

Room: 107  
Start: 11:15  
Varsity LD

6

Hom, Anna

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**Freehold Township MG**

Max = 30

Michelle Grushko

28.5

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Montville JZ**

Max = 30

Jerry Zhang

28.0

The better debating was done by the Aff from Freehold  
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

Neg

- case well presented and well warranted.
- good job with holding your own during cross-x ~~with~~ in maintaining that the violence inflicted on an abuser is not violence, but instead self defense.
- good speaker - fast, but very articulate -> good job during IAR -> flew down your case, opponent's side lightening fast
- good response to neg's rebuttal about no income -> point about husband ~~has~~ preventing access to funds
- it would have been better if you had responded to neg's point about shelters
- Aff's standard wins and aff did a better job of debating based on quality of arguments, rebuttals, etc. Aff also did a better job of achieving that std. -> Walker evidence meeting criteria of imminency / proportionality key

- good question during cross-x about what's worse? - being killed or being punched multiple times
- argument laid out well and warranted
- INK -> good job of addressing both framework and rebutting arguments.
- good point about if husband killed - then income stops which makes Aff's world worse since aff ~~controls~~ states one reason ~~women~~ abused women don't leave is because of financial constraints
- Analogy of milk -> not a good one - not comparable ->
- comparing repeated physical abuse (punched) to killing not fair comparison - not comparable
- Walker evidence not refuted well enough

Room: 222  
Start: 11:15  
Varsity LD

6

Bendi, Cristi

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**Marlboro Independent AN**

Max = 30

Alex Nayfeld

26.5

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Ridge DV**

Max = 30

Danny Van Nest

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from Ridge DV  
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

Kahn Card that you used at the bottom of the NC against the Criminal Justice System argument was

Very fitting, nice job; however, you did not have enough time to extend any points on the Aff!! You need to use your time more wisely.

→ The only thing I would have to vote on for you would be the Criminal Justice System, but everything else that Neg impacted outweighs this argument.

→ You can't extend new arguments in 2 Atc... use this time to crystallize.

Neg

Nice job w/ the values, you were able to prove that the aff values were a prerequisite to yours.

Excellent ~~2NR~~ <sup>2NR</sup>!! You extended, impacted, extended again and achieved morality for both sides... this made me very happy!

Room: 108  
Start: 11:15  
Varsity LD

6

Astacio, Carlos

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL


## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

| AFFIRMATIVE   | POINTS    | NEGATIVE      | POINTS      |
|---------------|-----------|---------------|-------------|
| Montville ND  | Max = 30  | Monticello LS | Max = 30    |
| Neville Dusaj | <u>26</u> | Lucas Smith   | <u>28.5</u> |

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

IAR should probably answer the analysis on theory for why him not having post-fiat ground is key to team ground.

Room: 207  
Start: 11:15  
Varsity LD

6

Grajewski A

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

*I like you  
Case.  
Best  
c/x I  
heard  
all  
Day*

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**Ridge DC**

Dane Chodos

POINTS

Max = 30

26.5

**NEGATIVE**

**Hunter College JK**

Jonathan Kupfer

POINTS

Max = 30

27.5

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

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

Signed: *[Signature]*

**COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:**

*I vote AFF due to the Framework debate by Frank Kent justifies the before  
culpability. Kragan meets AFF burden, overview/net case fail to hold up  
against conclusion. Arg I cr on the side of study over analysis*

Room: 205  
Start: 11:15  
Varsity LD

6

Arena, Jonathan

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Montville BG**

Max = 30

**Regis RF**

Max = 30

Ben Gaudiosi

28

Robbie Flatow

27.5

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

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

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

**COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:**

Double bond, caused arena to  
rejoice. Clear extensions of Valsken  
You clearly meeting immunity &  
proportionality. Analysis of the  
Obol also key for weighing analysis.  
You need to take about boy (3,  
you parameterize his vs to  
"minimally" terms, but it's  
"minimally" primitive terms. Be careful

How can the vs be an absolute statement  
but then we can be vs specific?  
You try to attack Valsken after  
Robbie. Badly misheard! The  
Obol vs specific. I'd be bad inputs  
on the NL if this goes forward,  
which it does. How can I make  
evidence be relevant and predictable?  
Your only explicit allusion is the  
children, but his extension enough  
to attack.

All clearly extends Valsken. It's wrong proportionality &  
immunity. Double bond sends the def. They ignores  
this argument, misstates vs specific observation.

Room: 228  
Start: 11:15  
Varsity LD

6

Omoregie, Kemi

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

| AFFIRMATIVE     | POINTS      | NEGATIVE      | POINTS    |
|-----------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|
| Monticello PC   | Max = 30    | Henry Clay BS | Max = 30  |
| Peter Chocolate | <u>29.5</u> | Ben Swanson   | <u>30</u> |

The better debating was done by the Neg from Henry Clay  
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: Really good at CX

Neg: Really good at CX. Very articulate.

~~30~~

Very Close! Hard Decision!

Room: 213  
Start: 11:15  
Varsity LD

6

Zhong, L

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Monticello BP

Max = 30

Bronx Science TB

Max = 30

Bhumi Parekh

27

Thomas Berruti

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:

If you're reading a narrative/emotional appeal, don't speed through the parts of the case that should appeal emotionally/matter. Bhumi— is this your case? The answer to his CX question "why is real world applicability the most fair/best way to argue"—is exactly the ~~Strake~~ Strake & Wallace card.

AC

You can't turn NC access to fairness just b/c he doesn't have education. Your extensions are sparse. Run a narrative like a story.

NC

They needs a voter also table it they Neg debater! Don't group! If you have so much time

Dral RFD

Room: 209  
Start: 11:15  
Varsity LD

6

Wolfe, Pheobe

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale CB

Max = 30

Charlie Blatt

28

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Timothy Christian GM

Max = 30

Gerritt Maniguet

29

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: \_\_\_\_\_

Pheobe Wolfe

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I don't see why the AC action of allowing women to kill  
caused any more "real world" change than the K alt.  
I buy the alternative and the clear extensions of  
the links. The neg also controls the internal links to  
patriarchy, even if I'm not looking at the alternative.

Room: 242  
Start: 11:15  
Varsity LD

6

Poveda, Christin

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

| AFFIRMATIVE  | POINTS      | NEGATIVE    | POINTS    |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| Scarsdale JA | Max = 30    | Ridge JC    | Max = 30  |
| Josh Annex   | <u>27.5</u> | Jeffrey Cai | <u>27</u> |

The better debating was done by the APP from Scarsdale JA  
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:

- APP wins on two frameworks which the neg does not answer:
  1. Neg must provide another framework, another solution to using deadly forces.
  2. Neg must link to the idea of the victims - textuality key to fairness (this goes conceded by the neg)  
The neg answers theory at the end of the round, - too late!
- APP also wins on Irrationality vs. Rational victims allowing to permit using deadly forces.
  - Neg responds by claiming there are internal reasons for why they must result into letting such as feelings, and emotions - but that does not provide a solution to solve their irrational motives. Through this contractarian view, there are other motivational factors that need to be taken into account. And that is best solved for through the app.

Room: 208  
Start: 11:15  
Varsity LD

6

Fitzgerald, Edwa

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

(100)

145

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Ridge HW

Max = 30

Livingston High JX

Max = 30

Howard Wei


28.5

Jessica Xu

28

The better debating was done by the Aff 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:

I have heard these IAC & IAC summer many times before...  
Generally, I think Aff is a better spot w/ these competency skills, unfortunately.  
Aff is always carrying a large & more spec. impact.

IAC could have been a bit more offensive / closing of doors. / organized a bit better

PR & Inherent Reasons are very close / synonymous. There may be differences but with debater  
is isolating & distinguishing them.

NK needs to be more spec. 2 situations of DV = not just arbitrariness with abstract.

RFR Aff is deeper & more developed.  
Plus DF is proper  
psychological abuse as a answer + Aff's case right to life is also won

Room: 201  
Start: 11:15  
Varsity LD

6

Cheung, William

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

Millburn YY

Yang Yi

POINTS

Max = 30

29.5

NEGATIVE

Scarsdale BU

Ben Ulene

POINTS

Max = 30

28.5

The better debating was done by the Aff from Millburn  
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:

- Neg - 1) Impact the exasability argument. I think it's fine but it's not important
- 2) why is the CP mutually exclusive. Also he's right your C-X answers were super abuse.
- 3) Spend less time on NBIs and more on fiat theory
- 4) ~~cross~~ your NBI standards answers fiat, (ros) team over.
- Aff - More work on the fiat and reasons to prefer fairness & edu would be nice.

Room: 301  
Start: 11:15  
Varsity LD

6

Kapoor, Akhil

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Hunter College HH

Max = 30

Freehold Township MA

Max = 30

Henry Ho


27.5

Muhammad Arif

27

The better debating was done by the Aff from FAH  
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's value criticism of Minimizing suffering defined the round

- Neg contradicted by stating that 50% of homeless women who leave dom violence suffer from poverty
- Neg failed to provide a study on intent of, houses of BWS, which he referred in his speech.

Room: 219  
Start: 11:15  
Varsity LD

6

Kelly, Tom

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Ridge EW

Max = 30

Montville RU

Max = 30

Eric Wei

28.5

Rahul Upadhyia

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

APP

- WELL OF REASONING  
AND SUPPORT IN THE  
(W) (W)

- YOU DID NOT RESPOND IN  
(AND) X REASON UNWARRANTED  
A PROBABILITIES OF STATISTICS

- WELL IN RESPONSE IN NEG;  
CONTRAST REASONING THE  
RESPONSE THE LIFE AND THE IN  
JUST DEBATE FACE AS PROBABILITIES

WELL

- CONTRAST WELL WELL CONTRAST  
AND (AND) X REASONING WELL  
THE RESPONSE IN NEGATIVE THE  
APP (W) PROBABILITIES  
PROBABILITIES

- DID NOT ADDRESS SPECIFICALLY  
THE CONTRAST OF REASONING  
OF CRUCIAL SYSTEM ON THE APP  
PROBABILITIES FACE USE

- GOOD SUMMARY YOU WERE ABLE  
TO SYNTHESIZE YOUR CONTRAST AND  
LIFE THE IN THE NEG POSITION

I NOTE THE WELL AS THE WAS BEST ABLE  
TO WELL THE REASONING AND REASONS THE APP POSITION  
REASONING PROBABILITIES RESPONSE, WELL WAS WELL CONTRASTED  
TO THE OTHER SIDES.

Room: 215  
Start: 11:15  
Varsity LD

6 Hansen, Rebecca

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

| AFFIRMATIVE  | POINTS    | NEGATIVE     | POINTS    |
|--------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| Delbarton RT | Max = 30  | Scarsdale ZE | Max = 30  |
| Ryan Teehan  | <u>27</u> | Zach Edelman | <u>28</u> |

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

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

Signed: Rebecca Hansen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The AFF didn't do enough work to refute the NEG analysis regarding the non-existence of actual real resolutional actors. The AFF presumes that the resolutional action exists, but NEG shows evidence of why we doubt that such choices are actually free and voluntary (i.e. free will doesn't truly exist). Unless you first establish this, you can't talk about whether d/f is truly permissible. The unicorn example and all of its implications were not dealt with as effectively or with as much depth of counteranalysis as they really should have been in IAR. The implications of this are at the heart of what NEG was trying to prove. AFF made some individual strong arguments, but didn't effectively deal with the two-part reasoning of the NEG thesis. In the absence of proving the res. true, I presume NEG.

Room: 109  
Start: 11:15  
Varsity LD

6

Koniuta, Robert

# NEWARK INVITATIONAL

## Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Hunter College AM**

Max = 30

**Stuyvesant JA**

Max = 30

Alberto Malaney

27.5

Jae Ahn

27.0

The better debating was done by the AF from HCC  
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:

AF

Contention of "children suffering" was never addressed by neg in a substantial way

NEG

Other options exist? ? shelters?  
? what?  
? else.  
? present evidence/data to prove your point

Child needs to witness suffering in order to know suffering?  
too harsh  
Neg needs to bring the debate arguments to a more concrete level  
Arguing about abstract concepts such as the "finality of death" takes time away from other arguments.