

Room: 212
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4

Hassin, Michael

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Montville OQ

Max = 30

Regis MK

Max = 30

Olivia Qiu

27.5

Michael Kigawa

27

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

standards debate should have been way clearer (i.e. q's should have explained how warrants determined etc) making this round is pretty sticky.
warrants for self defense are way more rigorous and consistent, the process just seems like a random floating framework that has no interaction with normal permissibility.
there is zero offense for the neg under the self defense standard; affirm on the risk of which

Room: 226
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4

Chy, Charles

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Timothy Christian JH

Max = 30

Jonathan Horvat

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Henry Clay BS

Max = 30

Ben Swanson

28.5

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Nice evidence Jon.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Princeton WM

Max = 30

Bronx Science TB

Max = 30

William Meyer


28

Thomas Berruti

29.5

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: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg - 1) ~~Fish for the linker better!!!~~ Nice job fishing for links lol; amazing.
2) Quit ~~readily~~ saying "women" reading a discourse bc it's kinda gendered!
3) Impact things on the level of discourse and reps, i.e. the construction of a battered woman

Aff - 1) Have better intersectionality answers
2) Saying "I'm colorblind" is a new link!!
3) Reasonability & is not mutually exclusive w/ reps
4) Ext your AC!

Room: 239
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4

Jaber, Ramy

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale LM

Max = 30

Stuyvesant SH

Max = 30

Larry Milstein

30

Samantha Hom

29.5

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

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

Signed: Ramy Jaber

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

EXCELLENT DEBATE!

BOTH DEBATERS DISPLAYED SUPERB SKILL IN UNDERSTANDING THE TOPIC AND FORMULATING STRUCTURED ARGUMENTS IN TRUE LD FASHION.

AFF WAS ABLE TO UPHOLD HIS OWN FRAMEWORK BUILT AROUND A SOCIAL CONTRACT AND LINK IT AS A CRITERION OF PRACTICALITY FOR UPHOLDING NEG'S META-ETHIC FRAMEWORK

NEG DID UPHOLD HER OWN F.W. THROUGHOUT THE ROUND BUT COULD NOT FIND A WAY TO DISASSEMBLE CONTENTIONS ON AFF NOR LINK TO AFF F.W.

Room: 224
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4

Cumming, Jay

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Marlboro Independent RD Max = 30

Rachel DiSciullo 28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College JK Max = 30

Jonathan Kupfer ⁴⁵ ~~100~~ 28

The better debating was done by the Neg from Hunter JK
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: Aff hard on to show
permissibility & excuseability
was conceded, there's & immorality
so there's an excusable moral wrong
but that flows neg

Room: 113
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4

Poveda, Christin

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis RF

Max = 30

Marlboro Independent AH

Max = 30

Robbie Flatow

27


Aviela Hochberg

27.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from Marlboro Indep. AH
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

When talking about proportionality, the neg does enough work to win that deadly forces must be proportional to take moral instances. The aff's moral claims are not enough to look at what will happen to the criminal justice system if we allow biased instances or the option to always consider yourself a victim through psychological effects.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

Millburn YY

Yang Yi

POINTS

Max = 30

29

NEGATIVE

Montville BG

Ben Gaudiosi

POINTS

Max = 30

28

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- AF • used many studies to support contentions
these were effective in advancing his case
- had good responses to the NBG assertions
 - displayed the ability to conjure different examples in an attempt to prove his points
 - effectively extended his contentions
- NEG • using more data to support your contentions will help your case

Room: 207
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4

Arena, Jonathan

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Ridge EW

Max = 30

Regis RM

Max = 30

Eric Wei

27.5

Ryan McEvoy

27.5

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

A On the Aff, I need to see you do a better job attacking his Nuten and PBS cards. If the answers are not credible, deathly tone is impossible, and once he extends those points, it's hard to hold to justify an aff ballot. Go with the T-stem skill, he's not responding to it at all, and you need to hit it at the end. DOR was pretty solid.

Don't attack the methodology of his evidence. I've heard enough evidence this year that shows reason is likely. Not a very strong plan of attack. I'm not a fan of a lot of your arguments, but if you win on the Aff you deserve the better ballot. US speaks arguments aren't that good. I need a response with his credibility argument. Exhibit at least all cases were to use.

Values found at a rush, but my the pts culpability side consistent on Aff grounds, so I can look to that. The only real extended aff offense is lower, but I think the Neg's all arguments.

Room: 242
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4

Omoregie, Kemi

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis PK

Max = 30

East Side VA

Max = 30

Paul Kigawa

29

Vaughn Akridge

27

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: *Kemi Omoregie*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: Loved the gender biased argument!! Really good at CX.
Really, no negative comments.

Neg: Needs to practice ~~answering~~ answering arguments. Contradicted himself
in 2nd CX, I don't think he fully understood AC arguments. Presented
~~case~~ argument that actually helped Aff's case. Argument that victims become
oppressors was really good; wished he brought it up in NC instead
of NR.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Montville JZ

Max = 30

Scarsdale BU

Max = 30

Jerry Zhang


28

Ben Ulene

28.5

The better debating was done by the Neg 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:

Seems the Aff read alot. Similar comments that I have given to Deep in the past. I think adding a section on how the environment surrounds DV speaks to structure rather than the A.

ng- is of nec. 2 separate your use from the net. bears with cp... they are synonymous + repetitive.

INC is strategic, but of all of the args you are making are the best... they are not as specific as most of the common aff args response to them will be.

CP still relies on reports + responses... which most Aff's will be able to deal with as well.

IAR is pretty good on level of argumentation, but needs 2 explain some more warrants and also be a little bit more organized.

You all have good clash in the round, but very little comparison + weighing...

ZAR of get to level of depth or specificity as NR does. Doesn't cover all options.

Also, there is very little response to the explicitly off in the ZAR

Room: 243
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4

Gimelstein, Shel

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Freehold Township MG

Max = 30

Millburn SM

Max = 30

Michelle Grushko

27.5

Shiv Malhotra

28

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

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

Signed: Shelli Stumbler

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I negate on the underview, its ~~was~~ conceded + functions as a side constraint to aff advocacy that aff does not meet. It also outweighs under aff's f/w.
I buy neg's arg that legal permissibility ≠ moral permissibility. Aff's turn re. CJ system is smart, but ultimately ~~aff~~ neg takes it out w/ weighing analysis.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale ZE

Max = 30

Lakeland BZ

Max = 30

Zach Edelman

29

Brendan Zarkower

28

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

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

Signed: Chris Fox Regis

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF Interesting counter intuitive argument. How do you account for the "deliberate" wording of the resolution? Fairly clear case → you handled the speed request well. I thought you would more clearly articulate how the social contract is in some ways determinative.

NEG I don't think you were particularly clear during your first speech. You need to highlight the organization in your case. You swallowed a lot of words. I feel like I am supposed to leave my beliefs / preconceptions out of the round, so your arguments against his determinism seem lazy & unwarranted. Rather, try accept that the SC is not a product of free will (we do not choose it per se) but it does determine how we should act, not a duty against that is. unnatural. OR attack "deliberate" in the resolution. OR the cause of the big bang.

RFD

Ultimately the AFF had more offense and arguments for that offense, proving without any real probabils this idea of determinism. The NEG did not prove a prohibition (on the AFF's burden) or clearly articulate his attitude / rebuttals in a persuasive manner.

Room: 233
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4

Harris, Kathryn

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Monticello LS

Max = 30

Timothy Christian AM

Max = 30

Lucas Smith

28

Andrew Meleta

~~28~~ 29

The better debating was done by the neg from Timothy Christian
AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Kathryn E. Harris

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

[AC] Thanks for adapting, seriously. I think there are issues in your case - like, by your logic shouldn't women use deadly force outside of domestic violence? and it sounds like your arguments encourage obligation, not permissibility - but you're talking about the topic, so hey, oh + I'd like you to link to female aggressors + how that reaffirms the patriarchy (which you can definitely argue) so you're more holistically affirming. **[NK]** I'd rather you have your own case w/ independent reasons to negate + run the kritik directly off the AC, but it's better than a metaethical part of the reason for that is bc of time allocation since you uncover the aff + I'm not sure if you grant him too much ground. I really appreciate you not speaking, as well. **[VAR]** You handle the K + V the alternative pretty well, but I'm not clear on the perm - do you mean ~~that~~ victims can use deadly force not as a response to domestic violence, but like, in life? You also undercut the NK... good to point out the cards give about masculine identity, but you need to explain how you don't exclude people in the middle or pit men opposite women. **[NR]** Great extensions, esp. of the K/gender binary stuff. More by picture could have been clearer though. **[CAR]** Voters/biz picture from aff does link to the K b/c the rhetoric of the cards still creates a male/female dichotomy, making it impossible to combat heteronormativity, which the NK says he links to S for 1st. So I negate.

Room: 209
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4

Kapoor, Akhil

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Ridge LP

Max = 30

Regis PM

Max = 30

Liz Pires

29

Peter McGahren

28-5

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 successfully defended that deadly force is morally permissible as it is the last resort for self defense
- Neg's case that Moneroff has to provide a guide for acting does not neglect the use of deadly force as a last resort

Room: 229
Start: 8:00
Varsity LD

4

Grajewski A

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Marlboro Independent AN

Max = 30

Monticello JC

Max = 30

Alex Nayfeld

~~26~~ 26

Jonathan Conklin

28

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

No new

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

in the 2AR please

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Vote NEG because of the motivational internalism in that the alleg of
can position is made in wholestic, Aff part only does tearing
instance also not internal justification to sic for future
the 1AR/2AR don't like aff's new lntes were drawn to
can pen state for NEG's offense, lntes for later.