

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science SS

Max = 30

Byram Hills OD

Max = 30

Shai Szulanski


27

Ofir Dinstein

25

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Ofir: I think that you need to be putting more arguments on the aff case than just the "aut." you also need to be extending that aut is a test of mob.

Shai: what's the brink of the 1 impact that you are extending in the round, you need to answer back the brink arg why has it & happened yet & why is UHC, key to condom distribution?

R. F. D. AFF shows me why we "can" / "aut" to have distribution of condoms, negative also concedes the aff framework. I have an obligation to vote AFF on the ~~case~~ only (i) in round.

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

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale SF

Max = 30

Lexington HK

Max = 30

Steven Friedman

27.5

Hannah Kwon

26.5

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~4~~ Steven: you are not putting any real answers on this pre-req
are from the NC so I don't know how to ~~eval~~ evaluate this
So it leaves me to weighing my self...

Hannah: I believe you need to be more comparative on the
UHC fails, because both sides are giving me args that
wash out.
- you need to also be more specific on genwelf...
we can all evaluate happiness & Health diff

R.F.D. AFF is showing me more reasonable (i) in
round, neg (i) are a wash. I DK how to eval
general welfare

Room: 130
Flight A: Start 4:00
Varsity LD

1

Cancro, Peter

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale MB

Max = 30

Michael Bogaty

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Monticello BS

Max = 30

Brittany Stein

27

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

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

Signed: Peter P Cancro

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Email the debaters' and their schools' names to:

Peter P Cancro@gmail.com

and I will reply with my flows, comments,
and RFD send to an excell workbook

Room: 111
Flight A: Start 4:00
Varsity LD

1

Cumming, Jay

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Regis RM

Max = 30

Ryan McEvoy

29.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science BA

Max = 30

Benjamin Adegbite 30

26.5

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

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

Signed: gag Cumming

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RM Dashing cross ex after ^{the} NC

BA ① End prep when prep is done

② signposts needs much work

RFP: ① spike in AC
clearly removes any
side constraint + offense

② Turn on AC
are non unique
in that ② deviation
made in negative world

③ Aff offense
clearly explained

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Stuyvesant SV

Max = 30

Sweyn Venderbush

28.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills AJ

Max = 30

Amos Jeng

28

The better debating was done by the

AP
AFF or NEG

from

Stuyvesant SV
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AC- Good case, just be careful in the beginning framework, you get too blurry at times

NC- Good case and good arguments on AC, but you're too jump. Try to be more top-down on the AC flow

IAR- Excellent extensions, you do a great job of explaining the linguistics argument, but I need more direct clash on the NC. You make some good cross applications, but ^{you need to} go directly to the NC flow and make sense of it all

NR- I like the extension of the ~~the~~ alternative, but you need to do better work on AC framework, the linguistics arg kills you here

ZAR- Great analysis on NC flow and extension of linguistics. You link back well and make all of the right extensions.

RFD: Aff wins democracy via linguistics, wins risk of offense on the polls

Room: 202
Flight A: Start 4:00
Varsity LD

1

~~Walker, Rachelle~~

~~DUNWORTH~~

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Lexington JS

Max = 30

Julia Sun

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Collegiate AO

Max = 30

Andrew O'Donohue

28.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from Collegiate AO
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 think your case has a bit of a stretch in that more growth will automatically come - it seems to me growth is always slow out of a financial crisis.
I may have missed it but if there is going to be a single payer, you need a funding mechanism. You wouldn't have said ~~that~~ that we look to the constitution as it is originally framed to determine what it means.

"I think a single-payer is dependent on ppl. ~~being~~ forced to enter it. you get to + + + spirit + + +

"I'm not sure how much I buy the fiscal diff argument, I get how your connecting it just seems only tangentially related.
"I'm not an expert but if I'm correct the Br. Lth VHS is not single-payer. An example would be re-distrib.

I vote off ms. ghts as role of govt.
for

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Berkeley Carroll WW

Max = 30

William Wells

26

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Sacred Heart AT

Max = 30

Adam Tomasi

28

The better debating was done by the Neg from Sacred Heart AT
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:

AC- Good case, but clarity is an issue. Also, your Contention II doesn't have an impact. There's no reason why strapping from the head minimizes suffering
NC- Good off-case strat. So how long did you do policy?

1AR- You need to do more work on the counterplan. I suggest using a perm that has the states enact universal healthcare and the federal government enforces. This takes out the CP and its net benefit

NR- Slow down. There's not that much work for you to do, so chill out and take time to explain the link story in politics and how the CP solves. That being said, good job with your impact calc.

2AR- Too little too late. You make good arguments on the disad, but they need to come sooner

RFD: CP solves case and has net benefit

Room: 133
Flight A: Start 4:00
Varsity LD

1

Drucker, Omri

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

2:47

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Monticello LS	Max = 30	Byram Hills LL	Max = 30
Lucas Smith	28	Lexi Leib	26

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

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

Signed: Omri Drucker

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD! vote on drop the debater on
theory, no ~~to~~ CI means no
offense

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College DL

Max = 30

Danny Li

28.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

NFA AS

Max = 30

Aamer Shikari

27.5

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

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

Signed: Omri Drucker

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD. The cap k doesn't link. Mayer says specifically the world "today". So, no link, because Mayer is not an indite on HC as a system. AFF should have turned cap.

AFF extends 2 preclusion args to the NC clearly, wins offense coming out of the F/w.

Room: 202
Flight B: Start 4:40
Varsity LD

1

Walker, Rachelle

DUNWORTH

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

275

100

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Monticello PM

Max = 30

Hunter College AM

Max = 30

Patrick Miraglia

28

Alberto Malaney

28

The better debating was done by the

~~NEG~~
AFF or NEG

from

Hunter College AM
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

* complex case it might have been that you were moving at a fast pace but ~~not~~ didn't understand it. I liked the story on why you can drop argument but insofar as he allows for this in (x) it is just a waste of time.

* You don't have a counter argument so he can drop argument.
I don't think you handle his truthfulness argument well enough.

RFD: ultimately in the 2AR the Affirmative does not ~~win~~ ~~through~~ ~~the~~ ~~GO~~ ~~steps~~ ~~doing~~ it is Aff ground so I ~~write~~ ~~off~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~Neg~~ ~~benefits~~.

Room: 130
Flight B: Start 4:40
Varsity LD

1

Cancro, Peter

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science ES

Max = 30

Ean Steinberger

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College JC

Max = 30

Joanna Cohen

28

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

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

Signed: Peter P Cancro

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Email the debaters' and their schools' names to

Peter P Cancro@gmail.com

and I will reply with my flaws, comments,
and RFD saved to an excel workbook

Room: 132
Flight A: Start 4:00
Varsity LD

1

Elisetty, Abhi

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale GT

Max = 30

Garrett Tanzer

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

NFA JH

Max = 30

John Hordines

27.5

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

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

Signed: _____

Elisetty

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Needham MG

Max = 30

Matt Goldberg

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science BR

Max = 30

Bill Reisman

26

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

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

Signed: Craig Gilbert

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Responsiveness was an issue for Bill. It didn't seem like he clearly heard/understood Matt's arguments, which allowed him to control the framework debate and subsequently the round. Bill should also be able to explain his own cards easily in ex, ~~the~~ which he wasn't.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Fiorello LaGuardia LM

Max = 30

Lena Mandell

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College SC

Max = 30

Sarah Cogan

27

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

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

Signed: Craig Gilbert

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Daniels is a clean extender out of
place at bar, which ends up controlling
the impact story for the rest of
the round. Time management
was a concern in the 1NR.

Room: 112
Flight B: Start 4:40
Varsity LD

1

Gofman, Alli

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills DS

Max = 30

Daniel Spingarn

26

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harrison AG

Max = 30

Amy Geller

27

The better debating was done by the

Neg
AFF or NEG

from

Harrison
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

Alli Gofman

A: 2:05
N: 1:18

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

COACHES: explain the categorical imperative to your debaters.

Use all your prep

Room: 112
Flight A: Start 4:00
Varsity LD

1

Gofman, Alli

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale RG

Max = 30

Rahul Gosain

28.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science SG

Max = 30

Sam Goree

27.5

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: _____

A 1:22
N/C: 30

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff - answer more clearly in cx. Neg. good cx.
Aff's cx was great.
"This may sound circular but it's not"

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT**Hendrick Hudson HS****November 9-10, 2012****AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Stuyvesant DW

Max = 30

NFA VB

Max = 30

Dillon Wu

26

Victor Bramble

27.5

The better debating was done by the

AFF or NEG

from **NFA VB**

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Victor K. Hertzog

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

you are very unclear when you read - you need to enunciate, slow down, and run arguments that make more sense. You have really extreme, Hendrick Hudson HS broderism-type impacts, but at least, they have a November 9-10, 2012 tenuous link to the topic. You should give a more tangible standard; what does it mean to maximize welfare? How do we know when we've done that? You do an okay job of showing the general benefits of HC provision, but you really don't engage the issue of the federal government being a cost. The better debating was done by the Neg from NFA VB. Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: provide. What if the neg runs a counterplan that takes out your benefits? How do you deal with the implementation issues inherent to your advocacy? (re) You don't need to read your framework, since you and he are using the same one. You have a really convoluted link story that doesn't really make sense. Why does VHC mean using the same doctors and providers - why can't we just increase the number of providers when we affirm? Also, why can't other nations aid the U.S. if it does face the problems you mention? Also, how does negating solve the harms you outline? Wouldn't people rely more on these limited services if the federal government were unable to step in and do something? You should try to make more answers to the AC, especially turns, because otherwise, your offense is limited to what's in your case. (1RR) You need to be clearer! It's really hard to follow this speech bc you aren't extending your full link story, only individual pieces of it. (2RR) You should do more work on the AC to show why I don't look to his cards there. You need to balance offense with defense. (2RR) This "children" stuff is new + unwarranted. (FD) I can't figure out what either side is impacting, but it's some vague notion of util. Aff mishandles 2RR in major ways, and doesn't deal with any of neg's extensions. I vote on the extended (FDA), (Lowry), + (Amc) cards that establish that aff overprescribes medicine and has a shortage of doctors, which means he has no comparative advantage.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

Scarsdale CB

Charlie Blatt

POINTS

Max = 30

NEGATIVE

Byram Hills CG

POINTS

Max = 30

The better debating was done by the

AFF or NEG

from

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed:

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This position is really absurd, so I wouldn't be very receptive to your theory spikes if you extended them in the 1AR. You said Hendrick Hudson HS me to use reasonability as my basis for deciding whether a position is absurd, in which case I'd default against this H. (1) You don't actually justify universal care for citizens, only a specific type of care for some people. There is no reason the neg should be able to access Claudia Greenspan (26.5) these args. Also, why would VHC necessarily include contraception, esp. if that's the controversial part? (2) The neg can't win procedural args, but you can spite out of them with procedural justifications? How is that fair? (3) You want the neg to engage you on substance, but you have them no ground. What are they supposed to say - that contraception shouldn't be provided? (4) You need to shorten your disad drastically - it's so long that it's impossible for you to cover her case. You need to provide a measurable standard with some justifications - why do we prefer your FW to hers? You need to link the arguments in the disad to the provision of health care generally; you have to show why her plan is better. It would be a good idea to get evidence that's more specific - I need to know why VHC decreases innovation, since that empirically hasn't happened, this needs to be fleshed out. (1AR) I really don't know what a lot of the cards you're extending are talking about ("her affir doesn't derive from identity"? What does that mean?). I feel like your case links to VHC are really weak, and don't actually affirm (you say you're advocating more than universal contraception, but you don't say why that's true). (2AR) You seem to be missing the point of her FW and preface arg. (2AR) You need some order + structure to this speech. (2FD) This round is problematic bc neither side is doing enough to engage the other. Aff clearly wins the FW with the extensions of Hendab, Dean, + Butler, and since the neg doesn't engage the FW or link in, I look to extensions of Leinenberg and Banned Parenthood (women need VHC to get contraceptives) and don't look to the disad, which doesn't seem relevant.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science AF

Max = 30

Aeshah Farrouq

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Lexington AH

Max = 30

Adam Hoffman

30

The better debating was done by the Neg from Lexington AH
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: Left w/ unaddressed Neg Argument that he can provide healthcare too!
Neg AFF successfully links this to VC debate and correctly applies the Argument to Both Standard. Either Standard I choose AFF uncontested argument is sufficient. VC debate a bit unsettled but Aff wins.
Neg AFF - Argue Life & valuable Rts & W of Neg we're sure! Sufficiently weakened Slow down! by inability to accurately define/limit - Sign post better Word Economy! Seems to be broad and hard to apply
AFGRAL Neg - Presence! Neg AFF be careful Confidence! determine b/t Crystallize! constitutional premissable and require 2 - why
→ take 3 level to critique can't we or should we do something not require
see case critique
Both Please Sign Post Better.

Room: 128
Flight B: Start 4:40
Varsity LD

1

Parker, Ari

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale LM

Larry Milstein

Max = 30

29

excellent layering!
in late

The better debating was done by the

Aff
AFF or NEG

from

Scarsdale
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Collegiate NE

Nathan Ewing-Crystal

Max = 30

29.5

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

Signed: _____

in Parker

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Fairness is a voter!

Room: 128
Flight A: Start 4:00
Varsity LD

1

Parker, Ari

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science DM

Max = 30

Daiya Massac

28.2/28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Monticello PC

Max = 30

Peter Chocolate

28

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

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

Signed: AP

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: ~~118~~ 134
Flight A: Start 4:00 B.
Varsity LD

1

Pritt, Jacob

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Lexington TM

Max = 30

Teddy McKenna

28.6

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science ID

Max = 30

Isis Davis-Marks

28.4

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:

Oral

Room: 134
Flight A: Start 4:00
Varsity LD

1

~~Zavislan, Matt~~
PRITT.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Monticello DT

Max = 30

Lexington CD

Max = 30

Dustin Thomas

27.5

Caroline Dugan

27.5

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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- This is a pretty interesting AC. It's probably not typical, but ~~not~~ can probably win that it's reasonable.

- These same arguments on the disad make no sense. The disad doesn't want you to defend the square it's a disad. to how you change the says

- Good NC / on case answers but do more work explaining how exactly your arguments link to his framework.
- Also, rather than reading this DA (which doesn't explicitly link to either framework), you should have more answers to the contracts framework.

Oral

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Berkeley Carroll CS

Max = 30

Charles Sherman

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills JA

Max = 30

Josh Altman

29.5

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: Sunpreet Singh

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

On the pre-fiat argument, I buy Josh's turn that the debate setting makes the conversation trivial and undermines the goal. Also, Aff never shows me why the problem is ~~just~~ not just financial. So even if he wins solvency, it doesn't solve racism but the financial disparities instead, thus no link to standard. NC is largely dropped and could also be a voter.

Room: 204
Flight A: Start 4:00
Varsity LD

1

Singh, Sunpreet

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Fordham Prep DJ

Max = 30

David Joannides

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College BL

Max = 30

Ben Laufer

28

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

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

Signed: Sunpreet Singh

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I vote off the poll. No metric for productivity is given by the neg and the aff fw still stands. The turns on the ~~the~~ CP responses dont link back to AC fw.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

Both of you: Watch rhetoric in referring to so-called economic classes and race.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

NFA JG

Max = 30

Regis PM

Max = 30

Jordanne Gizzarelli

25

Peter McGahren

28.5

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: Zack Struver

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AC: ~~Don't~~ Your FW needs to justify util, not describe it. Contentions need better togs. You have an extra minute and ten seconds left. How does discrimination int to util?

NC: NC is really long, and the floating PIC on the AC should be treated as a real counterplan.

IAR: signpost Extensions need to be more substantive.

NR: ~~Typical fluff with no real substance~~
Some of IAR comments on extension shorts. Also, weigh.

2AR: Give a big picture of the round. Don't make new arguments.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College RH

Rebecca Heilweil

Max = 30

26.5

Lexington MH

Michael Heyang

Max = 30

25

The better debating was done by the

AFF or NEG

from

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AC: The UDHR isn't binding. Neither is the Declaration.
The AC standard is pretty odd - it seems to be util, basically.
There's no blaming for prejudice.

CX: Don't just ask clarification questions.

NC: What's the impact of ^{higher} bad taxes? What do any of those impacts have to do with the general welfare or common defense. Don't argue with her value. Just weigh. Compare evidence - weigh. Don't just

Cross-apply.

CX: Yes - don't answer "not sure". Give a concrete answer to questions.

AR: You need to extend harms to no healthcare, not just surgery. Weigh the equal protection clause doesn't put positive affirmative obligations on gov't.

NR: Weigh + give affirmative obligations on gov't. 2AR: Don't make new arguments.

RFO: AC
Wire Fing
offense. Life of us
money.

Stand up in
speeches

NEGATIVE

Don't make assumptions
that more black people
die because of a higher
crime rate.

POINTS

20

I don't
think you're
racist,
but watch
your
rhetoric.

Look at me during
CX.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale BU

Ben Ulene

Max = 30

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis BK

Barrett King

Max = 30

26.5

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NC - you make a lot of points that are simply unwarranted, e.g. charities will provide care for people who ~~do~~ pay for private insurance.

Also, you should be taking advantage of the turns you made on the A-C, as they were not answered substantively.

I vote aff for the reason that the govt ought to "try" to provide equal opportunity, regardless of if it does 100% or not.

B/c Menzel is clearly extended, I would prefer govt system that helps ppl who are ~~not~~ covered, and would lose self-ownership otherwise.

Room: 113
Flight B: Start 4:40
Varsity LD

1

~~Pritt, Jacob~~

Zavislan

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Collegiate MA

Max = 30

Matthew Agar-Johnson 29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Livingston High JX

Max = 30

Jessica Xu 28

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

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

Signed: Matt Zavislan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

ORAL

I meets = theory

AFF wins substance b/c AC comes first

Room: 231
Flight B: Start 4:35
Public Forum Open (Regis BP vs. Stuyvesant UE)

1

Holmes, Wendy

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

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 BP Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 30 for Eddie Bannon (2)

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Christian Powers (4)

Team: Stuyvesant UE Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Jakob Urda (3)

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Jonathan Evans (1)

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

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Stuyvesant UE
(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:

These are the reasons for my decision:

DIAL

The facts backing up the weight
of the argument

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: Wendy Holmes

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

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

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 LS Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 (use) for Francis Leong
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Ferdinand Subag

Team: Byram Hills KB Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Ava Kingsley 3
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Jon Bohrer 1

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

too aggressive during evidence dispute

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

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

PRO → undermining security

Comments to Debaters:

CON → not undermining security

Speaker 2 - definitions → clear → good
I Iran - surplus of GDP → sanctions not working!
- closer to nuclear prolif.
- anti-american sentiment
Syria - Obama's credibility is undermined

Speaker 4 - ~~we must include Pakistan + Afghanistan~~
- Pakistan + Afghanistan is not in the middle east

- can you give examples in response to probes strikes? → your response

These are the reasons for my decision:

gives examples in Pakistan + Afghanistan

studies → you mentioned earlier that these countries are not in the middle east

Con was more convincing that Pakistan + Afghanistan are part of the middle east.

(considered) pros evidence enriched uranium ~~pro~~ does not support their case.
Cons evidence, despite lacking one source initially, overall case was stronger.

Speaker 1 I Aid to Pakistan is Beneficial
II Foreign Policy in Iran is beneficial
IV Foreign Engagement is Necessary for Security

Speaker 3 we must include Pakistan + Afghanistan
- very articulate when you speak
You should make sure in the future you have all of evidence / at least the url + preferably in text present
- what do you mean by powering medical research?

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

Speaker 1	CON	4 min	✓
Speaker 2	PRO	4 min	✓
Crossfire (1&2)		3 min	✓
Speaker 3	CON	4 min	✓
Speaker 4	PRO	4 min	✓
Crossfire (3&4)		3 min	✓
Speaker 1 Summary	CON	2 min	✓
Speaker 2 Summary	PRO	2 min	✓
Grand Crossfire (All)		3 min	✓
Speaker 3 Final Focus	CON	2 min	✓
Speaker 4 Final Focus	PRO	2 min	✓

2 minutes prep time per side

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

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 AA Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>	Team: Collegiate RP Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for Elena Anderson <u>4</u>	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27 1/2</u> for Austen Rattray <u>1</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Margarita Artoglou <u>2</u>	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27 1/2</u> for Seung-Min Park <u>3</u>

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

Round came down to Israel, Iran & O.I. The drug trade & Iraq got lost. The evidence & lack anti-American term. evd/links lost the drug argument

Comments to Debaters:

B.S. spoke clearly & used evidence in well articulated arguments. Both sides agreed on importance of O.I. to U.S., but differed on B.S. to estab. framework.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Con won the Israel & Iran Arguments. The O.I. debate forced weighing independence w/ jobs & war. I found the con more convincing on O.I.

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:

Dotti Dougherty

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

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: Park RT Circle Side: Pro Con ^{2nd}
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Francisco Ruela
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Mike Tartaglia

Team: Stuyvesant LK Circle Side: Pro Con ^{1st}
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Zachary Lemonides
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Ben Kessler

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

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Stuyvesant LK 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:

*Try to be less excitable during cross-fire.
Speaking over each other makes it hard to follow conversations.
Your framework was confusing at times.
- felt that you undermined yourselves at times.
Good points but needed to "gel" ideas.*

*Ran very effective cross exams.
Zack was good at refutation in his speech.*

These are the reasons for my decision:

Stuyvesant LK or Con had a stronger framework. I felt they were more coherent and consistent speaker to speaker and across flow.

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:

William Leong *Regis Parent*

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

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 JR Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Tom Jaklitsch (4) 2
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Patrick Rice (2) 1

Team: Bronx Science YS Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27.5 for Victor Yeung (3) 2
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Omair Shahid 1

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

22-23 Below Average

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

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Patrick

Your cross-X was strong

Tom

Your constructive was highly effective, concise, and well-spoken
We get most of our oil from ~~the~~ Canada (not SA)

Comments to Debaters:

Omair

The Syria point seems quite speculative — maybe focus more on Palestine? ~~or~~ Or Iran. Explore the complications of NATO interference more

Victor

No reason to re-quote evidence
Participate in grand-crossfire

These are the reasons for my decision:

Pro focused on the wrong scenario in the 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

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: J. Shaner

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

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 MS Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 1/2 for Taylor McCormack '1
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for William Smith 3

Team: Regis CO Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Jaime Cobham 2
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 1/2 for Jack O'Malley 4

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

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Regis

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

representing the PRO CON

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Good clash on nuc. issues -

Confusion w/ G.I. Truce/Policy -
Linkage to policy = impacts - got lost
on both sides.

Some confusion w/ use of evidence -

Comments to Debaters:

Truman Nuc.?

These are the reasons for my decision:

Law did not respond to France's policies Iran/Syria &
esp. Anti-Am. w/ clear policies.

Pro was convincing w/ failures & Pro did not give
me enough clear successor of policy

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:

D. Dougherty

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

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: Byram Hills RB Circle Side: Pro Con ^{2nd}
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27.5 for Max Rothschild
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.0 for Will Bohrer

Team: Bronx Science HF Circle Side: Pro Con ^{1st}
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Alon Handler
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29.0 for Adam Freilich

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

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

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Good framework - need to be more familiar with your evidence - eg. number of civilian deaths by drone. Also back up claims that Iranian oil money goes to fund terrorist groups.

Comments to Debaters:

Stronger contentions overall - good.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Bronx Science HF was convincing on cost-benefit argument. Evidence was better backed up. Cross fire more effective than Byram Hills.

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:

William Leong Regis Parent

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

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)

3:09 #13
Team: Bronx And/Aha Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Jeremy Andreades 2
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Towsif Ahasan 1

2:10 2:13
Team: Regis PP Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Christian Pavlakos 3
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Alex Petrillo 1

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

22-23 Below Average

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

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

I think it is important to make the causal link between Anti-American sentiment & Nat Sec interests explicit in every speech. It seems obvious, but it makes for a stronger argument when you say why.

- If you are going to go for the definition of exclude Afghanistan, focus your argument towards that.
- Your best arguments, are against their Afghan argument

I think Pro is winning definitional debate. However, I think that when you exclude Afghanistan from debate, Pro loses most of its strongest arguments which is left, and is the only point of clash in the final focus, is the debate over Democracies in Middle East. That argument flows to the Con side via Democratic Peace Theory.

Comments to Debaters:

I do like how focused your case is but you lose focus in ~~the~~ your arguments. Be wary of the word "better." "Better" doesn't mean much unless you qualify it (i.e. better foreign policy or better to US Nat Interest).
- I think you need to ~~fully~~ ^{do better} ~~see~~ ^{issue} speech. The \$ to Syria is not your strongest argument. Don't waste time on 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

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: J. Y. H. H. HEN HUN

Room: 231

Flight A: Start 4:00

Public Forum Open (Bronx Science DK vs. Byram Hills PG)

1

Holmes, Wendy

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

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 DK Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27.5 for Miranda Ditmore 1
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Morry Kolman 3

Team: Byram Hills PG Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 25.5 for Matt Percello 4
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 25.5 for Chris Gaetano 2

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

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is

Bronx Science
(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:

Byram Hills

More content, up to date ideas.
Better Research and articulation
At Q&A - springs from where?
And affects how?

These are the reasons for my decision:

Pro did not come forward
with a strong
enough case.

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:

Wendy Holmes

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

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 DP	Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u>	for Gabriel Delsol <u>24</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u>	for Jimmy Peraffan <u>22</u>
Team: Regis AM	Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u>	for Danny Apadula <u>1</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u>	for Matt Melbourne <u>3</u>

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

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is CON Bronx Sci DP representing the PRO CON

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

It my presuppositions about PF are still accurate, then you speaker 2 is speaking too quickly. I think.
- Speaker 4 - why waste time on delinths of Afghanistan & you said most of your time on Iran? In general, your concentration on Iran is healthy -> you now have to make the argument that this is our #1 Foreign Policy & #1 National Security threat (which you can, but is hard).

Comments to Debaters:

- Speaker 3 -> In CX, you argue that Afghanistan has come to be put at the ME when we talk about FP. How does the reconcile with the CIA delinths
- Speaker 1 - Thank you for dropping the Afghan is not a ME argument -> good issue selection! Debate does not turn on this

These are the reasons for my decision:

What are our national security interests? I have been getting a nuke vs. curbing anti-American sentiment vs. anti-terrorism. There needs to be more debate about which national security goals are most important to our NS. The effectiveness of the FP against Iran seems to be effective and I think that CON shows how our relationship with Israel has more impact on the benefit of our National Security than harm.

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:

GM

Ken Hild

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

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 GN Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 25 for Alexis Gajwani ^{1st}

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26.5 for Rebecca Ngu ^{2nd}

Team: Regis HS Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26.5 for DuMichel Harley ^{1st}

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27.5 for Sean Sonnemann ^{2nd}

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

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is

Regis HS

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

representing the PRO CON

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

- Why argue the Libya definition, but then allow Libya anyway? Either use it to deprive them of offense or don't waste 30 seconds of your own time.
- Thank you for bringing up definition of undermine - that was bothering me, too.
- Wasted 3rd speech - made no substantive points
↳ you had plenty of prep time to use to prepare

Comments to Debaters:

- opponents did fail to sufficiently address Iran contention but they did raise points against it (no better alternative, and future potential harms not mattering). These are defensible arguments, but don't pretend they weren't made.
- careful not to railroad opponents during Grand Crossfire
- good Final Focus - I like the clear reasons to vote

These are the reasons for my decision:

The CON really only has one main offensive point by the end (which is too bad, because everyone forgot about Israel after your 1st speech), which is Al Qaeda. The stats you use just aren't compelling - 500 dead terrorists doesn't seem like a lot unless you impact it back to organizational capacity, and 17 dead hijacked Americans seems like a weirdly specific metric for measuring terror. I vote PRO because they finally found the window-of-opportunity argument on Iran, and they effectively counter on terror by showing how Al Qaeda is just moving on.

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:

Ben Theodore Hen Hud

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

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 HM Circle Side: Pro Con Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Tim Hannan 3 Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Vincent Monti 1	Team: Lexington BH Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u> Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Holden Bruce 2 Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Reed Horowitz 4
--	---

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

The team that won this debate is Lexington BH 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:

It ^{really} came down to the future ~~vs~~ current ~~debate~~ clash. Both sides offered valid arguments, but what ~~is~~ ^{tipped the scale} was the ~~hated~~ ^{resentment} vs resentment CON 1st content ~~not being~~ ^{being} extended in the final focus.

~~To~~ This basically validated there points on current actions having indeterminate future effects, ~~which~~ which led me to side CON.

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: Matthew Treinish

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

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 ST Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Kevin Szura 3 4

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27.5 for Emily Tagarelo 4 2

Team: Monticello SH Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Emily Smith 3

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Jane Hyman 4 1

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

22-23 Below Average

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

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Emily:

Be more assertive in cross-fire
Your ~~summary~~ summary was scatter-shot - be more thorough in refuting the other team's args.

Kevin:

You need to be more specific
I like your contention about data being needed - so provide the data!

Comments to Debaters:

Jane:

Be more specific to go the extra step - what happens exactly if we stop supporting Israel?

Emily:

Your questioning was very on-point
I appreciate listing the reasons to vote con clearly and concisely

These are the reasons for my decision:

The pro team was not aggressive enough in defending the ~~the~~ resolution and conceded the con team's framework.
The status quo probably saves American lives given that the pro didn't make clear links to ~~low~~ policies harm American citizens.

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 HS

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 RS Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Michael Raevsky 1
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Joe Salmaggi 3

Team: Stuyvesant CC Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Jack Cahn 2
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for David Cahn 4

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

22-23 Below Average

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

PRO

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

CON

Comments to Debaters:

Comments to Debaters:

Speaker 1 Foreign Policy in Iran
Creating Counter Terrorism
Speaker 3 - we are driving Iran into a nuclear state
- nuclear monopoly in Israel
undermining security

Speaker 2 US Policy deterrence Nuclear proliferation
- you should slow down a little bit for the judge

Speaker 4 - you sway a bit when you speak, this can be distracting
- very articulate when you speak
- no need to be overly dramatic during crossfire, this is not DI... just make your points.

Final Focus - we have slowed GDP of Iran

These are the reasons for my decision:

Pro fails to show that the harm outweighs the benefits.
Con's evidence is stronger than the Pro's evidence

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 HS

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: Lexington CB Circle Side: Pro ConSpeaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Diana Cagliero 1stSpeaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Dina Benayad-Cherif 2ndTeam: Bronx Science AM Circle Side: Pro ConSpeaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Xavier Amarille 1stSpeaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Daniel Messner 2nd

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

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Bronx Science AM

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

representing the PRO CON

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

- 2nd contention is confusing - isn't the Afghan pullout current policy? Don't see how it helps your case, even so.
- take a breath in between points to let them sink in
- 3rd speech was wasted - no defense on Afghan point, no real strengthening of your offense
- how did Iraq invasion cause Arab Spring? Also, does that even count as current policy?

Comments to Debaters:

- justify your claim that MidEast gov'ts fund terror
- your 1st contention really isn't about "Law"
 - ↳ it's about threats to life • terrorists trying to kill ppl & undermine our laws, they undermine our safety
- "if we weren't there" - we aren't in Iraq anymore
- crumbling foundations - this all relative, so I don't really accept the impact of your definition. Net positive is what matters.
- guys debt ratio is not the only way to measure effectiveness of sanctions. Currency riots probably matter.

These are the reasons for my decision:

I thought the clean turn of the ~~Iran~~ Afghanistan contention would have made a great voter, but the PRO seemed to forget about it. Everything else is very muddled and unwarranted, and the one semi-strong argument by the PRO isn't even linked to their own definition of national security (seriously, why is safety not a part of that?). Still, I can't buy the CON's tenuous connection ~~between~~ between Iraq and Arab Spring, nor does Democratic War Theory protect us from terrorists.

I vote PRO because they actually give me some ~~data~~ semi-tangible impacts on our security

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:

Ben Theodore Hen Hud

Room: 224

Flight A: Start 4:00

Public Forum Open (Collegiate PW vs. Regis DP)

1

Treinish, Matt

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

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: Collegiate PW Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Joshua Podolsky 2

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27.5 for Charlie Windolf 4

Team: Regis DP Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Colin Donnelly 1

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27.5 for Brendan Powell 3

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

22-23 Below Average

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

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Be more careful w/ which case you read in the future

Comments to Debaters:

Specific cards and newspaper articles don't carry as much weight as you think

These are the reasons for my decision:

Oral disclosure
Aff ~~did~~ didn't extend any of their case & not much choice.

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:

Matthew Treinish

Master of time and space