

Room: 201
Start: 1:30
Varsity LD

DOUB

Chy, Charles

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Monticello LS (Lucas Smith) vs. Bronx Science AH (Anthony Hagouel)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the

aff
AFF or NEG

from

Monticello LS
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: 201
Start: 1:30
Varsity LD

DOUB

Cooper, William

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Monticello LS (Lucas Smith) vs. Bronx Science AH (Anthony Haguel)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

~~BRONX AH~~ MONTICELLO LS
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

~~MONTI~~ BRONX AH
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

al negate.

Negative I think clearly establishes that inviolability of persons is key, and if we accept the patriarchal - and also clearly places way over into the patriarchal structure with ♀. Morality - The U further sound - is best upheld w/ clear restraint, and by saying what we can't do, we have those restraints - There is a guideline to act w/in those bound.

Room: 201
Start: 1:30
Varsity LD

DOUB

Gimelstein, Shel

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Bronx Science AH (Anthony Hagouel) vs. Monticello LS (Lucas Smith)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the

Neg
AFF or NEG

from

Bronx
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Shelli Gimelstein

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Lucas, I don't think Young card is saying what you're trying to extrapolate from it - I don't see how the existence of social groups becomes a reason for me to affirm on face. Anthony, really effective CX. Good use of Butler in 2NR. On the framework level, I think neg does a better job of extending his & precluding AC f/w by saying that patriarchy presupposes maintaining a sense of human value/inviolability which the NC f/w does.

Infinite regress args in 1AR are really blippy & I don't buy their implications in the 2AR.

I vote on Kamm under the neg f/w because I buy that endorsing killing & everyone's woman, & advocating the elimination of patriarchy groups all women into this whether or not it applies to them (as per Butler). I think Butler cards acknowledge the existence of dominance & seeks to eradicate it which takes out the response that we can't recognize dominance.

Room: 107
Start: 1:30
Varsity LD

DOUB

Astacio, Carlos

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Bronx Science TB (Thomas Berruti) vs. Ridge VL (Vicki Liu)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Ridge VL

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Bronx Science TB

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from Bronx Science TB.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

2AR is not doing enough to impact the Skepticism argument in the 2AR. I think there is the risk of the aff perpetuating the harms of domestic violence when we accept the monolithic understanding of identity.

Room: 107
Start: 1:30
Varsity LD

DOUB

Arena, Jonathan

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Bronx Science TB (Thomas Berruti) vs. Ridge VL (Vicki Liu)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Ridge VL
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Bronx Science TB
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from Vicki Liu.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

[Behrman] takes at the neg's discourse K.
Loud the "actions & words" argument. 2 step
triggers go clearly established. Yes, I get
it, she "marginally" by partly with a brief
burst, but I need to know what those inputs
are! If anything else, I think she gets
back the M. (I apologize for the conduct of the
other two judges. Hurry your head down or keep on
your phone in (it is ^{inexcusable} ~~excusable~~ and something you
guys work too hard for to deserve.)

Room: 107
Start: 1:30
Varsity LD

DOUB

Grajewski A

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Bronx Science TB (Thomas Berruti) vs. Ridge VL (Vicki Liu)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Ridge VL

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Bronx Science TB

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the

AFF & NEG

from

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed:

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I do not know the !'s of the TC at all, you essent then & never explained what exactly marginalizing does, I defeat all based on behavior which is the clearest extension that says no discourse b/c of the infinite regress w/ ~~cross~~ treating everyone differently, hence AC precludes TC, and I bring the main round step args bc there is no other @ for me to lost, ~~the~~ the NC doesn't explicitly say how AC lites to exasability, she goes for general rule, thus I full finger on O far & steep

Room: 113
Start: 1:30
Varsity LD

DOUB

Atiyeh, Khaleel

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Monticello DT (Dustin Thomas) vs. Scarsdale CB (Charlie Blatt)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Monticello DT

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Scarsdale CB

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the ^{NEG}
~~AFF~~ from Scarsdale CB
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Khaleel Atiyeh

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This was a great round with lots of good arguments that were well played. However, I vote on the negs off case that self defense can be based on proportionate actions, given the fact that there are infinite alternatives. While ~~AFF~~ the aff has good arguments about morality being a guide to action & to win, there must be another alternative in the round - this does not triumph the argument that there are infinite alternatives, so I voted neg.

Room: 113
Start: 1:30
Varsity LD

DOUB

Akridge, Akilah

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Scarsdale CB (Charlie Blatt) vs. Monticello DT (Dustin Thomas)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Monticello DT
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Scarsdale CB
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Akilah Akridge

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Negative provided coherent ~~arguments~~ ^{arguments} throughout the round.
→ Stated why although it is morally impermissible to kill because ~~we~~ people are an end in ~~the~~ ^{themselves}.
This lead to the Lumar card stating why killing the abuser still doesn't provide ~~any~~ ^{any} solvency for the affects of abuse.

Room: 113
Start: 1:30
Varsity LD

DOUB


Hassin, Michael

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Scarsdale CB (Charlie Blatt) vs. Monticello DT (Dustin Thomas)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE



NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

alternatively

Room: 139
Start: 1:30
Varsity LD

DOUB

Golden, Lawrence ²³

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Ridge HW (Howard Wei) vs. Harrison AB (Ally Brabant)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Harrison AB

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Ridge HW

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from Harrison AB
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Laurence Golden

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

great round!!!

~~Is morality~~ Does morality demand subjectivity or objectivity that is the question? Well the Moss collaboration analysis does not take into the account that someone has to determine that aim was important in the first place. so I adopt AFF's framework which I think is a bit confusing in 1AR, but much clearer in 2AR that objectivity can only be derived by subjectivity so that truth telling goes out window

① Konzquard analysis coupled Strauss/Wink with definitions of Ewing and stuff cancel Weston makes this a reason @ each other the very least exception not apply needs out to some extent because to be a tool in the box

② Unique set of circumstances as per defined by both Neg and AFF however because we are looking to the unnecessary rule violation here to look @ what is most effective even while looking at external checks
③ Blacks law stuff