

Room: 112
Flight A: Start 11:30
Varsity LD

4

Cancro, Peter

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills LL

Max = 30

Lexi Leib

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College AM

Max = 30

Alberto Malaney

28

The better debating was done by the Neg from Hunter College AM
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 w/ my flows, comments, and

RFO saved to an excell workbook

Room: 130
Flight A: Start 11:30
Varsity LD

4

Crichton, McLean

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

^{2:30}
Monticello PM

Patrick Miraglia

POINTS

Max = 30

28

NEGATIVE

Bronx Science ES

^{1:27}
Ean Steinberger

POINTS

Max = 30

27

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

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

Signed: C. M.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: AC - I don't see a problem with the Sartre endorsement of existentialism & the ideas of existence (concerns about spread of disease) in the Social Contention. Be careful not to conflate the former philosophical doctrine with the common usage of existentialism (i.e. physical existence) used in ~~public~~ medicine.

RFD: This case comes down to the impact coming out of AC in Social Contention (Mensa). Inasmuch as AFF is not showing that UAC explicitly creates an imminent risk of disease, there is no clear reason why ~~regard~~ one it is desirable to implement UAC, and ~~what it is~~ I'm left with the Autonomy respects from Neg. Therefore, I negate.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Stuyvesant SV

Max = 30

Sweyn Venderbush

30

NEGATIVE

POINTS

^{1:40}
NFA JG

Max = 30

Jordanne Gizzarelli

27

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

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

Signed: C. M. H.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG → If I begin the round by saying I will prefer weighted arguments that are impacted through the standard, an off-case argument is probably not a good starting point. Not to mention, it's a terrible argument.

I AFFIRM. Morality is based around objectively through the method of voting. Attacking the methodology of the polls is not sufficient to show the the people have not decided that they want UHC. This is the only link to Morality + what the US should do. If I were to accept all of the negative impacts as true, I still cannot make the argument for you that this impacts to (M). It may be implicit that people dying is immoral, but you never make that argument.

Room: 128
Flight A: Start 11:30
Varsity LD

4

Cumming, Jay

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills AJ

Max = 30

Amos Jeng

28.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College BL

Max = 30

Ben Laufer

28.5

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

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

Signed: Jay Cumming

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

oral

Room: 128
Flight B: Start 12:15
Varsity LD

4

Cumming, Jay

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

NFA VB

Max = 30

Bronx Science DM

Max = 30

Victor Bramble

58; 29

Daiya Massac 1:19

28.5

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

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

Signed: Jay Cumming

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: ① aff proposes U.S. has 2 obligations

② ~~DA~~ DA posits that diminishing profits means less innovation, worse for the industry

③ DA impacts to the a) point of AC and weighed against point B)

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale BU

Max = 30

Ben Ulene

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Monticello PC

Max = 30

Peter Chocolate

28.5

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- AC-I like the underview. Rest of case is well read and not blippy.
- NC- On the AC, make responses independent of the DA and the K, Aside from that, good strat.
- IAR- Great answers on the K and DA, but I would have liked more AC analysis. Tell the complete story of the AC structure
- MR- Good analysis on the K, but give me more standard weighings here. At least establish that it functions outside of standards.
- IAR- The turn on the K saves you here. However, you don't do the necessary work on util, so I have to go there.
- RFD: DA shows solvency burden for aff, so AC fails in a util framework

Room: 126
Flight A: Start 11:30
Varsity LD

4

Drucker, Omri

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale RG

Max = 30

Rahul Gosain

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Fiorello LaGuardia LM

Max = 30

Lena Mandell

27.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from LaGuardia LM
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:

RFD: IF we default to epistemology while the
interrogation of flows, triggers step and then negates

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College RH

Max = 30

Rebecca Heilweil

28.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Stuyvesant SH

Max = 30

Samantha Hom

28.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from Stuy SH
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:

REF: Really messy round. Aff extends no offense about
describe comes out of the AC. The O/U's that
Some reads are not responsive, but the attributive ones
are not really that good. ~~no I so to the~~ aren't the
extrapolations that are being made. Even if there
is one dropped as an F/W on the 1g on Karsgaard,
it isn't enough work. The 2AR response
to neg offense wasn't sufficient.

Room: 234
Flight B: Start 12:15
Varsity LD

4

Dunworth, Jonath

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

Collegiate MA

Matthew Agar-Johnson 18

POINTS

Max = 30

NEGATIVE

Hunter College JC

Joanna Cohen 27

POINTS

Max = 30

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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Good IAR, but I think ~~that things~~ you should have spent more time on the Neg. criteria.

Although I like the CP I think you could do a better job w/ the standards debate as the negative harms in productivity you state seem to be extreme which I don't think will occur w/ a single payer system.
I didn't think you did enough on the standards debate.

RFD: I vote affirmative b/c I don't buy Neg argument state will cease to exist w/o efficiency, and then drops too much on Aff standards for me to negate that I believe.

Room: 234
Flight A: Start 11:30
Varsity LD

4

Dunworth, Jonath

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills JA

24

Josh Altman

Max = 30

28.5

NEGATIVE

24

POINTS

Monticello LS

Max = 30

Lucas Smith

29

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

- Your misunderstanding how Obamacare lowers premiums, it does it by spreading risk among a greater pool of healthy applicants (look up adverse selection)
- I don't really buy topic literature argument it seems there is a substantial amount on single-payer systems
- You say S.C. decisions

- I'm not sure I agree w/ the Reason to premise & statement also.
- The argument you label new isn't

RPO: Ultimately, although I had a fair amount of difficulty, but I like Aff's argument that shop triggers structural presumption thus I affirm.

Room: 109
Flight A: Start 11:30
Varsity LD

4

Elisetty, Abhi

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Sacred Heart AT

Max = 30

Adam Tomasi

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Collegiate AO

Max = 30

Andrew O'Donohue

28.5

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: 109
Flight B: Start
Varsity LD

4

Elisetty, Abhi

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale LM

Max = 30

Larry Milstein

29.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Monticello BS

Max = 30

Brittany Stein

27

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: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Monticello DT

Dustin Thomas

Max = 30

28

Pingry AK

Amol Kapoor

Max = 30

28.2

The better debating was done by the

neg

from

Pingry AK

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

Signed:

Chetan K. Hertzog

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

rights without universalizing case? That's really unclear/underexplained. (AC) You should shorten your case - it's nearly 4 minutes, so you don't have enough time to cover the AC fully. You need to explain the brightline between government actions that serve the "legitimate" ends of government and those that don't. You should tell me whether taxation in general is okay, or whether some taxes are and others aren't. If I don't have children, but I still pay taxes to support public education, is that okay under your standard, or not? You should try to generate more offense against the AC - as it is, you have some decent answers, but you don't really do much with them or explain how they weigh against the AC. (IAR) You should explain the variant for the claim that theories other than contractarianism are infinitely regressive, bc I don't think there is one. There should be more focus on the NC. (NR) You seem to run out of things to say. Give ratings issues! (2AR) need to deal with the NC move. (RFD) I have no idea how to weigh between competing "irreconcilably" claims in terms of the meta-theories. I start with contractarianism - the problem is that aff isn't answering back (Taylor), who say people can't be forced to ① subsidize others' care or ② make people goals they don't have (like abortion). Aff answers that they have to pay for more than abortion is over-responsive. neg wins his functionality role with the extension of (Locke).

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science BA

Max = 30

Benjamin Adegbite

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Stuyvesant DW

Max = 30

Dillon Wu

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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- The debate came down to whether universal health care can eliminate biases against minorities. Neg was more convincing that it will not remove biases, whereas Aff could not defend its key benefit.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science ID

Max = 30

Isis Davis-Marks

26.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Lexington MH

Max = 30

Michael Heyang

27

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

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

Signed: Joella Kudron

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

- make sure to ask for flex prep in the beginning of the round, not after your opponent has already used their CX time.
- BE CLEAR if you're going to read quickly
- signpost!!!

RFD

- Bioterror was awash. Gersten was a good card, Neg, but Korsgaard and Kohn outweighed Gersten. Additionally, Aff better proved (through Kors. & Kohn) that Deont. was a better framework due to our intent. The round was pretty messy. Both of you need to make sure you're signposting and communicating to the judge where you are on the flow.

Neg

- timing is everything. Make sure you have enough time to address all of her arguments.
- signpost!!!
- you had a minute left in your final speech. There was so much you could have done with it, especially w/ raters

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Lexington HK

Hannah Kwon

Max = 30

26.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills DS

Daniel Spingarn

Max = 30

25

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFID - This was not a good round and you both have to work on your time management. Neg basically drops AFF's case, including the "promote the general welfare" argument. AFF - currents on M RTS carry by B obs seems inapplicable, and o66 part, but general claim uncontested. ultimately Rund shines out this way. VP = M, VC debate about hcc by A or A by life is a wash → Fall back to AFF VC of fulling obs, which ss bad and sorta begs the question, but, neg drops AFF's arg that purpose of gov is to promote general welfare, and enough of AFF's Heath impacts survive to meet this obligation combined w/ AFF Arg's that obs come b4 Rights (ie A), I AFFIRM.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

Hunter College DL

Danny Li

POINTS

Max = 30

30

NEGATIVE

Scarsdale CB

Charlie Blatt

POINTS

Max = 30

30

The better debating was done by the Neg from Scarsdale CB
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:

Great Round!! Good luck

RFD: First some thoughts.
Neg drops desirability analysis true, but
Porter shows impossibility in long run. If it's
impossible in long run, it can't be desirable - many the drop a
wash.

Neg does great job weighing value of Porter/Fleming
and many it easy to find places to vote neg,
AFF would have been better served by more the spirit
crystallizing

OK, so Neg STD's justification is that (1) comprise gov, so STD need
to be based on (2) ops, AFF counter that STD needs to suit government
actor more precisely, seems more true. But that doesn't
prevent neg's analysis that her STD is a core req. etc that
must be met before you can affirm. Accordingly, AFF must meet
Both. Porter shows infeasibility, and AND each of
desirability, at which point AFF must meet his burden
of desirability. AFF also goes out to neg's analysis
that treat people as means to other's END and force them
to pay for this & cause. Clearly violating neg's STD, and
possibly AFF's too.

Room: 233
Flight A: Start 11:30
Varsity LD

4

Parker, Ari

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science SG

Max = 30

Sam Goree

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Fordham Prep DJ

Max = 30

David Joannides

28.5

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

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

Signed: A. Parker

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: 233
Flight B: Start
Varsity LD

4

Parker, Ari

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

Lexington JS

Julia Sun

POINTS

Max = 30

27

NEGATIVE

Harrison PG

Patty-Jane Geller

POINTS

Max = 30

28.5

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: ap

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills CG

Max = 30

Claudia Greenspan

28.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science AF

Max = 30

Aeshah Farrouq

28

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: _____

H. Schneier

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I feel that AFF won this round because framework very solidly delineated, and VC of Upholding Moral obligations followed clearly.

I chose this Framework/VC over the NEG (Autonomy) for these reasons:
AFF Contentions - solidly warranted, & carried through. Her argument about 'wellfare' especially strong.

I did not conclude that NEG's argument that the Autonomy Frame Supersedes 'Moral obligation' frame holds true. Her arguments about use of 'coercive power' were well developed but I do not think they ultimately proved that Autonomy 'must' be considered - over moral obligation. I ~~do~~ think AFF adequately refuted these arguments - though could have used more detail / examples - would have made AFF case better.

Room: 114
Flight A: Start 11:30
Varsity LD

4

Singh, Sunpreet

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Lexington CD

Max = 30

Caroline Dugan

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

NFA JH

Max = 30

John Hordines

28.5

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

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

Signed: Harvard High

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

On FW, I think while the aff was winning, the neg was able to link in with his contention (policy that kills many are not for general welfare). Given that I look to who fulfills the obligation the most (essentially consequential). I buy neg's superbug arg over the poverty impacts since 1) ~~the~~ the solvency isn't there 2) the impact claimed in round was not US specific.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale MB

Max = 30

Michael Bogaty

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis BK

Max = 30

Barrett King

29

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: Sunpreet Singh

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I vote neg. On fw I buy the cross-application of Andre, so neg wins fw and aff has no offense left. On the neg, ~~there~~ the contention was reiterated well enough for me to grant it as offense.

Room: 231
Flight A: Start 11:30
Varsity LD

4

Struver, Zack

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale SF

Max = 30

Steven Friedman

~~28~~ 28.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Lexington AH

Max = 30

Adam Hoffman

29

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

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

Signed: Zack

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Number arguments: 2 ^{contention} ~~2~~ and framework of AC.

Constitution

reflects will
of people.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science SS

Max = 30

Shai Szulanski

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Lexington TM

Max = 30

Teddy McKenna

24.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from BRONX SCIENCE SS
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

RESP. INDIV. RIGHTS

MORAL BEING

NON-VARY PERSON TO PERSON

RESPECTING HUMAN RIGHTS

Single paper

AFF - IF YOU PUNISH NEG PROTECTS MORE
LIVES MORE LIVES THAN AFF - NEGATIVE

SUPERB OR - HAD NEG ON HIS HEELS

(TRY & WORK ON SPEECH CLARITY)

VOTERS DONE VERY WELL IN 2AR

CHAMPIONSHIP - CLEAR, CONCISE

CONCISE

INTER

NEG

CANCER SURV. RATES IN US HIGHEST
w/o UHC

UHC WILL KILL UNKNOWN

FASTER ACTION

UTILITARIAN CONCEPT

Boston Globe - SCIENCE? AUTHORITY

A NEWSPAPER IS THE AUTHORITY?

RFD

NEG CLAIM: CANCER SURV. RATES HIGHEST IN US w/o UHC BUT
IS THIS BECAUSE OF OUR H.C. SYSTEM OR BECAUSE OF AN MEDICAL TRUST FOL
I DID NOT BUY THE AFF KILLING COMPET. - IMMUNIZATION W/INACT (FRANCE)
THE AFF CLEARLY THREW THE NEG FRAMEWORK NEG'S MAIN OFFENSE WAS
A NEWSPAPER ARTICLE!

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Regis PM

Max = 30

Peter McGahren

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale GT

Max = 30

Garrett Tanzer

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from REGIS PM
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: STATES PROTECT CITIZENS: VAL. CIVIL
MORALITY

#1 SAVES LIVES: 45 K DEATHS/yr NO H.C.

#2 GLOBAL CO-OP: UN MANDATE

UHC 7 32 MILLION MORE COVERED

#3 BIO-RECTOR; MANDATE ANNO. / SAVE LIFE

INTERESTING CNT #3 - UNIQUE

INTL CO-OP; PREV. RACIAL DISCRIM.

UHC IS NOT SINGLE PART SYST. IN AFF WORLD
COMPETITION EXISTS / keeps innov.

FAIR: TURNED

COMPET. WILL EXIST; GERMANY EX.

NEG:

#1) FREE MARKET / BET. SERV. / LIVES &

#2) GOV. LOWER CARE (WAITING)

#3) RESOLVES MED. INNOVATION

SCARS / AN. FLU OUTBREAK / PANDEMIC
1 B 1 6 MILES VACCINES

UHC SUPPRESSES COMPET. / INNOVATION IN
AFF WORLD: KILLING MORE (SAVING LESS)
LIVES

MAXIMIZE LIFE

"Even with UHC there could
be some innovation"

RFD: THE CNT. #3 By NEG WAS A HUGE VOTER IN THIS DEBATE
SAVING LIVES (REDUCING UNEMP. LIVES) CNT. By BOTH SIDES
AFF TURNS CNT #3 / FAIR - MORE LIVES SAVED IN AFF WORLD
AFF CLEARLY TAKES OUT THE MONOPOLY / LACK OF FREE Mkt. CNT. By NEG.

Room: 133
Flight B: Start
Varsity LD

4

Walker, Rachelle

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills OD: 32

Max = 30

Ofir Dinstein

21

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Livingston High JX 1:45

Max = 30

Jessica Xu

28

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

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

Signed: Rachelle Walker

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Jessica, I am right in front of you and your opponent is right next to you so yelling is not needed. When you gave up in the 2AR, you had plenty of things you could have went for but you were silent most of the time and in your last few seconds you just stopped mid sentence.

ORAL

Room: 133
Flight A: Start 11:30
Varsity LD

4

Walker, Rachelle

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science BR

Max = 30

Bill Reisman

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College SC ^{1:52}

Max = 30

Sarah Cogan

27

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

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

Signed: Rachelle Walker

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AC: you were unclear at many points and you need to use expression in your voice because it all sounded like one word at times. Also, your use of the word "umm" was very distracting. Other than that the case was fine.
NC/NK: Case is fine, I like the presume neg args at the top, I also like the strategy you took with the Framework debate. The overview really helps you but you cannot simply make 20 unique args.
1AR: you need to put more ink on the CP.
2AR: you got really flustered and stopped signposting ~~and~~ which made it difficult to flow arguments correctly. You are also not extending really good arguments from the NK.
2AR: you didn't signpost at all so I had no idea where to flow your arguments. Also you are making new arguments against the counterplan in this speech.

Neither of you are really weighing and you both agree that this is a util vs deon debate but neither of you do enough work to show why either of you are really winning that. In the end I am doing a lot of work to try and figure out who won the round.

RFD: Because of the dropped overview to the AC I vote NEG. Bill does not tell me why he is making healthcare universal as opposed to now making it easier for poor people to get it. She also says this is unique to the NC so if she is providing the same benefits in her case there is no reason for me to affirm.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Collegiate NE

Max = 30

Nathan Ewing-Crystal

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harrison AG

Max = 30

Amy Geller

27.1

The better debating was done by the Neg from Harrison AG
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

- ① Skip not triggered
- ② turns to AC/VC a

Room: 235
Flight A: Start 11:30
Varsity LD

4

Zavislan, Matt

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis RM

Max = 30

Needham MG

Max = 30

Ryan McEvoy

28.5

Matt Goldberg

28

The better debating was done by the Neg from Needham MG
AFF of 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

~~ORAL~~

Ought -> Can -> a Pres:

Room: 210
Flight A: Start 11:30
Public Forum Open (Lexington CB vs. Park RT)

4

Bannon, Ed

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 Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Diana Cagliero ①
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Dina Benayad-Cherif ②

Team: Park RT Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Francisco Ruela ②
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Mike Tartaglia ①

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

22-23 Below Average

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

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Good organization of arguments & good job responding to the CON's arguments. Don't make faces when you hear something you don't agree with. Dina needs to slow down a little on main argument in 2nd Round

Comments to Debaters:

adequately
Good organization but failed to respond to one of the Pro's primary arguments on Libya. ~~Otherwise both teams~~

These are the reasons for my decision:

Pro had stronger arguments and were more persuasive. Con did not really adequately respond to the Pro's position on Libya. Both teams were evenly matched.

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:

Ed Bannon (Regis)

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): 28 for Miranda Ditmore 1

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Morry Kolman 2

Team: Stuyvesant CC Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Jack Cahn ①

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for David Cahn ②

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:

Well organized, good eye contact, good support + good responses. Very calm speaking styles. Focused on the key issues and did so persuasively.

Comments to Debaters:

Well organized, good eye contact, good support + good responses to other side. I don't think it is a good idea to tell the judge what he or she MUST do. Should not yell at the judge but did show a lot of passion. You might want to temper the passion a little to be more effective.

These are the reasons for my decision:

This was a very close debate and both sides did an excellent job. I think the Pro won and was slightly more persuasive on the Israel issue.

note - Both sides were very professional in the way they went about the debate.

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:

Ed Bannon (Regis)

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 BH Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con	Team: Bronx Science AA Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Holden Bruce	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Elena Anderson
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Reed Horowitz	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Margarita Artoglou

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

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

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Holden Can roadmap points better during constructive. Don't dodge answers to questions -- but you did later respond. Clear, understandable delivery. Beginning of summation well organized. Then kind of fell apart.

Reed Trouble understanding you on account of speed + articulation. Missed a couple of your points for this reason. Good handling of tough questions -- not letting adversary mischaracterize your case.

Comments to Debaters:

Margarita Good responses to questioning and followup on answers to your questions. Great focus on connecting with judge.

Elena Very powerful + well developed first speech. Don't leave 44 seconds on the table -- especially when you talk a bit too fast to be easily understood. Not influenced by attempted mischaracterization of pro position in your questions on cross-ex. Nice job on final focus but too much strain to understand every word.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Pro failed to address flip side of withdrawing support of Israel, i.e., weigh the benefits of current relationships with Israel against incremental benefit of support (or at least benign neglect) of Pakistan.
Con prevailed on argument that Pro failed to provide evidence of causal link between support of Israel and harm to US citizens.
(Number of worldwide bombings not directly relevant to US security).
Pro points re: undemocratic nature of Israel and anecdotes of abuses by IDF not compelling as source of undermines US 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: 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: Bronx Science HF Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>	Team: Collegiate RP Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Alon Handler 1	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Austen Rattray 2
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for Adam Freilich 3	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Seung-Min Park 4

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

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is

Bronx HF

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

representing the PRO CON

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

I can't believe you never challenged that 40% of Saudi income is spent on weapons procurement, but coming back w/ OPEC was a smart move. I would have liked to see you exploit the citizens revolt in Iran more. In general, I felt you really needed to focus on impacts more. I've noticed I heard a lot of clichés, but they weren't fleshed out as well as they could be.

These are the reasons for my decision:

There was a lot of dropping and a lack of signposting, which made my job harder than it really needed to be. So, Israel, yes, pro is right that much Anti-American sentiment is b/c of our involvement, but not all, and they don't show how suddenly cutting things off will suddenly win over the hearts & minds of our enemies. The nail in the coffin though was the very simple argument that technology is constantly changing, and there's no benefit to cutting off ties and sticking w/ outdated technology, and that we're not just killing terrorists but also destroying the infrastructure of the organizations themselves.

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Michelle Carter, Hon. Hb.

Comments to Debaters:

You're right that not all terrorism stems from Israel, but there are strong examples to use then. Chalk homogeneity. How about Chinese cyber terrorism? The N. Korea nuke threat... you're lucky your opponents didn't blow this up more.

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: Bronx Science YS Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27.5 for Victor Yeung ^{3rd}
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Omair Shahid ^{1st}

Team: Regis AM Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Danny Apadula ^{2nd}
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Matt Melbourne ^{4th}

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

22-23 Below Average

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

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

I was sad to see you essentially drop your strongest arguments, the obligation to defend Turkey, and the economic impacts of that on our economy/aside from that. Had you focussed more on Iran/Israel and loss on Syria, you might have won this round.

Comments to Debaters:

If you're arguing a cost benefit analysis, picking only 1/2 of the framework to win leaves you in a risky position.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Neg sucked Aff into focussing on Syria to its detriment, b/c they never answered the question- Do we intervene or not? Can't have it both ways. This really could have been a much closer round.

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:

Mark A. Hen Ho

Room: 211
Flight A: Start 11:30
Public Forum Open (Byram Hills PG vs. Regis BP)

4

Cata, Nicole

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 PG Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Matt Percello 3
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Chris Gaetano 1

Team: Regis BP Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Eddie Bannon 2
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 25 for Christian Powers 4

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

22-23 Below Average

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

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Try not to use speeches made during a campaign as your primary example of a specific U.S. policy.

Comments to Debaters:

Try to have key pieces of evidence on hand in case they are called into question. Your opponents cannot meaningfully respond to this evidence if it is presented right before the final focus.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Pro's arguments regarding Iran are more grounded in specific examples. Pro more consistently referred to examples of harmful US FP than Con did beneficial US foreign 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: Nicole Cata, Hendrick Hudson

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 Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Gabriel Delsol 3
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Jimmy Peraffan 1

Team: Byram Hills KB Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 30 for Ava Kingsley 2
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Jon Bohrer 4

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

22-23 Below Average

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

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Good job pointing out recency of evidence.
Try to extend evidence clearly throughout the round. Some of the policies mentioned in the last 30 seconds of the final focus sounded somewhat new.

Comments to Debaters:

Try to divide speaking time evenly throughout the grand crossfire.
In less attenuating circumstances, try to be prepared with citations to controverted evidence.
Good job pointing out recency of evidence.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Because many of the policies listed at the end of the Con PF sounded new, and because the arguments regarding US-Israeli relations proved to be a wash, I look to the arguments re: Iran. By the end of the debate, extended evidence on Con points to less oil being sold (sanctions are working), while recent Pro evidence points to 3000 new centrifuges and an air strike.

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation: Nicole Cata, Hendrick Hudson

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

Great round!

I weigh this evidence and vote Pro.

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): 28 for Taylor McCormack 2

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29.5 for William Smith 4

Team: Regis LS Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Francis Leong 3

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Ferdinand Suba 1

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

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Monticello MS

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

representing the PRO CON

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Billy: use your prep. ONLY for the responses on sub. A. (resp. is not so good tho)

Taylor: more organization / better extensions of Iran answers
• You need to be following up the oil trade contention because they massively undercut it.

Billy: Good job knowing what your W SAYS.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Con is winning Iran
facts which are conceded by Pro the
entire debate + risk of oil impk since
Pro also concedes this

Comments to Debaters:

STOP: way too much time w/
F/W

Rebuttal: on 2nd sup. of Car contention
2nd jump to Iran & then go back.
Weak rebuttal. Focus on oil cont.

Hegemony
• Do more work on Car case, instead
of making extensions that aren't doing
anything

Summary answers 1/6 of responses on Iran

you need to show underm
in FF not just ineffective
for Iran.

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 Dan Brown Science

Room: 226

Flight A: Start 11:30

Public Forum Open (Regis CO vs. Monticello SH)

4

Hartigan, Reilly

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 CO Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Jaime Cobham 2

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Jack O'Malley 4

Team: Monticello SH Circle Side: Pro Con

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

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Jane Hyman 1

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

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is

Regis CO

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

representing the PRO CON

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

o Responses in rebuttal are largely defensive & ineffective. 1/2 of your responses are that Con doesn't explain their scenarios...

Comments to Debaters:

Jane: Don't spend 1 minute on the F/W debate when it doesn't matter in this instance
o why don't you have Iran & Syria backed out? Davis isn't going to work as responses to Iran & Syria.
off is all defense as Iran/Syria/unresponsive.
You fundamentally change your strat in answering these by saying they're not doing enough work w/ linking back to Nat Sec... they actually are ...

These are the reasons for my decision:

Con FF does no work weighing or even extending their contentions & mishandles both the Iran & Syria Sudan's. Targeted killings & response to Syria.

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:

Mr. Tony Science

Room: 208
Flight B: Start

4

Holmes, Wendy

Public Forum Open (Bronx Science ST vs. Byram Hills RB)

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): 27.5 for Kevin Szura 2
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27.5 for Emily Tagarello 4

Team: Byram Hills RB Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Max Rothschild 1
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Will Bohrer 3

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:

Comments to Debaters:

These are the reasons for my decision:

ORA

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

Room: 208
Flight A: Start 11:30
Public Forum Open (Bronx And/Aha vs. Regis JR)

4

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 And/Aha Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Jeremy Andreades 1
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Towsif Ahasan 3

Team: Regis JR Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29.5 for Tom Jaklitsch 4
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29.5 for Patrick Rice 2

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:

Comments to Debaters:

These are the reasons for my decision:

ORAL

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

Room: 224
Flight A: Start 11:30
Public Forum Open (Stuyvesant LK vs. Regis HS)

4

Leszczynski, Pau

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: Stuyvesant LK Circle Side: Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con	Team: Regis HS Circle Side: Pro <input checked="" type="radio"/> Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>30</u> for Zachary Lemonides <u>4</u>	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for DuMichel Harley <u>1</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Ben Kessler <u>2</u>	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for Sean Sonnemann <u>3</u>

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

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Regis HS representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)
Low Point Win? (Yes No) (I DON'T KNOW HOW THE AVERAGING works I HOPE IT'S AN EVEN 29-29)

Comments to Debaters:

THE DOLLAR HEGEMONY ARGUMENT
DOESN'T MAKE TOO MUCH SENSE WITH
RELATION TO SANCTIONS: WHY WOULD
EURO COUNTRIES IMPOSE SANCTIONS
TO ENCOURAGE A ~~STRONGER~~ DOLLAR
HEGEMONY INSTEAD OF EURO HEGEMONY?

Comments to Debaters:

I LIKE ~~THE CONCEPT~~ HOW YOUR
ARGUMENTS ARE COHESIVE WITHOUT
BEING REPETITIVE

These are the reasons for my decision:

ORAL; Libya + Syria: destabilization
causing terrorism seems bad, it's
also a direct link

GC devolved into a lot of yelling.

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:



HEW HUND

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	

Leszczynski, Pau

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 4
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27.5 for Joe Salmaggi 2

Team: Regis HM Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26.5 for Tim Hannan 33
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26.5 for Vincent Monti 41

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

22-23 Below Average

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

Bye 1:00 min 50

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

2:25 left → 1:15

Comments to Debaters:

* mispronouncing Said's last name
I think your burden is a bit abusive.

Comments to Debaters:

Cold War evidence feels a bit dated.
I need you to prove that Iran is
using \$ to fund Arms race over
everything- given the sanctions, their
economy is not as strong.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Both teams could benefit from being a bit more polite.
Bronx wins because PRO cannot prove
that Iran has the money to actually
participate in an Arms race. Further,
Con proves threat is perpetual from terrorists and
that USA participation
at Nato was

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Brianne

a clear act of
foreign 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	

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 AM	Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u>	for Xavier Amarille <u>2</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u>	for Daniel Messner <u>4</u>

Team: Regis PP	Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28.5</u>	for Christian Pavlakos <u>3</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u>	for Alex Petrillo <u>1</u>

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

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is

Regis PP

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

representing the PRO CON

(Please circle the winning side)

~~24 used~~ 29 left.

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

2:24

Comments to Debaters:

I guess it might be good to determine whether Afghanistan is in mid. East or not — too, how does saving \$ help our national security? I'm not sure how much weight your oil argument has — is there anything beyond Saudi Arabian "alliance" that is impacted.

Comments to Debaters:

— Israel / may be harmed if more arms. Strong evidence in Iran, leaves little open questions so v. helpful to me as the judge. what else can you tell me ab. Syria? unrest? bad gov? no control?

These are the reasons for my decision:

I'm ignoring the Saudi Arabia argument b/c I don't know which of you is actually right. I vote pro because of the following: more nuclear weapons is a threat even if not used here (the "if" factor is enough), and if Israel is attacked, we'll be dragged in. Also, Con does not effectively argue against Pro argument that one displaced terrorist

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Brianne

will be able to defend them

Also, national security, to me, includes anything overseas, so Pro wins on this point.

mobilize. Losing leaders doesn't stop them. Good round.

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	