

Room: 201  
Start: 8:00  
Varsity LD

3

Boone, Jabriel

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

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Scarsdale BU**

Max = 30

**Byram Hills JA**

Max = 30

Ben Ulene

29

Josh Altman

28

The better debating was done by the Aff from Scarsdale BU  
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:

- great speaking

- I voted off of Umberson, Maguigan, the arguments you gave against communitarianism and the fact that morality must provide a permissible option

Neg:

- great case but it wasn't defended well enough, his simple response to your position allowed him to win the round

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Timothy Christian GM

Max = 30

Montville DD

Max = 30

Gerritt Maniguet

28

Deep Dheri

29

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: \_\_\_\_\_

*Dr Kelly*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*APP*

*NEG*

- CONTRADICTIONS WERE NOT  
DEVELOPED WITH SPECIFIC  
THE 3RD CONTRADICTION RELEVANT  
IN THE CONTEXT OF CASE

- DID NOT SPECIFICALLY  
ADDRESS FIRST CONTRADICTION  
BUT USED STRONG RELEVANCE  
TO MORAL FEASIBILITY  
THAT WAS OBLIVIOUS

- GOOD RELEVANCE ON NEG!  
CONSIDERED ARGUMENT (CONTRADICTIONS)  
ON THE SELF-DEFENSE  
ALLOWANCE

- WAS ABLE TO REITERATE  
LACK OF RELEVANCE TO LACK  
OF IMMEDIATE DANGER

- REPHRASE ARGUMENTS IN RESOLUTION  
WITHOUT BRINGING IN EVIDENCE

- USE OF STAFFING WAS OVERLOOKED  
ESPECIALLY SINCE THEY WERE  
PART

- WAS ABLE TO BETTER EXPLAIN  
WHY THE RESOLUTION HAD TO BE  
NEUTRAL WITH THE AFF'S OWN  
CONTRADICTION OF MORALITY.

I VOTE FOR THE NEGATIVE AS THEY WERE BETTER ABLE TO  
DEFEND HIS POSITION AND IDENTIFY INCONSISTENCIES IN AFF'S  
ARGUMENTS - GOOD ROUND THOUGHT

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Timothy Christian AM**

Max = 30

**Montville TS**

Max = 30

Andrew Meleta

26

Tolga Sozusen

27.5

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

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

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

*[Signature]* Pro Vegr

**COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:**

AFF Nice, well built case. Be careful about opening this up to historical examples. The clear burden you set up held.

NEG Very small distinction, well see how it holds. The address of dualy force sometimes being necessary at the end of EX is tough. You seem disorganized + scattered address. Very hard to follow. This meant your voting issues didn't highlight your best points.

RFD

The AFF laid out a clear burden for the NEG at absolute prohibitor, which the NEG waffled on, and after not clearly "excusably" stray enough, I was forced to vote AFF. Close round.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Marlboro Independent AH** Max = 30

**Scarsdale SF** Max = 30

Aviela Hochberg 28

Steven Friedman 27.5

The better debating was done by the Aff ~~5/28~~ from Marlboro Independent  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Anna Lu

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

Neg

- very clear, and articulate speaker
- Excellent turn on Dresser card presented by neg with another Dresser card -> that an individual who has engaged in not respecting life forfeits their right to life and thus victim justified in the use of deadly force
- Rebuttal ~~at~~ to neg's argument about fight versus fight good as
- Aff's std is winning based on quality of arguments, rebuttals and cross -x
- moreover aff argument did a better job of achieving the std.
- Dresser card presented by aff was key in my decision.

- cross -x time utilized to try to better understand opponent's case.
- watch your speed; a speed is okay as long as you're clear
- make sure your arguments are clear -> make it easier for the judge's evaluation of the round. it was difficult to follow your arguments
- make your voter issues clear - delineate them point by point

Room: 213  
Start: 8:00  
Varsity LD

3

Cruz, Jon

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Scarsdale JA**

Max = 30

**Monticello PC**

Max = 30

Josh Annex

28.5

Peter Chocolate

28

good  
perceptual  
dominance  
even if  
you're  
relied on  
the eyes

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: \_\_\_\_\_

*[Handwritten signatures]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

if an arg is so unconvincing that you're offering to cross it off the flow after one CX question, don't run it. 😊

You 2 NR would really benefit from more structure; rather than full time w/ repetition, spend time on articulating a decision calculus.

RFD

Pretty simple. Neg seems to be misunderstanding how the 2 ft functions.  
- Kat Betancos  
- util isn't intrinsically motivating

oo {AFF}

o



# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Bronx Science AH**

Max = 30

**Stuyvesant JA**

Max = 30

Anthony Hagouel

28

Jae Ahn

27

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

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

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

**COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:**

IAR - You should say that you expand negative link ground by including emotional abuse. I would think "emotional abuse justifies lethal force" is a huge link to disproportionality args, which is core neg ground on this topic.

NEG - You are using too much of your time saying how your arguments function ("this takes out offense", or "this solves all his standards") instead of crystallizing what your args mean. (T) story needs tangible examples of crazy abusive cases he could run. Survivalism turn needs a concrete internal link story. What "constraints" does Otsuka provide? Too much is nebulous at the end of the debate.

AFF - You could do more line-by-line clash instead of just extending Foucault,

RFD: - (T) - no real abuse story

- NC - survivalism is a bit nebulous, does not answer power relations explicitly

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Bronx Science ZR**

Max = 30

**Hunter College AM**

Max = 30

Zeke Rosenberg

29

Alberto Malaney

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from Bronx Science  
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 like the AC but you should work on arguing why your case is specific to women & reversing the patriarchal mindset. The IAR is good but you need to better explain that affirming has the added advantage of transforming society into one that values women and deconstructs the patriarchal society.

The NC is poorly put together. all of your answers to the AC reaffirms a patriarchal mindset. Negative does not achieve autonomy because battered women's voices are not being heard. Your arguments are offensive to battered women because the majority of domestic violence cases are women who are battered.

Room: 107  
Start: 8:00  
Varsity LD

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

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Monticello DT**

Max = 30

**Scarsdale ZE**

Max = 30

Dustin Thomas

28.5

Zach Edelman

28.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from Zach Edelman  
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 has no moral framework, therefore he can't prove moral permissibility.*

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Henry Clay BS

Max = 30

Montville JZ

Max = 30

Ben Swanson

30

Jerry Zhang

28.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from Henry Clay BS  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Lawrence Golden

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This was a very refreshing round and I end up affirming for a few reasons. One of the neg off cases not matter because it does not fall into the system of ethics which the AFF clearly establishes as the framework for the round. The neg strategy is particularly damning by not adequately dealing with AFF definition of morally permissible in that while you outline other types i.e obligation justified you do not redefine it so I buy AFF framework with that does he meet the requisites of self defense under a feminist contractualism system of ethics.

1. Clearly winning psycho self-defense with Ewing case.
2. winning to a large extent the necessity when is kind of questioned with the lured example but does not correlate to the system used of morality
3. Wink is a performative contradiction that makes Neg framework less viable to judge.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

38

~~LAST~~

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Millburn SM**

Max = 30

**Regis RF**

Max = 30

Shiv Malhotra

28.5

Robbie Flatow

28.5

FEAR  
THE  
KUAL!

The better debating was done by the NEG from REGIS RF  
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:**

NC: Smart analytic responses. Really very nimble thinking here and good choices; NR had good framing of voters.

Aff could win by explaining why. Leonard 2 = neg standard of imminence / self-defense. Neg essentially beats aff framework - unwise IAR misconstruction of ext not enough on Walsh card, which is key to neg moral framework.

Very close & good

Room: 342  
Start: 8:00  
Varsity LD

3

Omoregie, Kemi

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

### AFFIRMATIVE

Montville BG

Ben Gaudiosi

POINTS

Max = 30

28

### NEGATIVE

Scarsdale CB

Charlie Blatt


POINTS

Max = 30

29

The better debating was done by the NEG 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: Needs better arguments. Really good at ZAR.

Neg: Really good at CX. Good at presenting arguments

Room: 242  
Start: 8:00  
Varsity LD

3

Grajewski A

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

East Side VA .50

Max = 30

Regis BK .56

Max = 30

Vaughn Akridge

~~26~~ 26

Barrett King

27

The better debating was done by the

NEG  
AFF or NEG

from

Barrett King  
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

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

*[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Juste Neg bc of the overview that d/f (#) / p & also the burden of efficacy  
and of proportionality all doesn't answer; also he has the ~~at~~ at it  
Non-leadly force which solves for some/all of the arms.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Stuyvesant SH**

Max = 30

**Montville OQ**

Max = 30

Samantha Hom

29.5

Olivia Qiu

28

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

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

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

**COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:**

Excellent analysis in 1AR. Clear extensions of 1AR + ripster + Eysen. You're the rebuttal/shut it's debate. Good analysis on the olds, you could have also said that they can't all anchor together simultaneously. Good break down of voters in 2AR. Excellent job relay very very clear too.

I don't see how you 3 OFFS can anchor together. How can something be necessary, obligatory, and excusable all at the same time? Seems contradictory to me in the first place. I also don't see how the 3rd old (excusability) can apply to the AC. You keep asserting that she's not telling me why it's good, but she does assert this. She's clearly telling me that the victim has to assert her value after the adviser might LBY here, as this would be the reason we are lucky to. Your excusability arguments don't anchor.

(Clear extensions by AFF in 1AR with Ripster, Hom), & Eysen. Neg tries to simplify the AC rules but much misses the nuts of the AC, erodes all to extend. The old's don't anchor well, all takes them all out. All breaks down the three voters.

Room: 217  
Start: 8:00  
Varsity LD

3

Poveda, Christin

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis PM

Max = 30

Princeton WM

Max = 30

Peter McGahren

28

William Meyer

28

The better debating was done by the <sup>APP</sup>~~Princeton WM~~ from Regis PM  
AFF/NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

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

*Christin Poveda*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The aff wins on theory. Theory turns were sufficient enough to justify the time skew debate and the fairness debate. The neg does not articulate well enough why maximizing fairness would be good especially in this debate round. This then makes it hard to win the morality claims and the discourse claims when you can either go for one of them. Reject the arg is good enough than rejecting the team.