

The 2012 Newark Invitational

Round: 2 Room #: Lib cof Judge Name: Laurence Golden

(Affirmative)

(Negative)

Name: Princeton RP
(Code) (Name)

Name: Ridge LP
(Code) (Name)

Points: 29

Points: 29

Needs Improvement	Growing	Average	Solid	Excellent	Amazing
23-25	26	27	28	29	30

Anything below a 23 means that there was either an ethical violation or the debater was extremely rude.

IAC 6 Minutes	CX 3 Minutes	NC 7 Minutes	CX 3 Minutes	IAR 4 Minutes	NR 6 Minutes	2AR 3 Minutes	Prep. 5 Minutes
------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------	--------------------

The better debating was done by the Aff | (Neg) representing: Ridge LP
(Circle One)

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

Signature: Laurence Golden

AFFIRMATIVE NEGATIVE

That was a lot of theory spikes
goodness. You can question moral
external norms, but is that a
discourse is very permissions.
The problem w/ so much weight/
time spent on the burdens
analysis
Yeah so the practical reason
to avoid infinite regress makes
sense,

Good constructive and great
rebuttal extremely effective.
The strategy for the round
was great in terms of
"crystallizing"

REASON FOR DECISION: (DO NOT WRITE ORAL!)

- Vote for the Neg extension of her burden all she must do is deny the truth while the Aff does not extend prohibition, so even if you get weight for the interpretation part of the debate i.e you can kick out you do not address the Neg overview
- Not really buy the discourse disad/courtplan. 3. Neg has sufficient defen

The 2012 Newark Invitational

Round: 2 Room #: Lib conf Judge Name: Laurence Golden

(Affirmative)

(Negative)

Name: Princeton RP
(Code) (Name)

Name: Ridge LP
(Code) (Name)

Points: 29

Points: 29

Needs Improvement	Growing	Average	Solid	Excellent	Amazing
23-25	26	27	28	29	30

Anything below a 23 means that there was either an ethical violation or the debater was extremely rude.

IAC
6 Minutes

CX
3 Minutes

NC
7 Minutes

CX
3 Minutes

IAR
4 Minutes

NR
6 Minutes

2AR
3 Minutes

Prep.
5 Minutes

The better debating was done by the Aff | Neg representing: Ridge LP
(Circle One)

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

Signature: Laurence Golden

AFFIRMATIVE NEGATIVE

That was a lot of theory spikes goodness. You can question moral external norms, but is that discourse is very permissions. The problem w/ so much weight/time spent on the burdens analysis. Yeah so the practical reason to avoid infantile regress makes sense,

Good constructive and great rebuttal extremely effective. The strategy for the round was great in terms of "crystallizing"

REASON FOR DECISION: (DO NOT WRITE ORAL!)

1. Vote for the Neg extension of her burden all she must do is deny the truth while the Aff does not extend prohibition, so even if you get weight for the interpretation part of the debate i.e you can kick out you do not address the Neg overrule
2. Not really buy the discourse disad/couterplan. 3. Neg has sufficient defen

The 2012 Newark Invitational

Round: 2 Room #: _____ Judge Name: Choster

(Affirmative)

(Negative)

Name: RP Princeton
(Code) (Name)

Name: Ridge LP
(Code) (Name)

Points: 28

Points: 29

Needs Improvement	Growing	Average	Solid	Excellent	Amazing
23-25	26	27	28	29	30

Anything below a 23 means that there was either an ethical violation or the debater was extremely rude.

IAC 6 Minutes	CX 3 Minutes	NC 7 Minutes	CX 3 Minutes	IAR 4 Minutes	NR 6 Minutes	2AR 3 Minutes	Prep. 5 Minutes
------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------	--------------------

The better debating was done by the Aff | Neg representing: Ridge LP
(Circle One)

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

Signature: [Signature]

AFF ~~APPEALATIVE~~ ~~NEGATIVE~~ ~~NEG~~

You need to do more work, like you ensuer some arguments but not specific enough and you can cry unfairness and loss education etc. but id rather have an argument given that would actually make his negating on this topic wrong.

You drop evidences like burice which is key and you dropped burice not because you didn't say anything against it but because general statements and your theory standard really had an effect on his case.

I really did not like the offense but she doesn't like in at all but she has practically reason on ethics and prove right to self defense

I feel like the neg did a great job of completely explaining why his case 1. was 2. is better than the neg.

He does an excellent job of explaining, ~~he~~ did but he needed to really negate on the meta-ethics

REASON FOR DECISION: (DO NOT WRITE ORAL!)

ORAL

I voted Neg for reasons above.

The 2012 Newark Invitational

Round: 2 Room #: Audit Judge Name: DUNAY

[(Affirmative)]

[(Negative)]

Name: SCARSDALE CM
(Code) (Name)

Name: NEWARK PV
(Code) (Name)

Points: 28.5

Points: ~~28~~ 28

[Needs Improvement]	[Growing]	[Average]	[Solid]	[Excellent]	[Amazing]
23-25	26	27	28	29	30

Anything below a 23 means that there was either an ethical violation or the debater was extremely rude.

IAC
6 Minutes

CX
3 Minutes

NC
7 Minutes

CX
3 Minutes

IAR
4 Minutes

NR
6 Minutes

2AR
3 Minutes

Prep.
5 Minutes

The better debating was done by the Aff | Neg representing: AFF SCARSDALE
(Circle One)

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

Signature: Matthew O'Keefe

AFFIRMATIVE NEGATIVE

--	--

REASON FOR DECISION: *(DO NOT WRITE ORAL!)*

The 2012 Newark Invitational

Round: 2

Room #: aud

Judge Name: Linda Zhong

(Affirmative)

(Negative)

Name: Scarsdale LM
(Code) (Name)

Name: Newark PV
(Code) (Name)

Points: 29

Points: 28

Needs Improvement	Growing	Average	Solid	Excellent	Amazing
23-25	26	27	28	29	30

Anything below a 23 means that there was either an ethical violation or the debater was extremely rude.

IAC
6 Minutes

CX
3 Minutes

NC
7 Minutes

CX
3 Minutes

IAR
4 Minutes

NR
6 Minutes

2AR
3 Minutes

Prep.
5 Minutes

The better debating was done by the (Aff) | Neg representing: Scarsdale
(Circle One)

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

Signature: [Signature]

AFFIRMATIVE NEGATIVE

I think you mishandled ontology & meta ethics — meta doesn't lead ~~the~~ is new for onto debate, you made your job harder

RFD: My standard is soc con... b/c of dropped meta ethics extensions (Neg responses are new). When only clear link story is Neg.

A risk to fortiks are that you don't do enough explaining the debate when you read the case. A lot of 2NR was new.

Better clash please.

(looking at the impacts, the

REASON FOR DECISION: (DO NOT WRITE ORAL!)