull
- Minor contradictions when making arguments against the opponent

Room: Aud D  
Flight B: Start 1:45  
Novice LD

5

Ruela, Andreia

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

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Hunter College SC	Max = 30	Ridge RK	Max = 30
Serina Chang	<u>30</u>	Raina Karia	<u>29</u>

The better debating was done by the Aff from Serina Chang  
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:

Both the Aff. and Neg. speakers were great debaters with great arguments but I vote Aff because all of her arguments were warranted with solid proof. Neg. speaker failed to have an implication for all of her contentions.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

### AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Montville LH

Max = 30

Ridge KS

Max = 30

Lawrence Hong

28

Kaitlin Smalling

29

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: Stephan Reinoso

#### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~NEG~~ NEG

~~NEG~~ AFF

- You very good at articulating yourself and you listen carefully which benefits you because you are able to pick at your opponents argument- do your benefit.
- You made a good argument and supported it efficiently with explanations and reasoning.
- you used the legal system to your advantage and linked it to your value.

- You are very good at speaking clearer and stating your reasons
- You have to be less agitated because then you stumble and just make a statement without extensively elaborating on your point
- you do not state and respond to the NEG when they question the time you can determine to actually take a life, you only gave one hypothetical scenario