

Room: 201
Start: 5:00
Varsity LD

1

Cooper, William

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Ridge HW

Max = 30

Marlboro Independent DP

Max = 30

Howard Wei

27

Daniel Pantelo

26

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

T SHELL - The Scholy Card gives me enough to
Drop The Topicality - also ~~was~~ most
arguments were too late.

AFF advocacy, links to both Neg + Aff
standards. QOL is better preserved
by reduced suffery, even if we
can't get rid of it.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Montville BG

Max = 30

Hunter College AM

Max = 30

Ben Gaudiosi

26.5

Alberto Malaney

26

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: Kathryn Harris

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AC Your case is all right, but I'm not sure when the cocke card fits into it. I know how you'll probably extend it, but it's just kind of sitting there in your case, not really connected to things. If you're arguing that they have no other options, you need to address incapacitating force + why it's inmissible. Your speaking is kind of mumbled. Your entire case is 5 clips about why respecting autonomy is a good criterion. **NC** I don't think having responses to the AG are assertions + means you essentially have no case for your side. Your arguments we have to assume the victim is conscious + can't address his warrants. We have to assume the victim is conscious + can't address his warrants. Never use all your proper 1st speech! That ensures your next speech is going to be a mess.

AR Work on word economy - you spend way too much time on each argument. Cool job extending arguments + showing how the line + line fits together. I see why you dropped the NC, but you should deal w/ it quickly @ least. **NR** You extend + throw in a lot + don't warrant anything. Moralib in recent splits people by determining why's moral + judge's immoral + I don't know why that's had any effect. Weigh arguments so + rather you not do line-by-line + just do voters, but I'll live. **RF** The best defense takes out the NC UC just because you can't use options are, even if you say it's possible they can't use Neg has no chance of self-defense. **RF** I'd say options are, even if you say it's possible they can't use Neg has no chance of self-defense.

Room: 113
Start: 5:00
Varsity LD

1

Astacio, Carlos

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale SF

Max = 30

Montville RE

Max = 30

Steven Friedman

27.5

Rachel Elias

27

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:

AFF wins that it is permissible when all other forms of recourse have failed. Also, neg pretty much concedes the framework of practical reasoning. Also, neg doesn't do much to weigh many arguments extended in either speeches.

AFF wins the argument that psychologically, women who have been abused are more likely to develop fear and sense of dependence on their abuser.

Room: 109
Start: 5:00
Varsity LD

1

Cumming, Jay

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Bronx Science SuSi	Max = 30	Montville DD 25	Max = 30
Sunpreet Singh	<u>28</u>	Deep Dheri	<u>28.5</u>

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

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

Signed: Jay Cumming

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: Brianley suggests we need to allow other forms of analysis, this would've precluded the theory arguments but going for the RVE gives legitimacy to those theory claims.

Room: 112
Start: 5:00
Varsity LD

1

~~Chy, Charles~~

Grajewski, Alexander

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Millburn SM. 55

Max = 30

Montville TS. 30

Max = 30

Shiv Malhotra

26

Tolga Sozusen

26

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: NO

Signed: *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Vote neg because I believe he establishes a moral prohibition which meets 1) imminence if no Alts, of 2) the dressner says that improve psych analysis -> false positives & thus shouldn't be treated & of 3) the dressner denies imminence in favor of a fully calculated choice i.e. flw to acknowledge introspect. Last, I feel comfortable voting off proportionality that meets prohibition.

Room: 107
Start: 5:00
Varsity LD

1 Mandhania, Ankur

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

1:16

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

45

POINTS

Ridge VL

Max = 30

Delbarton RT

Max = 30

Vicki Liu

27.5

Ryan Teehan

27.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from Delbarton RT
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Conceded fact on Kant = killing is
always wrong.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Princeton RP

Max = 30

Harrison AB

Max = 30

Ryan Protter

28

Ally Brabant

28

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

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

Signed: Anna Lee

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Aff
- ~~interesting point~~
 - interesting point ~~about~~ external law being escapable versus internal law not being escapable
 - ~~marker~~
 - would have been better if you could have better responded to her argument about everyone's reasons for doing an ~~un~~ universalizing making it difficult to universalize
 - would have ~~it~~ been good if you had responded to her point about the fact that you didn't address the "deliberate" aspect of the resolution
 - good speaker - clear and articulate
 - neg's standard wins based on the quality of the arguments, ~~the~~ rebuttals etc. moreover, neg did better job of achieving that standard
 - moreover, neg is ~~worse~~ yielded ~~greater~~ ^{greater} magnitude in terms of ~~rights violations~~ ^{rights violations}. minimizing

- Neg
- cross - x time used to clarify questions about aff's case - try to find weaknesses in opponent's case and use part of cross - x time ~~to~~ to highlight that
 - good job with responding to aff's case -> poked some weaknesses into aff's case such as point about not being able to universalize something internal because people all have different reasons for doing things
 - good job with wrapping up round and clearly delineating voter issues
 - excellent point about violence being learned behavior -> more domestic violence ~~resulting~~ domestic violence from both victi- and abuser standpoints

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Marlboro Independent AN

Max = 30

Alex Nayfeld

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Montville RU 2:00

Max = 30

Rahul Upadhya

27

The better debating was done by the Neg 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:

NC, clarify ~~are~~ is your case to be weighed or a side constraint?

RFD -

AC you were ruled ~~or~~ when you dropped
The 1st point in the NC contention. You need to win SD is topical (imminent ~~can~~ can be deliberate) but I only got a clear story in the 2AR.
NC. I have trouble believing that we need to defend the tyrants rule to life b/c there will be violence either way... no unique win for neg. Bot af this point the AC doesn't have a case.

Room: 224
Start: 5:00
Varsity LD

1

Arena, Jonathan

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

B/E
POINTS

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

~~Princeton MM~~

Max = 30

Livingston High JX

Max = 30

Menelaus Mazarakis _____

Jessica Xu _____

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: 217
Start: 5:00
Varsity LD

1

Hassin, Michael

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Stuyvesant SH

Max = 30

East Side VA

Max = 30

Samantha Hom

28.5

Vaughn Akridge

26.5

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

practical reason → self defense is permissible obligatory

Room: 240
Start: 5:00
Varsity LD

1

Pantelo, Aleksan

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale BU

Max = 30

Monticello JC

Max = 30

Ben Ulene

26

Jonathan Conklin

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from Jonathan Conklin
AFF & NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

B	S
facts ✓	facts ✓
20	25
	more facts
	Address of power.

Room: 228
Start: 5:00
Varsity LD

1

Phillips
Phillips, Les

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis JC

Max = 30

Scarsdale LM

Max = 30

Janus Cataluna

54
27.5

~~131~~
Larry Milstein

~~28~~ 28

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

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

FEAR
THE KVAAL!

Signed: Cedric R.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg on off-case, probably also on social contract indicts.

Room: 219
Start: 5:00
Varsity LD

1

Poveda, Christin

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Montville ND

Max = 30

Timothy Christian GM

Max = 30

Neville Dusaj

27

Gerritt Maniguet

27.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from Timothy Christian GM.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

Christin Poveda

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg wins on victimization K -

- APP does not do enough work proving there's no link to the K.
- the only response left in the rebuttal is this author's opinions to the language we use. This does not prove why you d/n use that kind of language in the AC.
- The PICS debate has no real impact in the AC.
 - education of winners

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

2:30

2:40

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Monticello BP

Max = 30

Lakeland BZ

Max = 30

Bhumi Parekh

25.5

Brendan Zarkower

26

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

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

Signed: Shelli Gimelstein

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AC is missing a lot of warrants — Bembe especially

JAR should cover NC more than just applying Euh 3 — need to specify what it takes out & how

(and to be honest, a stat about the # of women who die is not going to interact w/ the warrants + logic of the NC; his f/w is not just dealing w/ (body count))

Elste + Marshall card is just 1 example + the arguments you draw from it are yours & actually decided in court. Never explain why it generates a universal moral rule...

the death vs. dehumanization debate

Both: } — f/w debate!
 } — warrants + weighing

Label turns (dehumanization) explicitly & be more comparative.

Need to spend more time on the AC.

Point out lack of ~~our~~ warrants!

Address the VC + link/weight to it — need to create multiple pieces of offense for yourself.

Please actually engage w/ the rest of the arguments, this is crucial

RFD: only neg extends some sort of evaluative framework + explains legal/moral distinc. which aff & address. I don't buy Bembe + EM b/c there's at least ink on them + I'm never told how to evaluate. Rest is oral

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Marlboro Independent RD Max = 30

Byram Hills JA Max = 30

Rachel DiSciullo 28

Josh Altman 30

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

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

Signed: W. L. White

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~NEG~~ AFF:

1. Practice being more efficient during rebuttals
2. The aff's ~~clarity~~ effectively cover the flow
3. There weren't any impacts or clear issues/arguments the Aff weighed
4. ~~Make~~ Doesn't make any connection (impacts) to arguments.

NEG:

- Clear (~~is~~ NOT CONCISE) arguments (offensive & defensive) as well as voters.
- Needs better word economy. ~~DA~~ Neg talked fast without making every word count.