

Room: 322  
Start: 8:00  
Varsity LD

3

Astacio, Carlos

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Pingry AK	Max = 30	Ridge JC	Max = 30
Amol Kapoor	<u>26</u>	Jeffrey Cai	<u>26.5</u>

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

IAR extends 1 offensive argument, from the IAC

Neg makes a common usage argument, on a suicide argument.

- Neg should have answered the turn in the IAR

I vote on the dropped turn coming out of the IAR. increase in severity means we prefer the victim over the abuser.

Carlos Hungry!!  
↓

Room: 208  
Start: 8:00  
Varsity LD

3

Cumming, Jay

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

### AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College PG

Max = 30

Regis PK

Max = 30

Priscilla Guo

27

Paul Kigawa

: 29

26

The better debating was done by the Aff from Hunter College PG  
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: rights are essential, and rights  
still exist where governments don't

maximizing means of one case,  
in any way of protecting its  
absent govt structure

Room: 237  
Start: 8:00  
Varsity LD

3

Schneier, Holly

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Delbarton RT

Max = 30

Scarsdale AS

Max = 30

Ryan Teehan

28.5

Aron Szanto

28.5

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

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

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

*Holly Schneier*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I thought this was very close. however  
I voted for AFF because: I thought his  
careful support of the Value Criterion was strong, and  
use of explicit examples of exchanging items - essential.  
I agreed with NEG that burden is on AFF to  
prove proportionality. However I think AFF  
did do this by demonstrating with his data  
the degree of threat ~~of~~ to loss of life or  
such severe impairment of life that it is  
essentially lost. On the issue of  
Alternative Action I did not follow  
possibility of Electronic Monitoring at all &  
had to discount this.

Room: 222  
Start: 8:00  
Varsity LD

3

Atiyeh, Khaleel

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Marlboro Independent DD

Max = 30

Montville RE

Max = 30

Doron Darnov

27

Rachel Elias

27

The better debating was done by the NEG from Montville RE  
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 round comes down to morality & whether or not the aff. upholds it. The neg is making compelling arguments and extending them - which states upholding morality + self-defense over egoism that the aff is not adequately addressing. SO I (V) Neg.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

### AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Freehold Township MA

Max = 30

Pingry BC

Max = 30

Muhammad Arif

27.0

Brandon Chow

28.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from Pingry BC  
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: Well, you need a warrant as to how of why violence intrudes upon justice, or you have an IL:11 into your VP. At the high level of debate, there are no pre-conditions for knowledge. That is, I don't want it here for a while, violence is inherently bad or intrudes upon justice, you need to show this to be the case instead of making a generic claim.  
- It's embarrassingly acknowledged that justice exists, really? What's the point of debating it if it's assumed justice exists in the system? There are dozens of philosophers/ethicists who would deny the existence of the liberal notion of justice. There are also many scholars who would say your conception of justice is bad (i.e. Nietzsche, deLind, etc.)

neg: Honestly, I like your start of just negating the basic assumptions of the aff. As a debater in college, I do similar things, albeit in a much more unprepared and technical way. That said, make sure substantive cost's little epistemological nihilism or ethical relativism.  
- Also, if the aff changes advocacy, make a strong arg't on a new flow as to how that screws you and kills your start, sound, fairness, time sleep, etc.  
As this is definitely a voter for 99% of judges

Vote On: Thesis of the aff & the neg's in the last speeches  
- aff to extend any of case in any rebuttal so even if I buy that justice exists arbitrarily, there's no reason to vote aff

Room: 139  
Start: 8:00  
Varsity LD

# 3 Mandhania, Ankur

## NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

<b>AFFIRMATIVE</b>	<i>1/2</i>	POINTS	<b>NEGATIVE</b>	<i>1:00</i>	POINTS
<b>Livingston High JX</b>		Max = 30	<b>Bronx Science TM</b>		Max = 30
Jessica Xu		<u>26</u>	Tyler Morris		<u>28.5</u>

The better debating was done by the Ne from Bronx Science TM  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*Intersectability is good. So, in fact, is  
Fairness.*

Room: 212  
Start: 8:00  
Varsity LD

3

Smith, Elijah

NEWARK INVITATIONAL *COOPER, W.M.*  
Science Park HS  
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis MK

Max = 30

Timothy Christian JH

Max = 30

Michael Kigawa

~~20~~ 27

Jonathan Horvat

26

.75

1:00

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

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

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

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

restatement  
be careful about  
conceding

The examples are empirical  
examples

Neg has burden to show better alternatives  
to Aff's 3 prongs, and Neg poses a CP  
to do that. While Neg overcomes parts ② + ③  
(Fear of reprisal and what to do w/ children),  
The problem of perception which comes w/ BWS  
is not solved. at affrm.

Room: 224  
Start: 8:00  
Varsity LD

3

Chy, Charles

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Hunter College JK

Max = 30

Ridge JW

Max = 30

Jonathan Kupfer

28.5

Jack Wilson

28

The better debating was done by the Aff from Hunter College JK  
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: 319  
Start: 8:00  
Varsity LD

3

Cheung, William

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

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Ridge HW**

Max = 30

**Harrison AB**

Max = 30

Howard Wei


28.5

Ally Brabant

29

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: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Drops & Flows and articulation carry  
AC

Room: 207  
Start: 8:00  
Varsity LD

3

Chomba, Pamela

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis RM

Max = 30

Marlboro Independent RD

Max = 30

Ryan McEvoy

29

Rachel DiSciullo

26 1/2

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

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

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

*Chomba*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Rachel,

start doing some research  
on feminism and domestic  
violence. You could benefit  
from them.

RED: Aff wins.



Room: 230  
Start: 8:00  
Varsity LD

3

Fitzgerald, Edwa

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Ridge AM**

Max = 30

**Montville RU**


Max = 30

Arianna Montero-Colbert 28.5

Rahul Upadhya 28

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: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

in ex of what you are pressed on whether you value proportionality. Don't skirt the ?; Setup your responses rather by say why it is proportional & why proportional @ matter -

Neg- you would be better

IAR - too deep on this that are conceded. needs more of a distinguished response - 2/Deliberate  
it is his only arg!

Neg your stat is too generic. needs 2 be more spec 2 DV + counter in TDV especially given the Aff's Bandwidth  
3rd point which we had to counter

Aff prove sit. of W in DV as WP  
merit by argue Delib standard w/ psychology / helplessness.  
+ Em.

Room: 228  
Start: 8:00  
Varsity LD

3

Hassin, Michael

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS  
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Marlboro Independent DP

Max = 30

Regis JC

Max = 30

Daniel Pantelo

30

Janus Cataluna

29.5

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

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

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

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1AC: you are one of the more badass debaters i've seen in a while, keep doing what you do.  
the 1AC is basically fight club, no?  
1CX: one of the better CX discussions i've heard in a while. lol @ "buy people to do research for me"  
1NC: i think your theory is miss the boat, and you spent way too much time on the 1C given that you recognize it doesn't matter. ~~the 1C is miss the boat~~  
1AR: good, efficient  
2NR: you made a lot of insightful arguments

RFD -

the Aff is just ahead on the issues level, his story is topical & there's no reason to think the better worder topic is better than the fight club topic

Room: 108  
Start: 8:00  
Varsity LD

3

Akridge, Akilah

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Ridge VL

Max = 30

Freehold Township MG

Max = 30

Vicki Liu

28

Michelle Grushko

27

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

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

Signed: Bill White

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

- Argues why alternatives on the NEG ~~text~~ are inadequate
- Establishes KEY arguments in round & IRAS & achieves these burdens
- Provided impacts & CLEAR turns to every argument

NEG

- Doesn't provide clear direct responses (defensive arguments)
- Didn't exploit arguments opponent dropped in 1A2
- Got stuck on rhetoric & definitions
- Could've grouped ~~the~~ AFF arguments
- Emphasized legal recourse alternatives for victims

This round was won by the Affirmative.  
~~The round~~

Room: 209  
Start: 8:00  
Varsity LD

3 Bowyer, Jonathon

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

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Monticello BP**

Max = 30

**Ridge DV**

Max = 30

Bhumi Parekh

26.5

Danny Van Nest

27.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from Ridge  
AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: NC Standard  
+  
Harris  
+  
Mandatory arrest