

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS

115

Feb 2-3, 2012

32

AFFIRMATIVE

Byram Hills JA

Josh Altman

POINTS

Max = 30

29

NEGATIVE

Scarsdale LM

Larry Milstein

POINTS


Max = 30

29

The better debating was done by the Aff from Byram Hills JA
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Empiricism / Experience are ϕ synonymous terms... there is some confusion on this point in the CX / IAC.

W/C CX - What is universalizable?

↳ a priori + d posteriori

↳ subjective done + ϕ universalizable

Aff $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{use these} \\ \text{phrases!} \end{array} \right.$

"Existence precedes essence"

"conceded 2 be free"

Neg needs 2 narrow down

what he goes for in the CX, or really

win key arg instead of glossing over many,

Aff needs 2 do a better job of covering the neg's multiple of responses.

Aff shall go harder into the impossibility of objectivity (3rd person perspective)

+ how that negates all impacts.

Explain + connect your extensions of Sartre + MacIntyre, ϕ it's second then.

RFD / I don't ~~still~~ vld Aff

b/c of the work done on his

FW of Empiricism - it states out

impacts derived from an objective perspective.

Opening up agency is the only input + Aff shows w/ probab limits more than the other for D/F.

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

1

Vastremski, D
Zhong

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS

Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Byram Hills JA	Max = 30	Scarsdale LM	Max = 30
Josh Altman	<u>29</u>	Larry Milstein	<u>28.5</u>

The better debating was done by the Aff from Byram
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

It seems for prac rationale that there is some pre existing universal (u) rule that one can check one's conclusion against. There seems to be no explanation for why ^{there} this a priori rule exists.

AC - I wish your case were not so general & explained explicitly why ~~these~~ DA victims explicitly need this permissibility.

The aff's highest level argument is that ~~on~~ face we would not limit agency. Neg discusses that the resolutional action is excusable, not permissible. There's no clash over how these "a priori's" interact. One assumes maximizing agency is the best, the other presumes we're trying to determine the truthfulness of the res. I'd like some clarification.

As to the empiricism/rationality debate, I'd say that both appeal to some subjective experience an individual has. My logic & someone else's logic. Both bite into same harm (just fears & limited experiences) so... please clash more.

Overall, RFD. I buy analysis on neg (B), you didn't meet? we should win, but you also lost to AC FW b/c you are subjective. And your ~~the~~ turns don't stick.

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

1

Dunay, M

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS

Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Timothy Christian AM	Max = 30	Millburn SM	Max = 30
Andrew Meleta	<u>27.5</u>	Shiv Malhotra	<u>27.5</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from MILLBURN
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Matthew Dunay

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~g(1) = d(1) d(2) d(3) [x-x] [x-x]~~

APP: I DON'T REALLY LIKE THE AC. IT FEELS UNDERDEVELOPED IN THE FCU, BUT IT MIGHT BE THE ROUND. THE EVIDENCE IS OK, BUT EVEN YOUR STUDY BETTER. SAMPLE SITES ARE IMPORTANT EVEN THOUGH DEBATERS DON'T SEEM TO CARE ANYMORE.

NEG: YOU SHOULD HAVE READ A CP THIS ROUND (IF YOU HAD ONE WHICH I EXPECT YOU DO). THE PANEL WOULD HAVE LIKED IT.

AFF: SEVERE UNDER-COVERAGE OF NC.

DF some
Avoid
OK!!!
w/10 wrap
SS read
William
20%
hope on SG
part.
5% covered
in # fine
Wester
push @
1. push @
soft dot

Exp Stefan
Walt letter
76% only
panel etc.

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

1

Manning, T

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS
Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Timothy Christian AM

Max = 30

Millburn SM

Max = 30

Andrew Meleta

29

Shiv Malhotra

28

The better debating was done by the

aff
AFF or NEG

from

Timothy Christian
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- the affirmative argument states that the use of deadly force is morally permissible when the victim deems it is the best option to remove oneself from the abusive relationship

- the negative seeks to develop an objective sense, but he argues against himself in that objectivity requires that knowledge be complete - which cannot occur in the case of domestic violence, that morality is in & of itself a subjective interpretation

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS

Feb 2-3, 2012

115

32

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Byram Hills JA	Max = 30	Scarsdale LM	Max = 30
Josh Altman	<u>29</u>	Larry Milstein	<u>29</u>

The better debating was done by the Aff from Byram Hills JA
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Empiricism / Experience are \neq synonymous terms... there is some confusion on this point in the CX of IAC.

INC CX - what is universalizable?

↳ a priori + d posteriori
↳ subjective done + \neq universalizable

Aff use this phrases!
"Existence precedes essence"
"condemned 2 be free"

Neg needs 2 narrow down what he goes for in the end, or really win key arg instead of glossing over many, Aff needs 2 do a better job of covering the neg's multitude of responses.

RFD / I can't see still why Aff b/c of the work done on his FW of Empiricism - it states out impacts derived from an objective perspective.

Aff should go harder into the impossibility of objectivity (3rd person perspective) + how that negates all impacts.

Explain + connect your extensions of Sartre + Merleau-Ponty, if it's relevant them.

Refrain: Open up argu is theory input + Aff shows w/ phrasing / impacts more than the option to do.

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

1

Vastremski, D
Zhong

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS
Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills JA

Max = 30

Scarsdale LM

Max = 30

Josh Altman

29

Larry Milstein

28.5

The better debating was done by the ASB from Byram
AFF OF NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

It seems for princ rationale that there is some pre existing universal (u) rule that one can check one's conclusion against. There seems to be no explanation for why ^{where} this a priori rule exists.

AC - wish your case were not so general & explained explicitly why ~~these~~ DA victims explicitly need this permissibility.

The aff's highest level argument is that ~~on~~ face we would not limit agency. Neg discusses that the resolutional action is excusable, not permissible. There's no clash over how these "a priori's" interact. One assumes maximizing agency is the best, the other presumes we're trying to determine the truthfulness of the res. I'd like some clarification.

As to the empiricism/rationality debate, I'd say that both appeal to some subjective experience an individual has. My logic & someone else's logic. Both bite into same harm (just fears & limited experiences) so... please clash more.

Overall, RFD. I buy analysis on neg (B), you didn't meet? we should win, but you also lost to AC FW b/c you are subjective. And your ~~the~~ turns don't stick.

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS

Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Timothy Christian AM

Max = 30

Millburn SM

Max = 30

Andrew Meleta

29

Shiv Malhotra

28

The better debating was done by the

aff
AFF or NEG

from

Timothy Christian
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- the affirmative argument states that the use of deadly force is morally permissible when the victim deems it is the best option to remove oneself from the abusive relationship

- the negative seeks to develop an objective sense, but he argues against himself in that objectivity requires that knowledge be complete - which cannot occur in the case of domestic violence, that morality is in & of itself a subjective interpretation

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

1

Ballentine, J

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS
Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Max = 30

Ridge LP

Max = 30

Newark
Paul Viegas
tk

27

Liz Pires

29

The better debating was done by the NFG from Ridge
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Ridge spoke more to the technical side of the arguments. The affirmative argument was ambiguous. Affirmative conceded the Re.

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

1

Kozak, C

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS

Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Newark *PAUL
tk viegas*

Max = 30

Ridge LP

Max = 30

27.8

Liz Pires

28.0

The better debating was done by the Neu from Ridge LP
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Kozak

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

IAR concepts the entire NC. I also think the Neg controls the framework of the debate which is arbitrariness and they are the only ones with clear internal links to that value in this debate. also, the Neg is winning significant ground on the discourse debate.

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

1

Charles W.
McMillan, F


NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS
Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Montville DD	Max = 30	Princeton RP	Max = 30
Deep Dheri	<u>28</u>	Ryan Protter	<u>27.5</u>

The better debating was done by the aff from Montville DD
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

1

~~City, C~~

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS
Feb 2-3, 2012

membran,
F.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Montville DD	Max = 30	Princeton RP	Max = 30
Deep Dheri	<u>28</u>	Ryan Protter	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the Aff from Montville.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Joan Matella

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I Affirm, neg is not meeting the affirmative burden of showing evidence that viable alternatives exist to deadly force.