

Room: Blodgett 109  
 Start: 3:30 PM  
 ParN 13  
 Round: N4



Allen, Robin  
 Wilton Wilton

VASSAR COLLEGE INVITATIONAL

AFF NEG (Circle Side)

Speakers 1st 2nd

AFF NEG (Circle Side)

Speakers 1st 2nd

Spkr	NewHav Smith & Najari	POINTS (22-30)
1	Laila Smith	<del>25</del> <del>28</del> 24
2	Farah Najari	26

Spkr	HorMan May & Kurtz	POINTS (22-30)
2	Ben May	23
1	Zachary Kurtz	27

Winner: HorMan School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Definition of house was the key deciding factor. I have shared individual feedback with all speakers

**Point Scale:**

<23	..... see Tab
23-24	..... below average
25-26	..... average
27-28	..... superior
>28	..... justify on ballot

**Speech Times:**

PMC	..... 7 min
LOC	..... 8 min
MGC	..... 8 min
MOC	..... 8 min
LOR	..... 4 min
PMR	..... 5 min

4000214

Room: Blodgett 201  
 Start: 3:30 PM  
 ParN 1  
 Round: N4



Cooper, Adam  
 XX Hired

VASSAR COLLEGE INVITATIONAL

AFF NEG (Circle Side) Speakers 1st 2nd

Spkr	FriSem Block & Gund-Morrow	POINTS (22 - 30)
MO	Tenzin Gund-Morrow	28
PM	Julia Block	28

AFF NEG (Circle Side) Speakers 1st 2nd

Spkr	HorMan Talwar & Allard-Neptune	POINTS (22 - 30)
MG	Devin Allard-Neptune	25
PM	Arushi Talwar	25

Winner: FriSem School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Point Scale:**

<23	..... see Tab
23-24	..... below average
25-26	..... average
27-28	..... superior
>28	..... justify on ballot

**Speech Times:**

PMC	..... 7 min
LOC	..... 8 min
MGC	..... 8 min
MOC	..... 8 min
LOR	..... 4 min
PMR	..... 5 min

4000202

Room: Blodgett 105  
 Start: 3:30 PM  
 ParN 2  
 Round: N4

THR: use of \$ system as w 4:49  
 in foreign policy upon 5:04



Morris, Yemima

HorMan Horace Mann Parliamentary Debate

VASSAR COLLEGE INVITATIONAL

gov.  
 AFF NEG (Circle Side) Speakers 1st 2nd

Spkr	HarBri Pineda & Donnelly	POINTS (22-30)
	<del>Aguillar</del> <u>Latonia</u>	23
PM	Kenny Pineda	25

opp  
 AFF NEG (Circle Side) Speakers 1st 2nd

Spkr	Ridge Iyer & Narayanabhatla	POINTS (22-30)
	<del>Decker</del> Shruti Narayanabhatla	28
MO	Gia Iyer	26

Winner: Ridge Iyer & Narayanabhatla debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
 School/Team

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Point Scale:

<23	..... see Tab
23-24	..... below average
25-26	..... average
27-28	..... superior
>28	..... justify on ballot

Speech Times:

PMC	..... 7 min
LOC	..... 8 min
MGC	..... 8 min
MOC	..... 8 min
LOR	..... 4 min
PMR	..... 5 min

4000203

Room: Blodgett 122

Start: 3:30 PM

ParN 5

Round: N4

136



# Fenstermaker, Megan

FriSem Friends Seminary

## VASSAR COLLEGE INVITATIONAL

**AFF** **NEG** (Circle Side)

Speakers 1st 2nd

Spkr	Team	POINTS (22 - 30)
	Wilton Subramanian & Wang	
	Harish Subramanian	27
	Alex Wang	26.5

**AFF** **NEG** (Circle Side)

Speakers 1st 2nd

Spkr	Team	POINTS (22 - 30)
	Westfi Prakash & MacDonnell	
	Alish MacDonnell	26.5
	Eira Prakash	27

Winner: Wilton (OP) debating on the \_\_\_\_\_ Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Comments & Reason for Decision: of more clearly argued but didn't address the gradual withdrawal - so listen closely + address all points.

### Point Scale:

<23	..... see Tab
23-24	..... below average
25-26	..... average
27-28	..... superior
>28	..... justify on ballot

### Speech Times:

PMC	..... 7 min
LOC	..... 8 min
MGC	..... 8 min
MOC	..... 8 min
LOR	..... 4 min
PMR	..... 5 min

4000206

Room: Blodgett 118  
 Start: 3:30 PM  
 ParN 9  
 Round: N4



**Koutavas, Anastasia**  
 HorMan Horace Mann Parliamentary Debate

**VASSAR COLLEGE INVITATIONAL**

AFF **NEG** (Circle Side)

Speakers 1st 2nd

**AFF** NEG (Circle Side)

Speakers 1st 2nd

Spkr	FriSem Gorrivan & Rosenthal	POINTS (22 - 30)
1	Charlie Gorrivan	27
2	Ben Rosenthal	25

Spkr	Wilton Thomas & Kaimal	POINTS (22 - 30)
1	Gayathri Kaimal	26.5
2	Sean Thomas	26.5

Winner: Wilton School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Point Scale:**

<23	..... see Tab
23-24	..... below average
25-26	..... average
27-28	..... superior
>28	..... justify on ballot

**Speech Times:**

PMC	..... 7 min
LOC	..... 8 min
MGC	..... 8 min
MOC	..... 8 min
LOR	..... 4 min
PMR	..... 5 min

4000210

Room: Chicago 118  
 Start: 3:30 PM  
 ParN 8  
 Round: N4



Kumthekar, Anish

XX Hired

VASSAR COLLEGE INVITATIONAL

**AFF** **NEG** (Circle Side)

Speakers 1st 2nd

Spkr	HorMan Malik & Hasegawa	POINTS (22-30)
MO	Myra Malik	26
PM	Yui Hasegawa	25.5

**AFF** **NEG** (Circle Side)

Speakers 1st 2nd

Spkr	HarBri Aguilar & Ovalle	POINTS (22-30)
MO	Thomas Donnelly	25
LO	Anna Ovalle	<del>25</del>

23.5

Winner: Hor Man Malik & Hasegawa debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Better Rebuttal  
 Their points (read) as it did not  
 receive <sup>much</sup> ~~any~~ rebuttal from  
 the opposition.  
 Also better argumentation  
 & model.

**Point Scale:**

<23	..... see Tab
23-24	..... below average
25-26	..... average
27-28	..... superior
>28	..... justify on ballot

**Speech Times:**

PMC	..... 7 min
LOC	..... 8 min
MGC	..... 8 min
MOC	..... 8 min
LOR	..... 4 min
PMR	..... 5 min

4000209

Room: Chicago 109  
 Start: 3:30 PM  
 ParN 11  
 Round: N4



Cao, Carl  
 XX Hired

VASSAR COLLEGE INVITATIONAL

AFF **NEG** (Circle Side)

Speakers 1st 2nd

**AFF** NEG (Circle Side)

Speakers 1st 2nd

Spkr	FriSem Frazier & Shapiro	POINTS (22-30)
	Imogen Frazier 1	26
	Benjamin Shapiro 2	<del>26</del> 24

Spkr	BOW Bahel & Bahel	POINTS (22-30)
	Anchal Bahel 1	24
	Piyush Bahel 2	24

Winner: FriSem Frazier & Shapiro debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? /

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Gov Setup a framework  
 hard for themselves to argue.  
 Gov arguments are not convincing  
 the case itself is also kind of  
 weak.  
 Opp has good arguments and  
 rebuttals -

Point Scale:

<23	..... see Tab
23-24	..... below average
25-26	..... average
27-28	..... superior
>28	..... justify on ballot

Speech Times:

PMC	..... 7 min
LOC	..... 8 min
MGC	..... 8 min
MOC	..... 8 min
LOR	..... 4 min
PMR	..... 5 min

4000212

Room: Chicago 126  
 Start: 3:30 PM  
 ParN 7  
 Round: N4



Ko, Julie  
 Wilton Wilton

VASSAR COLLEGE INVITATIONAL

**AFF** **NEG** (Circle Side) Speakers 1st 2nd

Spkr	Stamfo Gewali & Osman	POINTS (22-30)
4	Krishma Gewali	25
3	Selin Osman	25

**AFF** **NEG** (Circle Side) Speakers 1st 2nd

Spkr	NewHav Bendolph & Joseph	POINTS (22-30)
1	Genesis Bendolph	26
2	Patricia Joseph	25.5

Winner: NewHav Bendolph & Joseph debating on the Opp Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Definitions
- Organization
- Arguments carried a higher weight of importance.
- Contributed useful, anecdotal evidence.

**Point Scale:**

<23	..... see Tab
23-24	..... below average
25-26	..... average
27-28	..... superior
>28	..... justify on ballot

**Speech Times:**

PMC	..... 7 min
LOC	..... 8 min
MGC	..... 8 min
MOC	..... 8 min
LOR	..... 4 min
PMR	..... 5 min

4000208

TH as a western liberal democracy world penalize

Room: Chicago 116 US states that discriminate against LGBTQ

Osman, Asif

Start: 3:30 PM

Stamfo Stamford High school

ParN 3 - penalize ind or state  
 Round: N4 - VA → women's rights not ratified  
 → LT remedy = education  
 → fine = -ve  
 → 1st Amendment



VASSAR COLLEGE INVITATIONAL

AFF NEG (Circle Side) Speakers 1st 2nd

AFF NEG (Circle Side) Speakers 1st 2nd

Spkr	Wilton Wangneo & Jayawardhane	POINTS (22-30)
	Vihan Jayawardhane MGC	27
	Samik Wangneo PMC	26

Spkr	Hackle Chandra & Zhang	POINTS (22-30)
	Arushi Chandra HOC	26
	Daniel Zhang MOC	24

Aff

Winner: Wilton debating on the government Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
 School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

717 Comments & Reason for Decision:  
 Samik (US govt)  
 - penalize = monetary retrib. as well as <sup>get to</sup> promote LGBTQ causes  
 - discriminate → <sup>get to</sup> ~~rights~~ rights for people  
 1) LGBTQ guaranteed = rights under law  
 2) moral argument  
 3) -ve precedent for US (to discrim)  
 - diff. sexual orientation protected  
 - immoral  
 - eg. Af. American DWB of discrim.  
 - social contract in democracy (POI) Arushi

804 Arushi - agree to definitions - discriminate as ind. but motion for states  
 → hurtful words also discrimination, obscure  
 - fined for being ignorant?  
 - everyone deserves equality but should states have to <sup>any</sup>  
 - agree disc. is bad but fail to specify remedy  
 - homophobia isn't US prob. only  
 1) state can't be homophobic (logical fallacy) → can't penalize state  
 2) penalty won't work defensive for freedom of religion eg. bakery. Need to educate  
 - misund. causes hate

Point Scale:

<23	..... see Tab
23-24	..... below average
25-26	..... average
27-28	..... superior
>28	..... justify on ballot

Speech Times:

PMC	..... 7 min
LOC	..... 8 min
MGC	..... 8 min
MOC	..... 8 min
LOR	..... 4 min
PMR	..... 5 min

156 Vihan → states as collective make laws for ind. to behave  
 - against Religion (POC) can be over ridden for betterment of society  
 - Hitler eg. is extreme  
 1) Civil Rights Act 1971 = rights → LGBTQ is gender  
 2) all must to treated equally  
 3) US moral leadership  
 - ST, LT impact

134 Daniel - Women's rights w/o state penalties  
 - acceptance and education not penalize  
 - respectful in own expression (POI) Vihan  
 - states not penalized for oddballs  
 - both parties allowed to express opinion  
 - Hitler's hateful beliefs  
 - penalize not answer  
 - accept everybody's differences

523 Samik → monetary cost = learn lesson → deterrent  
 - hate speech isn't allowed in all case (fire, bomb eg)  
 - cyberbullying eg. irrelevant

421 Arushi [ded. contrary to motion itself] xxx  
 4000204 - don't tell how penalizing will help change  
 → homophobic isn't profile of US globally  
 - can implement due to logistics

Room: Chicago 102  
 Start: 3:30 PM  
 ParN 12  
 Round: N4

TH, as a Western liberal democracy, would penalize states that discriminate against LGBTQ.



Sadoff, Elliot  
 FriSem Friends Seminary

VASSAR COLLEGE INVITATIONAL

AFF NEG (Circle Side)

Speakers 1st 2nd

AFF NEG (Circle Side)

Speakers 1st 2nd

Spkr	Hopkin Lowenstine & Cotaj	POINTS (22-30)
2	Giacomo Lowenstine	25.5
1	Matthew Cotaj	26

Spkr	NewHav Pugh & Ardhi	POINTS (22-30)
2	Julius Pugh	23.5
1	Syed Ardhi	24.5

Winner: Hopkin LC School/Team debating on the OPP Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Gov defined USFG and states=foreign countries
- But, both sides moved off to US states
- Gov theoretically, as USFG, doesn't need to protect non-US citizens so argument flawed
- Gov both used their phones for unrelated purposes
- Gov or opp didn't define 'penalization'

**Point Scale:**

<23	..... see Tab
23-24	..... below average
25-26	..... average
27-28	..... superior
>28	..... justify on ballot

**Speech Times:**

PMC	..... 7 min
LOC	..... 8 min
MGC	..... 8 min
MOC	..... 8 min
LOR	..... 4 min
PMR	..... 5 min

Room: Chicago 134  
 Start: 3:30 PM  
 ParN 6  
 Round: N4



**Plehn, Gingin**  
 HorMan Horace Mann Parliamentary Debate

**VASSAR COLLEGE INVITATIONAL**

**AFF** **NEG** (Circle Side)

Speakers **1st** **2nd**

Spkr	FriSem Owett & Friedman	POINTS (22 - 30)
1	Lola Owett	27
2	Samara Friedman	27.5

**AFF** **NEG** (Circle Side)

Speakers **1st** **2nd**

Spkr	Hopkin Cotaj & Samuel	POINTS (22 - 30)
2	Laila Samuel	25
1	Andrew Cotaj	25

Winner: Fri Sem debating on the Aff Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Comments & Reason for Decision: very excellent speakers & performers

Samara had great clarity & organization of points  
Lola ~~was~~ was incredibly persuasive & assertive in her points & rebuttals

**Point Scale:**

<23	..... see Tab
23-24	..... below average
25-26	..... average
27-28	..... superior
>28	..... justify on ballot

**Speech Times:**

PMC	..... 7 min
LOC	..... 8 min
MGC	..... 8 min
MOC	..... 8 min
LOR	..... 4 min
PMR	..... 5 min

4000207

Room: Chicago 123  
 Start: 3:30 PM  
 ParN 4  
 Round: N4



**Chen, Mary**  
 NewHav New Haven Urban Debate League

**VASSAR COLLEGE INVITATIONAL**

AFF **NEG** (Circle Side) Speakers 1st 2nd

Spkr	Wilton Gao & Shim	POINTS (22-30)
1	Phillip Shim	24.5
2	Connie Gao	24

**AFF** NEG (Circle Side) Speakers 1st 2nd

Spkr	FaiWhe Gnoto & Rivera	POINTS (22-30)
1	Stephanie Rivera	24.5
2	Clementine Gnoto	25

Winner: FaiWhe School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Better, more fluid speaking style, with stronger rebuttals presented and more cogent argumentation; speaking style also more well developed and engaging.

**Point Scale:**

<23	..... see Tab
23-24	..... below average
25-26	..... average
27-28	..... superior
>28	..... justify on ballot

**Speech Times:**

PMC	..... 7 min
LOC	..... 8 min
MGC	..... 8 min
MOC	..... 8 min
LOR	..... 4 min
PMR	..... 5 min

4000205

Room: Chicago 106  
 Start: 3:30 PM  
 ParN 10  
 Round: N4



**Grillo, Maria**  
 NewHav New Haven Urban Debate League

**VASSAR COLLEGE INVITATIONAL**

AFF **NEG** (Circle Side)

Speakers **1st** 2nd

**AFF** NEG (Circle Side)

Speakers 1st **2nd**

Spkr	FriSem Lyne & Belcove	POINTS (22-30)
1	Nina Belcove	26.5
2	Theodore Lyne	26

Spkr	LooCha Mai & Pan	POINTS (22-30)
23	Tina Mai	25
24	Jenny Pan	25

Winner: Friends Sem. debating on the Neg Low point win? no  
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

THS the complete with drawal of US troops from the me.  
 Comments & Reason for Decision:

The govt faislly thought conflict in the middle east was over and failed to prove why we should leave regardless. The opp aptly pointed out ongoing conflict in the m.e. The opp also explained how conflict across the world is bad for us' security + economy. The govt was also arguing the entire conflict was due to ~~the~~ US intervention, which did not make much sense.

**Point Scale:**

<23	..... see Tab
23-24	..... below average
25-26	..... average
27-28	..... superior
>28	..... justify on ballot

**Speech Times:**

PMC	..... 7 min
LOC	..... 8 min
MGC	..... 8 min
MOC	..... 8 min
LOR	..... 4 min
PMR	..... 5 min

\* oral feedback given

govt

TH- US complete

\* very wordy contentions  
\* not a depth

- 1) complete waste of \$, time, resources  
→ nuclear war + ISIS have been solved
- 2) troops make US colonial + bad public img  
→ have been asked to withdraw
- 3)

\* super bad take  
m6

1) \* "caused instability in ISIS"  
democracy?

"all of this \$, time" very vague

opp Nina "childish" kinda ruce?

good framework, weighing on global human safety

- 1) we escalated / started conflict → messed up to leave →
- 2) lives lost in vain if we leave → complete chaos
- 3) decrease US safety + harm diplomatic rel's

conflict won't resolve peacefully  
you can go more extreme

- public scrutiny
- morally wrong
- hurt us

} kind of repetitive + confusing subcontentions

\* for allies

rebuttal

- 1) problems aren't resolved
- 2) drawing out causes a worse public img.

Jenny - start w/ rebuttals

Theodore - be more formal "they say"  
\* internal conflict? "in vain" w/ govt #1  
\* good - not wasted of \$

rebuttals

crystallize  
be memorable  
IMPACT

Tina

"look at everything the US has done"  
→ bad bad internal conflict

"syria was successful force everywhere" → false