

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Princeton WM

Max = 30

Monticello BP

Max = 30

William Meyer

28

Bhumi Parekh

26

The better debating was done by the AFF from PRINCETON WM  
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:

GOOD DEBATE. CAME DOWN TO 3 V.I.S

① MORAL CULPIBILITY: AFF CASE RELIES ON WARRANTED CLAIM THAT VICTIMS ARE NOT CAPABLE OF RATIONAL DECISIONS. NEG FAILS TO SEE THIS IN HER RESPONSE TO AFF FRAMEWORK.

② LEGAL: NEG RELIES HEAVILY ON STATUS QUO OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM TO MEDIATE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE. AFF SHOWS SOWENCY.

③ KUMAR "DROP"  
WAS NOT ACTUALLY DROPPED. RESPONDED TO THRUOUT AFF REBUTTALS.  
PART OF THIS CARD WAS DROPPED (TIME RELEVENCE OF CRIME)  
BUT WAS NOT IMPACTED ON NEG

Room: 222  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5

Kapoor, Akhil

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

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Ridge DV**

Max = 30

**Montville ND**

Max = 30

Danny Van Nest

29


Neville Dusaj

29

The better debating was done by the Neg 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:

Neg defined "deliberate" as premeditated, i.e. abused  
had the time to evaluate options  
- Aff did not provide any defn & had to  
prove imminence for self defense which  
Aff could not do successfully

Room: 207  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5

Wolfe, Pheobe

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College JK

Max = 30

Regis RM

Max = 30

Jonathan Kupfer

28

Ryan McEvoy

29.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from Regis RM  
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 overviews, ~~and~~ but even if I look to the case level, the NC f/w is clearly won as well as extensions from the NC & turns on the se.

Room: 205  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5

Grajewski A

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

### AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis RF *3.05*

Max = 30

Lakeland BZ *2.00*

Max = 30

Robbie Flatow

*27.5*

Brendan Zarkower

*25*

The better debating was done by the *AFF* from *Robbie Flatow*  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: *[Signature]*

*please refrain from merely reading a bunch of cards & not sign posters*

*sign post better you are all over the flow*

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*I vote AFF b/c 5/10 ⊕ for. 7 are → shows morally neutral & that  
Aff's don't matter if looking to moral neutrality also I beg that  
life needs freedom -*

Room: 301  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5

Koniuta, Robert

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

Freehold Township MA

Max = 30

Muhammad Arif

28.0

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Marlboro Independent DD


Max = 30

Doron Darnov

29.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from DD  
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

repeated abuse creates a situation which is outside the norm  
found. "It alters the psychology of the abused woman.  
This concept needs to be grounded in some trusted source.

NEG → seeks to find proof why a ♀ could not seek other options beside talking abuser  
if they leave →  
if they call police →  
if they stay

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Henry Clay BS

Max = 30

Hunter College AM

Max = 30

Ben Swanson

28.5

Alberto Malaney

28.0

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

**AFF**

- FRAMEWORK WAS SUPPORTING BY CONTESTANTS AND EVIDENCE

- DID NOT ADDRESS QUESTION OF PROPORTIONALITY PROBABLY BETTER BY NEG

- QUESTION OF SEPARATE PEOPLE INTO GROUPS BY NEG WAS NOT ADDRESSED

- GOOD SUMMARY AS YOU WOULD ASK TO LINK THE VALUE (YOUR ARGUMENT) TO THE RESOLUTION

**NEG**

- GOOD FRAMEWORK FOR ESTABLISHING YOUR ARGUMENT

- DID NOT ADDRESS AFF'S VALUE OF YOUR ARGUMENT - YOU WOULD NEED POINTS AND MORE PERSUASION

- YOU WERE EFFECTIVE DURING (AUG) X IN ADDRESSING AFF'S (DEFENSE) OF DISPROOF OF SELF-DEFENSE (DAN) US NW CREATING

- GOOD SUMMARY

I VOTE FOR THE AFF AS ITS WAS BETTER ASK TO DEFEND THE RESOLUTION FOLLOWING A MORE CONSISTENT FLOW TO THE ARGUMENTS

Room: 219  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5

Bendi, Cristi

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Montville RU

Max = 30

Regis JC

Max = 30

Rahul Upadhyia

29

Janus Cataluna

26.5

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

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

Signed: C. Bendi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

aff

You are a very good speaker -  
I really liked how you showed  
a clear difference b/w legal and  
moral permissibility, neg didn't  
show me otherwise.

- Pick and choose your arguments  
more carefully bc a lot of good  
cards/warrants went unspoken of,  
along with your entire contention I.

neg

You should really stand up when  
speaking, especially if you are not using  
your laptop, it just looks better and will  
get you higher speaker pts.

- You ran out of time and  
dropped the con cards at the  
bottom of the AC which really hurt  
you. aff was able to extend these  
and outweigh your time card.

Great values debate, really nice to see that class. @

Room: 215  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5

Hassin, Michael

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

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Scarsdale ZE**

Max = 30

**Regis CL**

Max = 30

Zach Edelman

28  
~~28~~

Chris Luccarelli

27  
~~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: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*empiricism → anything is permissible*

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Montville RE

Max = 30

Hunter College HH

Max = 30

Rachel Elias

27

Henry Ho

27

The better debating was done by the

Aff  
AFF or NEG

from

Montville  
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Kathryn Harris

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AC If we can't evaluate alternatives, why are you arguing that victims can't leave? NC your case only talks about self-defense, not the use of deadly force; this only justifies non-lethal means of self-defense. You need to clearly link to deadly force. I think the Locke/Card talks about the State of Nature and why we need government. UC I saw your roommate win this case yesterday so if you guys see all morning the same thing, don't do it write your own case. You case is basically meaningless - 5 blippy justifications for the criterion + ~~the~~ saying "deadly force is not automatically in any way." Not making any offense is going to hurt you. Good to point out that self-defense doesn't automatically include deadly force. I hope you really blow that up in the NR. TR You should have yourself more than 13 seconds to prep signpost is more than telling me Card names - you have to say where the Cards are on the flow! Good to point out the internal contradiction. NR You need to address her respect. You just extend through it. Yeah saying self-defense doesn't work is a new argument. A lot of your NC arguments are basically the same, so you couldn't really do much in this speech. WR I don't think you extended Locke in the 1AR. Why are you doing me - by-line after all? RFD I can't look at authority, so I look at self-defense + the rig doesn't give me anyway victims can defend themselves, so I affirm.

Room: 201  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5

Akridge, Akilah

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

### AFFIRMATIVE

Scarsdale BU

Ben Ulene

POINTS

Max = 30

30

### NEGATIVE

Marlboro Independent DP

Daniel Pantelo

POINTS

Max = 30

29

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: \_\_\_\_\_

Akil Akilah

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Aff: Excellent TURN in 1st 1AR. Victim R will actually spark compassion from others. "Victim" shouldn't deny themselves of their experience
- Aff: Great Wpckee card with blaming the victim
- NEG: Topicality argument is important yet it was outweighed in Aff's 2AR

Room: 230  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5 McKinney, Alzama

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Ridge AM**

Max = 30

**Harrison AB**

Max = 30

Arianna Montero-Colbert 27.5

Ally Brabant 28

The better debating was done by the Neg from Ally Brabant  
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 offense coming out of AC, and Neg places  
turns on AC, thus I affirm

Room: 319  
Start: 9:30  
Varsity LD

5

Astacio, Carlos

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale AS

Max = 30

Ridge HW

Max = 30

Aron Szanto

28

Howard Wei

28

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

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

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



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

If the 2AR was going to go for theory, I think the abuse story needs to be better. When explaining an abuse story, the aff only says that I have to use my ballot to check back the strategy skew of him having to answer a lot of arguments in a short amount of time.

The negative has the better evidence/argument for why even if the aff is winning it doesn't matter because the analysis for why is explained as why the reasoning in Ripstein just bites into the criticism/argument for why the use of violence perpetuates the cycle of violence. This is probably a rule that we don't want to be universalizable. So I vote negative.

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

<b>AFFIRMATIVE</b>	POINTS	<b>NEGATIVE</b>	POINTS
<b>Bronx Science SuSi</b>	Max = 30	<b>Timothy Christian JH</b>	Max = 30
Sunpreet Singh	<u>21.0</u>	Jonathan Horvat	<u>24.5</u>

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

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

Signed: [Handwritten Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: IAC is cool but I think you need a better ROB. "determines who is the better debater" doesn't give me a specific way to evaluate your performance. The ROB here should be "whichever best brings humanity back into debate wins" -> more evidence to why the song = a reason to vote aff

Neg: I like the AC & I think in case you should be using arbitrariness as an internal line to them (i.e. - its - the song - vague so that kills fairness of ed, etc.). I think you'd just win this straight up b/c abts. songs can't be minimized - that's the whole point of them!!! It tries to make "I meet" or TD arg's than he dubh fears his attempt to universalize a song will kill others' ability to use their own personal performances which bites all his arg's in the AC.

IDK why you guys let this get so messy!!! For both of you, there were easy ways to close this round, which I'll talk about in the AFD

Thy:  
Ed: All tries to leverage all other on Brinkley, but the last aff speech is NOT pulling out the contents of this ed and telling me why the neg's strategy is the same sat. I know you're Brinkley but - I can read the card but that doesn't mean the arg't was in the last rebuttal!!! - I see this as an I'll to your ROB, but in the last speech I have no idea how you assess your ROB b/c you do no analysis

Overall, the last aff rebuttal is not telling me why the neg's failure to have the pointed they shall is especially bad if worse than we start skew the aff cases.  
- last aff speech isn't extending any of the terms or offensive reasons to give you they as in ROB  
- Neg has all of analysis on they & I'm not comfortable doing the work for the aff when the neg is providing an abuse story, albeit somewhat unclear w/ regard to Ed.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Bailey, Asha

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Ridge JC

Max = 30

Regis PK

Max = 30

Jeffrey Cai

23

Paul Kigawa

25

The better debating was done by the NEG from Regis PK  
AFF OR NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

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

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Regis PK

- o Provided strong examples + evidence to support claims.

Strongest examples:

- a. Statistics/facts - "only 33.75% are fatalities due to domestic violence."
- b. Other alternatives for Domestic violence can be used other than death (this countered the slavery argument)
- c. Used loaded language to show that "Punishment doesn't fit the crime!"  
Eg. - Devaluing humans by taking away human rights to life.

Improvements = You relied much on law instead of focusing your entire argument on proving morality.

Ridge

Did well on the following:

- o clearly stated the definition + where morality derives from (Universal Rationality)
- o Great Rebuttal when you used slavery as an example to show that law + morality is mutually exclusive.

Improvements

- Need to provide more concrete examples to counter your opponents strongest points.

Ex: 33.75 fatalities  
- Human Rights  
- Definition of Morality  
ON BACK