

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Needham AT

Max = 30

Alexa Tierney

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Monticello SA

Max = 30

Stacy Andryshak

29.5

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

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

Signed: John SB

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AC: Wow! Really well
warranted case + great structure.

- The Diamond card fit really
well, I have no criticisms for
the Aff.

For responses to arguments
like the "democracy will devolve
into anarchy w/out laws" consider
cutting back social contract + state
of nature cards about how when
govts fail, they can be disrespected
to a degree. Bad summary on my
part, but you got the idea.

Good use of notes,
and your point about solutions
was great.

CX: Aff: really smart
- responses to the "right infringement"
Q.
- Point about topicality + violence
was good.

CX: Didn't really go anywhere...
Neg was hesitant to make concessions
but when Mont. SA asked if it was
okay to read a card in CX
Needh. AT said yes? NOT A GOOD
STRATEGY

RFD: Aff extensions +
notes did prove that obedience would
suffice to change laws/was inefficient/
expanded minority rts. There could've been
more clear arguments about the legitimacy
of the minority's claim to representation,
but this was touched upon. The NC was
great, and had the extensions/best speech in
general been more clear + efficient, perhaps
the point about democracy devolving into
anarchy would've persuaded me. The point
about how violence is outweighed by positive
choice made sense though, so affirmed.

NC: Good response, resp.
to framework. Also, good
crossapplication of the
"settling precedents" point.

2NR: MAKE extensions!
also, organize responses better
a lot of what you said
about minorities being equally
susceptible to flawed opinions/
arbitrary moral perceptions, etc
was really valid! just crossapply
more and go into it more,
and have confidence in it!

- Didn't cover enough ground
in your last speech!

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Needham AR

Max = 30

Alec Robbins

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Berkeley Carroll KE

Max = 30

Kirsten Ebenezer

28.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from Needham AR
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

- great speaking style!
- consider adding more analysis to your case
- good job at running down framework debate

NEG

- very persuasive speaking style - great!
- make sure you're giving unique arguments to answer the case - it's given you more strategy to make a case, etc.
- work on signposting & telling the judge where you are on the flow (especially with it's a flow judge)
- strengthen extensions

Both:

- great job in cross-examining and answering
- work on being concise to get more arguments out there
- wonderful round! It was very pleasant

RFD:

- AFF is making basic more analytical arguments to the framework & weighing these against neg arguments

wonderful job to you
both! !!

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

2:00

1:53

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Regis AA

Max = 30

Andrew Aoyama

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Needham TA

Max = 30

Tolu Ajayi

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:

RFD: Neg needs to prove how legal means is more preferable in terms of protecting individual rights. Concedes that legal means by means of his value ~~with~~ criterion, ~~the~~ (rule of the majority) leads to creating unjust, immoral laws thus hurting individual rights.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Harrison EA

Max = 30

Elyssa Alfieri

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills CS

Max = 30

Chad Schwam

28

The better debating was done by the Neg from Byram Hills
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

- infamous not in-famous
- not quotes, cards
- too much time on NC
- I don't think the no brightline guys on the standard is good.
- your turns aren't turns
- really poor extensions in 2c

~~Both: How can you extend it~~
~~between the two~~
Both: you need to extend forever.

Neg

- don't ask her to reread ask for summary or the tag
- C2 doesn't ~~like~~ ^{link} to standard it talks about universal ~~that's~~ ^{that's} ~~don't~~.
- not quote card
- you can't respond to standard in the 2NR
- don't reread the card to extend it
- Why aren't you extending turns on the ac?

I resate on the NC, the turns put on it are of not turns and b) not responsive to his args.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Harrison SR

Max = 30

Sarah Ryan

28.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Fiorello LaGuardia AB

Max = 30

Anna Bores

27

The better debating was done by the aff from Harrison
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 | Neg |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Interact with your op opponent's warrants- respond to specifics in the NC- signpost in the 2AR | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- signpost !!!- don't keep making the same argument- No new args in the 2NR |

REP: Aff
wins bc so I vote
on arg that col forces
response

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT
Hendrick Hudson High School
November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science JH

Max = 30

Joe Harari

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Monticello DA

Max = 30

Daniel Aguirre

29

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

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

Signed: Mohammed R. Islam

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Negative debater had plenty mainline
stream and explain details. But
Affirmative also strong candidate.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Monticello SB

Max = 30

Shawn Burke

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harrison BA

Max = 30

Bea Almeida

27.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from HARRISON BA
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 -

- GOOD CONTENTIONS, BUT YOU COULD HAVE EXTENDED THEM FURTHER
- NEED A BETTER LINK BETWEEN VALUE (MORALITY) AND CRITERION (UPHOLD DEMOCRATIC IDEALS)
- YOU NEED TO ATTACK THE NEG'S CONTENTIONS MORE EFFECTIVELY.

- NEG - ALSO GOOD CONTENTIONS AND BETTER LINK BETWEEN VALUE AND CRITERION
- DIDN'T UNDERSTAND YOUR POINT ABOUT THE BROWN SOUTHERN CONTRACT

RFD - THE NEG BETTER ATTACKED THE AFF'S CASE. THE AFF COULD HAVE DONE A BETTER JOB ATTACKING THE NEG'S CASE. THE NEG'S SECOND CONTENTION WAS DROPPED BY THE AFF. THE DEBATE NEED TO CENTER AROUND THE VALUE AND CRITERION. - VASTLY DIFFERENT SO THE CONTENTIONS DID NOT CLASH WELL

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

Lexington ZA

Zahin Ahmed

POINTS

Max = 30

28.5

NEGATIVE

Regis JG

James Garry

POINTS

Max = 30

29.5

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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

COMMENTS

AFF wear a belt + jacket

- good case, needs more links to criterion
- good responses in CX
 - ↳ Also good CX strat
- think outside the box a bit more
- you make the right arg that there is no true democracy, but you never impact it or tell me what to do because of that fact
- you should discuss what happens w/human rights violations

NEG - Bitch, preflaw BEFORE the round!!! ;)

- I like your accent :)
- good CX strat
- very thorough INR
 - ↳ I am extremely impressed !!
- refer back to your defn of the perfect dem to Block against his question of human rights viol.
- really good arg that CD has a legal component

LEARN TO FLOW

RFD

I vote Neg on the Defn of Democracy

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NFA SD

Max = 30

Steven Dziedzic

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale SS

Max = 30

Sam Sanders

26.5

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

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

Signed: Andy Aoyama

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF - REALLY GOOD CONTENTIONS, ESPECIALLY THE 2ND ONE - JUSTICE SHOULD PREVAIL OVERALL. YOU NEED TO DEFEND AND SUPPORT THIS CONTENTION → ~~GOOD~~ IF SUCCESSFUL, IT OVERCOMES THE VIOLENCE ARGUMENT.

- YOUR VALUE AND CRITERION WERE GOOD ~~AND~~ ^{AND} TIED TOGETHER WELL

- YOU SHOULD WORK ON BETTER DEFENDING YOUR CASE AND EXPANDING YOUR CONTENTIONS

NEG - I DIDN'T COMPLETELY UNDERSTAND HOW YOUR VALUE AND CRITERION TIED TOGETHER. + THE AFF WON THIS VALUE DEBATE ~~WITH~~ WITH EQUALITY.

- USING THE SOCIAL CONTRACT AS YOUR CRITERION WAS DIFFICULT TO FOLLOW

REF - THE AFF HAD BETTER CONTENTIONS ~~AND~~

- NEG ~~TRIED~~ TRIED TO USE THE SOCIAL CONTRACT AS THE CRITERION BUT THE ARGUMENTS WERE NOT CLEAR AND UNDERSTANDABLE

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale DW

Max = 30

David Wang

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Lexington SA

Max = 30

Shahrouz Alam

26

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

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

Signed: Safiya Osisami

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

Aff gave links and impacts that were extended across the flow nicely. Also gave follow-up questions that were clear and made sense. Although, the aff was abit gassy, everything was clear across the flow.

Neg

During ex, try going straight to the question...

Aff

Great ex questions, but try not to cut off your opponent so much.

Neg

Try giving examples. Also, try not to be so nervous. Breathe and stay calm.

Neg

Try finding cards that are more recent.

Aff

Try attacking as much as the neg's arguments as possible

Aff and Neg

Work on voters more of why you should win the round on all arguments

Room: 7
Flight B: Start 9:45
Novice LD

3

Chace, Alyaa

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Monticello RB

Max = 30

Rachel Broder

~~20~~ 27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Stuyvesant ST

Max = 30

Siena Trautman

~~20~~ 28

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

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

Signed: _____

Alyaa Chace

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Rachel- They ARE dictatorships! She responds to this saying tyrannies are not obligated to give these rights - this is why they are a tyranny. You need to do more work on the standards debate. You could extend Pettis. Judkins doesn't help you at all in the round, it's just restating ~~the~~ your tagline and you seem too repetitive.

Siena - Really great arguments. Make sure you sign post. You need to implement more legal recourse arguments into your case.

Good Value criterion debate. I look to your standard of

util - Make sure your standard is a verb in the future, maybe make it "upholding utilitarianism." You need to improve your word economy. You cannot state you want to smack protesters upside the head:D

GOOD ROUNDS!

Room: 17B
Flight A: Start 9:00
Novice LD

3

Leisenheimer, Mr

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science DR

Max = 30

Diganta Rashed

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Collegiate DK

Max = 30

Dean Kaiserman

27

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

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

Signed: Patricia Leisenheimer

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF - addressed Neg lack of definition and support for his 2nd contention.
Neg. - to give more support for contentions - hist. examples or current.

Room: 17B
Flight B: Start 9:45
Novice LD

3

Leisenheimer, Mr

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science SF

Max = 30

Steven Falco

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Needham DM

Max = 30

Dan Mahoney

29

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

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

Signed: _____

Patricia Leisenheimer

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG - addressed all AFF contentions
and excellent rebuttal &
cross.
AFF - needed more detail to contentions
and examples.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills AA

Max = 30

Akhil Arvati

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale MC

Max = 30

Marie Ceske

30

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

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

Signed: Keya You

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- you talk fast for a novice
- you should probably flow your opponents case instead of letting her basically re-read her entire case during CX...

- you need to manage your time better, you didn't have enough time in your 1AR to extend your own case

- not every ^{response} ~~argument~~ is a turn

- you need to signpost/organize your speech more.

- you were really aggressive during CX which was good :)

- your ZNR was really good but you did jump around a little bit but you did say which argument you were jumping to so it wasn't too hard to follow.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Needham EL

3:00 left

Max = 30

Emily Levy

28.5

NEGATIVE

2:15 left

POINTS

Monticello AS

Max = 30

Allison Smith

26.5

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

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

Signed: _____

Thaler, Noah

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Emily:

- Good cx - pretty assertive
- So many "um"s
- You ~~were~~ could've had a really good IAR b/c she dropped pretty much the whole AC, but I think your work on covering the NC wasn't great
- Don't conclude CD can lead to violence
- Fine 2AR, but re-extend your framework

RFD:

- This was kind of annoying b/c your frameworks aren't really extended
- Under the aff flw I can easily vote aff b/c of the dropped C2 A+B
- The neg is kind of irresolvable b/c there is very little clash, but I think the defense saying "even if CD → viol, it's not war" combined with "CD is nonviol, that's just the oppressive gov" is enough to give ~~the~~ the aff. ballot

Allison:

- Be more assertive in CX + don't let her read cards in full text, ask her to summarize
- Use all of your CX - you had like 30 sec. left
- You need to be responding to the AC - there were only two responses on the whole thing. AND they contradict
- Signpost better
- Can't go new in the 2NR
- You can't stop your 2NR with over 3 minutes left!

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Berkeley Carroll AG

Max = 30

Angela Goldshteyn

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Stuyvesant KW

Max = 30

Kathy Wang

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from Berkeley Carroll AG
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: K. Leib

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative Comments:

Angela had a very calm demeanor and was clear and organized with her contentions, including good examples. Great job defending herself on cross-examination and a great job rebutting the negative contentions in an organized manner. Good logic and reasoning skills were used throughout.

Negative Comments:

Kathy used clear organization for her case and outlined it well. I would have liked to see some examples for her contentions such as an example of civil disobedience leading to anarchy or stricter laws; or of other alternatives having the same result or effect of letters sent to government. Work on clarity while being cross-examined. Laid out why she should win her case very well at the end (on negative rebuttal).

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Berkeley Carroll NK

Max = 30

Nadine Khoury

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Fiorello LaGuardia AV

Max = 30

Alinah Vis

28

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

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

Signed: _____

Alyaa Chace

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

LOOK AT ME DURING CX! MAKE sure you sign post.

Nadine- Good job diversifying arguments in your AC. You don't need to introduce yourself at the start of the speech. You extend your value of justice when you should have payed more attention to protecting the voices of minorities. No standards debate? Come on guys.

I vote AFF on the extension of C3 (turning points), CD is a last resort, and the turn on the categorical imperative. These are dropped arguments.

Alinah- You never address her *consequentialism framework. Your response to contention 1 was very good but you need to do work on her contentions 2 and 3. What happened to her standard???

Great 2NR- you explain why she does not uphold justice when ppl are being killed - HUGE CONTRADICTION. You NEED to extend your evidence - what happened to Korsgaard and Welch.

You need to extend this for more offense.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills JH

Max = 30

Jake Honig

30

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Fiorello LaGuardia GT

Max = 30

Grace Traore

247

The better debating was done by the Aff from Byram Hills
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:

COMMENTS

AFF Your contentions need more link to your framework

- you need to elaborate on the importance of minority freedom specifically in the criterion
- look @ judge during CX
- don't let your opponent take over your CX
- good CX strat
- you have good discipline in rebuttal, just remember to extend your own points which she dropped
- you should have pointed out how ABUSIVE OF THE PEOPLE her case is
- good catch on her new arg
- Don't kick your 3rd contention just because your defns don't agree... just tell me why your defn. is better

NEG - I like your suit

- don't lean over during CX, you compromise your presence/confidence
- stand and look @ judge during CX
- your case is a bit offensive. If you think abt. it.
↳ you suggest that ppl ought to just accept rights violations
- your defn of CD could justify the Holocaust...
↳ you understand the social contract wrong
- All your framework is smartly written, but unnecessary. Since it just is a justification for morality as a value... the textual link in the res is enough.
- you need to flow properly and improve your discipline

RFD

I vote Aff on the idea that the govt cant abuse basic rights.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Harrison CM

Max = 30

Cassie Marriott

28.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science DS

Max = 30

Demetrios Stratis

28.5

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

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

Signed: Safiya Osisiemi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD

Neg gave great extensions
in the case also voters
were clear across the flow.

Turns were clear and
gave links to the VC

Also, I agreed to the
slippery slope argument

Aff

Never agree
with your opponent.

Neg

Questions during CX were
good

Aff

You keep asking the same
question over and over again.
Just skip it and go on to
something different. Don't
waste all of your C-X

Neg

You dropped many of her
arguments during the 1NR,
try to speed up the process.

Aff and Neg

Gave great turns and
arguments, but try not to
repeat yourself so much.

Aff and Neg

Both gave amazing voters
and links into the VC

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills SC

Max = 30

Sarah Crucilla

29.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science MM

Max = 30

Marta Maksymyuk

28

The better debating was done by the Aff from Byram Hills, SC
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Keya Y

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- you asked really smart questions during CX
- Key market example was really good, should've spent more time on it.
- using your own contentions to answer your opponents points is a really smart idea, you should try to do that whenever you can.
- your speeches were all very well organized, easy to follow
- clarifying questions are good but you want to make sure you ask some offensive questions as well.
- you were good about signposting
- need to respond to her points on your conts.

Room: 6
Flight A: Start 9:00
Novice LD

3

Ortiz, Kate

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

2:00

1:50

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale GD

Max = 30

Gabriel Dolsten

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harrison EE

Max = 30

Ella Eisinger

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from HARRISON
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 would stray away from third party / Bipart politics a part of the debate and focus more on this human rights business

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Collegiate HH

Max = 30

Harrison He

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science JS

Max = 30

John Staunton

28

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

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

Signed: Mohammed R. Islam

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both are strong debaters. They did
excellent explain. But Affirmative was
more details and end nice way.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Lexington EC

Erica Cagliero

Max = 30

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills PE

Paul Erlanger

Max = 30

28

The better debating was done by the aff from Lexington
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 | Neg |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">- just Signpost better- respond to specific warrants in the NE | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- you're talking too much in CX, ask questions don't make speeches- respond to the AC framework- you keep making the same argument during the WR |

AFF: I vote aff
arg that says ed is needed
when legal means fail

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Monticello JM

Max = 30

Jacob Martin

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills FC

Max = 30

Fionn Connolly

28

The better debating was done by the

AFF

from

Monticello

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

Neg

- your reading of the AC was choppy
- don't say are you okay with speed if you aren't going fast.
- Why didn't you just say the AC VC has no warrant, enter the spikes with mason and sit down
- extended too much from AC intro.
- Sign post

- You should have extended Mason + Dale into 2nd but mason is sufficient

- you need warrants for the VC in the NC
- you dropped a lot of args on the AC
- Don't go over to look at his case during his prep time
- Sign post in 2NR
- don't reread the NC in the 2NR
- don't go new in the 2

RFD: I affirm on mason. It's the only offense because the NC VC literally has no warrant and the responses in the 2nd are new

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science OK

Max = 30

Oliver Korten

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Fiorello LaGuardia ML

Max = 30

Margaret Leisenheimer

28

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

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

Signed: Kate SB

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AL: Great framework justifications
Really good case in general,
covered all the bases + good
CX answers.

1AL: very well organized
responses -- you responded
to everything and this is
the first round where I've seen
really good framework debate!
Awesome speech.

2AL: You didn't need to ext.
everything! And don't turn in
your last (make
speech! new)

Time yourself. Your last
speech got really weird
when you had to suddenly
stop after what felt like
2 minutes.

CX: Lag ML:

be more assertive

1) aggressive! Less vague

Q's might get better answers

- Cut him off when his
responses go on!

2) Some of Neg (Lag ML)'s rejs
were a little confusing (point
abt slavery?)

RFD: B/c of the total lack of
framework debate, and lack of responses to
Aff contentions, I defaulted to Aff. And you
not messed up the timing & you could've
had a much better 2AL, but it was
a pretty good round in general.

NC: A little long.
Could prob. cut down the
case a bit but
solid responses.

Might want to differentiate
between the two contentions
b/c it looks like ~~the~~ the
2nd is mostly impacts from
the first (the point about
breaking laws + setting precedents
was C1, and then C2 explain
how this leads soc. down
the road to chaos).

2NR:

No framework debate!
You got caught up making
responses (mostly to arguments

on the NC) but neglected
much of the ~~Aff~~ offense +
the nonvize and all
of the framework.

- Also, time yourself better!
(but its not a big
deal)

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

During CX you need to make questions & arguments.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale SJ

Max = 30

Byram Hills TS

Max = 30

Samara Jacobson

27.5

Trent Stafford

26

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- 4:00
2:00
6*
- 4:00
2:00
2:40 mins left for NR...*
- 1AC - Four contentions are kinda... unnecessary especially when only one of them have an impact. Aff should be writing out extensions and possible answers to his arguments during his prep... makes prep more time efficient.
- NC - Too many of your arguments are predicated off of the possibilities of legal alternatives, you need to increase variety within your argumentation because she needs to answer one portion of your case and have ample time to extend stuff. Also do not contradict yourself in CX (Police started to beat OWS, ~~the protesters~~ started it) this does hurt your image to me as a judge.
- 1AR - This was a good 1AR. However you failed to explain to me how your framework should be a prerequisite to his framework, the Locke card was one of them. Also what you could have done is explain why the social contract matters.
- NR - This speech did very little for you in the scope of things. You just answered some of her arguments on your flow and you left her side of the story completely blank. Also back to the variety of your arguments, you need to ↑ variety otherwise she will win 1 point ~~that answers~~ yours well and put your cooked.
- 2AR - That was kinda... & the 2AR I was expecting. You do & explain Starr evidence the way that it alone would win you the round
- RFD - The neg made the mistake of conceding the entire AC, this is crucial b/c this leads me to believe that ~~that~~ the AC is true in its claims.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale DA

Max = 30

David Annex

27 1/2

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Needham MT

Max = 30

Maddi Terry

28 1/2

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

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

Signed: _____

G. SIMPSON

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I found this to be an excellent debate, both sides organized thorough. Neg adopted an excellent strategic approach and used the issue of accountability as essential to democracy excellently. This point was not effectively counteracted. Aff position was also very interesting + use of notions of equality and checks and bal. were interesting in the contention, but unfortunately not adequately developed. So Aff's counter to issues of majoritarianism + accountability not fully developed + this close debate consequently awarded to the ~~Aff~~ Negative proponent.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Harrison EB

Max = 30

Evan Burger

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills NA

Max = 30

Nolan Abramowitz

28 1/2

The better debating was done by the NEG from Byram Hills / Nolan Abramowitz
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

G. Simpson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Some excellent and innovative arguments by the Aff. candidate, especially in respect of the issues of value of conscience and how civil disobedience is essential ^{to democracy} however he did not develop the argument at the heart of his ^{value} contention on individual rights which was critical flaw in his argument. The Def. candidate also offered some vital arguments and examples including of alternatives to civil disobedience - such as constitutional court challenges to majority laws.

So, although close, I awarded this to the def.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Lexington AS

Max = 30

Achal Srinivasin

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Berkeley Carroll JS

Max = 30

Jake Simpson

28

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

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

Signed: Tom Erlanger

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I had to find for the AFF given the historical inaccuracy of saying the KKK movement and violence was a result of the civil rights movement

The AFF used the "Veil of Ignorance" argument in-
precis but failed to truly tie it into a moral
justification of CD. Otherwise the AFF did a
great job in structuring this argument

Finally I needed to turn the use of
"Utilitarianism" against the Neg as actually
a very premise of why CD is sometimes necessary.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Regis SD

Max = 30

Sean Davey

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Stuyvesant VG

Max = 30

Vanathi Ganesan

~~28~~ 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: Tom Erlanger

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both debaters did well. The Neg failed to provide examples of her contention about CD leading to anarchy & disorder. Neg also failed to explain her use of the Bill of Rights as sufficient cause for not needing CD. The Aff developed his case well and addressed all points made by Neg.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Bronx Science LZ Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Jake Levitt 3
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Joshua Zakharov 4

Team: Regis HW Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Blaise Haddad 3
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Alex Watkins-Goodman 4

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average
22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Bronx Science representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Jake
- Great rebuttal
addressed pros containing
and proved why cons were
more powerful
- good speaker
- good questions during
crossfire

Joshua
- very strong speaker
- strong points in
climaxes.
- great questions
at crossfire
- good summary
addressed all
points and tied
new opp. points
were not correct

These are the reasons for my decision:

Although both sides were great speakers and had amazing and hard
I feel like Bronx Science had a little more
evidence in their points which tied them
over the top. Very strong teams

Comments to Debaters:

Blaise
- good rebuttal
- strong points
- needs to speak a
little louder
- addressed great
issues at crossfire
- good summary
and addressed
all points
- has very good
sources

Alex
- very strong speaker
- addressed issues
at con and
said why their
point was better
- confused me
a little during
crossfire
- more terrorist because
innocent people dying

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

| | |
|-----------------------|-------|
| Speaker 1 | 4 min |
| Speaker 2 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1&2) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 | 4 min |
| Speaker 4 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3&4) | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary | 2 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary | 2 min |
| Grand Crossfire (All) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus | 2 min |

2 minutes prep time per side

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: [Signature]

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Stuyvesant SC Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Danielle Segal ⁴

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26.5 for Kelly Chen ³

Team: Monticello SM Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Cristiane Salcedo ¹

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Naomi McCallion ³

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is

Stuyvesant

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

representing the PRO CON

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Danielle

- strong on crossfire
- very good points
- need to say less um
- very strong final

- great

Kelly

- great start
- great points

- need to be stronger on crossfire
- had time left over for points
- needs more confidence in points because they are very strong
- Summary make sure to address your points

Comments to Debaters:

Cristiana

- need to be stronger in crossfire
- ~~had time left~~
- ~~over time left~~
- needs more confidence
- was
- need to address more of your own points in summary
- good points addressed

Naomi ²

- strong on crossfire
- great questions
- strong speaker

These are the reasons for my decision:

was a little confused at one point in time with some points because they seemed to be supporting each others sides. However the Final speeches decided for me whe Danielle made great points about oil and U.S. both teams were overall great

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

| | |
|-----------------------|-------|
| Speaker 1 | 4 min |
| Speaker 2 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1&2) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 | 4 min |
| Speaker 4 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3&4) | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary | 2 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary | 2 min |
| Grand Crossfire (All) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus | 2 min |

2 minutes prep time per side

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Kathleen O'Connell

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Chapin OD Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Amelia O'Donohue ³

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Katerina Dangas ¹

Team: Regis GR Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Vincenzo Guido ²

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for John Rindone ⁴

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is CON Regis GR

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

representing the PRO CON

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Comments to Debaters:

Katerina- good case, may want to explain what we have done that has ↓ foreign powers of the US. Use your time in CF to get him to admit case weaknesses, not just clarify
Amelia- good rebuttal, need to work on sounding confident in your CF, you know your facts, don't let him dominate the entire time. If you have questions on his case, ask them, but don't let him "elaborate on that"
Katerina- good job! You do need to be clear about 2-3 arguments that you're winning and be specific about why
These are the reasons for my decision:

To All Debaters: Good debate, all 4 of you need to work on organizing your rebuttals so that you will have easier summaries and FF. You make good points, but they are scattered and so I have a hard time finding where to categorize what you're saying. Tell the judges always that what you're saying matters more than your opponents arguments.

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Chapin OD

Vincenzo- your case spends over a minute on framework, and it doesn't do anything for you. Try not to say all Iranians are illogical. Don't make arguments in CF that are not asked for, save that for case
John- stop talking during your opponents speech but this goes for your opponents speech partner as well. Good rebuttal, body and that will let your arguments be more important b/c you can show how they do matter more than your opponents. (Be more discreet when helping Vincenzo w arguments in his speech)
You guys should just generally not

RFD:

Vote con off Iranian economy of affecting US so he loan to building ties w Israel who helps us, not undermines.

| Order/Time Limits of Speeches | |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Speaker 1 | 4 min |
| Speaker 2 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1&2) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 | 4 min |
| Speaker 4 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3&4) | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary | 2 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary | 2 min |
| Grand Crossfire (All) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus | 2 min |
| 2 minutes prep time per side | |

NOT A CHAP

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Bronx Science BR Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Alec Bardley 2
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Mert Rodoplu 4

Team: Stuyvesant BL Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26.5 for Emma Bernstein 1
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26.5 for Jeanne Locker 3

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Stuyvesant BL representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Comments to Debaters:

AB: Very good, straight forward delivery - good points

MR: Iran point ok - sanctions point weaker (what about terrorism?)
- but speech gets very repetitive half-way through

AB: democracy argument lacking specifics - imbecilic enough to talk about how we're spreading democracy
- summary should be much more focused

MR: Careful about "no evidence" argument - overused here

These are the reasons for my decision:

Don't forget your strongest points just b/c the other side doesn't respond as well! That's where you should focus. (Pro: Syria regional chaos / Con: funding/stability).

The Iran point was largely ad hominem b/c North Korea only came up at the end of the round. But Pro effectively rebutted the democracy point and demonstrated why that and sanctions would make terrorism (civil war) more likely. Con's literacy point was too vague.

EB: Strong speaking - some more inflection/eye contact would help your persuasion though

JL: Work on more fluid delivery - point on democracy very smart though - but careful about saying that spending any amount of money "hurts our economy!"

EB: terror points strong - money points were vague/weak

JL: N. Korea point very good, but very late

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

| | |
|-----------------------|-------|
| Speaker 1 | 4 min |
| Speaker 2 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1&2) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 | 4 min |
| Speaker 4 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3&4) | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary | 2 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary | 2 min |
| Grand Crossfire (All) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus | 2 min |

1/2 minutes prep time per side

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Colin Ross - Regis High School to rebuild from that.

Room: 15
Flight A: Start 9:00
Novice PF (Regis KT vs. Bronx Science XL)

3

Duda, Thomas

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Regis KT Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): _____ for Liam Kelly

Speaker Points (20 to 30): _____ for Thomas Tyson

Team: Bronx Science XL Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): _____ for Yang Xue

Speaker Points (20 to 30): _____ for Felix Liang

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Regis KT representing the PRO CON

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Comments to Debaters:

These are the reasons for my decision:

Bronx Science didn't show up

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

| | |
|-----------------------|-------|
| Speaker 1 | 4 min |
| Speaker 2 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1&2) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 | 4 min |
| Speaker 4 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3&4) | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary | 2 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary | 2 min |
| Grand Crossfire (All) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus | 2 min |

2 minutes prep time per side

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Thomas Duda, Student

Room: 15
Flight B: Start 9:45
Novice PF (Regis BJ vs. Chapin CC)

3

Duda, Thomas

4:00
3:19
MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT
Hendrick Hudson High School
November 9-10, 2012
4:00
- 120
3:40
- 140
3:00
- 3:00
0:00

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Regis BJ Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Andrew Bigelow 2
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Erik Jaklitsch 4

Team: Chapin CC Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 25.5 for Liddy Cotter 3
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26.5 for Estefania Colon 1

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average
22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Regis BJ representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Andrew: - Great speech, focus more on Syria though
- Very good cross, you played both
defensively and offensively well
Erik: - Great Rebuttal, you effectively went down
their points, but bring out some more
evidence
- Very good cross.
Andrew: - Good Summary, but state the major
points at the beginning of the speech

These are the reasons for my decision:

Erik: - Solid Final focus

Comments to Debaters:

Estefania: - Good speech, but put in a few more
numbers
- Very efficient cross, good offensive
questions
Liddy: - You only used two minutes of your rebuttal
and brought up no new evidence. That is
not good, it shows a lack of preparation
Decent cross, but be a little more offensive
Estefania: - Your summary was a rebuttal. Don't do
that, sum up the
round.
Liddy: - Solid Final Focus

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

| | |
|-----------------------|-------|
| Speaker 1 | 4 min |
| Speaker 2 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1&2) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 | 4 min |
| Speaker 4 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3&4) | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary | 2 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary | 2 min |
| Grand Crossfire (All) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus | 2 min |

2 minutes prep time per side

Pro's points carried through to the end, they debated
much more effectively.

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: Thomas Duda, Stayresant

Zip

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

3:30 3:00 1:30 AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4) 3:25 2:40

Team: Hastings on Hudson BB Circle Side: Pro Con 2nd
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Katharine Berman 2
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Richard Berman 4

Team: Bronx Science GW Circle Side: Pro Con 1st
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Andrew Gazal 3
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Bryce Whitaker 1

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

Key + Pele

The team that won this debate is Bronx Science GW representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

- State why policy is economically beneficial
- provide link between oppression and hatred to U.S.
- provide impact between economy and Iran loss of oil trade.
- Syria has major anti-American sentiment. Apology means nothing.
- Find hard numbers to support your own case.
- These are the reasons for my decision:
- connect the arguments of your case better to make it easier for me.
- Iran wants to have a nuke.

Comments to Debaters:

- Good evidence.
- Iran will strike Israel, not us. it will hurt our allies, and our economy, but not our people.
- Strengthen blocks to opponents arguments: Use evidence.
- Achmedinejad not believing in the Holocaust does not prove he is bad with nuclear weapons.
- Terrorists own their Drones.
- oil dependency is indeed bad, but we need it.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

| | |
|-----------------------|-------|
| Speaker 1 | 4 min |
| Speaker 2 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1&2) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 | 4 min |
| Speaker 4 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3&4) | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary | 2 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary | 2 min |
| Grand Crossfire (All) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus | 2 min |

2 minutes prep time per side

- Superior numbers evidence and connections supports a win for the Pro.

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: Christopher Barra

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Bronx Science BG Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Isaac Bardin 3

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Eli Guenzburger 1

Team: Chapin OP Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Juliana O'Donohue 4

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Anna Pouschine 2

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Chapin OP representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Comments to Debaters:

EG: strong case and strong delivery / strong cross-fire by both
IB: good speaking style - authenticative, but also down-to-earth
(must know reasoning behind studies you cite, not just bare existence - have to sound up better in CX)

AP: good - some more eye contact would be helpful
JOD: very clear speaking - nil point weak - they also say not all nil from ME
- strong cross-fire

EG: excellent summary - clear and focused

IB: better points - but framework point cheap and saps time from arguments

AP: excellent focus - very good responses (except maybe to have to consent to sanctions)
JOD: solid focus - clear but would have emphasized economic nil points more

These are the reasons for my decision:

Excellent round - and very close. On democracy, Pro would have done better to clearly state the unstable democracies reasoning much earlier - only comes in grand crossfire. The Con's solid Amb Spring point 5 win 17 that point. The sanctions debate had no effective winner - ~~arguments~~ but Con questioned the Hezbollah/mide connection enough to allow democracy point to win the day. Con's nil terrorism almost won but democracy and economic issues just outweighed it.

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Colin Ross - Regis High School

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

| | |
|-----------------------|-------|
| Speaker 1 | 4 min |
| Speaker 2 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1&2) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 | 4 min |
| Speaker 4 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3&4) | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary | 2 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary | 2 min |
| Grand Crossfire (All) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus | 2 min |

2 minutes prep time per side

Room: 16
Flight B: Start 9:45
Novice PF (Stuyvesant PR vs. Bronx Science LQ)

3

Ference, Charlot

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

| | |
|---|--|
| Team: Stuyvesant PR Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u> | Team: Bronx Science LQ Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con |
| Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Daniel Poleschuk 4 | Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Kevin Lam 1 |
| Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Ben Rothman 2 | Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Norman Qian 3 |

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Stuyvesant PR representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Ben - well that's the first con case I've heard with that argument. a bit optimistic in your impacts though.
To Both Ben & Kevin -
Look up the breakdown and
Daniel - you don't get too much from talking about families but you do a good job taking out their ~~points~~ Saudi ~~point~~ point.

Comments to Debaters:

Kevin - good job, your case is strong but you need to ask more direct questions in CF to help you get the answers you want.
organization of Syrian rebels.
Norman - NEVER Leave 1:30 left at the end of a rebuttal. Your arguments have good claims but you don't prove any of what you say.

These are the reasons for my decision:

all claims
organize
rebuttal
use your time
research
make claims with you
don't need evidence
Pro makes no warranted response to anything
Easily vote CON
on oil, Syria, Israel
on a nuclear Iran, but I could
RFD

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

| | |
|-----------------------|-------|
| Speaker 1 | 4 min |
| Speaker 2 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1&2) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 | 4 min |
| Speaker 4 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3&4) | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary | 2 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary | 2 min |
| Grand Crossfire (All) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus | 2 min |

2 minutes prep time per side

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: Chunhua Gu

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Stuyvesant ZG Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Rachel Zeide W 3

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Margaret Garber 1

Team: Regis CV Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Jordan^P Campbell 2

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Peter Vanderslice 4

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is STUYVESANT ZG representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

1. troops stationed in ME
good + precise statistics
Adequate FACTS (W)

2) 3) SAFETY on IRAN - Adequate evidence (W)
EFFECTIVE

Comments to Debaters:

1) Broad Argument about Repeating Hx
ended up being Vague. (-)

2. Terrorist Attacks up-
Limited evidence to
NYC can show
Need more (-)

These are the reasons for my decision:

N.B - Speaker 4 ~~did~~ A sit aggressive in
grand CX. Need to Allow
Opponent to Answer

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

| | |
|-----------------------|-------|
| Speaker 1 | 4 min |
| Speaker 2 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (1&2) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 | 4 min |
| Speaker 4 | 4 min |
| Crossfire (3&4) | 3 min |
| Speaker 1 Summary | 2 min |
| Speaker 2 Summary | 2 min |
| Grand Crossfire (All) | 3 min |
| Speaker 3 Final Focus | 2 min |
| Speaker 4 Final Focus | 2 min |

2 minutes prep time per side

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: _____

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson High School

November 9-10, 2012

Before EVERY round, flip a coin to determine the side and speaking order of the debate. The winner of the flip has the option of choosing either the side (Pro or Con) or the speaking order (1st or 2nd) in the round. The team that loses the flip makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order. After this is determined, record the names of the competitors. Please note that new arguments in the final focus are to be ignored. The Final Focus must be based on arguments and issues previously addressed in the debate.

AFTER THE COIN TOSS, HAVE THE DEBATERS CIRCLE WHETHER THEY ARE PRO OR CON AND ALSO HAVE THEM WRITE IN THEIR SPEAKING ORDER (1, 2, 3, OR 4)

Team: Monticello KH Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27.5 for Allison Kurthy ¹

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27.0 for Max Heimowitz ³

Team: Stuyvesant JM Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.0 for Royyan Jokhai ⁴

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27.5 for Mary McGreal ²

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Above Average
24-26 Average

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is STUYVESANT JM representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes/ No)

Comments to Debaters:

1st speaker - good prep, good initial use of FACTS

2nd speaker - TRS USING prep time to set evidence at hand so there is less dead space during Rebuttal. That's why Rebuttal is harder to do.

~~CON~~ CON appeared to have only 2 contentions. This made it easy for PRO to attack

These are the reasons for my decision:

RFD CRITICAL ISSUES

1. Deep strikes effective YES or NO.
CON HAD preliminary evidence on terrorists killed, But was countered by PRO stating strong negative ANTI US feelings.
CON needed to respond with more factual evidence

2. Dependence on Gulf oil.
PROS case about our dependence on SAUDI ARABIA was good. CON suggestion about moving oil dependence to South Am. was speculative, but CON did not attack this

Comments to Debaters:

1st speaker - good presentation

2nd speaker - excellent use of 2nd position to counter opponent's arguments. Would just suggest you stress how your arguments fit with your own contentions

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

Speaker 1 4 min
Speaker 2 4 min

Crossfire (1&2) 3 min

Speaker 3 4 min
Speaker 4 4 min

Crossfire (3&4) 3 min

Speaker 1 Summary 2 min
Speaker 2 Summary 2 min

Grand Crossfire (All) 3 min

Speaker 3 Final Focus 2 min
Speaker 4 Final Focus 2 min

2 minutes prep time per side

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

M Berman

HASTINGS ON HUDSON