

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS

Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Princeton RP

Max = 30

Timothy Christian AM

Max = 30

Ryan Protter

28.5

Andrew Meleta

28

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff - you could do a better job of clearly delimiting between the world of universality of maxims and the world where self-defense is justified and the consequences that result. I felt like the discussion was so abstract that it leaves a lot of burden on the judge to compartmentalize the arguments.

Neg - I think it might be a mistake to concede to practical reason F/W. It allows aff. to only defend the theoretical maxim instead of having to resolve some of the issues that arise when acting on the moral judgment.

TRFD : - Neg provides some good reasons why there need to be checks on self-defense when acted upon and how there is an arbitrary nature to evaluating justifications of self-defense in action. Aff, however, never really defends self-defense as an action, but only as a theoretical maxim that does not have to be justified (into action), only permissible. Neg does not distinguish these two enough.

Room: 109
Start: 9:30
Varsity LD

6

Ballentine, J

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS
Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Princeton RP	Max = 30	Timothy Christian AM	Max = 30
Ryan Protter	<u>28</u>	Andrew Meleta	<u>26</u>

The better debating was done by the Affirmative from Princeton
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:

Very close. Ryan provided clear logical & practical examples that affirmed the resolution. He also rebutted the NC argument point by point.

Timon made valid arguments, however Ryan did a better job in his articulation of his side.

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS

Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale LM

Max = 30

Montville DD

Max = 30

Larry Milstein

29

Deep Dheri

28.5

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- 1) Aff turns CP, not answered, worse cuz of social norms + stigmatization
Also danno why it solves. Aff also not ben,
2) Meets deliberate, deadly, unlawful interp of deadly force or impulsive D.B
Dropped
- 3) Meets theory arg not parametric, just defend permissibility arg
also no reason to reject on theory
- 4) Neg also concedes obligation ≠ permissible, when all else fails O-P.
is permissible via Drexler, breaking S.C. or otherwise.


NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS
Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Scarsdale LM	Max = 30	Montville DD	Max = 30
Larry Milstein	28.5 28.5	Deep Dheri	28.5

The better debating was done by the APP from Scarsdale LM
APP or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Well, it doesn't seem like the counterplan solves it leaving escalated the violence. The point would be that there should be other alternatives. There don't seem to be. ~~This is~~

On the

Neg should have gone far less and went deeper. Neg said if there are no alternatives then it's an obligation and we negate. And it is then, and it is possible to justify a neg. ballot, but I understood this ~~argument~~ ^{less the} the argument that the C.P. doesn't solve and it actually increases abuse. But I don't know what started to ~~bring~~ ^{link} it back to besides a general utilitarian one.

I lean aff because aff does a better job weighing. But this was a close round.

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS

Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Millburn SM

Max = 30

Ridge LP

Max = 30

Shiv Malhotra

29

Liz Pires


29

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

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

Signed: Mattam [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:



NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS

Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Millburn SM

Max = 30

Ridge LP

Max = 30

Shiv Malhotra

26

Liz Pires

26

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I ~~do~~ ^{think} don't think the permissibility arguments were sufficiently answered back in the SNR. IAC sets this as the burden for the debate. The AFF is also impacting it to both frameworks.

SNR could have won on Kappalar, but it needed to do more in terms of explaining why its enough to mitigate or take out permissibility.

Room: 112
Start: 9:30
Varsity LD

6

Chy, C

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN


Science Park HS

Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Byram Hills JA	Max = 30	Newark	Max = 30
Josh Altman	<u>28.5</u>	tk	<u>29</u>

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS
Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills JA

Max = 30

Newark

Max = 30

Josh Altman

28

tk

29

The better debating was done by the MEH from Newark TK
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:

AFF: I think, as to the thing, you try to kill turn the NC but there are a few problems
1) your term defense ev talking about how discourse of shape reality is generic of does NOT have a warrant regarding "victim" vs. "survivor"
2) could ev. not saying what you want - the warrant specifically says that using "victim" is problematic. Even if it's not, his mirror ev. says my collection "victim" would be bad anyway so you shouldn't - there here.
3) Aff - I think the neg clearly wins on kill turn to epistemology b/c his ev. says that discourse determines experience, which is what we know
↳ The Standard/Borden debate: not developed enough for me to vote aff on presumption. I tried to give you some leeway here by making your burden text but doesn't