

# The 2012 Newark Invitational

Round: 2 Room #: \_\_\_\_\_ Judge Name: MITCHELL

(Affirmative)

(Negative)

Name: MILLBURN SM  
(Code) (Name)

Name: MONTVILLE DD  
(Code) (Name)

Points: 28

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<br>6 Minutes | CX<br>3 Minutes | NC<br>7 Minutes | CX<br>3 Minutes | IAR<br>4 Minutes | NR<br>6 Minutes | 2AR<br>3 Minutes | Prep.<br>5 Minutes |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|

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

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

Signature: [Signature]

AFFIRMATIVE NEGATIVE

- I think you should be trying to answer some of the neg standards (arbitrariness, proportionality) in the last rebuttal. You really are banking on the determinism argument, but I think there are other levels of this debate that are still relevant

- You ~~are~~ should develop some better args against determinism. Your attacks on his evidence are just plain false.  
- Also, set up an alternative framing (e.g. "Even if I lose" determinism, negate b/c ...)

REASON FOR DECISION: (DO NOT WRITE ORAL!)

I think, although there is credibility to determinist argument, the standards of arbitrary vigilantism, infinite regression, and proportionality are not addressed at all by the last AR and give me reason to lean towards creating universal moral standards, even if it is difficult to morally judge someone b/c of determinism



# The 2012 Newark Invitational

Round: 2

Room #: \_\_\_\_\_

Judge Name: E. Smith

**(Affirmative)**

**(Negative)**

Name: ~~Byram~~ T. Christian AM  
(Code) (Name)

Name: Byram JA  
(Code) (Name)

Points: 28

Points: 27.5

| 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: T. Christian  
(Circle One)

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

Signature: [Signature]

AFFIRMATIVE NEGATIVE

Make more explicit extensions

leverage the Aff burden more as sufficient regardless of the NC.

The NC needs to burden placed on him. Spin as / Make that insufficient by the way the NC operates.

Compare your t/w to the Aff. He tells me your Meta-level analysis of the community... Doesn't matter materially in terms of self pres. I still don't know why it is.

Both

Don't use All of your prep for the 1st speech

REASON FOR DECISION: (DO NOT WRITE ORAL!)

Oral

VZL stems from community, but exists only if you can keep it / defend it once in that comm.

violence may not always work, but best option.

# The 2012 Newark Invitational

Round: 2 Room #: 113 Judge Name: Kozak

(Affirmative)

(Negative)

Name: T. Christian AM  
(Code) (Name)

Name: Byram JA  
(Code) (Name)

Points: 28

Points: 27.8

| 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<br>6 Minutes | CX<br>3 Minutes | NC<br>7 Minutes | CX<br>3 Minutes | IAR<br>4 Minutes | NR<br>6 Minutes | 2AR<br>3 Minutes | Prep.<br>5 Minutes |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|

The better debating was done by the (Aff) Neg representing: T. Christian AM  
(Circle One)

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

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

~~AFFIRMATIVE~~ ~~NEGATIVE~~

GOOD but I ~~think~~ think you  
~~should~~ should have extended  
this death argument as the  
main internal link to your  
case?

Don't make this argument  
about it fun more  
That's stupid, of course that's  
a risk and an abuser could  
kill a child if uncorrected.

You are too defensive  
in this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION: (DO NOT WRITE ORAL!)

The ~~new~~ mishandling the framework of this debate  
I don't understand the community morality framework  
and it seems defensive at best. The affs were about  
the nature of self defense and proportionality seen  
debative to me. Consistency was not a value or  
the aff NO link to me or offence