

Room: 303  
Flight A: Start ASAP

SEMI

Fox

Novice Public Forum Deibarton BJ (Vito Brancatella & Christopher Jagoe) vs. Princeton MM (Pragya Malik & Jacob Middlekauff)

# 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: Princeton MM Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u> Speaker: <u>3</u> : Pragya Malik Speaker: <u>1</u> : Jacob Middlekauff	Team: Deibarton BJ Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con Speaker: <u>2</u> : Vito Brancatella Speaker: <u>4</u> : Christopher Jagoe
---	---

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

**Comments to Debaters:**  
1st speaker - try not to get flustered during cross fire. You need to help out your partner in crossfire.  
2nd speaker - Your rebuttal was one of the better speeches I've heard. You used logic well and explained events clearly. Nice final focus. You show how the problems they show are not unique to birthright citizenship.

**Comments to Debaters:**  
2nd speaker - Be careful about being too aggressive in crossfire. You were fine, but close to yelling. Stop being rude. You CANNOT TELL your opponent to "LOOK IT UP!" You are responsible for your sources and need to provide them OR better yet, explain them thoroughly.  
4th speaker - You were very overbearing in that last speech, and I feel like you were frankly losing your important points. Your rebuttal felt under-explained. I find it hard to believe a debater ~~doesn't~~ thinks that logic and speculation are always the same.

These are the reasons for my decision:  
 The PRO claims the CON makes "Broad claims about what would happen with no evidence" but also does not prove persuasively that birthright citizenship is the "true incentive" for illegal migration. Without that link, which is not clearly explained or supported (maybe logically, but they denied the logic of the other team). The CON was clear and the PRO dropped their impacts to regular Americans, focusing only on illegals at the narrow address of the scope.  
 Judge Signature: [Signature]

CON also shows that PRO problems are not unique to Birthright.

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	

Room: 303  
Flight A: Start ASAP

SEMI

Pradeep Tejus

Novice Public Forum Princeton MM (Pragya Malik & Jacob Middlekauff) vs. Delbarton BJ (Vito Brancatella & Christopher Jagoe)

# 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: Princeton MM Circle Side: Pro (Con) Speaker: _____: Pragya Malik (2) Speaker: _____: Jacob Middlekauff (1)	Team: Delbarton BJ Circle Side: (Pro) Con Speaker: _____: Vito Brancatella (1) Speaker: _____: Christopher Jagoe (2)
--	--

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

Comments to Debaters:

Jacob: Have clearer, expressive, useful questions to advance your arguments in crossfire. Very ~~clear~~ good speaking voice overall - understandable.

Pragya: Fantastic speaking overall. You addressed most of their points, but try to address some of their specific nuances → eg. \$113 billion cost, not horns, etc.

I liked your crossfire style → be a bit more clear in your questioning.

Summary: Overall good, but you should give me clear why reasons.

GEX: Jacob you should be contributing a lot more!

Comments to Debaters:

Vito: Argue the points in crossfire, not talking about ultra-specific aspects of the other team's evidence. Spoke clearly and was calm.

Christopher: I think you should spend a bit more time on the other team's case. However, I loved how you wiped out their major responses to your case. Well done. (I liked your rebuttal point.)

Summary: Thank you for giving clear notes in summary. it was helpful.

GEX: I'm not sure why ~~you guys~~ you guys constantly say bin. citizenship is necessarily illegal other than the SCOTUS → you don't really see specific reasons

These are the reasons for my decision:

Initially, I felt Delbarton was clearly winning the round. However, in the summary and final focus speeches, I don't feel like you guys emphasized the correct arguments. At the end, your offense was completely based on winning the huge link between birthright citizenship and illegal immigration. I don't believe you guys really win this. The CON provides economic factors as a more pressing priority. Overall, the round had CON winning ① Undermines ② Burden of proof (barely), while CON minimized

PRO's numbers like \$113 billion cost as coming from illegal imm. overall. Although PRO wins constitutionality, it is not weighed or emphasized enough for me to value it over the CON points. I now by gave it to PRO, I was nervous.

Judge Signature: Pradeep Tejus

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	

Room: 303

Flight A: Start ASAP

Novice Public Forum Delbarton BJ (Vito Brancatella & Christopher Jagoe) vs. Princeton MM (Pragya Malik & Jacob Middlekauff)

SEMI

Lee Nancy

# 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: Princeton MM Circle Side: Pro Con 1  
 Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_: Pragya Malik 2  
 Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_: Jacob Middlekauff 1

Team: Delbarton BJ Circle Side: Pro Con 2  
 Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_: Vito Brancatella 1  
 Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_: Christopher Jagoe 2

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

Comments to Debaters: CON  
Speaker one = good compelling constructive. be more persuasive in your summary.

Comments to Debaters: PRO  
Speaker one = ~~great constructive~~ great constructive, you seemed to know what you were talking about in cx. don't get so worked up in grand cx. Well-organized summary.

Speaker two = Obviously, you are a very good speaker. Good rebuttal but remember to neglect your time - you spent too much time on Ark.

Speaker two = good rebuttal, you covered everything you needed to. But you guys really need to have doc to win that. Nice FF

These are the reasons for my decision:

I had to go w/con, they won off the birth registry point, which was not sufficiently rebutted and the ~~fact~~ <sup>point</sup> that welfare is ~~not~~ nonunique b/c naturalized citizens can receive it. I don't think pro sufficiently proved that causal link between BRC and illegal imm., pro needed better evidence there.

Judge Signature: Nancy Lee

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	