

Room: 139
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4

Cruz, Jon

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills JA

Max = 30

Livingston High JX

Max = 30

Josh Altman

Jessica Xu

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

FORFEIT

Room: 208
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4

Astacio, Carlos

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Ridge JW

Max = 30

Hunter College PG

Max = 30

Jack Wilson

Priscilla Guo

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Forfeit

Room: 109
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4

Boone, Jabriel

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

Stuyvesant JA

Jae Ahn

POINTS

Max = 30

29.5

NEGATIVE

Timothy Christian GM

Gerritt Maniguet

POINTS

Max = 30

30

The better debating was done by the Neg from Timothy Christian GM
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 theory, I usually will not look to theory, but you ran it so well that it really gave me a lot to think about
- very close round;
- case is interesting, immigrant focus was a great way to approach the topic

Neg:
- great critique
- great responses to aff theory
- heteronormative oppression arguments really won you the round

Room: 228
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4 Bowyer, Jonathon

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College AM

Max = 30

Marlboro Independent DP

Max = 30

Alberto Malaney

27

Daniel Pantelo

27

The better debating was done by the Neg from Marlboro
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:

Voted on Quaine (sp?) from NC

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Monticello PC

Max = 30

Hunter College HH

Max = 30

Peter Chocolate

29

Henry Ho

27

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

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

Signed: [Signatures]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: I think the IAC is pretty awesome and I think you should play more off of society (media's glorification of DV (i.e. - the fact that these famous narrations exist is a reason to vote aff)) - I also think Flew should be diff't => I've read those Mitchell cards & I really don't think you're offering the type of Ed. he's talking about. The Flew Interp'll should be something like "the team that wins is whoever best breaks down the meta narratives and their shortcomings of domestic violence" - or something like that. Also, make an arg't on Flew that we should only evaluate personal narratives as a source to understand the position of the victim, as well as a "discover matters" arg't (i.e. - my violent narratives are real world representations of domestic violence so evaluating this is a pre-req to breaking down the meta narratives of DV.

Neg: Need to make some arg't's at least leveraging case against the aff to have some offense. Coming out of the 1st rebuttal you concede almost all of the AC so you MUST win impact analysis as well as the internal link level of the debate (i.e. preserving everyone's right to life is a pre-req to preserving autonomy). You also need to, b/c you put yourself in this hole, explain why preserving autonomy is MORE important than protecting/following victims to protect themselves.

- Also, this was the WHOLE AC to read against this aff. His AC are a bunch of reasons why abusers are intruding upon victims' autonomy now, so I think you make it EXTREMELY easy for the aff to win when all he has to say is "I control the I'll to autonomy, here's a bunch of reasons in the AC as to how and why"

1st aff rebuttal: It was all but you could have ended the debate by internal link focusing his VC of respecting autonomy - that's some case b/c the VC becomes a net benefit to the aff. Your offensive arg't's are OK I just think you need to see how your aff functions if recognize that your narratives are a direct result of people (victims) having no autonomy which is why violence is the only response.

DNAL (u)

Room: 219
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4 ~~Golden, Lawrence~~

Mitchell

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Montville RU

Max = 30

Princeton RP

Max = 30

Rahul Upadhyia


28

Ryan Protter

28.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from PRINCETON
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 - I think you could demonstrate better how your interpretation of permissibility does not have to link to the slippery slope towards anarchy in Derschwitz. You should defend the theoretical permissibility, not the "vindication of murder" characterized by Derschwitz. Also, I think you need to answer this contradiction argument better (it to life contradicts with self-defense inherently regardless of forfeiture claims).

NEG - Go for fewer extensions in last rebuttal and crystallize the Practical Reason argument - I still am a bit confused by how abstract the claim is. Also, give historical examples of how violence begets more violence. I really like the argument about how abused become abusers - give more empirics on this!

REF: I buy the cycle of violence turns and that using social resources to solve is mutually exclusive from morally permitting lethal self-defense.

Room: 111
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4

Zhong, L

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Montville RE

Max = 30

Bronx Science ZR

Max = 30

Rachel Elias

27.5

Zeke Rosenberg

27.5

The better debating was done by the Neg 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:

She doesn't assume deontology. The answer is util - either way some one dies. Similar end states = can pick either. debate v real world?

AC
Better
covering

reliance
on ready
cards.

NC
impact turns better
newish solvency.
real world vs
debate - get lost
away.

can't just run res & happen

Room: 108
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4

Wolfe, Pheobe

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis BK

Max = 30

Ridge VL

Max = 30

Barrett King

28

Vicki Liu

28.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from Ridge VL
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:

Neg wins the arbitrariness standard, so in the end I'm looking to who's minimizing the most arbitrariness. Although self-defense may be accepted under the current legal system, neg proves that it still shouldn't be accepted because it is arbitrary. Neg also proved that the checks and balances of the legal system make it always at least less arbitrary than vigilante justice. The extensions of the ~~2nd~~ ~~3rd~~ 3rd, 4th, and 5th points don't link to any standard.

Room: 107
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4

Rahman, Rabeya

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Ridge DV

Max = 30

Monticello DT

Max = 30

Danny Van Nest

28

Dustin Thomas

28.5

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

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

Signed: _____

Rabeya Rahman

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD:

Aff drops case arguments in final speech of the round. This leaves Neg's arguments to stand on case. As such, the Neg's arg that burden lies in middle ground leaves heavily on the down for them. While negatively ^{is} good for the condition of providing an alt and proving the aff alternative is better, it does not quite link to the resolution (as defined by the aff) for the case & action. So, providing two cases & actions (alt) is not the resolution; the resolution ^{are} the acts of directly prove readily permissible. Neg proves no.

Room: 218
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4

Chomba, Pamela

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Pingry BC

Max = 30

Ridge DC

Max = 30

Brandon Chow

27

Dane Chodos

27 1/2

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: Chomba

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Brandon,
Use another example on morality since the way you handle abortion can become ~~the~~ really problematic. Abortion debate is not on whether is moral or not, but on ♀'s choice to be able to have one.

Dane
Work on line by line.

RFD: Neg wins that aff if prove burden to defend Rez.

Room: 322
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD


4 Mandhania, Ankur

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	14 35	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Scarsdale AS	Max = 30		Pingry AK	Max = 30
Aron Szanto	27 35		Amol Kapoor	<u>28</u>

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Educate to Self

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harrison AB

Max = 30

Delbarton RT

Max = 30

Ally Brabant

28.0

Ryan Teehan

28.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from DELBARTON
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

- YOU WERE NOT CLEAR ON HOW YOUR EVIDENCE SUPPORTS THE AFF POSITION - THERE WAS INCONSISTENCY IN HOW THE EVIDENCE BEST SUPPORTS YOUR POSITION AND NOT THE NEG'S POSITION
- SUBSTITUTION OF RIGHTS IN LIFE EXIST IN PRIORITY W/ A CIRCUM ARGUMENT
- YOU GAVE A GOOD SUMMARY SYNTHESIZING YOUR CASE

NEG

- GOOD SUPPORT OF YOUR CONCLUSIONS FROM EVIDENCE AND ANALYSIS OF AFF'S EVIDENCE
- YOUR FRAMEWORK OF THE CONCEPT OF A LIFE GOOD AND HOW IT CAN BE IN A RELATION WAS WELL SUPPORTED
- YOUR SUMMARY WAS WELL DONE THROUGHOUT THE COMPARE ABOUT AFF'S DEFINITIONS OF PREFERENCES WHICH WERE NOT SUPPORTED IN YOUR ARGUMENTS

I VOTE FOR THE NEG AS THERE WAS BETTER ANALYSIS OF THE RESOLUTION AND SUPPORT (CONTRASTION).

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale CB

Max = 30

Bronx Science AH

Max = 30

Charlie Blatt

28.5

Anthony Hagouel

29

The better debating was done by the

^{Neg}
~~Bronx Science~~

from

Bronx Science

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

- Try to emphasize your taglines more - ~~repetitive~~ which ~~you~~ it makes it easier to flow.
- case well warranted ~~with~~
- responses to neg case weren't sufficient enough to take out neg's warrants - Cam 1, Cam 2 and otake.

Neg

- INR → good job with responding to aff's case, especially with take out of aff's Shunder's evidence - citing the flawed aspects of the study.
- excellent response to aff's case (Ripstein cases) that aff would create more abuse / more restraints
- effect argument made that in aff's world, everyone's nervous ~~word is deleted~~

Neg's standards ~~at~~ wins based on quality of arguments, rebuttals and cross X. Moreover, neg did a better job of answering that standard based on Cam 1 / Cam 2 and otake warrant.

which ~~violates~~ ~~aff's~~ own value of morality.

Room: 222
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4

Schneier, Holly

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Montville ND

Max = 30

Marlboro Independent DD

Max = 30

Neville Dusaj

29

Doron Darnov

29

The better debating was done by the AFF from _____
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 think both sides did an excellent job with their cases.
I voted for AFF because he proved his use of ^{presenting right to} self defense through all contentions.
~~He~~ On my opinion he did a better job of rebutting the NEG argument that "victims think there is no way out due to impaired cognitive state - but this is not true" - i.e. that DV threat is to who is Always imminent. He ~~also~~ also rebutted NEG contention that "excusable is not moral", and further rebutted notion of alternatives to deadly force. However each side had very solid cases + rebutted process and it was no difficult to decide.

Room: 241
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4

~~Smith, Elijah~~
Les Phillips

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

STOP FLIPPING
YOUR PEN

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Ridge JC

Max = 30

Bronx Science SuSi

Max = 30

Jeffrey Cai

26

Sunpreet Singh

27.5

FEAR
THE
KUALA!

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

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

Signed: Leslie P.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I JUST HATE ELIJAH SMITH SO MUCH!

THE IAR PICKS NITS - AND CHOOSES
EXTREME EXAMPLES - AND DROPS SUBSETS
ARG.

NR should address proportionality on face

NEG wins definitions, therefore wins most
case args; aff doesn't get underneath
~~aff~~ case warrants. ~~aff~~ 1/2AR
drop subset's argument.