

Room: 203  
Start: 6:30  
Varsity LD

2

Grajewski A

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Marlboro Independent DP**

Max = 30

**Bronx Science AH**

Max = 30

Daniel Pantelo

28.5

Anthony Hagouel

28.5

The better debating was done by the Net from Bronx Science AH  
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:**

I vote Net because of kill or destroy institutions, Ne links, I buy CAmc, Cam which  
link to 2<sup>nd</sup> term regarding oppression w/o groups, I don't buy extinction  
w/c AFF framework doesn't warrant why I look to life as is / st.

Room: 207  
Start: 6:30  
Varsity LD

2

Wolfe, Pheobe

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Regis PK**

Max = 30

**Marlboro Independent RD**

Max = 30

Paul Kigawa

28

Rachel DiSciullo

28

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

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

Signed: Pheobe Wolfe

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AC - if there's a gender bias in the courts, doesn't that mean the bias will also be present when the victim faces trial for murder? Also, C1 & C2 are really similar.

NC - case is a little long, but not bad. Try to make sure you have enough time left to respond to the AC contentions.

RFD: ~~the~~ AFF doesn't prove that domestic violence is always imminent, so I buy that the neg can defend self-defense when it is imminent. That means the AC doesn't matter & I can vote off the NC extenuations.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Montville RU

Max = 30

Pingry AK

Max = 30

Rahul Upadhya

28.5

Amol Kapoor

28

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

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

Signed: Holly A. Schneier

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I feel that NEG won this round because he successfully made distinction between excusable and permissible, and argued that the premise is <sup>morally</sup> excusable but not permissible. He also did a solid job arguing imminence, proportionality + alternatives. I gave AFF slightly <sup>higher</sup> ~~higher~~ speaker points because he presented his case extremely clean and supported everything across the debate. His initial case was easier to understand thoroughly. However in the end the NEG argument won because NEG successfully argued distinction between excusability + permissibility.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**Byram Hills JA**

Max = 30

Josh Altman

28.5

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Ridge HW**

Max = 30

Howard Wei

29.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from Howard Wei  
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:**

I think the issue here is your choice for this specific AC. I think it very easily falls right into the hands proposed by the NC, in terms of considering the motion to be the best judge for action and rejecting proposals. Also, him using a really short case is going to enable him to put a lot of arguments down for you to rebut in 1AR, which is difficult to sum up. I'm just not buying the analysis in 2AR. If it's on my part, I apologize, I just didn't see how those extensions are wrong for the motion.

WOW. What a NR. That was <sup>N</sup> really, really, good. I don't think I've heard a brief done at a case rebutted that clearly and effectively in a while. Great Job. Especially in the standards debate. I think you could've talked winners to take into the AC when he says "it's ok as long as it's institutionalized" some of your analysis in 2NR did seem new to me, he could. Your clearly many the values table, and the answer is clearly extended.

RPD. NEG clearly won the values debate, clearly extended answer. The all's analysis and extensions on the AC in 1+2AR, I don't see how this takes out the NC offense. Sanders extension, writes extension; I think the key is that the neg is showing me more clearly why I should reject the all's case.

Room: 208  
Start: 6:30  
Varsity LD

2

Chy, Charles

**NEWARK INVITATIONAL**  
**Science Park HS**  
Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Hunter College PG**

Max = 30

**Timothy Christian AM**

Max = 30

Priscilla Guo

26

Andrew Meleta

28.5

The better debating was done by the neg from T C A M  
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: 222  
Start: 6:30  
Varsity LD

2 Mandhania, Ankur

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

241

POINTS

NEGATIVE

5  
1:40

POINTS

Montville RE

Max = 30

Regis CL

Max = 30

Rachel Elias

26.5

Chris Luccarelli

27

The better debating was done by the Neg from Regis CL  
AFF of NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Juries = 11

Room: 219  
Start: 6:30  
Varsity LD

2

Zhong, L

**NEWARK INVITATIONAL**  
**Science Park HS**  
Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Scarsdale CB**

Max = 30

**Montville ND**

Max = 30

Charlie Blatt

29


Neville Dusaj

27

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Oral

Room: 243  
Start: 6:30  
Varsity LD

2

Cumming, Jay

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

### AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science ZR

Max = 30

Zeke Rosenberg 2:22 29.5

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis RF

Max = 30

Robbie Flatow 2:20 29.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from Bronx Science ZR  
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:

RFP:

Thought Robbie substantively crushed more things in the round, the Nietzsche argument about the requisition of moral knowledge means Walsh is true that morality ends, but we don't know how to get those statements

Room: 301  
Start: 6:30  
Varsity LD

2 Bowyer, Jonathon

**NEWARK INVITATIONAL**  
**Science Park HS**  
Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Monticello LS**

Max = 30

**Pingry BC**

Max = 30

Lucas Smith

28.5

Brandon Chow

27

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

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

Signed: J M Bowyer

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Presumption

Room: 139  
Start: 6:30  
Varsity LD

2

Pantelo, Aleksan

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Lakeland BZ**

Max = 30

**Bronx Science TB**

Max = 30

Brendan Zarkower

25

Thomas Berruti

20

The better debating was done by the AFF from Brendan Zarkower  
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:

B	T
More Stats.	More facts

Questions

B	T
8	Power

Room: 226  
Start: 6:30  
Varsity LD

2

Omoregie, Kemi

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

### AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Ridge JW

Max = 30

Montville JZ

Max = 30

Jack Wilson

29

Jerry Zhang

28

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:

Aff: Kind of confused me b/c he stated in AC that proportionality doesn't make sense then makes argument that deadly force is proportional to domestic violence. ~~Really good AR:ZAR.~~ Really good AR:ZAR.

NEG: Presented his arguments very well. Needs to practice answering in CX.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

East Side VA

Max = 30

Ridge AM

Max = 30

Vaughn Akridge

27

Arianna Montero-Colbert 28

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

- STAYS VALUE & CAPTURED ANSWERS WAS ABLE TO SUPPORT THE PMS (CONTRADICT)
- DID NOT SUPPORT DR SECOND (CONTRADICT) TO SECURITY ON REBUTTAL
- WAS NOT ABLE TO CONTRADICT ARGUMENTS REVEREND (LAWYER HELPlessness)

NEG

- DID PROVIDE UPON GOOD DEFENSE OF WITH AFF DID NOT JUSTIFY OR PREPARE THE RESOLUTION
- DID REPEAT SEVERAL REBUTTAL ARGUMENTS MULTIPLE TIMES WITHOUT BRINGING IN NEW EVIDENCE
- DID A QUALITATIVE JOB OF POINTING TO AFF, INABILITY TO EXPLAIN THE LAWYER HELPlessness AND LINK IT TO THE RESOLUTION

I VOTE FOR THE NEGATIVE AS THE AFF WAS NOT ABLE TO NEGOTIATE THE RESOLUTION DRAWING REBUTTAL AND IDENTIFYING MISCONDUCTS IN THE AFF ARGUMENTS

Room: 322  
Start: 6:30  
Varsity LD

2

Akridge, Akilah

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

### AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Ridge JC

Max = 30

Jeffrey Cai

30

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College HH

Max = 30

Henry Ho

29

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

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

Signed: ~~AK~~ Akilah Akilah

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

- Defined ~~weight~~ <sup>weighing</sup> standard for round early in cross - x
- Provided clear arguments that directly responded to the arguments in the negative's case

NEG

- kept re-iterating args. w/o providing claims/impacts
  - extensions
  - rebuttals
  - votersNone of them had impacts
- Didn't provide OFFENSIVE ARGS. throughout round. ~~voters.~~
- voters were all defensive w/o warrants.

Aff. established ~~why~~ on multiple levels why the use of deadly force is ultimately the most EFFECTIVE avenue/means of self-preservation to life. Aff. provided TURNS and impacts that left the negative without any grounds to win. Thus, I voted Affirmative

Room: 233  
Start: 6:30  
Varsity LD

2

Bendi, Cristi

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Montville TS

Max = 30

Marlboro Independent DD

Max = 30

Tolga Sozusen

24.5

Doron Darnov

24.

The better debating was done by the Aff from Montville TS  
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

Neg

Excellent Job extending the point that the Aggressor loses his Rt to life when harming another! that is what I was waiting to hear!

Be careful running this "Planned outbreak" argument, it could work against you, especially if the death was accidental and if you conceded to the Max argument in ex which was not a very good move.

Dressler card is good, but I don't think you are looking at the Big Picture here - he is not talking about relative abuses or BWS (Burt explains this) he is talking about life/Life. abuser has rt to life to the point that it harms someone else!

- Both debaters need to do a better job on the value clash - although you

both upheld morality, I want ~~to see~~ you to show me who upholds it better and why - this would have made this a much more interesting round. All in all - Good Job!

Room: 342  
Start: 6:30  
Varsity LD

2

Fitzgerald, Edwa

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Freehold Township MA**

Max = 30

**Montville BG**

Max = 30

Muhammad Arif

27

Ben Gaudiosi

27.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from Montville BG  
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 can needs less statistics + more cycles / things / discussion / society.

The Negs arg need 2 be more specific 2 DV.

You are good at arguing your case, but need 2 make it more spec. 2 DV

You need more depth to your arg on his case overall

Engage in debate on M. or J. ...

Aff needs 2 actually make arg instead of just repeat talking of argnts.

RFD

via arg => less for cycle / no purple / system of harm.

Also is example + of persuasive