

Room: 217
Start: 11:15
Varsity LD

6

Schneier, Holly

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Lakeland BZ

Max = 30

Princeton WM

Max = 30

Brendan Zarkower

28

William Meyer

29

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both cases were delivered in a solid thorough manner. I voted for NEG because I thought his rebuttal was stronger on a number of levels.

First on Moral Feiture, and fact that AFF used very partial quote by Dussler - while Dussler's argument is against infuiter. Second on

his rebuttal of vigilantism -- Neg's argument against was much stronger than AFF's -- that Domestic Violence is a special case. NEG rebutted notion of special case successfully.

I don't think there were many strong elements in the AFF case including "limitation of Alternatives" and VC of social contract. However, I thought "Good Means" worked ^{NEG VC.} but overall I feel that NEG was stronger.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Marlboro Independent RD Max = 30

Regis BK

Max = 30

Rachel DiSciullo 27.5

Barrett King 28

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

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

Signed: Kathryn C. Harris

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

[AC] Your criterion forces you to show that using deadly force actually increases the victim's quality of life + you don't do that. Moreover, your ~~criteria~~ value needs to be more specific - people can have a bad quality of life. I find it really disturbing that you compare abuses to brain-dead people. **[NC]** Some of your arguments in case aren't really warranted - you do a better job w/ this in rebuttal. You set up a very clear structure in your framework, but the case itself isn't that unified - it totally would be stronger if it were. Good overview, but I wish you'd make another one saying she needs solvency or her case goes away. You're very, very clear, but you get a little mundane. **[AR]** Pretty sure saying affirming leads to alternatives is a new argument, + that card doesn't attribute the stat to using deadly force - it attributes it to alternatives! You severely under cover here and drop his overview, which is a huge problem bc it obliterates your case to the resolution. **[NR]** Great going for the overview right away! Really clear extensions. Voters are kind of haphazard though - I'd rather you crystallize @ the end + give yourself time to develop them + impact + weigh. **[AR]** I'd serve you better to start the speech weighing arguments instead of rehashing the values. **[ZFD]** All days the overview that necessarily shows equal morality so I disagree on that. Aside from that, aff shows how deadly force actually increases quality of life + the neg shows how he better achieves that w/ alternatives.

Room: 233
Start: 11:15
Varsity LD

6

Akridge, Akilah

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis RM

Max = 30

Bronx Science AH

Max = 30

Ryan McEvoy

30

Anthony Hagouel

29

The better debating was done by the AFF from REGIS RM
AFF for NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Will Rip

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The negative dropped ~~a lot~~ a lot of arguments throughout which later became voters for the AFF.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis PK

Max = 30

Montville TS

Max = 30

Paul Kigawa

28

Tolga Sozusen

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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Close round. I was impressed by the talents of both debaters.

Here's the bottom line: the proportionality arg + nec/exc arg are compelling but the first isn't clearly articulated in the 2NR and the second, while extended, needs to be compared to the offense on which I eventually vote. Namely:

1. Deadly force meets NEG's std. for permissible self-defense.
2. @ DV perpetrate violence, disrespecting value of life.

o - (AFF)

Room: 113
Start: 11:15
Varsity LD

6 Bowyer, Jonathon

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harrison AB

Max = 30

Ridge LP

Max = 30

Ally Brabant

29.5

Liz Pires

30

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

RFD: Voted on Truth testing / NC

Rest was oral

Room: 218
Start: 11:15
Varsity LD

6

Chomba, Pamela

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Stuyvesant SH

Max = 30

Princeton RP

Max = 30

Samantha Horn

28

Ryan Protter

28 1/2

The better debating was done by the Princeton ^{Neg} from Princeton
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:

*Samantha,
practice clarity.*

REF

*aff loses autonomy/personhood
burden to prove show
a judgemental person
can act on a deadly
force be of self defence.*

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis JC

Max = 30

Bronx Science SuSi

Max = 30

Janus Cataluna

28

Sunpreet Singh

27.5

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: Philip Williford

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg. - Standard was respect invariable value of person, b/c in CX recognized problem of how do we protect ^{self} value in cases of immediate threat

It is hard to see how an actor being excusable b/c action not being permissible works. If the actor is excused from deadly force, it seems invariable right to self-preservation is meaningless since we do recognize it as being acceptable.

Aff. - Social contract is typically political, & therefore legal, & not interrelated & moral as Neg. points out. However, when choice b/w self & other, Aff. gives justification for arbitrariness.

Definition debate - It felt abusive to force Aff. into Neg. definition when Aff. provides a justification for domestic abuse definition

Vote reason - Neg. standard was weakened in CX. Aff. capitalized on excusable use, permissibility & successfully showed justified definition of domestic abuse to establish case.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Marlboro Independent DD	Max = 30	Pingry BC	Max = 30
Doron Darnov	<u>29</u>	Brandon Chow	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the aff from Marlboro Independent
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:

I Voted Affirmative for the following reasons:

① The Neg was unable to address a majority of the aff arguments along with being unable to meet the burden.

Aff provides: Victims the opportunity to reclaim their freedom.
: Provides a balance to egoism / checks & Balances.
: in the most extreme circumstances, victims may be unable to turn to society for help. Violence is only acceptable as a last resort.

Neg: I found your 1 argument case to be innovative yet it put you at a great disadvantage.

The idea that "everything is considered false until true" is not a sufficient standard to vote Negative.

Please build a proper case with strong valid arguments.

* Card should be used as reference material
Net independent arguments * → good luck

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Ridge JW	Max = 30	Montville RE	Max = 30
Jack Wilson	<u>29</u>	Rachel Elias	<u>29.5</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from MONTVILLE RE
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! AND TOUGH DECISION.

- I VOTE NEG BECAUSE OF THE UNFULFILLED BURDEN AFF DEFINES FOR HIMSELF IN 2CY. (4 PTS + WINK CARD)
- I VOTE AFF ON POINTS 1 AND 2 ABOUT IMMINENCY OF VIOLENCE AND PROPORTIONALITY OF PUNISHMENT AS NEG'S RESPONSES TRIED TO DIFFERENTIATE "REPEATED" AND "CONTINUOUS" ~~BY WINK CARD~~ I DO NOT BUY THE DISTINCTION.
- I VOTE A STRONG NEG ON POINT 3 THAT THE HARM ALREADY IS KNOWN BEFORE "ULTIMATE" VIOLENCE AND ∴ BUY PREMEDITATION ARGUMENT.
- ~~POWERFUL RESPONSE~~
- LASTLY, ALTHOUGH AFF DID RESPOND TO WINK W/ THE NORMATIVE KNOWLEDGE ARGUMENT. (NIETZCHE?) HE FAILED TO PROPERLY ADDRESS THE SLIPPERY SLOPE OF VIOLENCE MENTIONED IN THE CARD. NEG'S POINT OF STOPPING SINGLE CYCLE OF VIOLENCE NOT PROVING MORALITY IS WELL TAKEN

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis PM

Max = 30

Montville OQ

Max = 30

Peter McGahren

27

Olivia Qiu

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: Matt Dunay

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

VC opposes particularly

1. root opp
 cutare
 Bronca
 logic
 dom.

1. del =) \emptyset
 SD
 ! use M
 opp on
 group.

1. del =) cop/
 get: impic
 \rightarrow delib \emptyset
 firm opp
 ! Delil re
 \rightarrow opp re

ZAR IS RATHER UNORGANIZED.

ZAR HAS A LOT OF NEW ARGUMENTS,
 AND DIDN'T HAVE TO

2. delium

Cooler

VC FWU
 prog.

Delin
 in particular

1. elinaw/
 NC ble solve
 vicil \rightarrow
 solve flow

reg part
 delin cross
 is to delin.

look keep
 sets / (obj) sets
 tell.

1. delin, contrast
 del =) ambati
 up no on
 \rightarrow DE

delin
 (delin =)
 \rightarrow delin =)
 part
 delin

delin
 delin
 central

delin
 delin
 delin

Room: 237
Start: 11:15
Varsity LD

6 McKinney, Alzamar

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Timothy Christian AM

Max = 30

Montville DD

Max = 30

Andrew Meleta

29

Deep Dheri

29

The better debating was done by the Aff from Andrew Meleta
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:

I accept Aff's interpretation, therefore I accept that deadly force is morally permissible some of the time.

Room: 342
Start: 11:15
Varsity LD

6

Gimelstein, Shel

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis CL

Max = 30

Monticello DT

Max = 30

Chris Luccarelli

27

Dustin Thomas

27.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from Monticello
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:

The squo vs. hypothetical debate was super messy. It's unclear what either of you meant by hypothetical (i.e. does that mean any theoretical argument, like social contract?) you need to say what specifically your interp will take out, not just "the AC goes away." Also unclear was the debate over rights, since in both worlds rights are being violated & no one is telling me how to weigh the rights violations in jail vs. at home. Also, not sure why the neg. burden/aff burden (as per NC) is never discussed, seems like it'd be important. Ultimately the only f/w both are linking to & referencing in 2NR & 1AR is Aff's f/w of maximizing rights via consequentialism. Aff is saying that when DFIS used, 42% of the time it results in death, whereas Neg is saying that 45% of the time it's used, women end up in jail where they are raped. ~~these stats don't seem to be able to be used~~. So either you die or you go to jail, seems there's no other alternative. Neg gives weighing analysis ~~but~~ that rape is worse than death because there's ongoing trauma & no escape, so I have to vote there - but literally neg won by a hair & this round was nearly irresolvable b/c neither of you did enough framework analysis

Dustin:
CX: stay away from "you can make that argument, but..."
no need to preempt, just answer

Room: 322
Start: 11:15
Varsity LD

6

Hassin, Michael

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Ridge VL

Max = 30

Scarsdale LM

Max = 30

Vicki Liu

28.5

Larry Milstein

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:

v. close round, offense isn't relevant bc there's nothing to prove if it meets conditions for impermissibility, i'll affirm on the resource/proportionality types

Room: 239
Start: 11:15
Varsity LD

6

Golden, Lawrence

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Timothy Christian JH

Max = 30

Scarsdale SF

Max = 30

Jonathan Horvat

27.5

Steven Friedman

28

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

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

Signed: Laurence Golden

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff good constructive but why is everyone caught up this 2 prong Wallerstein assertion when it probably can be better explained and warranted with your own analysis as a better author

Neg effective ex in terms of strategy

This round was different one because there was attempted clash, but pointless attempts to extend arguments with ink and responses to it. Here's how the round breaks down. I adopt negative framework of motivational internalism with the criteria of reciprocity/proportionality. because the Aff framework is adequately dealt with he takes out the Wallerstein stuff

he responds to the burden stuff with this notion of objectivity being more preferable than victim perspective so the extension of burden is through ink because he does have a response and in IAR the warrant is not extended with that easy to negate

A Imminence of Cold War relationship \rightarrow it is personal not like does not deal with
B.

Room: 139
Start: 11:15
Varsity LD

6

Cumming, Jay

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Millburn SM

Max = 30

Bronx Science TM

Max = 30

Shiv Malhotra :40

29.5

Tyler Morris :50

29.5

The better debating was done by the Nes from Bronx Sci TM
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: ontology → ethical system

object exists → we need a theory
consistent with that

Buddhism believes → There is a scripture
we're all one in buddhism that
says do not kill

the only general prohibitions argument
doesn't affirm of object, my understanding
of the warrant is there have to be allowable
actions, just b/c we can't kill doesn't mean
we can't do other things

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Pingry AK

Max = 30

Ridge AM

Max = 30

Amol Kapoor

28

Arianna Montero-Colbert 29

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

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

Signed: Rabeya Rd

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFDs

First, good round/debate. Appreciated the clash that remained direct and clear throughout the arguments. Second, thought the debate stayed focus to more of a standards/deontological debate than anything.

NC - Aside from the oral comments, focus on 3 arguments: 1) If of team that Harbored and, APP obviously needs the understanding of what created the idea of being called a victim can entail, as it's on how of objectivity. Accepting it, he goes beyond to say in addition to how, the whole aspect of being dehumanized (as a victim) also then being called as victim. 2) If being called as victim denotes a status, then the agency of that status is derived from the action of that person, which APP turns to a positive effect. 3) The idea of being called as victim can have multiple impacts like on both ~~APP~~ neg's conceptions that eventually cannot be a collective objective.

AC - The last idea is pretty well explored in heavy rebuttal against APP's standards, but APP explains that both explanation & retaliation + morality fall under natural reasons, which I agree APP never contextualizes, but considering the only offensive argument on the AC side, that ~~APP~~ self-defense does not justify the violation of others' life or the desperate, APP expands the suicide contention (which remained unaddressed) as the justification. And if morality cannot be objective, this would best exemplify which morality can be subjective, and yet still take into the standards of rationality as a guide to behavior. If a person rationalizes, as would be necessary, then are his the morality to do so - the exception.

Room: 229
Start: 11:15
Varsity LD

6


Chy, Charles

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Marlboro Independent DP	Max = 30	Regis MK	Max = 30
Daniel Pantelo	<u>28</u>	Michael Kigawa	<u>26.5</u>

The better debating was done by the aff 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:

Room: 319
Start: 11:15
Varsity LD

6

Cooper, William

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

1:03

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Monticello JC

Max = 30

Scarsdale AS

Max = 30

Jonathan Conklin

28

Aron Szanto

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from SCARSDALE
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:

The key to this round is determining determinism. I think the neg does an admirable job of going back to the beginning of time to prove that, since there is no demonstrable cause to the universe, then it all is determined by causation - ~~and~~ and, since our brains are ordered like the universe, our decisions are not determined. Therefore, we need a system of Ω to govern decisions.

App Neg's argument on probability
 \therefore we.

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Marlboro Independent AH

Max = 30

Bronx Science ZR

Max = 30

Aviela Hochberg

27

Zeke Rosenberg

27

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff)
Naturalistic ethics?
NO idea what this means.
How do we weigh this standard?

1 Negated b/c
Aff did not extend evidence into the ZAR that would have affirmed the resolution.
Just extended the standard that doesn't allow me to weigh anything and cards that do not link to standard.

Zeke,
① you're not reading fast. just speaking loud and unclear. practice speed reading.
② Great ex, but then you read a bunch of irrelevant cards in the NR...
~~Zeke~~

② How is the Aff marginalizing women of other races via her definition?

④ You are funny! you should use your humor more to your advantage

What is monolithic discourse?

⑤ Your argument came down to "Negate, because we ignore tabus being flipped over in Japan!"