

# THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

**PRO** **CON** (Circle One) PRO

2-0

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Millburn BV	POINTS (0 - 30)
<u>2</u>	Dylan Boyd	<u>29</u>
<u>1</u>	Zachary Vinik	<u>28</u>

Spkr	Stuyvesant WW	POINTS (0 - 30)
<u>2</u>	Andrew Wallace	<u>27</u>
<u>1</u>	Eamon Woods	<u>28</u>

Winner: MILLBURN BV debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? no

Signature: [Signature] School: BRHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

## Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex
Summary: 2mins Speaker 2	(all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final
Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team):	2mins
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.	

## Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex
Summary: 2mins Speaker 2	(all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final
Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team):	2mins

Boyd - good speaking skills overall, excellent energy solid during cross fire. speeches were very thorough.

Wallace - speaking skills were solid, at times they lacked fluidity, could have been more assertive during cross fire.

Woods - solid as a speaker - opening speech was very unique. Contributions were interesting performed well during cross fire.

Vinik - good speaking skills, could be more conversational in tone. very good in cross fire. speeches were well done, clear make

PRO wins BC... debate was very close up until grand cross fire. PRO won on argument about "rule of law" CON could not relate that crime decreases. CON case was more speculative, even though many points were solid and made sense. Very hard to quantify. PRO made a very good case to show the primary right was to protect US citizens debate on Dream Act was even. PRO won on economic debate.

- con - you misunderstand their economic argument,  
just read the card
- ~~reference~~ references to batman vs. "195  
just a metaphor" argument is contradictory
  - Impact analysis of both teams frameworks,  
how they function in this round/other round
  - ~~exp~~ explain why your flw is a prereq  
to both their flw and the rez
  - need more core clash OR none at all,  
don't need these econ args if you're going to  
go for this ~~Williams~~ argument
  - pro - this "sacrifice" argument that (L) to  
the case is hellu abusive, need to  
attack the (L), flw and alt of the K
  - even if you don't want to argue theory,  
need to present def/off on K
  - discuss the wording of the rez,  
and ~~present a framework~~ clash more on flw
  - ~~why econ~~ explain your framework,  
why theirs is abusive, and the impact  
of education
  - give a quick overview of your  
inputs, maybe ~30s, then like 1:15-1:30 on  
framework



Room: 612  
Flight 2 Start: 3:00 PM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

1

*Morag, Ryan*  
**Shahid, Omais**

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Summit HM	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Doug Huneke	25
4	David Meyers	27

Spkr	Pingry SK	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Peter Shim	27
3	Amol Kapoor	29

Winner: Pingry SK debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No

Signature: *Amol Kapoor* School: Mattam

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro - good job destroying methodology of studies and misleading comparison of legalization and citizenship and why citizenship is more beneficial. Nice extension throughout the debate.

Con - lost me on SS didn't prove it would clearly fail only based on assumptions. Human rights violations are also different from violent crimes. Make clear difference.

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins

# THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

**PRO** **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Maspeth GR	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
3rd	Andy Gonzalez	26.
1st	Javier Ruiz	28

Spkr	Union Catholic AB	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
4th	Michael Abreu	28
2nd	Kyle Borowski	20

Winner: Union Catholic AB debating on the Con. Low point win? no  
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: *Ryan Monagle* School: Maspeth

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Pro never showed why legalization is pathway specific. Stop spending so much time bias studies didn't help.*

*Con- good job repeating legalization and showing citizenship as end result is bad.*

## Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	Summary: 2mins Speaker 2
Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4):	3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.	

## Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	Summary: 2mins Speaker 2
Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4):	3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins



## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	BrRar RN	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Adarsh Rangan	28
4	Asraar Naseer	27

Spkr	Hackley VC	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Basia Van Buren	20
3	Kelly Castro-Blanco	28

Winner: BrRar RN debating on the Con Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature [Signature] School: SPHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro failed to disprove the negative impacts of a path to citizenship (Example: Still our argument, (families will come too over crowded)  
Discrim & Drug/sex crimes

Pro failed to prove why <sup>the</sup> path works and was non responsive to most specific arguments made against the path (example: Con's terrorism claims)

towards the end of the round the negative effects of the path outweigh the benefits.

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	Summary: 2mins Speaker 2
Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4):	3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.	

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	Summary: 2mins Speaker 2
Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4):	3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins

# THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Stuyvesant KU	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Ben Kessler	29
4	Jakob Urda	29

Spkr	Regis CC	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Joseph Caparelli	28
3	Ryan Carragher	28

Winner: Stuyvesant KU debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: SPHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

At the point where the pro didn't effectively answer/refute the con's feasibility standard I have to look to it. Though pro claims we must only look to the "path to citizenship" portion of the bill, this does nothing to prove that the bill will pass for the "path to citizenship" to even possible be implemented in the future.

All abuse arguments & reasons to reject the standard were only made in the final focus so they couldn't be considered.

Even if I didn't look to this standard Con is winning on economic impacts & ~~the terrorism impact~~ the terrorism impact as well

## Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	Summary: 2mins Speaker 2
Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4):	3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.	

## Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	Summary: 2mins Speaker 2
Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4):	3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins





Room: 528  
Flight 1 Start: 3:00 PM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

1

Brown, MaryJane

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

☒ PRO ☐ CON (Circle One)

Spkr	Maspeth NP	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
2	Horia Negru ✓	28
4	Jordy Portugal ✓	28

(Circle One) ☐ PRO ☒ CON

Spkr	Stuyvesant CP	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
1	Daniel Charnis ✓	28
3	Daniel Poleshchuk ✓	29

Winner: Stuyvesant debating on the CON Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Mary Jane Brown School: Regis

Comments & Reason for Decision:

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins



Room: 528  
Flight 2 Start: 3:00 PM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

1

Brown, MaryJane

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

Spkr	Millburn LL	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
3	Marc Lincer	28
1	Maxwell Lincer	28

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Nightingale Bam CJ	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
2	Arlene Casey	28
4	Anna JAcobson	27

Winner: Millburn LL School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No.

Signature: Mary Jane Brown School: Regis

Comments & Reason for Decision:

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins

Room: 531  
Flight 2 Start: 3:00 PM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

1

Morse, David

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO ☒ CON (Circle One)

Spkr	Montville AS	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Vikas Akkaraju	28
4	Daniel Shafir	28

(Circle One) PRO ☒ CON

Spkr	Millburn VK	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Natasha Verma	28.5
3	Anne Kramer	28

Winner: Millburn VK debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? N

Signature: David Morse School: Bronx Sci

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I don't buy the implementation argument, but even if I do, I see no offense. I see no offense on con side at all. Don't show me why there is a harm to going pro, so if pro shows me one offense I vote pro. The healthcare is unrelated so I vote Pro.

Oral

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins



Room: 706  
Flight 1 Start: 3:00 PM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

1

Ricklin, Zach

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	Newark Science IE	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Adobi Ikeniefor	26.5
3	Zarina Etheridge	26

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Regis Ca	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Andrew Bigelow	27
2	Jordan Campbell	27.5

Winner: Logis debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: Bxsci

Comments & Reason for Decision:

FW - debate a mess actual compare say  
why one is better or worse


Con wins on econ only fully  
extended (!)

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins



10 years

less skill no taxes

not fast



# THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Nightingale Bam BS	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Alyssa Bueno	27
1	AnnaMaria Stebbins	27.5

Spkr	KAPPA Internati Bm	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Rousseau Beauvais	26
3	Anselmo Morales	25

Winner: Nightingale debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature: [Signature] School: Bxsc

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro  
Need ~~better~~ framework just say Human Rights most important then only have human rgh contentions.

## Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

## Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins

{FD} must default to Con FW. so I evaluate  
econ first Con note the econ contention.  
Con environment contention not well integrated into  
of fw

Room: 532  
Flight 1 Start: 3:00 PM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

1

Michael Blenner  
Handler, Alon

# THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

☒ PRO ☐ CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) ☐ PRO ☒ CON

Spkr	Millburn SP	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Griffin Schwab	27.5
1	Sarah Park	28

Spkr	Regis HP	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Tim Hannan	28.5
1	Alex Petrillo	27.5

Winner: Regis HP ~~Millburn SP~~ debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: mm mr School: Bronx Science

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Sarah - better transitions, clarify the later parts of your speech, know your cv during cx

Alex - your cross-x demeanor is very abrasive, don't laugh at the opponent

Tim - speak up, besides that good coverage and excellent consistency of tone

Griffin - don't need to repeat arguments, explain your exten stops and how they operate offensively / defensively

Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex:	3mins Speaker 1
Summary:	2mins Speaker 2
Summary:	2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4):
3mins Speaker 3 Final	Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final
Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team):	2mins

Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex:	3mins Speaker 1
Summary:	2mins Speaker 2
Summary:	2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4):
3mins Speaker 3 Final	Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final
Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team):	2mins

1.05 / .30  
SS



Con - expand on the wages argument  
you have the better i/c to  
wage fluctuation

- morality argument needs a clearly  
defined impact, ~~that~~ illegal immigrants  
by definition are breaking the law,  
explain why that is ~~uniquely~~ bad in  
the context of the bill

- influx argument is really strong you need  
a card saying that immigrants are going  
to enter the US illegally because of  
immigration reform

Pro - morality argument is weak, non-unlike,  
and the identity theft / children arguments  
are systemic

- immigrants will immediately be  
available to use ~~these~~ govt  
services

Room: 531  
Flight 1 Start: 3:00 PM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

1

Morse, David

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Chapin NZ	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Rebecca Ngu	28 <del>27.5</del>
1	Alice Zheng	27.5 <del>28</del>

Spkr	Millburn GB	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Daniel Gold	29
2	Cole Bond	29

Winner: Millburn GB debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature] School: Bronx Science

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro Summary

Please Signpost! I didn't know where to flow

First since it's currently living in the US, future  
illegals shouldn't matter. Basically I buy the drain  
on social services so I vote Neg.

Oral

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins





Room: 530  
Flight 2 Start: 5:00 PM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

2

Gupta, Arjun

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

☒ PRO ☐ CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) ☐ PRO ☒ CON

Spkr	Stuyvesant EL	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Jonathan Evans	29
3	Zachary Lemonides	29

Spkr	Regis LM	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Jonah Langan-Mamur	28
4	Roy Menguito	27

Winner: Stuyvesant EL debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team

Signature: Arjun Gupta School: Millburn

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I voted PRO. On Econ, PRO's cards were better. CON had trouble defending Heritage card and PRO did a good job attacking it. At the point where both sides agree illegal immigration is good and will increase, PRO wins. CON tried to show how it leads into deficit but CON's case clearly showed otherwise. Also, PRO won crime.

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins



Room: 706  
Flight 2 Start: 5:00 PM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

2

Arungah, Alixandri

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	Newark Science Me	POINTS (0 - 30)
3rd	Daniel Martinho	28.5
1st	Katherine Mendoza A	28.5

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Maspeth GR	POINTS (0 - 30)
4th	Andy Gonzalez	28
2nd	Javier Ruiz	28

Winner: Newark Science Me debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Alixandri School: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CON  
① NO IMPACT TO ROL OF NATIONAL SECUR

PR  
② EXPLAIN WHY YOU SAW SCREEN

③ ADDRESSING AM CITIZEN

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

CON  
1.5

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins

PRO  
1:55  
:50

Room: 530  
Flight 1 Start: 5:00 PM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

2

Gupta, Arjun

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Montville AS	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Vikas Akkaraju	29
2	Daniel Shafir	28

Spkr	Stuyvesant CP	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Daniel Charnis	29
3	Daniel Poleshchuk	28

Winner: Montville AS debating on the PRO Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Arjun Gupta School: Millburn

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Shafir - be careful not to say you have evidence  
because you don't

Akkaraju - strong rebuttal

Charnis - strong case and good CF

Poleshchuk - rebuttal was good but speaking style was unclear.

Speed isn't the problem,  
just general clarity  
- let the other person speak  
in crossfire

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex
Summary: 2mins Speaker 2	(all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.	

I voted PRO for a few reasons. ECON was by far the best debated issue. PRO won that by adequately attacking the Heritage card with the GDP increases and more. CON even said that ~~base~~ <sup>base</sup> Heritage considered immigrants paying the same taxes which with increased wages is unfair.

Thus, PRO's evidence better stood. Crime went to CON with the idea that immigrants don't commit crimes out of fear. Terrorists went

PRO although not as weighty but CON never addressed it.

Framework, I went PRO because it is more open to debate.

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	Summary: 2mins Speaker 2
Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex	(all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins



Room: 706  
Flight 1 Start: 5:00 PM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

2

Arungah, Alixandri

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

Spkr	Montville LS	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Reza Lofti	28
4	William Sun	28.5

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Bronx Science SF	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Demetrios Stratis	27.5
1	Steven Falco	27

Winner: Montville - LS debating on the CON Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: HKSD

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Spkr 1  
- louder  
- ask abt their wage & anal job & in context of Ptc.  
Spkr - Dont ask questions about the case "If it will do this, why should we do the case?"  
- immigration reform is a bit of many parts, & being debated now.  
Spkr 1 - & say & happenig now - thats & a good impact analysis

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	Summary: 2mins Speaker 2
Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4):	3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.	

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	Summary: 2mins Speaker 2
Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4):	3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins

P  
1:09

C  
1:24

**Arungah, Alixandri**

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

(Circle One)      **PRO**      **CON**

Spkr	Bronx Science GQ	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Cassidy Gordon	27.5
2	Norman Qian	28

Winner: Drunk Science School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? ☒

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ School: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments &amp; Reason for Decision:

- #NOT REAL FACTS!
- #Extend your drug traffick stuff.
- #OFF TIME ROAD MAP/DONT TELL ME THEIR AGE

**Point Scale:**

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary : 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

$\frac{P}{1.15}$   
1.07

**Speech Times:**

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	
Summary:	2mins Speaker 2
Summary:	2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4)
Focus:	3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus:	2mins Speaker 4 Final
Focus:	2mins Prep Time (each team):
	2mins

$$\begin{array}{r} C \\ 1.15 \\ \underline{1.65} \\ 0.50 \end{array}$$



Room: 612  
Flight 2 Start: 8:50 PM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

3

Boyd, Kamera  
Tirado, Ivellisse

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

☒ PRO ☒ CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) ☒ PRO ☒ CON

Spkr	Bronx Science SF	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
4	Demetrios Stratis	27
2	Steven Falco	27

Spkr	Maspeth GR	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
3	Andy Gonzalez	27
1	Javier Ruiz	29

Winner: Maspeth GR debating on the CON Low point win? 27  
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Kamera Boyd School: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision: \_\_\_\_\_

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins

Room: 612  
Flight 1 Start: 8:00 PM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

3

Kracy  
Tirado, Ivelisse

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

**PRO** **CON** (Circle One)

Spkr	Maspeth NP	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
1	Horia Negru	28
3	Jordy Portugal	26

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Millburn JL	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
2	Austin Jia	27
4	Bryant Le	27

Winner: Millburn debating on the Con Low point win? 27  
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Kamora Byrd School: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Worked together as a team. Used more dominant ~~big~~ language such as refuting, contradiction, pointed out what their opponents did wrong. Incorporated opponents points in argument here.

Both teams too focused on statistics and the accuracy of them. Focus on debating points and slow down!

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	
Summary :	2mins Speaker 2
Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex	
(all 4):	3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final	
Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team):	2mins
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.	

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	
Summary :	2mins Speaker 2
Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex	
(all 4):	3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final	
Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team):	2mins





Room: 707  
Flight 1 Start: 8:00 PM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

3

Arungah, Alixandri

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	Hackley VC	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
1	Basia Van Buren	27.5
2	Kelly Castro-Blanco	27

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Regis CC	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
1	Joseph Caparelli	28
2	Ryan Carragher	28.5

Winner: Regis CC debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- talk louder
- idget less
- face the judge
- ARE YOU TRYING TO MAKE AFRAINING QUESTION WITH YOUR QS
- ABOUT "WHAT WE WIN"
- humped to a immigrant xenophobia
- BE LESS REPETITIVE
- say that they want continuity as in vels be u they cant
- RELY OFF-TIME READMARKS

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	Summary: 2mins Speaker 2
Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4):	3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.	

P  
1:45  
1:20

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	Summary: 2mins Speaker 2
Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4):	3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins

C  
1:37  
1:02



Room: 511  
Start: 8:00 AM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

4

Trivedi, Piyush

# THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Bronx Science BX	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Julia Bittencourt	29
2	Yang Xue	28

1:12

Spkr	Regis LM	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Jonah Langan-Mamur	28
1	Roy Menguito	27

20

405

Winner: BX (BRONX) debating on the CON Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

School/Team

Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Piyush Trivedi School: BRNS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

upset economy, cost vs. tax, criminal history, public benefits, border security, drugs, legals vs. citizenship,

earning potential, GDP, tax deficit reduction, family

citizens → legal, quality study, political capital, GDP increase, smuggling,

legalization vs citizenship, repay tax, education level, cannot achieve citizenship, farm jobs lost, deportation → return, legal immigrants, misdemeanor crimes waived, more workers argument,

question a sources,

Crime, background check, terrorism check, smuggling, drug potency, take more benefit than contribute, parents cannot be deported, deportees return back,

question on heritage source, moral argument,

increase border sec → kill people,

source discussed,

lives argument, background check, education level, cost high to citizenship

Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): ~~4mins~~  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): ~~4mins~~  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): ~~4mins~~ Speaker 4 (Team 2): ~~4mins~~  
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: ~~2mins~~ Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins

THEORY OF THE EARTH

CHAPTER I. OF THE ORIGIN OF THE EARTH.

SECTION I. OF THE ORIGIN OF THE EARTH.

SECTION II. OF THE ORIGIN OF THE EARTH.

SECTION III. OF THE ORIGIN OF THE EARTH.

SECTION IV. OF THE ORIGIN OF THE EARTH.

SECTION V. OF THE ORIGIN OF THE EARTH.

SECTION VI. OF THE ORIGIN OF THE EARTH.

SECTION VII. OF THE ORIGIN OF THE EARTH.

SECTION VIII. OF THE ORIGIN OF THE EARTH.

SECTION IX. OF THE ORIGIN OF THE EARTH.

SECTION X. OF THE ORIGIN OF THE EARTH.

SECTION XI. OF THE ORIGIN OF THE EARTH.

SECTION XII. OF THE ORIGIN OF THE EARTH.



Room: 710  
Start: 8:00 AM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

4

*Pillinger, Judy*  
~~Eglow, Mr. or Mrs.~~

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

Spkr	Bronx Science SF	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
	Demetrios Stratis 2	28
	Steven Falco 1	27.5

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Stuyvesant RL	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
	Ben Rothman 1	28.5
	Jeanne Locker 2	27

Winner: CON debating on the CON Low point win? CON

Signature: [Signature] School: Hunter

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: *Economy*  
*long term impact*  
*argument won over*

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins

Room: 515  
Start: 8:00 AM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

4

Hagan, Tom

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	Bronx Science RA	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
	Michael Raevsky	29
	Elena Anderson	29

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	BrRar RN	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
	Adarsh Rangan	28
	Asraar Naseer	27

Winner: Bronx Science debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? no

Signature: Tom Hagan School: Regis

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Bronx Science better prepared + for establish that BrRar had to show unique benefit to citizenship. BrRar was not able to establish this point. BrRar did not rebutt Bronx Science point ~~seem~~ ~~also~~ on burden of priority illegal immigrant or legal immigrant. Bronx Science establish evidence from Heritage Foundation and ~~the~~ response to BrRar counter rebuttal with Kato base on the date of publication Herity, 2013 vs Kato 2007.

Both team style was very good and are very promising debaters.

Overall Bronx Science established their case more thoroughly had better evidence. The who were able to rebutt all BrRar points where BrRar was not able to rebutt Bronx Science on all of his points.

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins



Room: 406  
Start: 8:00 AM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

4

Huneke, Myung

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

**PRO** **CON** (Circle One)

Spkr	Regis RW	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Joseph Ryan	28
3	Alex Watkins-Goodman	29

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Newark Science Me	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Daniel Martinho	26
2	Katherine Mendoza A	26

Winner: Regis RW debating on the Pro Low point win? no  
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Myung Kang Huneke School: Sum

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro side won the argument on the second speech. It was a good rebuttal that was organized and logical and went immediately to the heart of the clash. Amnesty proposal by Con was a counterplan. And even if it was not, ~~Con~~ side made a number of assumptions that were not based in evidence. Pro did an excellent job of turning the "abuse" argument and the unfairness of the amnesty argument, and the fraud possibilities. Pro side controlled the terms of this debate.

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	Summary: 2mins Speaker 2
Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4):	3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.	

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins ✓
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins ✓
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	Summary: 2mins Speaker 2
Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4):	3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins





Room: 510  
Start: 8:00 AM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

4

Hossain, Saeeda

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	Nightingale Bam BS	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Alyssa Bueno	27
1	AnnaMaria Stebbins	26

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Regis CC	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Joseph Caparelli	28
2	Ryan Carragher	29

Winner: Regis CC School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: S. Hossain School: Freehold School

Comments & Reason for Decision: They have strong arguments.

Joseph well prepared - confident - nice quality of voice. well sustained energy. Try to have good eye contact.

Anna Maria - well prepare - nice voice - Try to have good eye contact You have strong arguments.

Ryan well prepared - confident - nice quality of voice. Good eye contact. Articulated. Strong ideas.

Alyssa Well prepared. Soft voice. articulated - good eye contact. confident.

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	Summary: 2mins Speaker 2
Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4):	3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.	

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	Summary: 2mins Speaker 2
Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4):	3mins Speaker 3 Final
Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins





Room: 509  
Start: 8:00 AM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

4

Arif, Mahmud

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

**PRO** **CON** (Circle One)

Spkr	Bronx Science AL	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Arsalaan Ansari	28
3	Kevin Lam	28

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Maspeth GR	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Andy Gonzalez	29
2	Javier Ruiz	30

Winner: Maspeth debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: Freehold HS.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Arsalaan

could have been a lot clearer on some points. Economic benefits argument was well made. Moral argument was a little more difficult.

Andy  
Well presented and debated. Answered all challenges very well. Aggressive. It was not overly so. Answered moral argument well. Command of the topic was excellent.

Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 4 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	Summary: 2mins
Speaker 2	Summary: 2mins
Grand Cross-ex (all 4):	3mins
Speaker 3 Final	Focus: 2mins
Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins
Prep Time (each team):	2mins

Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

Kevin

Try to speak a little louder. Picked it up later in the round. Answered questions and challenges well.

Javier

well taken on all issues, command of the topic was good

Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 4 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	Summary: 2mins
Speaker 2	Summary: 2mins
Grand Cross-ex (all 4):	3mins
Speaker 3 Final	Focus: 2mins
Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins
Prep Time (each team):	2mins

In Maspeth team in my opinion had the better argument and won the debate.





Room: 630  
Start: 8:00 AM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

4

Arungah, Alixandri

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

**PRO** **CON** (Circle One)

Spkr	BrRar FK	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
1	Nicholas Fedorochko	28
2	Jeremy Kritz	27.5

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Millburn BV	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
2	Dylan Boyd	28
1	Zachary Vinik	28.5

Winner: MILBURN BV debating on the CON Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: AlexCh School: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

P  
1:02

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins

C  
1:40  
1:29





Room: 516  
Start: 8:00 AM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

4

Tosato, Megan

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Regis DK	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
4	Colin Donnelly	26
2	Liam Kelly	25

Spkr	BrRar AT	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
3	Max Albert	26
1	Tanay Trivedi	24

Winner: Regis DK debating on the con Low point win? NO  
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Megan Tosato School: Hired

Comments & Reason for Decision:

con  
126  
-6  
114  
-76  
38  
-38  
0

pro  
120  
-14  
107  
-88  
19  
-19  
0

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins

Room: 539  
Start: 8:00 AM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

4

Carragher, Owen

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

**PRO** **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Newark Science IE	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
①	Adobi Ikeniefor	27
③	Zarina Etheridge	27

Spkr	Summit WB	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
②	Caroline Wohl	27.5
④	Jeff Berkowitz	27.5

Winner: Summit debating on the Con Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: Regis.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Too much interrupting of the other side by both sides in  
Crossfire.

Both sides failed to seize opportunities that the other side  
gave them, particularly on the communitarianism  
+ authoritarianism argument and the difference between  
anarchy + pathway to citizenship..

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins



Room: 527  
Start: 8:00 AM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

4

Cuppari, Rosa

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	Stuyvesant KU	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
1	Ben Kessler	
2	Jakob Urda	

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Millburn LL	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
	Marc Lincer	
	Maxwell Lincer	

Winner: Stuyvesant KU debating on the \_\_\_\_\_ Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Rosa Cuppari School: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Forfeit

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins

Room: 624  
Start: 8:00 AM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

4

McCormick, Jinping

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Millburn VK	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Natasha Verma	28
3	Anne Kramer	28.5

Spkr	Regis HP	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Tim Hannan	28.5
2	Alex Petrillo	29

Winner: Regis HP School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature] School: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Con team successfully debated and supported their contentions; also addressed the Pro teams 3 contentions with strong logic and evidence.
- Pro team needs to show greater & more convincing evidence on economic benefit, lower healthcare cost. Didn't address the "unjust & fairness" contention of Con team with convincing argument.
- Good job everyone!

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	
Summary:	2mins Speaker 2
Summary:	2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4):
3mins Speaker 3 Final	
Focus:	2mins Speaker 4 Final
Focus:	2mins Prep Time (each team):
	2mins
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.	

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1):	4mins
Speaker 2 (Team 2):	4mins
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1):	4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2):
4mins Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1	
Summary:	2mins Speaker 2
Summary:	2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4):
3mins Speaker 3 Final	
Focus:	2mins Speaker 4 Final
Focus:	2mins Prep Time (each team):
	2mins



Room: 209  
Start: 8:00 AM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

4

Casais, Andrew

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO ☒ CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) ☒ PRO CON

Spkr	Millburn Wo	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	David Yaffe	26.5
1	Arik Wolk	27.5

Spkr	Bronx Science BG	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Alec Bardey	28
2	Eli Guenzburger	29

Winner: Bronx Science BG debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature] School: Hired

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Can argued <sup>increased</sup> polarization won't advance issue of path to citizenship / <sup>will</sup> make polarization safe (Con's argument)  
- however, Pro proved that path to legalization will create at least as much polarization & gridlock
- Con's response to morality <sup>in</sup> argument is that undocumented are criminals  
- but criminals should be legal residents & then you have all these people who should <sup>(criminals)</sup> sometime be citizens?
- Con throughout argued that these undocumented ppl should have path to legalization which they can be a citizen (citizenship)

↳ Path to legalization is path to citizenship w/  
extra step → flows Pro.

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins

Room: 708  
Start: 8:00 AM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

4

Hannan, Steve

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	Nightingale Bam AY	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
	Annie Abruzzo 2 <sup>nd</sup>	27
	Megan Yang 1 <sup>st</sup>	29

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Millburn SP	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
	Griffin Schwab 2 <sup>nd</sup>	28
	Sarah Park	28

Winner: Millburn debating on the Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? W

Signature: [Signature] School: REGES

Comments & Reason for Decision:

VERY CLOSE. Fought for con on:

- STAGNANT OF CROSS REPLY
- Argument on RECAUTIONS, WHO SHOULD
- NO LINKAGE OF GROWTH FOR COMPARISON
- INCOME TAX

GOOD JOB BOTH SIDES

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins



1/2

0

on  
1st

25  
25

25  
25

will be

for

for

Next class

at  
- present or  
no change  
of  
at least for  
computer

Good job with

6.

0.00

0.00

Room: 614  
Start: 8:00 AM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

4

Tirado, Ivelisse

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Millburn ZP	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
4	Denis Zou	28.5
2	Ishan Pandey	29

Spkr	Bronx Science GQ	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
2	Cassidy Gordon	27.5
1	Norman Qian	27.5

Winner: Millburn ZP debating on the con Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: SPHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1. Legalization ~~is~~ <sup>solves</sup> & goes unrefuted
2. Pro couldn't gain any benefits from the agriculture claim because if given the opportunity to educate themselves formally immigrants will flock away from the farm life in hopes of improving their quality of life
3. Pro Failed to answer "sex offenders" impact

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins



(1)

(2)

3.06  
2.85

6  
1

220  
260

4  
2

100

100

100

100

1. Let us suppose that the  
population is a mixture of two

types, one of which is

more numerous than the other.

Let us suppose that the

population is a mixture of two

types, one of which is

more numerous than the other.

Room: 531  
Start: 8:00 AM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

4

Schwab  
Scwhab, Michael

## THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	Bronx Science ZS	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
<u>2</u>	Joshua Zakharov	<u>29</u>
<u>1</u>	Joe Salmaggi	<u>27.5</u>

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Nightingale Bam DK	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
<u>1</u>	India Dasbach	<u>28.5</u>
<u>2</u>	Sophia Kiam	<u>28</u>

Winner: Nightingale debating on the Con Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ School: millburn

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both teams did an outstanding job advocating for their positions and this was a very hard decision. ~~My~~ My vote went to Nightingale on the basis that they set a framework for the round and stayed within the framework. They also kept pushing to make sure Bronx Science stayed within the framework. I also thought they had the slight edge on the evidence <sup>used to support the arguments related</sup> to the moral, economic and cultural ramifications of immigration and a path to citizenship.

### Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

### Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins



18

18

Handwritten text, mostly illegible due to fading and bleed-through. The text appears to be organized into several paragraphs or sections, with some lines starting with capital letters. The ink is very light and the paper shows signs of age and wear.

Bridgewater RK  
NEG

Hunter College SA  
AFF  
Meeting Room 1

AL

no single ESS  
truth seeking  
ACP communications

VJ  
VC: culpability  
1. Criminals incarcerated  
→ safety of citizens  
2. Leads to justice, broken rules  
3. govt protect citizens  
→ broken contract  
4. culpability way to promote fair punishment

adversarial system precludes

justice pre-reg to govt legit  
2. culpability before contract

1. ACP supports all of it  
→

ACP only guilty path  
→ innocent

1. broken contract, social contract, TS ⊕

1+2 contention

C1: ACP benefits guilty  
→ no harm to justice  
→ convict/punish guilty

1. TS, truth doesn't come out at all, no method.  
→ no way of getting knowledge to court

1. If person innocent, then they're fine, if not, then they guilty

1. They can't possibly know that

C2: winning ACP protects wrongful convictions  
→ price of privilege  
→ ACP hides privilege  
→ upholding culpability

1. Some people don't know that they are guilty, if ACP

1. w/out ACP, info in the open and info not useful

1. TS doesn't bring out true evidence

C3: ACP gives attorneys special preference  
→ harder for representation  
→ 2 systems:  
1. wealthy  
2. poor

→ everyone gets public defenders, not everyone bad. Can declare for new trial  
→ new trial

1. No re-trial for just consulting.

Δ. More cases, still stereotyping  
→ grounds for re-trial. More experience → that's how more trials

NOVICE  
LD

BRIDGEWATER RK

HUNTER COLLEGE SA

CONFERENCE ROOM 1

29

29.5

I voted for Bridgewater on the negative  
1. LOW POINT WIN

Do you know Lena?  
Denny, H?  
Gina, Edie?




NC

V: govt legit

VC: social contract

Locke → state of nature

→ own best interests



C1: ACP just rulings

→ frank → fight theory/truth theory

→ relies on effective truth seeking

T: unjust, if attorney can't tell, then there are not just rulings

C2: TS induces suspects

→ self incrimination board for constitutionality

1. people can ask/not respond

2. look to consequences



Room: 516  
Flight 2

Round 3

Novice LD (B)  
Asimah Boateng.

Aff

Points

Neg

Points

Stuyvesant SL

27

Hunter AZ

29

Winner: Hunter AZ debating on Meg (unpoint? No)

Signature: Asimah Boateng

Neg outweighs Aff on the benefits/problems of ACP over truth seeking. Also, Neg better supports her own value C and value P. Aff uses upholding government legitimacy as her value P. However, tells Neg that the Constitution <sup>(5th Amend.)</sup> cannot be used in our legal system because the Constitution is always changing. She argues to maintain the legitimacy however she questions the validity of the constitution. Unable to prove how ACP promotes crime.



# Defines Criminal Justice System

Value P - Justice

Value C - upholding law / government legitimacy

C1 - ACP threatens safety of the innocent.

• ACP - burdens search for justice.

• Attorney acts as a bystander allowing the guilty to go.

• Terrorist in war time - We are in a state of war - ACP can lead to harm.

• 10,000 guilty are let go each year. - No link between this statistic and ACP.

• Government loses legitimacy.

C2 - Encourages guilty criminal behavior. - No link between how one act encourages repetition.

• ACP does not help the already innocent. - Without ACP, people may withhold embarrassing facts.

C3 - truth seeking should take priority over ACP. - Truth is objective. If truth seeking takes precedent, then ACP cannot be protected.

• ACP should have exceptions.

• Value P - Morality

• Value C - upholding the law.

C1 - 5th amendment says lawyers are the representative of the accused. - Constitution is always changing and should not be used. - laws are designed to respect rights. - Constitution is essential to criminal justice system.

• The lawyer cannot go against the accused.

• C2 - US CSS fails without ACP.

• Without ACP people withhold truth.

• People may break laws without lawyers.

• Misrepresentation. Government legitimacy must be upheld.

Extend.

Room: 223

Judge Name:

Kelly Krong

Event/Division: NLD

R3F2

Stuy YE wins.

Teams

Aff  
Stuy YE

Neg  
Timothy NT

Speaker points: 30

- add to your case, you still had time left
- you get a 30 for nuclear terrorism
- organize the framework, it was confusing to flow
- Q / AR went overtime
- word economy

Speaker points: 30

- NC/NR went overtime
- no new arg. in 2AR
- ~~both have~~ don't debate values if you have the same one
- time management
- don't make new args in 2AR

no one showed how to compare between

like it <sup>by saying</sup> ~~disorder~~ is winning on probability & the other is winning on magnitude  
\* after 5 seconds overtime, I stop how do I compare  
flowing. don't steal time

Judge Signature: Kelly Krong

\* If you made 2 new arguments or went overtime, I stopped flowing.

I vote for the AFF because it seems like she is winning the framework and the NEG made no link in.



Room: 532  
Flight 2 Start: 3:00 PM  
Open - Public Forum Debate

1

Michael Brennan  
Handler, Alon

# THE RIDGE DEBATES 2013

Dec 13 - 14, 2013

TOPIC :Immigration reform should include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants currently living in the United States. Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs. Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to a non-specialist citizen judge. Clash of ideas is essential to debate. Debaters should display logic and reasoning, advocate a position, use evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum. Neither the pro nor con should offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions. Crossfire should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referenced. No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments. Debaters must supply evidence on request to the judge or their opponents.

PRO ☒ CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) ☒ PRO CON

Spkr	Montville PS	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Sarthi Patel	27.5
1	Tolga Sozusen	27.5

Spkr	BrRar FK	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Nicholas Fedorochko	28.5
2	Jeremy Kritz	27.5

Winner: Bridgewater debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win?   

Signature: [Signature] School: Brnx Science

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Tolga - "responsibility" + "obligation" - dangerous words  
Nick - very polite in ex, good job! dont need this "time limits" rldr, need framework clash  
Sarthi - more impact analysis, ~~don't need to~~ expand on this "heroism" argument more  
Jeremy - spend more time on framework, quick impact analysis

## Point Scale:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins  
Please use half points. Tied points and low-point wins are acceptable.

## Speech Times:

Speaker 1 (Team 1): 4mins  
Speaker 2 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-Ex: 3mins Speaker 3 (Team 1): 4mins Speaker 4 (Team 2): 4mins  
Cross-ex: 3mins Speaker 1 Summary: 2mins Speaker 2 Summary: 2mins Grand Cross-ex (all 4): 3mins Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2mins Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2mins Prep Time (each team): 2mins

1.21 1.10  
.41 .30

- con - you misunderstand their economic argument,  
just read the card
- ~~reference~~ references to batman vs. "195  
just a metaphor" argument is contradictory
  - impact analysis of both teams frameworks,  
how they function in this round/other round
  - ~~exp~~ explain why your flw is a pre req  
to both their flw and the rez
  - need more case clash OR none at all,  
don't need these econ args if you're going to  
go for this ~~Williams~~ argument
  - pro - this "sacrifice" argument that (L) to  
the case is hellu abusive, need to  
attack the (L), flw and alt of the K
  - even if you don't want to argue theory,  
need to present def/off on K
  - discuss the wording of the rez,  
and ~~present a framework~~ clash more on flw
  - ~~why econ~~ explain your framework,  
why theirs is abusive, and the impact  
of education
  - give a quick overview of your  
inputs, maybe ~30s, then like 1:15-1:30 on  
framework