

Room: 723  
Flight 2 Start: 3:00 PM  
Novice - Public Forum

1

*Zimmerman*  
**O'Connell, Kathi**

## 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	Timothy Christian OP	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Tammy Ong	26
3	Rebecca Prill	27

Spkr	Bronx Science PM	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Miranda Powell	28
2	Abby Martucci	29

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

Signature: *Kathi O'Connell* School: Chapin School

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Bronx Science has some very strong  
debaters in Miranda and Abby. Both had  
good evidence

Tammy needs to have a little more confidence  
in what she is debating.

Rebecca be careful with using like  
a lot, and how you start F.F. but very  
good speaking otherwise also be careful  
w/ evidence

Bronx science has great debaters  
and had very great evidence  
and case

### Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best  
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -  
Good, should break 27 - Average,  
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average  
25 - Far below Average 24 & below  
- Offensive, rude  
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)

Spkr	Timothy Christian OP	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Tammy Ong	29.5
2	Rebecca Prill	30

Spkr	Montville BN	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Alex Benno	29.5
2	David Natanov	29

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

Signature: [Signature] School: RIDGE

Comments & Reason for Decision: You all made judging fun

## Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best  
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -  
Good, should break 27 - Average,  
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average  
25 - Far below Average 24 & below  
- Offensive, rude  
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



Pro

citizenship is a civil right  
- violation is different  
- like a voting person  
- is against the law

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Pro - this is the way to go

Room: 511  
Start: 8:00 PM  
Novice - Public Forum

3

Lu, Michelle

## 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	Bridgewater Raritan PR	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Connor Mangean	30
1	Devin Sun	29

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Stuyvesant YZ	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Elise Wang	28
2	Theodore Danzig	28

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

Signature: [Signature] School: Ridge HS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Connor: Great rebuttal! And very calm and polite in cross fire  
Good final focus

Devin: Good summary - try to focus on summarizing the round rather than a line by line rebuttal of your opponents rebuttal.

→ I like how you gave and listed clear reasons as to vote for your side and gave me a weighing mechanism (morality/ethics over economics)

Elise: Don't read statistics in cross fire, and don't make a statement and ask "do you agree" or "do you know that this means"

~~THE~~ HAVE YOUR CARDS/SOURCE READY GUYS!!

(even though I agree Supreme Court decisions like Obamacare are common knowledge have decent anyway!!)

Theodore: You need to be more polite in ex - let your opp speak and don't cut him off constantly

### Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best  
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 - Good, should break 27 - Average, shouldn't break 26 - Below Average  
25 - Far below Average 24 & below - Offensive, rude  
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

I ended up ~~voted~~ voting for the con because ~~that~~ you give me a solid weighing mechanism (morality over economics) and ~~though you I find your argument~~ and the fact that you also have economic harms.



Room: 509  
Start: 8:00 PM  
Novice - Public Forum

3

Montero Colbert, *ARIANNA*

# 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 MZ	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Eoin Matthews	29
3	Randall Zuccamaglio	29.5

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

Spkr	<del>Bronx Science KO</del> Chapin GD	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Eli Kaimowitz Barley G	28.5
4	<del>Avery Ostro</del> Azusa O	28.5

*try for the best for your team*

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

Signature: [Signature] School: Ridge

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Regis Grals

Chapin Grals

## Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best  
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -  
Good, should break 27 - Average,  
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average  
25 - Far below Average 24 & below  
- Offensive, rude  
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	Grand Cross-ex
(all 4):	3mins
Speaker 3 Final	Focus: 2mins
Speaker 4 Final	Focus: 2mins
Prep Time (each team):	2mins.

- \* I feel like you guys are thinking & saying very smart things, but (in this round) you're not really going the next step to play the game of debate as well as your opponents in a few ways:
  - Your question/answer style is much too straightforward about your shortcomings in the round evidence wise. If you're not sure about methodology, become sure before round!! or at least try & have a semblance of redirecting the questions away from what you don't know
  - LOVED Azusa's interaction w/ the internal warrants in the first rebuttal of pro case [trillion/billion analysis, per capita stuff & the idea that pro's 2nd contention was essentially artificially limiting the debate to certain terms of illegal imm, ETC]
  - Barley u rocked the answering of their questions in Grand Crossfire or whatever w/ the 4rd, but u both were wayyy unpersuasive in individual CX fire
  - Azusa nice exts in last speech not enough crystallization ultimately need big picture analysis of interactions to win

-35 ~~PRO~~ -30 -20

*PF prep is weird USE EXTRA TIME 2 ORGANIZE yourselves 4 speeches, SILENT!!!!*

- \* I really like your rebuttal strategy!!
- \* Both of you very good combo of friendly/aggressive during CX also... Gotsomekey concessions, imo.
- \* The rebuttals were UBER interactive for PF novices, I'm quite impressed 😊
- \* Try to respond to con's contention on individual contention here/args more directly, would make the ballot a lot easier to sign because it looks like you're not responding
- \* Eoin! I heard you were lying in your rebuttal on con's case "Less consistent", "longer term benefit" VAY impact weighing, very persuasive
- \* Both of you a rock perceptual things - so engaging I wanted to listen so hardcore to all ur words
- \* RANDALL pointing out that logical contradiction in the last speech - I totally agreed... Printed by iDebate Tabroom, Free Online Tournament Management. I felt like you guys were generally really even is
- \* WORK ON SIGNPOSTING PLEASE ... my flow was so messy... didn't impair decision

PRO = Oral

*even if they were losing other points on the flow case. Dream Act stuff particularly persuasive & general understanding of arg interactions in the round work*





Room: 730  
Flight 1 Start: 8:00 AM  
Novice - Public Forum

4

Wilson, Jack

## 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 BD	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Patrick Beyrer	28
2	Luke D'Cruz	28

Spkr	Stuyvesant GV	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Zachary Ginsberg	28.5
2	Lorenz Vargas	29

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

Signature: Jack Wilson School: RIDGE

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Vote off on C1

### Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best  
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -  
Good, should break 27 - Average,  
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average  
25 - Far below Average 24 & below  
- Offensive, rude  
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

I think citizens come (or) but this still a bulk from C1 & C2  
on for case plus ties to C1 on my

"they wish not to be  
citizens"  
↳ this argument is  
really dumb  
① they migrate for a  
reason  
Page 5 of 8 ② LBA - you for  
is normative  
③ off impacts still  
true

CBA - quality of life is worse

Life

A. Johnson has higher ① Bloomberg puts more money on the

metaphor (city)

64% are uninsured

2. Life, permanent bc

its a prerequisite

③ fix our own problem

of our cities (it's in two

with their time

B. Tuberculosis

117000 will die this

year of tub.

Tuberculosis - more #1

will also be effective

to insurance sales

to 25% not ↓

C. Cities as Diverse

very contentious, pointed

to immigrants (communities)

sales from way we set it

C. Economy

① local and illegal

to immigrant - illegal

come from where

base & w

education

② High school America

costs. really

citizens jobs - they

work on for

equity

yo

③ offset any impacts

so we can't worst

3. Pay mortgages - really

Don't always want to

add by 2.5 trillion

be cities - mostly

they don't contribute &

they reap the benefits

why should we let them

be citizens

#1

no way it

wife - falling to

below this with

but not in long

run

runways -

goes to

come in

with money

what my

① walking

home

new says to the program - not

step coming in relevant

#3

citizens along

come (to

analysis

#4

citizens along

come (to

analysis

family day

② all ppl

new are against

this - won't pass

↑

city's not w/ citizens

→ Dream Act sold

even before yo

new plan w/ a CBA

C. Bad Presidents

to include of immigrants

① Does - to apply - the

previous reform wasn't

growing enough - CBO

slippers shop

hats - empire / without

entire press this

lots of illegal immigrants

mainly state prisons

C. Economy

FAR - cost the US

employees 1.3 trillion

also hits welfare system

5 billion in Cali alone

philanthropist - lots of new

funds, 400 billion dollars

per year, they can't pay

for insurance

Card - laws wrong

for Americans, hits

American workers

① Turn - we legalize

them to stop all

these impacts

② Turn - legalizing

actually is good - citizenship

lowers health care costs

by empirical study by Fritz

③ Turn - we increase education

which will result in more

progress

to CAP - dream act costs

1.4 million new jobs



Room: 725  
Flight 2 Start: 8:50 AM  
Novice - Public Forum

4

Lu, Michelle

## 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 BW	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
<u>3</u>	Ethan Brown	<u>30</u>
<u>1</u>	Seamus Wiseman	<u>29</u>

Spkr	Bronx Science OD	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
<u>2</u>	Maya Osman-Krinsky	<u>27</u>
<u>4</u>	Ben Davar	<u>28</u>

Winner: Regis BW

School/Team

debating on the Pro

Side (Pro or Con)

Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Michelle Lu

School: Ridge HS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Seamus: Good case reading and summary, try to work on looking more confident.

Maya: You need to work on your crossfire skills, you are stuttering a little too much and it is difficult to understand your point - Also look at the judge during CX

Work majority on your fluency, especially in summary, you pause and stutter to the point of distraction

Ben: Be more assertive in CX! ~~Be more~~ Your opp was being a little rude but you need to stop him and get your points in. Good fluency in your speeches.

### Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best  
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -  
Good, should break 27 - Average,  
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average  
25 - Far below Average 24 & below  
- Offensive, rude  
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

Ethan: Great rebuttal! Good fluency good points ~~for~~ Good CX too, just make sure you don't continually cut off your opponent

In the end I vote Pro because I bought their economic benefits and their long term v. short term framework. Great round though!

Room: 725  
Flight 1 Start: 8:00 AM  
Novice - Public Forum

4

Lu, Michelle

## 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 MZ	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
	Eoin Matthews	
	Randall Zuccamaglio	

(Circle One) **PRO CON**

Spkr	Hackley FC	POINTS ( 0 - 30 )
	Owen Friesen	
	Neil Suri	

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

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

OTHER TEAM  
DIDNT SHOW UP  
FORFEIT

### Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best  
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -  
Good, should break 27 - Average,  
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average  
25 - Far below Average 24 & below  
- Offensive, rude  
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: 726  
Flight 1 Start: 8:00 AM  
Novice - Public Forum

4

Montero Colbert, A

## 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	Timothy Christian OP	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Tammy Ong	28
3	Rebecca Prill	28.5

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Bronx Science KR	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	John Kabbani	27.5
4	Ted Reiner	28

Winner: Timothy Christian OP debating on the CON Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

School/Team

Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Ridge

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**John**  
\* You make me want to not listen to your opponent's speech...  
# public speaking activity  
\* You're saying smart points w/ strong direction!  
Say them as if you are!!!  
\* Yo if you'll say @ = 4 there's only 4 cases about US citizens, why do I care about your 2/3 impacts? They kinda point this out (but not really) you're reading this!  
\* Your final speech was much stronger than your first. Start w/ confidence!  
\* STOP TALKING SO LOUDLY DURING YOUR OPP'S SPEECHES OMG WTH  
**Ted**  
\* Don't say I have 3 reasons "if you have 1 response & 1 poor cross application of your contention 3 (that's unwarranted in the first place) & you aren't even telling me how that interacts w/ their 2nd & 4th  
\* Nice analysis on con contention two! ("No impact etc")  
Don't feel bad to call your arg a turn, hoh.  
\* Loved how you actually responding to args on your contention.

**Tammy**  
\* Your CX was pretty solid/argumentative. John was actually just asking pretty straight forward questions, unwarranted "I don't understand ur question", just answer.  
\* Don't answer on ending tones down the end of your sentences during CX - difficult to hear & kinda  
\* Honestly (both you con) I'm just really unclear about your whole advocacy because "NEVER TALK ABOUT IT EXPLICITLY UNTIL REBUTTAL ON PRO CASE! what does 'legalizing not citizenship' get you out of?? Capitalize on that"

\* Don't submit to Rebecca's annoying yes/no questions about criminal activity, there's actually more to it, like you said in your rebuttal  
\* extending a defensive comment on your opponent's frame more is NOT an reason to vote for you...?  
>.<

**Rebecca**  
\* Nice first rebuttal! Solid evidence on each of opp's contentions & dominant by re...  
\* If you have extra time, MAKE + REBUTTAL INTERACTIONS!  
\* Yo dude "educational hypothesis" doesn't sound any better than "speculative"  
\* You're doing weighing args in CX, which are good things to do, but in the rebuttals...  
If anything, rephrase questions:  
"You have no evidence" → "Where do you prove that?"  
"My args are long term" → "Which of your impacts look to the future?"

**Point Scale:**  
30 - Surpassing; the level best  
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 - Good, should break 27 - Average, shouldn't break 26 - Below Average 25 - Far below Average 24 & below - Offensive, rude  
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

HERE'S WHAT HAPPENED:

PRO up like economy...  
CON no but like economy...  
also no economy bc my arg

PRO up like economy...  
CON no but like economy...  
also no economy bc my arg

PRO up like economy...  
CON no but like economy...  
also no economy bc my arg

PRO up like economy...  
CON no but like economy...  
also no economy bc my arg

0:30  
0:10

HERE'S WHAT SHOULD HAVE HAPPENED:

PRO = IF I WIN HOUSE ARGS, THEY ARE MOST IMP

CON = IF THE ARGS REPLY ECON ARGS, REPLY PATH TO CIT, DEPT THEIR ARGS

CON = THIS IS MY ADV, THIS MEANS IT 2 & 3 OF THE PRO CASE DON'T MATTER

IF U LOOK 2 THE ECON, THEN FISC BENEFA BOTH CIT & ALIENS RIGHT NOW + LONG TERM! BUT WEIGH ON LONGEVITY

MY RV BENEFITS MEAN U CAN'T ACCESS W/ BUILD

Tell me what happens when you lose an arg!!  
OK if they win an arg!! by how the economy impacts function on a diff TIMEFRAME than yours!!!  
Reasoning don't just repeat yourself



Room: 723  
Flight 1 Start: 3:00 PM  
Novice - Public Forum

1

*Zimmerman*  
O'Connell, Kathl

## 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	Princeton DZ	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Charlie Doran	28
1	George Zhu	28

Spkr	Bronx Science OD	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Maya Osman-Krinsky	27
4	Ben Davar	28

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

Signature: *[Signature]* School: The Chapin School

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both teams did a great job and  
con had some very interest points  
but pro defended their case very  
well had great evidence  
and also has very strong  
speakers.

### Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best  
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -  
Good, should break 27 - Average,  
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average  
25 - Far below Average 24 & below  
- Offensive, rude  
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

12/11/11



Judy Pillinger (hunter)  
Rm 725  
NPF

Bronx AM  
Abby Marzucci 27  
Miranda Powell ~~26.5~~ 26.5

CON

Stuyvesant YZ  
Elise Wang 26  
Theodore Danzig 26.5

PRO

WIN : CON

RFB : US can't afford this resolution  
was a strong a well-run contention  
which PRO did not block convincingly

5K J20201013  
J20201013  
J20201013

Q50

Microbes lower  
Acidic pH  
Broth DM

402

Q: K1W



# SAN FILIPPO

Round 3 NPF Room 404

Regis BH vs Bronx Sci PM  
Pro Con

5/13/5/1:37 Regis Beyrer [29] WIN: REGIS  
Hagan [27] BH

5/13/55 Bronx Sci Powell [26]  
Martucci [26]

1st speaker

- economic benefits ↑ GDP earnings employment
- ↓ budget deficit by 158 billion dollars
- multiple moral benefits / dreamers
- very good constructive, very easy to follow

2nd speaker

- this reform has failed in the past after Reagan
- this will raise undocumented immigration
- price of this is high economically
- "lost cause" pronunciation
- is it possible the reform would work this time?
- U.S. can't afford this
- cost of medicaid / medicare would go up

### 3<sup>rd</sup> Speaker (PRO)

- ↑ border security will prevent more people from coming in
- immigrants have to pay off their debts, processing fee etc.
- ↑ jobs, income, GDP, ↑ minimum wage
- "wakes all of your 'ons" because it makes you sound less credible
- more benefits out, less income in

### 4<sup>th</sup> Speaker (CON)

- i'm not following your CBO reference + link to your case
  - your rebuttal seems fragmented + is difficult to follow.
  - carry it "off" or "out"?
  - "if we don't compare it to 1986, it won't work now" → what do you mean?
- This is not clear!

PRO's case was more convincing + clearer.  
CON's case was fragmented + not well supported by evidence.



Judy Pillinger - Judge  
NPF  
Rm 725

Princeton TC

Daniel Tse 26.5

Sean carson 26

CON

Bronx Sci KR

John Kabbani 27

Ted Reiner 26.5

PRO

WIN GOES TO ☿ CON

Low  
point  
win

RFW : won by a hair because  
Con proved the lack of feasibility of  
fair treatment for all

Princeton NJ

Princeton NJ

John Kappas

David Lee

Ted Palmer

Sam Pearson

P.D.

Col

Win 100 to 2

WFS



Monville

negate: def & framework  
\$120 → 200 billion in healthcare  
Obamacare trillion  
9.4 benefits, 3 taxes  
deficit = 6 trillion

3: education → compete  
w/ native children  
1970's great society  
↳ 2000 (what was  
connector?)  
\$ to educate immigrants  
but not natives  
productivity in  
classes - smaller classes

and will be explained  
in rebuttal  
- ed taken away from  
natives \* DATA?  
debt 17 trillion

revenue

TAX

726 N.PF

105 sec prep  
205 of

Regis

726

spread - PRO

1: economic benefits

- GDP, tax, emp
- entrepreneur
- increased spending power
- decrease deficit
- pay all taxes

2: abusing entitlement false

- level competition
- children path to success
- Dream Act
- Bach day  
↳ 2nd class

racist bias to 6.3 trillion  
of source

source for children

Q: education - keep  
them in shadows

Land of Opportunity

rhetoric

13 yr backlog

principles  
of freedom

# MONTVILLE

spreading (basically - arbit)  
 A → entrepreneurship <sup>no</sup> LIKE  
 cost me on the 1 of 4  
 X/Y workers  
 → asked for methodology  
 about job creation  
 - take more time to let  
 you #5 & state  
 sink in  
 - law protecting separation  
 - confusion - born vs  
 brought  
 edu: but more tapes  
 = more school

law - allowed to call police  
 if abused; assume will  
 fix exploitation  
 fucked for # who  
 is scared?  
 - clautzinger kids sit

C  
R  
O  
S  
S  
F  
R  
E

# REGIS

reputing opponents  
 → GTO includes  
 7.1% less likely to use  
 benefits of given  
 citizenships, not as  
 strong at spreading -  
 cut out these um  
 \*assume 11m people will  
 pay all taxes  
 - ill add to deficit but  
 everyone is eligible for  
 citizenship - more like 1/2  
 → so 1/2 are criminals?  
 203K jobs created - how?  
 - no income taxes - in debt  
 either way (becoming not  
 looking good)  
 kids being brought here  
 by parents - they didn't  
 break the law  
 → TAX more \$ to edu.

2nd perpetual class - good? pay above  
 min wage - fed w/ american ideals  
 → \$6.50/hr, 9¢ rez  
 discrepancy, exploited  
 # for who call? Poor Dream



Prep time 50 sec <sup>05:47 1m</sup>

Sp 2 but 1<sup>st</sup> on this side  
- 7.1<sup>20</sup> less likely to use  
benefits, low #  
(don't use OK)

- still going to be in  
debt

- racist card is out  
of context

1/4 no total should also  
be dropped

- drop phone call  
children being taken in  
healthcare stands for  
harm

just try to back up  
source & move on  
from mistake

boy asked to clarify  
toddler's logical fallacy?  
reward \*P880 conversion  
= new!

54: economic 1<sup>st</sup> then  
morality (card out of  
context) why are we  
dropping eugenics card?  
need to have exact # if weighing  
economic

Sp1 - summary  
weigh the sound for  
economic benefits

- 1 in 4 new businesses are  
created by immigrants  
- racist heritage study  
(no new in the 2?)

\* MORALITY ARGUMENT

↳ not aware

- dreamers deserve opp

G  
R  
A  
N  
D  
\* brought up pt that  
phone call is just  
OK

51 self perpetuating 2<sup>nd</sup>  
class citizens

13 yr

adversary / generally

USING REST of PREP

52 → framework should  
be cost/benefit & morality  
abusing welfare (new?)

203K jobs study / 1 in 4 business

51 exonerated - helping art  
animals

arguing un-American

Judge - Mantel

726 - Nov 7<sup>th</sup>

all notes from  
debate for  
comments

1 → 27  
2 → 26

1 → 29  
2 → 28

WINNER

Keep

Mantel

con  
russian Tg/ava 11  
1st early Goldsmith

1st speaker - Thomas Hagan  
2nd speaker - John Bayes

On



Room 728

Board of Flight

NPF

Regis MS Bronx Science Y.K.  
Con 3:30 used

idol

2 Mack Sheehan 30

I voted for  
for the CON

Pro

from  
REGIS

1 Adam Yoo 29

3 Ben Katch 30

4 Jack McCordick 30

Comments: tell me why stuff matters.

Impacts need to be made relevant

There's a contradiction in the your  
case, you're saying illegality,  
immigration.

1st speaker - make eye contact  
with someone in CK

1- You shouldn't press the "it's not  
the only thing we look to" point so  
much in crossfire, unless they're actually  
giving

2nd. You're really good, just slow  
down your speaking a bit  
↳ Just enunciate

2- Signpost please

Well, \$2 for a glass of orange juice  
seems a bit much.

1st - I'd imagine illegal immigration  
would be a big issue on  
an illegal immigration topic

Honestly, I don't think the "insertion  
of immigration reform is to help immigrants"  
argument is nearly fleshed out enough  
and you only bring it up in Cross,  
and you don't engage nearly enough  
with their responses to HR, you  
need a proactive reason besides  
this city - upon - a - hill argument you're  
talking about, or at least to flesh that  
out.

I voted out  
of the  
clearly extended  
arguments about  
bankruptcy and  
harms to consumers.