

Room: 212  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5

Boone, Jabriel

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Montville OQ	Max = 30	Millburn YY	Max = 30
Olivia Qiu	<u>28</u>	Yang Yi	<u>29</u>

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

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

Signed: Jabriel Boone

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: You have great points, but not all of them link together  
- sign post

neg:  
- reflecting arbitrariness is a great position to have on the neg  
- sign post

Room: 218  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5

Chy, Charles

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

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Princeton RP	Max = 30	Ridge DC	Max = 30
Ryan Protter	<u>28.5</u>	Dane Chodos	<u>27.5</u>

The better debating was done by the aff from Princeton RP  
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 or nc

ORAL, too

Room: 213  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5

Rahman, Rabeya

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
<b>Bronx Science TB</b>	Max = 30	<b>Scarsdale JA</b>	Max = 30
Thomas Berruti	<u>17.5</u>	1:40 Josh Annex	<u>27</u>

1:15

The better debating was done by the Aff from Bronx Science TB  
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:

(NC - a bit unclear at times, but appreciated the tactics to be clear for key lines at the very least.)

RFD:

So, they drops case on final speech, this allows the to stand on the argument that he precludes any way arguments through will-power & moral permissibility of the use of deadly force <sup>as morally</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>precludes</sup> ~~precludes~~ in those conditions.

They: A bit messy. Vote for Aff on theory, as the case uses the interpretation. Framework is on ~~the~~ the footing of excellence, and while occasionally does use the rd of excellence, it is not always so. The claims will-power which precludes self-prohibition, which leaves prohibition embedded upon, and thus he wants.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Pingry BC**

Max = 30

**Marlboro Independent RD**

Max = 30

Brandon Chow

27.5


Rachel DiSciullo

27.5

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: \_\_\_\_\_



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- ~~task~~ case well warranted
- play nice with your opponent - be courteous, don't put arguments into your opponent's mouth that they didn't say → Dr. Who bc comment about judge voting aff / Barack etc.
- watch your speed → fast is fine, but make sure you are clear
- response to her social contract argument weak
- theory → didn't buy into it, which weakened your overall case.

Neg

- good question during cross x asking whether morality requires us to make a judgment of other actions
- argument about ~~that~~ subjective morality and sustenance of life cannot co-exist in the same world
- ~~rebuttal~~ response to his social contract rebuttal effective

- Neg's std wins based on quality of arguments, rebuttals ~~and~~ etc →
- Neg did better job of achieving that standard

Room: 209  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5 Bowyer, Jonathon

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

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Timothy Christian GM	Max = 30	Regis PM	Max = 30
Gerritt Maniguet	<u>26.5</u>	Peter McGahren	<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Timothy Christian  
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:

REF: I buy slippery slope fallacy. AFF PW + contentions.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Stuyvesant JA**

Max = 30

**Millburn SM**

Max = 30

Jae Ahn

28

Shiv Malhotra

28.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from Millburn SM  
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:**

Aff good constructive be careful with being hyper-specific without hyper-specific evidence. Also, in terms of case design if you are going to run conflicting cards right after one another.

Neg good ex try not to appear so frustrated when not getting the responses you would like.

I despise the Clash that existed

(1) Side constraint of proportionality easiest place to negate in that there are three reasons for why self-defense demands this precondition which are unaddressed

(2) Even if I say the Kwon study you do not account for his two responses

(3) Counterplan of Neg women can go to shelters

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Ridge LP

Max = 30

Marlboro Independent AH

Max = 30

Liz Pires

28

Aviela Hochberg

30

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

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

Signed: JK

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I Voted Neg. for Several Reasons:

① Cycle of Violence Argument → abused often become abusers. Death will not provide a resolution as it is not solving the root cause of the problem. the Victim has now become a killer, what are the psychological effects moving forward?

② The Aff was unable to address the mult. forms of Domestic Violence Argument. What type of Abuse warrants the use of deadly force?

Neg provides outside options / checks & balances.

Aff → I had a hard time hearing you when you spread. You were unable to provide a clear definitive answer for when ~~Deadly force~~ Deadly force is necessary.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science AH

Max = 30

Timothy Christian AM

Max = 30

Anthony Hagouel

28

Andrew Meleta

28.5

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

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

Signed: Philip Bauchan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff - we must protect life, so self-defense  
self-defense is only possible alternative

Neg. - shelters ensure an alternative + deadly  
force is not proportional

Neg. offers an alternative to killing, but Aff. does it really stop domestic abuse?

Neg. arbitrariness is bad, but Aff. seems to argue a consistent rule that  
deadly force in self-defense is acceptable

However, Aff. defines domestic abuse as simply controlling + not necessarily  
life threatening. Is it always acceptable (i.e. proportional) to kill  
someone who is controlling but not necessarily threatening life

- very close debate - no obvious approach

Vote reason: Neg. exploits definition of Aff. self-defense. Deadly force  
does not appear proportional to this + therefore is an arbitrary  
response - that is, not a legitimate way to protect right  
to life.

Room: 243  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5

Cooper, William

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

### AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis BK

Max = 30

Freehold Township MG

Max = 30

Barrett King

28

Michelle Grushko

28

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:

ok affirm.

• A / THE argument flows +ff.

• Lots of Drops / Affextuals

#3 + 6, including Self defun

• V/VC - effective courses +

Room: 322  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5

Chomba, Pamela

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Scarsdale LM	Max = 30	Pingry AK	Max = 30
Larry Milstein	29 1/2	Amol Kapoor	28

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: Chomba

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Amol, for this specific AC, try to use a different NC.

REF.:

Neg loses theory clarification debate.  
Amol, work on standards early.

Room: 139  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5

Mashack, Muta

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science TM

Max = 30

Ridge EW

Max = 30

Tyler Morris

28

Eric Wei

27.5

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:

③ minimize patriarchal ~~standards~~ barriers to discourse.

④ link between patriarchy & domestic violence.

- evidence doesn't provide a real link.

ie. if a man rapes his wife & she rapes him back, the power has ~~shifted~~ shifted, however, the patriarchal mindset that we must use aggressive force to penetrate another still exists and is perpetuated.

NEG/  
Get rid of the aff!  
It's just sounds like you're complaining. It is not well-developed. Spend more time making responses to ~~the~~ AFF than the OFF.

- extending through mic?  
no.

Affirmed. ~~was~~ The neg simply spends too much time on a poorly developed theory shell. Should have spent more time on breaking down Aff framework. I vote on the extensions clearly coming out of the Aff that link back to the standard of Deere using barriers to discourse.

Room: 203  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5 Mandhania, Ankur

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

**AFFIRMATIVE**

Montville TS

Tolga Sozusen

POINTS

Max = 30

26.5

**NEGATIVE**

Scarsdale CB

Charlie Blatt

POINTS

Max = 30

27.5

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

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

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

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Killing = 11  
7

Room: 208  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5

Cheung, William

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL


## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Livingston High JX	Max = 30	Ridge JW	Max = 30
Jessica Xu	<u>28.5</u>	Jack Wilson	<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the Aff from Livingston High  
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 - 1) Explain skepticism in terms of subjective and objective understandings.  
2) exploit the contradictory affs, permute one and turn his meta-ethic  
3) Hard to evaluate the question of identity shift and an objective morality.  
Neg - careful of contradictory affs

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Montville DD**

Max = 30

**Delbarton RT**

Max = 30

Deep Dheri

29

Ryan Teehan

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from Montville DD  
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 Nice, clear case. I thought you could have covered the NC a little more thoroughly. I wanted you to talk more about these basic goods and what are they, and not drop his points about the scope, but attack them. At the same time, the Hitler example in the 2AR was a persuasive magnification of your primary argument. Someone has to do it, "stop the violence" but does that someone have to be the victim? Not sure.

NEG I think you can use your ~~cross~~ cross examination more effectively. You seem to only ask clarifying questions. You can more clearly define what we are weighing. I think the notion that we are weighing the victim's possible actions and their morality regardless of the abuser's actions is interesting, but you have to explain why the resolution would be specific. Also, I think the "deliberate" argument is a good one, but I'm not sure how this ties into moral goods. Wouldn't the basic good require some more flesh out? or be so basic it passes itself.

So I look to the framework, and I think the AFF better proved the UC's premises.

RFD It feels like there were a lot of drops in this round and a lot of rebutted points which began "that's not what I'm saying" which I credit to a failure to listen. It comes down to whether or not the scope of this resolution is on balance or based in the individual opinions of the victim. There is no free frame on deliberation, accord to the AFF, which means he proves self defense can be deliberate. I also think the AFF proves that self defense precedes tort. The Neg's notion that the victim can do nothing (basically martyrdom) is a choice, yes, but he needs to respond to the 13 strategies and are these strategies also immoral? Or less real, since they are attempting to get at the basic goods? I'm not sure. Neither side engaged with the vocabulary adequately.

Room: 239  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5

PHILLIPS  
~~Phillips~~, Les

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

*W*

### AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale SF

Max = 30

Stuyvesant SH

Max = 30

Steven Friedman

28

Samantha Hom

28

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

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

*FEAR  
THE  
KVAAL!*

Signed: *Cedric P.*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*Reject HARUAN "IS/ought"  
on REPUGNANCE*

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

102

29

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Monticello LS**

Max = 30

**Ridge VL**

Max = 30

Lucas Smith

28

Vicki Liu

28.5

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

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

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

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Grant case Aff! - (Could have been on the Int. inputs of patriarch vs more the Government rights of private/public relations.)

"Define the Patriarch...?"

"How does killing solve patriarchy...?"

Aff needs some better more contextualized answers to these

Show (if escapes from history) that the spirit of domination is at the root of all int. conflicts.

Describe the dom as essentially patriarchal.

Figure out your approach to the questions.

Does killing end patriarchy? or is it permissible within the system of patriarchy? A contribution of the two?

UN fortunately, the NC orgs are not designed to answer an Aff like this...

The best arg comes from Burke, but it seems that it is solved (especially by the Affs indep of them) by the Aff action on that side of the res. What I mean by that is that the neg side seems to blame the victim more when they don't give personal reasons to end their own violence by blaming the reaction to an already involved situation. Permissibility also does not imply responsibility.

IAR needs 2 for an essential arg more...

Aff needs a greater understanding of how can 2 arg it better to pose responses from the neg.

Also needs 2 can better in the 2AR - & just repeat args from the actual speeches.

Room: 111  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5

Atiyeh, Khaleel

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Bronx Science ZR**

Max = 30

**Monticello PC**

Max = 30

Zeke Rosenberg

28

Peter Chocolate

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from Bronx Science ZR  
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 Neg misses a lot of the affirmative arguments, has 6 minutes unused speech time. Clearly an affirmative ballot.

Room: 107  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5

Poveda, Christin

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Montville JZ**

Max = 30

**East Side VA**

Max = 30

Jerry Zhang

27

Vaughn Akridge

27

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

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

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

*Christin Poveda*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Aff wins on self defense claims. Dresser does not answer how there might be other alternatives to self defense or to justice killing. There's no real answer as to why when the cycle stops then you solve the value to life. Neg also concedes how there's a power shift to the aff's moral claims. Aff also wins on the utility claims. Neg has no offense against that but these value to life claims.

Room: 342  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5

Cruz, Jon

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Monticello DT**

Max = 30

**Montville BG**

Max = 30

Dustin Thomas

29.5

Ben Gaudiosi

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from MONTICELLO  
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, sophisticated use of CX.

Apathy of judge needs more development.

A 1:30 2AR = major perceptual dominance. Nice job!

~~the judge's decision~~  
~~was based on the 2AR~~  
~~major perceptual dominance.~~  
~~Nice job.~~

RFD

I vote on the dropped elts requirement.

: (AFF)

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

36

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis MK

Max = 30

Monticello JC

Max = 30

Michael Kigawa

27.5

Jonathan Conklin

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: Shelli Gimelstein

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Good AC

JAR needs to do more work on the f/w debate. You can very easily take out the overview bc self defense is motivated by internal will to survive or whatever - that's implied in your responses but needs to be more clear. Good job on linking to util though.

RFD: I end up voting aff because he o/w on the util impacts (legal alternatives are empirically & effective / lead to death, and victims & have freedom both at home and in jail so it's nonunique. So at least deadly force is a way to avoid almost certain death.)

NC + NR: ~~read card~~  
Petra card just says liberty is good, I don't see why that necessarily means these women deserve it (missing link as to why they ought not go to jail for killing) - is the implication that all jail is bad? (he's also linking to it b/c victims of DV lose freedom already.) I also don't see how AC f/w excludes self defense since the intrinsic motivation is preserving one's life, and that is "pleasure" > pain...  
I generally dislike when a 1 sentence f/w exclusion blip in the AC becomes a huge deal in 1AR + 2AR. I also think he's proving the res wholly actually in that his offense is ~~relevant~~ relevant to all cases of BW - his "3 cases" is just a way of specifying what the res asks us to deal with