

Room: 215
Start: 5:00
Varsity LD

1

Bendi, Cristi

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Ridge AM

Max = 30

Regis PK

Max = 30

Arianna Montero-Colbert 29

Paul Kigawa 28.5

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

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

Signed: C. Bendi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

Excellent IIR! Great job
Extending Cards and Proving
that moralit is in fact logical
in the case. Neg failed to
respond to any of the
Saunders points!

• Q

*Bandra

• You did a great job
explaining the fine line
in physical abuse.

Neg

You seemed to be all over the
place in IIR - it was very difficult
to follow you. If you are going to
hang around make sure you always tell
the judge where you are.

You didn't do a very good job at the
value clash - try and do a better job
with this in IIR, that way it will
be easier for you to extend
throughout the round.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science AH

Max = 30

Hunter College PG

Max = 30

Anthony Hagouel

28

Priscilla Guo

~~29~~ 27

The better debating was done by the ^{AFF} ~~PG~~ from Bronx Science AH
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Gaurance Golder

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF good constructive work on explicating clearer links between (n) permissibility and rejecting domination as it's your analysis that can further Foucault's claims, I get it, but it can be a lot clearer.

neg use you ex more effectively in that a syllogism is naturally flawed you press, but are not quite sure ask him how does this relate to (n) can anyone trying to breakout of subjugation do anything they want too. Also, you may want to change some of your definitions watch your rhetoric because @ times you sound like you are endorsing the Aff framework and arguments. Watch new stuff

- RFB:
- ① Foucault 2-4 establishes framework
 - ② Weston/Desose
 - ③ Turn to case

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Pingry BC	Max = 30	Ridge LP	Max = 30
Brandon Chow	<u>27.5</u>	Liz Pires	<u>29</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from Ridge LP
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 - It is an interesting idea, but you left a minute of your AC blank and stumbled all over yourself. You also should be able to talk about the data and methodology of your sources.

NEG - nice case, but I sort of feel like you had little to no defense. Nice job in CX. You are a very good speaker. I thought the distinction between "permissibility" and "excusability" was persuasive.

RFD
The Negative flow covered the flow much better and provided a clear persuasive reason why this action is not permissible. The AFF dropped several points and used flow poorly, resulting in a spotty offense.

Room: 139
Start: 5:00
Varsity LD

1

Atiyeh, Khaleel

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science TB

Max = 30

Thomas Berruti

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Marlboro Independent AH

Max = 30

Aviela Hochberg

29

The better debating was done by the NEG from Marlboro Independent AH
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

Khaleel Atiyeh

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The AFF case is solid and AFF upholds it well through out the round. However, the Neg Dis Ad critique has good points regarding proportionality & eminence that the AFF does not address adequately. As a result, I vote neg.

Room: 218
Start: 5:00
Varsity LD

1

~~Hansen, Rebecca~~
AKHIL KAPOOR

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Ridge DC

Max = 30

Princeton WM

Max = 30

Dane Chodos

28

William Meyer

29

The better debating was done by the

NEG
AFF or NEG

from

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Aff contradicted the fact that women are rational to know that they are doing something "deliberate" yet they are not rational to evaluate other options.
- Also Aff did not contest Neg's value that killing is bad/immoral, therefore permission to kill is also bad