

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Princeton DE (Daniel Edelberg) vs. Bronx Science ID (Isis Davis-Marks)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Princeton DE

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Bronx Science ID

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Buonna Robinson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative

- Clearly presented argument
- Clearly warranted argument
- was better able to defend position with last speech
- last speech was the strongest because debater was able to link certain key points to each proving value intention true and making argument stronger
- be more aware of timing

Negative

- speak a little bit slower and clearer
- clearly presented argument
- clearly warranted
- was able to defend but did not bring out key points earlier in the round

Room: 205
Flight A: Start 3:15
Novice LD

OCTA

Ferreira, Jagger

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Bronx Science ID (Isis Davis-Marks) vs. Princeton DE (Daniel Edelberg)

AFFIRMATIVE

Princeton DE
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

~~Princeton DE~~ Bronx Science ID
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Jagger Ferreira

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative:

- Strong voice, clear, extremely well organized.
- Strong contentions and card to warrant
- Answered all of opposition's questions

Negative:

- Well organized and clear,
- Gave strong questions for her opponent, but couldn't answer some of Affirmative's
- Improve: could better support her value criterion

Room: 205
Flight A: Start 3:15
Novice LD

OCTA

Magalhes, Monic

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Bronx Science ID (Isis Davis-Marks) vs. Princeton DE (Daniel Edelberg)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Daniel Edelberg

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Isis Davis-Marks

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The negative attacked the affirmative's criteria and value by saying that guidelines weren't given when they were. The offense wasn't strong and two contentions were dropped which strengthened the affirmative's case. The affirmative demonstrated great direct clash against all arguments and even showed that his criteria fit hers. Thus, the affirmative had a stronger case upholding the shared value of morality.

Room: 148
Flight A: Start 3:15
Novice LD

OCTA

Ruela, Andreia

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Monticello BS (Brittany Stein) vs. Ridge YK (Yana Kropotova)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Brittany Stein

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Yana Kropotova

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Nea from Yana Kropotova
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Andreia Ruela

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff speaker was extremely rude, rolling her eyes and mouthing comments while her opponent was speaking.

I vote Neg. because she was consistent with her contentions, solid warrants, and she was able to impact and prove her arguments.

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 3:00
Varsity LD

OCTA

Bendi, Cristi

112

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Regis PM (Peter McGahren) vs. Timothy Christian GM (Gerritt Maniguet)

AFFIRMATIVE

Regis PM

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Timothy Christian GM

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: C. Bendi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: Patriarchy - Cochran
Theory -

Critique on Aff → I bought this completely, nice job showing this!!

Domestic violence is man/women - Analysis proves critique wrong on homosexuality,
Almost makes NE irrelevant and non-topical.

Room: 148
Flight A: Start 3:15
Novice LD

OCTA

Velastegui, K

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Ridge YK (Yana Kropotova) vs. Monticello BS (Brittany Stein)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Brittany Stein

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Yana Kropotova

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Karina Velastegui

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff defended cases well despite attacks + had abundant support.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Monticello BS (Brittany Stein) vs. Ridge YK (Yana Kropotova)

AFFIRMATIVE

Brittany Stein

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Yana Kropotova

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Ysame Y Gonzalez

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- couldn't prove why proportionality which is equal to "justice" was moral in the case of abuse.
- no clear link as to why using deadly force is just or morally permissible
- doesn't view justice under both sides. victim vs abuser.

- proves that deadly force isn't proportional
- makes point that victim is irrational because they are under abuse, so they don't know what "is" moral.
- means vs ends. (if done under malice it isn't moral)

Room: 209
Flight A: Start 3:15
Novice LD

OCTA

Zurita, Carla

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Ridge SY (Sophia Yan) vs. Randolph NC (Nathan Cha)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Nathan Cha

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Sophia Yan

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Carla M. Zurita

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The affirmative won because he left the negative's arguments all responded to leaving her with no standing argument by the end of the round.

The neg lost because her classes were not strong enough or supported strong enough in response to the aff's arguments.

Both were clear speakers.

Room: 209
Flight A: Start 3:15
Novice LD

OCTA

Silva, Daniel

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Randolph NC (Nathan Cha) vs. Ridge SY (Sophia Yan)

AFFIRMATIVE

Nathan Cha

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Sophia Yan

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Daniel Silva

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG	AFF
Was clear in speaking Was a great debater but it was true she drops an argument	Was clear in speaking Won because he attacks NEG criterias very well as well as defend his own
Good job	Good job

Room: 209
Flight A: Start 3:15
Novice LD

OCTA

Johnson, Mufasa

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Randolph NC (Nathan Cha) vs. Ridge SY (Sophia Yan)

AFFIRMATIVE

Nathan Cha

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Sophia Yan

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Mufasa Johnson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff:
Was able to take the
opponent's argument into account
is disprove when it fails.
' very well spoken

Neg:
During cross-ex you weren't
able to defend your argument
effectively leaving you open
for your opponent to attack it.
- very well spoken

Room: 207
Flight A: Start 3:15
Novice LD

OCTA

Lantigua, Lucian

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Ridge YP (Young Park) vs. Scarsdale TC (Tomer Cherki)

AFFIRMATIVE

Ridge YP

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Scarsdale TC

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Ruecanny Family

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

It was a very difficult round (both parties defended their cases extremely well). The aff. was not able to rebut that victims ^(irrational) themselves can't be moral because based from the def. morality is rational. The aff. conceded to the neg value and value criteria. The aff. also ~~dropped~~ did not rebut ~~on the social contract~~ that was not able to defend the social contract that she was able to propose and the neg was able to rebut it.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Scarsdale TC (Tomer Cherki) vs. Ridge YP (Young Park)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Young Park Ridge YP

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Tomer Cherki Scarsdale TC

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff.

- Spoke clearly
- Good argument
- Didn't really attack Neg, strongly and consented to Negs. Arguments at times.
- Lost because she didn't really try to make NEG case seem wrong, didn't answer all the different types of attacks.
- Great job

Neg.

- Spoke quickly but clearly
- Supported case
- used his case to make Aff case seem wrong.
- Work on speaking slower and taking time to speak
- Won because he was able to answer clearly and present ideas and persuade.
- Great job

Room: 207
Flight A: Start 3:15
Novice LD

OCTA

Pastrano, Freddy

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Ridge YP (Young Park) vs. Scarsdale TC (Tomer Cherki)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Ridge YP

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Scarsdale TC

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Freddy Pastrano

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Negative has won because he spoke with much authority. His argument also was very strong, and addressed all the points that his opponent made. ~~The~~ The negative also broke down the affirmative's argument well.
- affirmative lost because I felt as if she didn't respond to her opponent as well as the negative did. However, she was very clear with her argument and also spoke fluently with authority. This debate was a tough choice, however negative has debated better.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Ridge RK (Raina Karia) vs. Scarsdale GT (Garrett Tanzer)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Ridge RK

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Scarsdale GT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Lisa Dias

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff presented an innovative point of view in this debate, that the victim cannot be penalized for his/her course of action if they are mentally unstable and scared due to the aggressor's abuse. The idea of focusing on the future violent actions rather than present actions was a bit confusing. There was clash on the definition of "permissible" which Neg negated. Neg states that repressibility and evolution/survival of the human race which links to equal or lower severity. Neg clashed more and was able to get the Aff to contradict her position (def of permissible and ~~collateral~~ morality = justice).
GOOD Round!

Room: 147
Flight A: Start 3:15
Novice LD

OCTA

Oke, Damilola

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Ridge RK (Raina Karia) vs. Scarsdale GT (Garrett Tanzer)


AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Ridge RK (Raina Karia)
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Scarsdale GT (Garret Tanzer)
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff. - Didn't listen nor understand the Neg.'s argument of reciprocal acts.

Neg. - Is able to prove that aff's value criteria isn't upheld in her case. He's then able to redefine, what value criteria her case reflects. Also he makes the point that if things are predetermined there'd be no point to a moral system. The

↓
Aff. fails to address this
In which
the Aff. claimed

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Scarsdale GT (Garrett Tanzer) vs. Ridge RK (Raina Karia)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: Please don't run determinism, it's stupid and doesn't do what you want it to. You took a lot of prep, you should be making more clear extensions and not spend so much time on the AC.

Neg: Don't run an abusive case, it is very annoying and not at all persuasive, she could and should have run theory. Don't use shep triggers, they don't apply or negate.

RFD: There is mk on AC standard, ^{rc}NC is clearly extended. I negate off NC C1 as an apriori negation through neg standard. Even if I look to AC standard, I negate off police as alt.