

Room: 108
Start: 10:45
Varsity LD

7

Astacio, C

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN


Science Park HS

Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Ridge LP	Max = 30	Byram Hills JA	Max = 30
Liz Pires	<u>28.5</u>	Josh Altman	<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF 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:

I think the Neg needs to be weary of skepticism triggers. Also needs to specifically answer it in the rather making a NR cross-applications of the INC.

Aff is not asking you to defend a comparable policy option, but instead to say/show that there is another form of recourse that fails.

Neg could beat the skepticism with the is-ought fallacy argument by impacting it more in terms of the recourse available.

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS
Feb 2-3, 2012

22

34

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Ridge LP

Max = 30

Byram Hills JA

Max = 30

Liz Pires

28.5

Josh Altman

28

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Difficult 2 decide b/c of concessions on both sides =

Neg ~~Aff~~ skip/moral relativism concerns / not dealing well w/ the psychology of helplessness

Aff ~~Aff~~ of attorney on face the comm. few of the neg.

All of these args interact ... which is why their concessions makes it very difficult 2 decide, it necessitates judge intervention.

Neg needs 2 impact violations of comm. more. You focus on this as the source of M, but know of leave open why violate this is bad. You just say it asserts 1 value over another value/gut, not of what this leads to.

I guess I vote on the skip args & as a "hijack" but a take out the comm. as the source of M b/c who on aff my 2nd on cases 2 exist for individuals so they exist out side of the comm. Then Aff detects DF as opp. b/j merely permissible + 6 more + Skagitons what's next

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS

Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Scarsdale LM	Max = 30	Millburn SM	Max = 30
Larry Milstein	<u>28</u>	Shiv Malhotra	<u>28</u>

186

The better debating was done by the RAF from Scarsdale
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:

Larry: you need to let him think his answers to your questions answered
I can't follow how your args attract, ~~or~~ nor do I get a sense
of what you're trying to accomplish with your line of questions

Shiv: you were very unclear to me when reading Contract Plan
I barely understood you in the 1st R, your speed compromises
your clarity.

RAF establishes that no failure of no social contract to protect is
the good way to making ^{actions} ~~actions~~ ^{admissible} ~~admissible~~, the social contract
warrants the failure of legal options i.e. no "contract", and
Larry's arg is that failure is permissible or obligatory in this context
The arguments about whether or not there is an inherent
to reject the S. contract (the double bind) has nothing to do
with the nature of RAF arg. here which is that we're dealing
with the question of how to respond to failure of no contract to protect
the victims

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS
Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Scarsdale LM	Max = 30	Millburn SM	Max = 30
Larry Milstein	<u>28</u>	Shiv Malhotra	<u>28.5</u>

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: didn't do in CX and let the neg answer your questions. This trying to tell you what objective moralities (ethics) are, but you're like "isn't there still a pre-existing ethical foundation that allows for subjective ethics?" => this answer would be "no! Ethics are relative and in a constant state of flux, thus there's also objective standards from which to evaluate action according to 'ethics' if they exist at all. There's also an epistemological solipsist notion of the neg that you're missing bc you won't ask him answer questions. It's probably important you see this before you 1st rebuttal.

NEG: If you want the exact wording of an arg't flawed, slow down a little so I know that. I still flew about you're saying BUT it may be not be EXACTLY what you want me to write

The debate: IAL => I don't really evaluate the double bind and I think the aff is probably right so I try the response in the 2nd that it's term defense. However, I think the neg ILL turns the DE for a few reasons.

1) Permissibility vs. obligatory - the Deviden ex. that the aff consistently drops says that democracy autocorrects for the shit that would ~~lead~~ lead one to exit the SC in the 1st place and puts the state of nature. I think the neg access dom. is much better as a permissible option b/c ending it from a subjective standpoint, I'd say, is the best ILL into subjectively permissible action

2) The CP - Aff you need to make some answers here. I'm honestly not sure how or why the CP "solves" case at all, but at the least the neg is extending his arg't that we shouldn't evaluate anything bc they're detached from subjectivity. The aff would say this under the neg to the CP debate so I have to give the neg full insight on the fact that the aff access it's ILL bc the neg controls the ILL (as to why the aff's ex is shitty and a PCL of the harm that necessitate something when as unappeal in the 1st place

Zhang, L

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS

Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

0:50

Montville DD

Deep Dheri

POINTS

Max = 30

29

NEGATIVE

0:21

Timothy Christian AM

Andrew Meleta

POINTS

Max = 30

28

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

TC - you were on the right track when you were questioning.
If all other alts fail, ~~then~~ he still needs to win that Self Defense
is not just another bad alt... which is the Burr card.

ALL YOUR EVIDENCE IS US SPEC DEEP.
↳ all the studies & all the psych reasoning.

Deep, your case is really tight, don't waste it's quality by
going for silly minute definition extensions. Even your
FW arguments are super nuanced, ~~strong~~

RFI: Above all, this round is framed by situational
(M) - never contested. also def of (M) permiss is accepted. So,
NC goes away. Side constraints that bar action w/o providing alt (Andrew
you said "even if the V's suck, it's still enough" - NO!) can't be eval'd.
So it's self-defense vs CP. I'm defaulting to a util std b/c it's
consistent w/ situational (M) (NC re discarded) and b/c the criticism of forfeiture
theory was mishandled by Deep. ~~So~~ I vote aff b/c CP
needs a lot more work in terms of money, but social forces front
is ok - the res makes same assumptions

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS
Feb 2-3, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Montville DD	Max = 30	Timothy Christian AM	Max = 30
Deep Dheri	29	Andrew Meleta	28.5

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- 1) No ^{case} by mpxs, mitigated by some defense on self defense,
 - 2) worse than Death probably dws
 - 3) Neg burden to prove alt action through CP But
- CP
- 1) Doesn't solve aff, not specific instance b) Not U.S.A.,
 - 2) kinda above
 - 3) Aff - why don't you prove?

NEWARK SCIENCE ROUND ROBIN

Science Park HS

Feb 2-3, 2012

52

153

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Newark

Max = 30

Princeton RP

Max = 30

tk

28

Ryan Protter

27.5

The better debating was done by the

NEG
AFF or NEG

from

NEWARK
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Godwin R.

FEAR
THE
KVAAL!

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG, very reluctantly, on the (T) arg, dropped 2AR