

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 3:00
Varsity LD

OCTA

Atiyeh, Khaleel

107

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Scarsdale ZE (Zach Edelman) vs. Stuyvesant SH (Samantha Hom)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Stuyvesant ZE

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Scarsdale ZE

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Khaleel Atiyeh

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

There was a lot of good direct clash in the round. However, I vote neg. because the aff does not adequately handle the off case which says that we should be evaluating deliberat(ion) over morality in the resolution. AFF provides counter definitions but the Lock Card also beats her morality claims with regards to intentions.

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 3:00
Varsity LD

OCTA

Cheung, William

107

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Scarsdale ZE (Zach Edelman) vs. Stuyvesant SH (Samantha Hom)

AFFIRMATIVE


NEGATIVE

Stuyvesant
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Scarsdale
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: _____



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 3:00
Varsity LD

OCTA

Astacio, Carlos

107

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Stuyvesant SH (Samantha Hom) vs. Scarsdale ZE (Zach Edelman)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Stuyvesant SH

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Scarsdale ZE

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 3:00
Varsity LD

OCTA

Mandhania, Anki

112

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Regis PM (Peter McGahren) vs. Timothy Christian GM (Gerritt Maniguet)

AFFIRMATIVE

226

Regis PM

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Tim Christ GM

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the *Neg* from *TC GM*
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____

[Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Patriarchy = 11

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 3:00
Varsity LD

OCTA

Cumming, Jay

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Regis PM (Peter McGahren) vs. Timothy Christian GM (Gerritt Maniguet)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Jay Cumming

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- RFD:
- ① Thew's sets wasted with coin flip argument
 - ② NA analysis about the alt means the K's still functions as a moral prohibition

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 3:00
Varsity LD

OCTA

Bowyer, Jonathc

109

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Bronx Science ZR (Zeke Rosenberg) vs. Ridge VL (Vicki Liu)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Bronx Sci

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Ridge

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Oral

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 3:00
Varsity LD

OCTA


Chy, Charles

109

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Ridge VL (Vicki Liu) vs. Bronx Science ZR (Zeke Rosenberg)

AFFIRMATIVE



NEGATIVE

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: _____

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'C. Chy', written over a horizontal line.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 3:00
Varsity LD

OCTA

Fox, Chris

109

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Bronx Science ZR (Zeke Rosenberg) vs. Ridge VL (Vicki Liu)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE


Bronx Science ZR

Ridge VL

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The extension of the Foucault cards ^{for AFF} results in one clear truth for the round. whoever reduces dominance the most wins. AFF creates an equal power relationship between abuser and abusee, a free flowing channel for power, but I think the brightline can be clearer. NEG asserts the is the dominance within discourse (which can be more specific) since the focus of the resolution ~~is~~ (or debate) might create one dominant idea. But I'm not sure if I buy the dominance idea. The discourse, since any specificity will do that, but is it direction or dominance? The scope is sort of unclear, but I am glad Neg provided me with some clear voters and an assertion of the case of solvency. ultimately this is a tough round, but weighing down on the level of ideas vs people I come down on the side of people in this case because of the nested card and the arguments themselves. AFF can be clearer about the robustness, since the legal system extends by Neg or persuasion.

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 3:00
Varsity LD

OCTA

Grajewski A

108

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Regis RM (Ryan McEvoy) vs. Bronx Science TM (Tyler Morris)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from Tyler Morris
AFF OF NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I grant that CRT Dis ≠ oppression, no culpability we goes away, I vote
AFF on Harbelyed b/c Neg fails to show why the women is
seen as the Absen when Harbely says we get rid of role all together,
to empower them, AFF clearly limits round to what we
talk about.

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 3:00
Varsity LD

OCTA

Gimelstein, Shel

108

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Regis RM (Ryan McEvoy) vs. Bronx Science TM (Tyler Morris)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Bronx

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Regis

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Shelli Gimelstein

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff frames the round as coming down to who gives women more of an ability to express themselves/partake in critical discourse. Under that framework, I think neg's turns re: women becoming aggressors/abusers & being stigmatized are sufficient because women will be effectively silenced from discourse if DF is allowed.

However I also buy neg's answers to flw that culpability is a preveg, I don't think those are ever really addressed & I'm also left wondering what the AC defines as a patriarchal barrier.

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 3:00
Varsity LD

OCTA

Tirado, Ivillese

108

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Regis RM (Ryan McEvoy) vs. Bronx Science TM (Tyler Morris)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Bronx Science TM

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Regis RM

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Chloe Tinsley

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg Newr addressed the aff's critical discourse argument ~~proving~~ that in the world of the neg Patriarcal views are reinforced since women lack the ability to engage in this discourse and are also denied the right to use deadly force. Though using deadly force does make the woman the aggressor the neg concedes to the fact that this does break down that "weaker" view of women

113

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Timothy Christian AM (Andrew Meleta) vs. Bronx Science AH (Anthony Hagouel)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

TIMOTHY Christian AM
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Bronx Science AH
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signatures]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

OK so after all is said and done, I had to decide which team. After the election the best course of action = aff started b/c it's created by the neg

- Aff wins death = result of DV

- the issue I have at the end of the round's comparing whether aff truly devalues the aggressor more, or if neg truly devalues the victim more. This is more problematic for the neg b/c there is no alternative for the neg, when the aff at least created the possibility for the victim's recovery

- On the I'll level, I don't think the aff links to the neg I'lls of death. I don't think the aff strips anyone of the right to life, rather it says possibly the victim's right to life is morally permissible. This seems detached from the aggressor. Ultimately, I do think intent of aggressor means the victim position demands recovery for potentially the right to life, since there's no threat to the aggressor.

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 3:00
Varsity LD

OCTA

Wolfe, Phoebe

113

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Timothy Christian AM (Andrew Meleta) vs. Bronx Science AH (Anthony Haguel)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Timothy Christian AM

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Bronx Science AH

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Phoebe Wolfe

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~AND~~ Neg drops the args on the definition of domestic violence and violates the neg standard by allowing the killing of the abuser. Wasserstein says the right to life is conditional on the intent & actions of the individual, so the aff just needs to prove that the abuser has the intent to kill, which is done through the ac extensions. Thus the aff meets the requirement to justifiably kill.

113

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Bronx Science AH (Anthony Hagouel) vs. Timothy Christian AM (Andrew Meleta)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Timothy Christian AM
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Bronx Science AH
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from Timothy (AM)
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Rebecca Hansen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- (1) NEG does an insufficient job of dealing with the moral dilemma/tragedy that the AFF sets up in-case.
- (2) Something can be permissible w/ the context of the situation w/o nec. being morally ~~ly~~, AFF sets up the moral dilemma and shows how both courses of action may be immoral or undesirable, yet some action has to be taken. NEG doesn't suff. deal w/ this. The choice is depend your own right or lose it.
- (3) NEG tries to thread an impossibly small needle by trying to establish a distinction b/w forfeiting a right and "forfeiting the rt. to exercise it." AFF exposes how it's essentially the same thing, so essentially the NEG is allowing for the ramifications of "failing to exercise your rt." AFF uses Wollenstein more effectively.

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 3:00
Varsity LD

OCTA

Harris, Kathryn

201

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Scarsdale CB (Charlie Blatt) vs. Millburn YY (Yang Yi)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Millburn YY

Scarsdale CB

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the neg from Scarsdale
AFF OF NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Kathryn Harris

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AC/Starting your case saying you might say ~~exist~~ sexist/offensive things really doesn't make me want to vote for you from the start - I don't see how being offensive is necessary or even okay. I understand not adapting to me on the panel but if I ever see you in prelims please don't go that speed and make presumptions arguments, I'm unclear on your burden - I can't find it on my flow, which means it fell by me + that's a problem. **NC** I see why you don't really have a neg. position given your fourth & fifth argument, but I'd prefer you have something more substantial. You spend way too much time on each argument - you over-explain things a lot + it means you can't respond to as many things specifically. **VAR** You had so many double-bills + put so fast I couldn't process them all. You never touch her arbitrariness turn, which clearly links to the standard so I don't know why that's a good idea. **NR** This cleared things up for me a lot - could have had more detailed votes, but you go for the right things. **2 AZ** She tells you how to beat the affirmative argument, + as well, she's not really standing by them - there's no warrant or anything. Claiming unfairness just sounds whiny. **RFD** This can of course have been much clearer if you'd both pulled it together more. I negate bc I don't know why it's not elevated to prioritize one life over another, + affirming makes life arbitrary on a societal level. The imminence argument goes to that, too.

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 3:00
Varsity LD

OCTA

Cruz, Jon

201

NEWARK INVITATIONAL
Science Park HS
Feb 3-4, 2012

Scarsdale CB (Charlie Blatt) vs. Millburn YY (Yang Yi)

AFFIRMATIVE

MILLBURN

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

SCARSDALE

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Please advocate something
in round. ☹️

Theory
or, if relevant,
Turn on act/omission

∴ (AFF)

Room: Check with Tab Room

Start: 3:00

Varsity LD

OCTA

Philips, Les

201

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

FEAR
THE
KVAAL!

Scarsdale CB (Charlie Blatt) vs. Millburn YY (Yang Yi)

S3

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

MILLBURN YY

SCARSDALE CB

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Celia B.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 3:00
Varsity LD

OCTA

Arena, Jonathan

342

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Montville DD (Deep Dheri) vs. Scarsdale LM (Larry Milstein)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Deep Dheri

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Larry Milstein

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the

NEG
AFF or NEG

from

Larry Milstein
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Your signposting (or lack thereof) was pretty curious in your IAR. I didn't love anything placed on his OFF line especially. Need a response to the horns, the most domestic violence is mental. You asked that the abused has the right, but who is the victim here? "Death is not subjective"? I didn't see how Burke is getting you at all.

What about the double bond? I need a response to that in 2ND, so when you claim that Burke's in other place to a horn, you look pretty silly. I need responses to Every, Lewis, & Glen extending do you three horns send the deal.

All's signposting in IAR was very curious, probably led to me not giving him the bullet, since I love to debate to the neg's inlets at the end. 3 horns extending on the AC at horns; I didn't see how Burke gets at all at all at the horns.

342

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Montville DD (Deep Dheri) vs. Scarsdale LM (Larry Milstein)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Montville DD

Scarsdale LM

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Lawrence Golden

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This round was a bit difficult and simple to adjudicate. a paradox for sure but here is how the round breaks down even if I grant AFF is winning on some level of decreasing arbitrariness. he is definitely missing some levels on self-defense which is the way he framed the round. While most find Wallerstein is I guess persuasive in AFF it does not create this double-bund that he speaks of when it is clarified that self-defense may or may not be a absolute right but it still needs to be contextual i.e. as a response to domestic violence

(3) AFF
Cx becomes crucially important

(1) OFF case establish what is or is not morally permissible as outlined by Kelly so we can label self-defense as necessary as an excuse, but not as AFF as a positive and right this is enough to show why has not addressed

(2) Bucke not matter as much because it is mitigated by the overaggression Crawford stuff, Also the Campbell/Struff as well as mutual domestic violence

Room: Check with Tab Room
Start: 3:00
Varsity LD

OCTA

Rahman, Rabeya

342

NEWARK INVITATIONAL

Science Park HS

Feb 3-4, 2012

Scarsdale LM (Larry Milstein) vs. Montville DD (Deep Dheri)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Montville DD
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Scarsdale LM
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Rabeya Rahman

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD:

Based off the arguments on the self-defense - ~~idea of the negative is to argue that~~
~~the negative is to argue that the affirmative is no longer in self-defense~~ ~~then~~ the
AFF's arguments on the moral aspect of violence from both parties suggest ~~in~~ ~~is~~
being reciprocal 2) just increasing the level of violence. Even if self-defense is ~~allowed~~
so deadly force, the use of violence is present → neg's argument on ~~the~~ ~~use~~ ~~of~~ ~~violence~~ ~~is~~ ~~not~~ ~~valid~~
and the aggressive nature throughout the proof procedure.
The combination from the combination of the already argument that ~~the~~ ~~aff~~ ~~is~~ ~~decreasing~~ ~~the~~
violence here, by AFF's argument - really only increasing it.