

Room: 203
Flight A: Start ASAP
Novice LD

QUAR

Goree, Sam

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Ridge KS (Kaitlin Smalling) vs. Scarsdale AY (Adam Young)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Oral

Room: 203
Flight A: Start ASAP
Novice LD

QUAR

Silva, Daniel

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Ridge KS (Kaitlin Smalling) vs. Scarsdale AY (Adam Young)

AFFIRMATIVE

Adam Young

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Kaitlin Smalling

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Daniel Silva

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG

Was clear

Lost because she did
drop some arguments

AFF

Was clear

Won because he turn tides of
argument with mention of slavery

Both did a good job

Room: 203
Flight A: Start ASAP
Novice LD

QUAR

Lantigua, Lucian

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Scarsdale AY (Adam Young) vs. Ridge KS (Kaitlin Smalling)

AFFIRMATIVE

Adam Young

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Kaitlin Smalling

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Lucian Rantigua

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Aff. was able to continue extending and his value criteria and the Neg. was not able to drop it efficiently. The Neg. contradicted herself and the Aff. was able to use it (contradict and) to drop her contentions.

Room: 209
Flight A: Start ASAP
Novice LD

QUAR

Magalhes, Monic

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Scarsdale GT (Garrett Tanzer) vs. Randolph NC (Nathan Cha)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

~~Garrett Tanzer~~ Nathan Cha
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Garrett Tanzer
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: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both showed great clash. The problem with one of them though was alternatives. The negative gave suicide as an alternative. When it came to rebutting proportionality though the affirmative agreed that death is less retaliation than constant torture which proves the alternative given by the negative is possible. Suicide is death and thus disproved the affirmative's own contention. The debate had plenty of direct clash but this contradiction made me take the negative side.

Room: 209
Flight A: Start ASAP
Novice LD

QUAR

Ferreira, Jagger

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Scarsdale GT (Garrett Tanzer) vs. Randolph NC (Nathan Cha)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Randolph NC

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Scarsdale GT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Jagger Ferreira

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative

- arguments were organized. Loud, clear voice
- Had a counter / answer for the opposition's arguments/questions
- Used his card well to support his value criterion.

Negative

- Started weak, but picked it up a lot on NR.
- During the NC, he ~~ex~~ spoke fast and unclear, so it was difficult to understand at times.
- Should start off as strong as he did in NR

Room: 209
Flight A: Start ASAP
Novice LD

QUAR

Pastrano, Freddy

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Scarsdale GT (Garrett Tanzer) vs. Randolph NC (Nathan Cha)

AFFIRMATIVE

Randolph NC

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Scarsdale GT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Freddy Pastrano

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

affirmative has won because he had better responses to his opponents arguments and his rebuttle. He did address his opponents arguments, and proved his.

Negative has lost because he did not respond well to his opponent. Much of his arguments failed to counter his opponents.

Both speakers spoke very well and had authority!

Room: 315
Flight A: Start ASAP
Novice Public Forum

QUAR

Coyne, Lynne

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Regis BP (Liam Brozen & Luke Powers) vs. Delbarton BJ (Vito Brancatella & Christopher Jagoe)

AFFIRMATIVE

Delbarton BJ (2ND)

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Regis BP (1ST)

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

PREP:

prep: 1/15

The better debating was done by the NEG from Regis BP
AFF of NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____

Lynne Ridge RIDGE



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Little comparison of the big picture in the late speeches —
how do your positions fit together — why are individual args
VOTING ISSUES.

Vote on economic impacts. At least 3 state examples
show that ↓ illegals will put UNOUE stress on the economy.
Yes we pay out lots, but your "ADVANTAGES" of ↓ wages
etc., might cripple small farmers, businesses etc.
If major motivators were gone, many other states
might experience a similar breakdown.

Room: 315
Flight A: Start ASAP
Novice Public Forum

QUAR

Tareen Marium

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Regis BP (Liam Brozen & Luke Powers) vs. Delbarton BJ (Vito Brancatella & Christopher Jagoe)

AFFIRMATIVE

DELBARTON

(2nd)

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT


NEGATIVE

REGIS BP

(1st)

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- CON**
- 1st SPEAKER: PRO MUST PROVE COST BEN ↑
 - C1 - BIRTH RIGHT CITIZENSHIP IS CONSTITUTIONAL
 - STATES LIKE ALABAMA LOSE \$ IF UNDOCUMENTED WORKERS
 - ARIZONA USES \$ TO VERIFY STATUS
 - C2 - BUREAUCRATIC NIGHTMARE
 - C3 - DESERVING OF RIGHTS
- PRO 2nd SP: AFFIRM**
- C1 14th Amendment - GRANTS TO THOSE BORN HERE, NOT ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS
 - PRE 1870 - Before MASS IMMIGRATION
 - C2 - INCENTIVES FOR ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION
 - C3 - ECONOMIC COSTS FOR ILLEGAL IMM
 - WELFARE COSTS

CROSSFIRE:
ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS PAY TAXES
3 STATES REP OF WHOSE

3rd SP CON-
GOOD REBUTTAL OF CAUSE OF BIRTHS BY ILLEGALS, 87% 14 years in USA
IF WE ABOLISH BIRTHRIGHT CIT, ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION WILL ↑
MORE TAXES - BIRTH REGISTRY

4th SP PRO-

CROSSFIRE

SP1 SUM - CON

SP2 SUM PRO - MAIN INCENTIVE OF IMMIGRATION IS BIRTH RIGHT CITIZENSHIP

GRAND CROSSFIRE:

FF SP3 -

RE SP4 - subject to jurisdiction does not include illegal immigrants

COMMENTS TO TEAMS:

DELBARTON:

GREAT DEBATING
GOOD USE OF STATISTICS TO
BACK UP CONTENTIONS

REGIS:

GREAT DEBATING
TRY NOT TO EXPRESS OPEN
FRUSTRATION IN PREP w/ PARTNER

CON did not negate PROs

point on \$ of welfare money
spent on illegal immigrants.
if your going to rebut your
opponents main contentions or
support your main one,
do so with more than one source
For this reason, I'm
voting PRO in this round. (Migration 101-4)

Room: 303
Flight B: Start
Novice Public Forum

QUAR

King, George

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Ridge WT (Christine Wang & Oliver Tang) vs. Princeton MM (Pragya Malik & Jacob Middlekauff)

AFFIRMATIVE

Ridge

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Princeton

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the

NEG

from

Princeton

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____

Meow Kin

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff says ^{frankly} works in other countries but no development of that point except final focus.

?

© Tax practical advice issues

Standard is with vs. width but Con wins that standard (!)


©

underclass problem is key point but no explanation

?

© New unique regarding education are because are are II issues, not BRC issues

"Mexico" exyle



"stateless" - no citizenship anywhere will cause class

Am Values + Economy issues

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Princeton MM (Pragya Malik & Jacob Middlekauff) vs. Ridge WT (Christine Wang & Oliver Tang)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Ridge WT

Princeton MM

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- * Con team is effective in establishing the arguments about child's right, cause of socio-economic harm (illegal immigration vs. birthright citizenship), ^(equal contribution)
- * ^{Contention about} Bureaucratic cost was not adequately rebutted by PRO
- * Significance of socio-economic harms were washed out due to contradictory evidence
- * PRO's contention about security/terrorism was good. But need ^{stronger substantiation}
- * Pro team was not able to ~~establish~~ ^{establish} cause of societal harm due to birthright citizenship
- * ~~Very~~ Excellent cross-exam from both sides
- * Con's rebuttal about for anchor child was good (21 yrs + 10yr wait)

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

2
PRO

Ridge WT (Christine Wang & Oliver Tang) vs. Princeton MM (Pragya Malik & Jacob Middlekauff)

1
CON

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Ridge WT

Princeton MM

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Moscaritolo Moscaritolo

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Jacob
good job clarifying the issue of terrorism in connection to the resolution (there is none)

Pragya
- good job clarifying Wong Kim Ark case
- even if Birthright citizenship were abolished illegal immigration would still increase

Both: good creative skills and ability to keep your position relative to the resolution coherently

Christine
Impact of world w/o birthrite - not clear;
In your summary you could have clarified your case, you spoke so fast and tried to address too many issues.

Oliver
- Imm. Displacing American citizen
- punishing those who follow the law, reward those who are breaking the law

Both your case could be stronger if you emphasized the social & economic harms of abolishing birthrite citizenship more clearly

Use your final focus to strengthen your case by clearly linking your points to the resolution
Shoot for coherence
It felt very fractured

Very good debate - all four!