

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Monticello PM	Max = 30	Bronx Science SS	Max = 30
Patrick Miraglia	<u>28</u>	Sorana Selegan	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the Neg from Bronx Science
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:

The Aff value is physical permissibility and VC is permitting protection of one's physical wellbeing.

The Neg value is morality and VC is maximizing life.

~~Aff claims that~~ Neg claims Aff VC doesn't let her live into it; Aff disagreed and Neg then tried to live into it so I don't find the Aff VC abusive.

Aff had a self imposed burden - deliberate deadly force on this aggressor is permissible, Neg claims Aff failed to meet this burden. Neg extended this in AR2 and Aff did not respond in AR2; I also agree with the Neg.

While the Aff had other arguments on his side of the flow as well as the Neg side, Aff lost his self imposed burden by failing to address the fact that not all DV cases are violent and by contending that SD is allowed in innocent harm situations which is ~~narrower~~ than his burden. I delegate.

Room: Aud E
Flight A: Start 8:00
Novice LD

3

Chamba, Steven

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Princeton RD

Max = 30

Hunter College EZ

Max = 30

Rishi Datt

27

Elvan Ziyalan

26

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

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

Signed: Steven Chamba

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- well spoken, calm
- attacked all points made by opponent
- no eye contact

Neg

- Nervous, shaking at times
- was not able to successfully defend against all the opponent's questions
- little eye contact

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills CB

Max = 30

Montville AV

Max = 30

Caleb Brown

25

Adin Vashi

28

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

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

Signed: Steven Chamba

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- Distracted, kept playing with pencil/calculator = rude
- not focused at times
- attacked opponent, but did not give enough support

Neg

- well spoken, good eye contact
- attacked opponent successfully
- good, clear points

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Hunter College JC	Max = 30	Monticello BS	Max = 30
Joanna Cohen	<u>28</u>	Brittany Stein	<u>29</u>

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

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

Signed: Brionna Robinson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative

- ~~Be~~ speak more slowly
- was able to clearly present argument
- was able to warrant all arguments
- no direct clash when it came to the point that "you need the right to life for all other rights"

Negative

- Be more organized
- was able to clearly present argument
- was able to clearly warrant arguments
- changed ~~to~~ meaning of moral / immoral during cross ex regarding domestic violence.

Room: Aud C
Flight B: Start 8:45
Novice LD

3

Velastegui, K

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale GT

Max = 30

Princeton DE

Max = 30

Garrett Tanzer

28

Daniel Edelberg

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: Koime Velastegui

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff was able to respond well to opponent's argument and relate back to his case; had plenty of statistics

Neg contradicted himself a few times but still defended his case very well and negate opponent.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Freehold Township CC

Max = 30

Scarsdale MB

Max = 30

Craig Chikis

28.5

Michael Bogaty

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: Burt

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both sides accept morality as the value. Aff VC is preventing further violence; neg VC is maintaining reciprocity. Aff contends its VC should prevail but neg argues it is unwarranted and that reciprocity comes first. The aff has no response and I thus accept the neg framework.

The aff case of SD was undermined by the neg and the aff had no response to the imminent vs. deliberate argument.

The 2nd aff contention was also effectively countered.

The 3rd aff contention was dropped by neg but as pointed out by the neg that contention fails to carry the aff when measured by the VC of reciprocity.

On the neg side the neg's argument that deadly force is not reciprocal stands notwithstanding the aff claims that not all deadly force results in death. I negate.

Room: 147
Flight B: Start 8:45
Novice LD

3

~~Lee, Joanna~~
Martinez, Jacob

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College TW

Max = 30

Byram Hills JS

Max = 30

Tiffany Wang

28

Josh Spingarn

29

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

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

Signed: Jacob Martinez

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- Won because he was able to support his argument with great cards
- Great speaker, clear and did an excellent job

Neg.

- Lost only because her warrants were dropped.
- Could work on supporting ideas better more than using attackers for her argument.
- Great speaker clear and did a great job.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Byram Hills DS	Max = 30	Regis CH	Max = 30
Daniel Spingarn	<u>28</u>	Christopher Hillebrand	<u>26</u>

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

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

Signed: Lisa Manuel Dias

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Negative and Affirmative had growing arguments. However Negative continued to bring up the use of non-lethal force, to not kill the abuser but he failed to list or identify or warrant this claim. Proportionality was not extended very much due to this. Therefore, Aff won the debate. Aff used justice, the link between torture and domestic violence (he did give a definition of torture in CX), and the Tasele Doctrine. Aff mumbled a bit but his arguments and impacts were consistent. Neg is ~~growing~~ growing, ~~see~~ he had trouble extending his claims. Neg must project his voice more.

It was a good debate however.

Room: Aud B
Flight B: Start 8:45
Novice LD

3

SALAAM
Patel, Shivam

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Bronx Science AF	Max = 30	Randolph AS	Max = 30
Aeshah Farrouq	<u>27</u>	Aaron Sorrin	<u>27</u>

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:

Both debaters unsuccessfully achieved their goal of morality. Also the direct clash in the round was pretty non-existent. Because of the constant focus of the value criterion's both debaters didn't spend ample time in reaffirming their own arguments or ~~excess~~ rebutting their opponents. The vote was based on the failure of the neg to ① provide warrants to claims and ② the weak argument about impartial judges.

Spa Presentations were good!

Good Luck