

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS

Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Princeton RP

Max = 30

Millburn SM

Max = 30

Ryan Protter

28

Shiv Malhotra

28.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from MILLBURN SM
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:

RFD: aff mishandles two things 1. the practical reason
stander and 2. the probability argument, just saying
extend Burke is not enough to compare the concession
that abusers don't have the intent of death so
vs. death force is not persuasive. You can't
universalize that and you also can't universalize
particular reason because the father proves
claims which I think the neg is
w/mtz also the existence argument the
neg makes in the NC I think takes out
the affs ability to universalize morality. even if
the aff can't do that it's consistent for
that fact.

Room: 108
Start: 4:15
Varsity LD

3

Yastremski, D

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS

Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Princeton RP

Max = 30

Millburn SM

Max = 30

Ryan Protter

29

Shiv Malhotra

30

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: I vote on the clearly untouched borders debate.

More over, if I had not, I ~~by~~ buy practical reasoning for the clearly dropped turn. Even if prac reasoning is one of many possible, it's the only one that a) motivates and b) can let people act/prescribe action.

Messy part: who is using whom/defending self from being used as means to an end? I agree proportionality ~~is~~ doesn't mean much here (exceptional circumstances), but you are still using someone as a means to an end. Good thing this has no link into SD?

Shiv - speaking style was killer as always. I like how you impact everything. Just missed stuff.

Room: 112
Start: 4:15
Varsity LD

3

Smith, Ava
~~Chung, W~~

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS
Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Newark	Max = 30	Timothy Christian AM	Max = 30
tk	<u>29</u>	Andrew Meleta	<u>28</u>

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

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

Signed: Ava D. Smith

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I felt the affirmative maintained the ~~aff~~ position while the negative focused more on the language, rhetoric, & description of the "victim", and didn't provide any alternative solutions or options for the safety of victims.

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS
Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

1/28 Newark
tk

Max = 30

Timothy Christian AM

Max = 30

123

28

Andrew Meleta

28

The better debating was done by the Aff from Newark AM
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:

Both sides need to do a better job of analyzing each other's evidence in order to better explain why the AC rhetoric works (if doesn't) to NC countries. Both sides claim some form of dehumanization but the Aff is outwinning because the Aff wins that morality is a guide for both and neg provides no alternative that better protects the "victims" from further physical harm. Neg is actually rhetoric arg but fails to explain how specifically the rhetoric of "victim" in specific regard to A/violence is more harmful ~~than~~ from the physical consequences of not acting at all.