

Quarters 7 Rm 1

J. Giambrone

YALE INVITATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DIVISION

Yale University

September 19-21, 2014

PROF

PROPOSITION

POS	School: NC EM	POINTS:	RANKS
LD	Speaker: Veronica Ma	26	3
NO	Speaker: Erik Esch	26.5	1

POS	School: Shady Side HM	POINTS:	RANKS
PH	Speaker: Shea Minko	26.5	2
HG	Speaker: G/Ham Hart	26	4

OPPOSITION

PROF

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION

Signed: *John Giambrone*

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

The better debating was done by the PROF from NC

- Both teams need to listen & read more
- very good speaking skills
- good riders
- good riders
- Both have stated the need say well in terms of logic
- out a good framework but much of the debate centered
- around rebuttal instead of analysis & logical progression
- point on "social mobility" and lot of loss of
- clarity in "low mean" but never explained
- need more to demonstrate why progression & multiple effects
- why should you value more & mistakes on former
- and equality?
- good a world analysis but lack of answer to other questions
- but the need

PROF
need work on applying centurians on lot consistency but
short of burden to get argument & argument over fairness
wins result => ie speaker under PROF
& equality

YALE INVITATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DIVISION

Yale University
September 19-21, 2014
Ron Small

Fight A: Start ASAP
Yale Invitational Parliamentary Division

Quarters 7 Rm 1

~~Butter~~

PROPOSITION

POS	School: NC EM	POINTS:	RANKS:
1	Speaker: Veronica Ma	27	
3	Speaker: Eric Eason	25	

Opposition

OPPOSITION

POS	School: Shady Side Hm	POINTS:	RANKS:
2	Speaker: Shea Minter	26	
4	Speaker: Adam Platt	24	

Propositions

The better debating was done by the Opposition from NC EM

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: Yuan M Yin

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION

Propositions should off guard effectively.
 But they failed to explain that the free college cost would go to the best qualified, but the best secondary CMC.
 The opponents argued that the Fed. Gov. could not shoulder this cost. The real cost is that paying back loans provides for learning about adult responsibility.
Propositions
 made some strong points without the outlay of some scholarships, student loans might be available to a wider range of students.

YALE INVITATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DIVISION
 Yale University
 September 19-21, 2014

OPPOSITION

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
M0	Speaker: <u>Clare Wilson</u>	25.5	4
L0	Speaker: <u>Tom Howells</u>	26	2
	School: <u>St Lukes</u>		

PROPOSITION

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
PM	Speaker: <u>Matthew Sauer</u>	26.5	1
Mg	Speaker: <u>Frank Kachner</u>	26	3
	School: <u>Amity</u>		

The better debating was done by the Pro from Amity
 Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: B. Fulton

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD - Pro side clearly illustrated multiple benefits & free education to individuals and to US economy. Opp side did not convince regarding cost burden to public, nor specific harms to education. Opp side seemed less sure of their case, with far fewer tangible examples. Discussion re: EU countries that provide significant education subsidies favored pro; not sure how smaller economy matters if cost/per student is comparable.

YALE INVITATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DIVISION

Yale University
September 19-21, 2014

Fight A: Start ASAP
Yale Invitational Parliamentary Division

Trevor

Quarters 7 Rm 4

PROPOSITION

Pos	School: Amity	POINTS:	RANKS
Speaker:	Matthew Sisco	36	
Speaker:	Frank Kachane	35	

OPPOSITION

Pos	School: St Lukes	POINTS:	RANKS
Speaker:	Tom Howells	36	
Speaker:	Clare Wilson	24.5	

The better debating was done by the Prop from Amity
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: Tr

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION

This debate was amazingly close. Gov did not effectively rebut all of opp's claims, but opp's claims did not make much sense (or did not stand up to scrutiny: eg. why does expanding financial aid reduce quality of education? why does debt hurt the US gov't? ~~these~~ opp did not answer these questions possibly (gov))

Quarters 7 Rm 4

YALE INVITATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DIVISION

Yale University
September 19-21, 2014

POS	School: Amity	POINTS:	RANKS:
Speaker:	Frank Kahan - 25.5		
Speaker:	Matthew Sacco 26		

PROPOSITION

POS	School: St. Lukes	POINTS:	RANKS:
Speaker:	Tom Howells 26.5		
Speaker:	Clare Wilson 25		

OPPOSITION

The better debating was done by the OPP from St. Lukes
PROP or OPP TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: X Chris Xinyu Guan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

My decision was based on the stronger arguments
 each side raised and whether they still stand
 after the rebuttals. The government made a really
 good case by narrowing or down the definitions
 and providing sufficient details on the situation in Europe.
 However, the college loan programs and social mobility. However, the
 opposition side won, in my opinion, with their argument
 on the quality of education and social security, despite the
 fact that they could've been less on more precise and
 a lot clearer.

YALE INVITATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DIVISION

Yale University
September 19-21, 2014

Quarters 7 Rm 2

Yale Invitational Parliamentary Division
Fight A: Start ASAP

OPPOSITION

POS	SCHOOL:	POINTS:	RANKS
3	Syosset		
2	Speaker: Elymshock A.	2	26.5
1	Speaker: Bhadokkar.	3	24

PROPOSITION

POS	SCHOOL:	POINTS:	RANKS
1	Westfield		
2	Speaker: Felham S.	4	25
3	Speaker: Peck A.	1	27

The better debating was done by the PROP from Westfield.
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION

- ① Impact on poor people
- side prop winners big more debt used others competing reason
to turn off water than handing paper to retailers, giving them water stamps
on out all reducing cost.
- ② The complainant didn't
- it won't fair to bring it up in the record to vote speech, BUT even
if it stands, prop win it.
- a. side app. can't propose giving water stamps + measuring # of people
in meters.
b. side app did talk about any obvious impact on economy.



YALE INVITATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DIVISION

Yale University
September 19-21, 2014

Quarters 7 Rm 2

Fight A: Start ASAP
Yale Invitational Parliamentary Division

POS	School	POINTS	RANKS
1	Westfield PP	96	
2	Yale	95	

PROPOSITION

POS	School	POINTS	RANKS
3	Blumstark	25	
4	Blumstark	25	

OPPOSITION

The better debating was done by the PRO from WESTFIELD
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Sammy

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

lots of dropped analysis + unexplained ideas on both sides - but I believe
opp focused entire "many aspects" no case in their "proving one is unnecessary +
strategies" cap out + should have spent more time on comparing analysis +
debat analysis. Prop didn't flesh out their analysis either but their
was less unexplained

YALE INVITATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DIVISION

Yale University
September 19-21, 2014

Flight A: Start ASAP
Yale Invitational Parliamentary Division
Quarters 7 Rm 2

POS	School:	POINTS	RANKS
4	Syaset BB	25	4
2	Blumensack A	25	2
4	Braddock M	25	4

OPPOSITION

POS	School:	POINTS	RANKS
1	Westfield PP	26	1
3	Peck A	25	3

PROPOSITION

The better debating was done by the Prop from Westfield

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: Jr. Call

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- keep the "uni" (S) / - goal up (cont'd) (S) /
- don't refer to opposing argument as "strong" pt to have rebuttal (S) /
- "strong" can be hard to follow when you go on quickly (A) / - inverse logic doesn't work that X, Y and Z invest in X, Y, or Z. (A) / - can you rebut? Is something you claim was never attached? (A) / - inverse (PS) - use use of humor (S)
- clear ordering of expository speech

- nice logical delivery w/ good eye contact (A) /
- nice job putting a good given on opp arguments & then trying to show that they still don't work (A) /
- had strategy to take PPT at end to endorse MSF as the way we cope w/ our world (M) / - signpost w/ your world (M) / - signpost + person subarguments to help clarity + person (M) / - look w/ your strongest or which have most phrases about humor rights/necessities (A) /
- signpost clearly in expository

I actually think CPT raised some stronger pts, but let this debate get away from them + let debate get defined by the low pts where they were strongest

BFO

YALE INVITATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DIVISION

Yale University
September 19-21, 2014

Quarters 7 Rm 3

Yale Invitational Parliamentary Division

Fight A: Start ASAP

PROPOSITION

POS	SCHOOL:	POINTS:	RANKS:
1	Regis		
2	Speaker: Kennedy		
3	Speaker: Jones		

OPPOSITION

POS	SCHOOL:	POINTS:	RANKS:
1	St. John's		
2	Speaker: Ross		
3	Speaker: Kerkeljan		

The better debating was done by the Opp from St. John's
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION

Oh, did he but does own the house.

PM

• Lack of case well

• Good try refuting, but there were more good points during rebuttal, but there were more good points during rebuttal.

• Like the way you spoke "Kiss" in beginning but links all of your contentions together.
• Good responses to questions.
• Good class during loc.
• Enforcing v. evidence and counterpoint good.

MC

• Good point about "self" definition.

• Good deal during MGC

• Comprehensive - addressed everything

20

negative v. positive point

• Good question during MGC

• Good point about purpose

• Just like system and social contract

• Don't let opponent speak too long without acknowledging either way.
• Good answer to question.

RPD: Strong case, presented a bit late.

YALE INVITATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DIVISION

Yale University
September 19-21, 2014

Quarters 7 RM 3

Flight A: Start ASAP
Yale Invitational Parliamentary Division

PROPOSITION

POS	SCHOOL	POINTS	RANKS
	Regis		
PM	Speaker: Dylan Kennedy	27	2
MC	Speaker: Kyle Jones	26	4

OPPOSITION

POS	SCHOOL	POINTS	RANKS
	St-Lukes		
LO	Speaker: Eliza Forner	26.5	3
MO	Speaker: Chloe Kerkeljan	28	1

The better debating was done by the DPF from SL-PK
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: *J. Miller*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION

Government's primary argument is that it is the job of the government, ~~not~~ the lender to enforce and mediate contracts. "Due process": Disposition responds with 1) distinction b/w contracts covering & enforcing entities, 2) private contracts aren't the gov't's responsibility. Legal disputes of law breaking, and dispute process only applies to not contract disputes. Govt doesn't adequately address this.

Both sides had very well developed and articulated arguments, and all 4 speakers were clinical in delivery and organization, but in the end the opp won.

Opp is able to extend broadly all their arguments, as the gov't response is the same as in essentially all opp contentions. Responded very well to all gov't arguments. MO in particular did well in this.

YALE INVITATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY DIVISION

Yale University
September 19-21, 2014

Quarters 7 Rm 3

Flight A: Start ASAP
Yale Invitational Parliamentary Division

PROPOSITION

Pos	School: Regis	POINTS:	
PM	Speaker: Dylan Kennedy	25	1
NOI	Speaker: Kyle Jones	26	3

OPPOSITION

Pos	School: St. Luke's	POINTS:	
LO	Speaker: Eliza Posner	26.5	2
MO	Speaker: Chloe Kellendonk	27	1

The better debating was done by the Opp from St. Luke's
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Kyle Jones

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

LO: + Price, steady presentation
+ Nice breakdown of slippery slope
- Organize your rebuttal
- Your case was very one note

PM: + Great language and organization
+ You had a steady rhythm

NOI: + Somewhat monotonous clash
- You need your questions to be more pointed

MO: + Lots of great verbal clash
+ Excellent organization
- Make sure to either take up or dismiss questions
- A pause here or there enhances your flow

LO: + Excellent use of crystallization in the rebuttal
+ You hold a distinct impact advantage
- In some more class in 1st speech
- The slippery slope argument was hard to buy

RFD: You stuck to one argument that couldn't stand up to Opp's onslaught of decon