

Room: 235

Start: 3:00

Public Forum Open (Byram Hills KB vs. Regis DP)

5

Carter, Michelle

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 KB Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Ava Kingsley 1

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Jon Bohrer 43

Team: Regis DP Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Colin Donnelly 2

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 30 for Brendan Powell 4

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

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is

Regis DP

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

representing the PRO CON

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

This is the best pro case I've heard so far. Very well written and laid out.

Comments to Debaters:

It was a mistake to show the centrifuge argument, it was pretty strong.

These are the reasons for my decision:

If this round was decided strictly on the issues, it would have gone pro no question. However, that case wasn't well defended. I don't understand why pro insisted on talking about sanctions not being clearly shown to be the reason Iran's failing economy etc. when the card is obviously clear on this point. Con wins b/c they addressed each item head on with clear, rational arguments, while pro seemed to go off on tangents and address nitpicky fringe parts instead of the meat of what was being presented.

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Michelle A. 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

Room: 234

Start: 3:00

Public Forum Open (Park RT vs. Chapin GN)

5

Harley, Estelita

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
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Francisco Ruela
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Mike Tartaglia

Team: Chapin GN Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 25 for Alexis Gajwani
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Rebecca Ngu

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

The team that won this debate is Park RT 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: Speaker 1: Alexis

- sources must be analyzed not only quoted
- vague framework → relate it to the resolution
- be confident & be very aware of what your contentions are. Asking your opponent about your own contentions
- lack of your own team's knowledge/info.

Comments to Debaters: Speaker 2: Mike

- well defined & organized scope of framework
- fluent & convincing public speaking ability
- summary provided strength on the key issues
- of the team's framework

Speaker 1: Rebecca

- updated stats
- thoughtful & realistic analyses to refute Con team
- show confidence & speak loud. Be assertive

Speaker 2: Francisco

- informative/evidential rebuttal of Pro's framework
- Exhibits in depth knowledge of both sides of the resolution.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Although the Pro team provided & clarified their framework during the later part of the rounds, the Con team is more fluent with organized flow. Refuted the Pro team's with all the Pro team's contentions throughout the round. Con team won the 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:

Estelita Harley Ngu

Room: 206

Start: 3:00

Public Forum Open (Bronx Science YS vs. Monticello MS)

5

Leong, William

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): 28.5 for Victor Yeung

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Omair Shahid

Team: Monticello MS Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Taylor McCormack

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for William Smith

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

22-23 Below Average

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

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Frame work OK but appeared at times to lose consistency. Watch flow across speeches.

Need to make clearer how one of 4 threats beats a more comprehensive (nett) argument approach.

Missile shield card did not weigh much for me (either way)

Comments to Debaters:

Impact of oil on US (~25%) was turned on Syria/Turkey/etc => good.

You lost me on the 2% killing and actual numbers point. I got the killing of effective leaderships argument.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Monticello MS won on a Con framework of nett harm/benefit argument. Good well constructed speeches.

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.

Room: 210

Start: 3:00

Public Forum Open (Bronx Science DK vs. Regis JR)

5

Urda, John Karl

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): 28.5 for Miranda Ditmore 1

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Morry Kolman 3

Team: Regis JR Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Tom Jaklitsch 4

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 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:

Pro
Be careful to rebut the specific points of each contention.

Comments to Debaters:

Con
Don't spend quite so much time on definitions, for ~~your~~ case

These are the reasons for my decision:

Terrorism flowed to the Con: the decrease in terrorist acts against US went unanswered, and the killing of Al Qaeda leaders not effectively rebutted.
Iran flowed to the Con: economic collapse and no bomb-making technology not rebutted.
Israel was a wash.

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:

John K. Urda / Stuyvesant HS

Room: 233

Start: 3:00

Public Forum Open (Monticello SH vs. Byram Hills PG)

5

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: Monticello SH Circle Side: Pro ConSpeaker Points (20 to 30): 25 for Emily Smith 2Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Jane Hyman 1Team: Byram Hills PG Circle Side: Pro ConSpeaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Matt Percello 2Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26 for Chris Gaetano 1

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

22-23 Below Average

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:

Jane had a very good speaking style & was well organized but misspoke on a critical fact. So you need to be more careful on what you contend and agree to. Emily just needs a little more experience on her feet & should be careful not to play with rubber bands and the like since the judge will be watching this.

These are the reasons for my decision:

I think the Pro made a critical error by arguing that Iran supplies 25% of US oil. The Con had evidence that this was not true. Con was more persuasive and won most of the individual rounds.

Comments to Debaters:

Both speakers were well organized and had their facts available to respond to the other side. They did a good job responding to the Pro's arguments. They just need a little more time on their feet.

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)

Room: 226

Start: 3:00

Public Forum Open (Collegiate RP vs. Regis CO)

5

Sperber, Brianne

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 RP Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>	Team: Regis CO Circle Side: <u>Pro</u> Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Austen Rattray <u>2</u>	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for Jaime Cobham <u>1</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Seung-Min Park <u>4</u>	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>29</u> for Jack O'Malley <u>3</u>

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

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is

Collegiate RP

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

representing the PRO CON

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

your case really needs to discuss more than just Iran. I really like the argument about the Strait of Hormuz, and trade. I find it troubling that you guys use evidence that implies the leader of Iran says they're not building weapons - the issue here is, he can't be trusted - but the point is helpful. Could you find other evidence that shows this?

These are the reasons for my decision:

Comments to Debaters:

public protesting Israel/cyber warfare. Can you guys add anything about Syria's uprising? their civilian protests? violence? good point ab terrorism - if not really in your case, they should just be concerned w/ nuclear wars, not whether there are more terrorists.

Can wino because they prove Iran isn't really creating nuclear weapons

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Brianne Sperber (Hendrick Hudson Alum)

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

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

2 minutes prep time per side

Room: 208

Start: 3:00

Public Forum Open (Stuyvesant CC vs. Bronx And/Aha)

5

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: Stuyvesant CC Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Jack Cahn 1

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for David Cahn 3

Team: Bronx And/Aha Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Jeremy Andreades 4

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Towsif Ahasan 2

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

22-23 Below Average

The team that won this debate is Stuyvesant CC
(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:

Oral disclosure

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:

Matt Treinish

Room: 224

Start: 3:00

Public Forum Open (Bronx Science HF vs. Regis HS)

5

Creed, Elizabeth

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 Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Alon Handler 1
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Adam Freilich 3

Team: Regis HS Circle Side: Pro Con
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for DuMichel Harley 4
Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Sean Sonnemann 2

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

22-23 Below 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:

Comments to Debaters:

These are the reasons for my decision:

The con team won on evidence and links and also presented its arguments more clearly and in a more organized manner.

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:

Elizabeth Creed Collegiate

Room: 229

Start: 3:00

Public Forum Open (Bronx Science ST vs. Regis HM)

5

Dougherty, Dotti

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 <u>Con</u>	Team: Regis HM Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>26 1/2</u> for Kevin Szura #1	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27 1/2</u> for Tim Hannan #4
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>21 1/2</u> for Emily Tagarello #3	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Vincent Monti #2

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

22-23 Below Average

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

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

① Speak clearly - enunciate - use evidence effectively
speed does not allow you to skip syllables & mumble.
② Please try to follow the cases & extend the ideas - AVOID
jumping about - Create clear turns.

Comments to Debaters:

These are the reasons for my decision:

Democracy contention turned w/pro evidence.
Libya, Egypt & extension on Anti-Ar.
Nuclear discussions & Al Qu. showed
the fascist threat. Con dropped arguments
& the "cyber stuff" was not supported

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

Room: 211

Start: 3:00

Public Forum Open (Bronx Science DP vs. Regis BP)

5

Devlin, Alan

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: Regis BP Circle Side: Pro Con
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Eddie Bannon 2
 Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 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 Bronx Sci representing the PRO CON
(Team Name for the Winning Team) (Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Good Final summary -
 Good starts on 95% drone strikes effectiveness, and good crosses.
 Hacker viruses pretty even...
 would establish that Israel as our enforcer aspect in Middle East... acting in cases where we can't.

Comments to Debaters:

good relaxed cross shows solid understanding of
 would like to see more of how "unchecked Israel support is wrong" believe this could lead somewhere beneficial to Pro.
 Could use link to weapons thru Syria - how do they threaten our national security.
 good point on more Marines at French embassy vs Benghazi.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Basically argument comes down to weighing positive side of drone strikes in eliminating terrorist leadership versus increase in anti-US sentiment. Historically, Anti-US sentiment has risen & fallen and Pro has no burden to show that, but does have burden to show how that current anti-US sentiment is currently hurting us... except for a terrorist attack in Benghazi, that was not sufficiently established.

Can able to establish almost loss of threat so NE policy must be somewhat effective & we are better off today vs 4 years ago.

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Alan Devlin Monticello

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

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

2 minutes prep time per side

Room: 230

Start: 3:00

Public Forum Open (Bronx Science RS vs. Stuyvesant UE)

5

Theodore, Ben

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): 28.5 for Michael Raevsky 2nd

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Joe Salmaggi 1st

Team: Stuyvesant UE Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29.5 for Jakob Urda 2nd

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Jonathan Evans 1st

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: BRONX

- Iraq argument that if we leave things will get worse is offense for your side, Michael's extension that it would be a waste of past resources ~~and~~ lives is NOT. Read about sunk costs.
- If the uranium offer was so important, why did it not come up again until Grand ~~Crossfire~~?
- You are completely backwards on whether being in Iraq makes threatening Iran more or less credible.

→ I wish CON had made the point more clearly

These are the reasons for my decision:

All of you are extremely proficient at this activity, and worthy of praise for consistently weighing and impacting arguments. The dollar hegemony argument does outweigh thanks to the unrefuted Anderson-Liu cards, so I have to look there first. It is weak offense, but still sufficient to vote CON when paired with impacts on regional stability, given that the PRO's Iraq harms are not sufficiently proven/emphasized, nor is Iran proven to be sufficiently unique.

Comments to Debaters: STUYVESANT

- Yeah... Never say "it depends" when asked "are terrorists bad?"
- Jakob - fantastic rebuttal,
- you really need stronger evidence to show potential harms of African currency union.

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

Room: 213

Start: 3:00

Public Forum Open (Stuyvesant LK vs. Bronx Science AM)

5

Borek, John

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 Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 26.5 for Zachary LemonidesSpeaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Ben KesslerTeam: Bronx Science AM Circle Side: Pro ConSpeaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Xavier AmarilleSpeaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Daniel Messner

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:

CON
Xavier Great headlining of points. Very clear + easy to follow. Great question on cross.

Comments to Debaters:

PRO
Zachary Your speed of speech made it difficult for me to understand. Hard to follow your organization. Too much ~~fill~~ filibustering in responding to cross-ex questions - in both cross + grand cross.

Daniel Terrific presentation. I understood pro initial presentation more clearly on account of your organized response

Ben I had difficulty following your organization. I lost you on the hedge point. Better to ask questions on cross than ~~just~~ argue.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Pro contentions about harm to US security of UN voting record not supported by evidence. Causation a large leap. Pro arguments about Afghanistan, NATO, global environmentalism, etc, ~~are~~ are not on point to the resolution. Pro point re: terrorism on the increase (17 is more than 14) only weakly supported, and ~~then~~ rendered irrelevant by contention that loss of so few lives is insignificant compared to ~~the~~ harm to U.S. dollar. Lack of causal link between Russian-Chinese displeasure with U.S. ME policy and active intent to devalue U.S. dollar.

Judge Signature & Affiliation/Occupation:

Regis/Parent

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

Speaker 1	<u>4</u> min
Speaker 2	<u>4</u> min
Crossfire (1&2)	<u>3</u> min
Speaker 3	<u>4</u> min
Speaker 4	<u>4</u> min
Crossfire (3&4)	<u>3</u> min
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min
Grand Crossfire (All)	<u>3</u> min
Speaker 3 Final Focus	<u>2</u> min
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min

2 minutes prep time per side

Room: 232

Start: 3:00

Public Forum Open (Regis PP vs. Bronx Science AA)

5

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 PP Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 29 for Christian Pavlakos (3)

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28.5 for Alex Petrillo (1)

Team: Bronx Science AA Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Elena Anderson (4)

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 28 for Margarita Artoglou (2)

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)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Comments to Debaters:

These are the reasons for my decision:

These Regis team come up with more harm and reasons for harm and Bronx Science did not return with substantive rebuttals.

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 Laguardia

Room: 228

Start: 3:00

Public Forum Open (Lexington CB vs. Regis LS)

5

Shaner, Jake

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: <u>Pro</u> Con	Team: Regis LS Circle Side: Pro <u>Con</u>
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>26.5</u> for Diana Cagliero 1	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27.5</u> for Francis Leong 2
Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>27</u> for Dina Benayad-Cherif 2	Speaker Points (20 to 30): <u>28</u> for Ferdinand Suba 1

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

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

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

Diana:
Be more aggressive
Parse out your contentions more individually

Dina:
Channel your frustration into questioning

Comments to Debaters:

Ferdinand:
Time your constructive better - but your speaking style is clear and ~~easy~~ listenable

Francis:
Spend less time on definitions, more on your own case
Ask questions, don't answer your own questions

These are the reasons for my decision:

The pro spends too much time trying to justify talking about Pakistan & Afghanistan.

Con does a better job arguing that Iranian sanctions are working now - one drone shot down does not condemn all 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: _____

Room: 231

Start: 3:00

Public Forum Open (Regis AM vs. Lexington BH)

5

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 AM Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Danny Apadula ¹

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 27 for Matt Melbourne ³

Team: Lexington BH Circle Side: Pro Con

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 24 for Holden Bruce ²

Speaker Points (20 to 30): 24 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 Regis AM

(Team Name for the Winning Team)

representing the PRO CON

(Please circle the winning side)

Low Point Win? (Yes No)

Comments to Debaters:

o Syria contention doesn't have impact.
o Don't just restate their args if know what they are. just answer them.
o You need to do more work in rebuttal.
talk about US/ISR = good.
o reference of us in rebuttal.
o OK!

Comments to Debaters:

o Focus your israel/anti-Zionist points (sent + iran?)
in terms of US Nat. Sec... not just
that it's inconsistent w/ U.S. values.
o Rebuttal needs to do work on Con
case!

WAKE UP. speak louder... I'm
falling asleep.

These are the reasons for my decision:

Con is winning Iran & Syria & outweighing
"Anti-American Sentiment" — overall both teams need
to do a lot more work explaining their scenarios
& being responsive. Con could have beat back Israel
contention much better... Instead of focusing on
"U.S. sentiment doesn't matter" talk more about "Blackwell"
& Israel-US relations good, Pro needs to rewrite their 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: _____

[Signature]

Room: 109
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

5

Drucker, Omri

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NFA VB

Max = 30

Victor Bramble

28.25

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Monticello BS

Max = 30

Brittany Stein

27

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

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

Signed: Don Mer

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: Neg is non-responsive AC, AC has mitigating
defense against ~~cominski~~ cominski. Aff has an intact
f/w and extends offense.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NFA JG

Max = 30

Jordanne Gizzarelli

~~14.5~~ 25

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale MB

Max = 30

Michael Bogaty

~~14.5~~ 26.5

The better debating was done by the NEG. from SCARSDALE MB
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

CONSEQUENCES

HARMS VS. BENEFITS

#1) US NOT FUNK. IN INT'L ARENA w/o UHC
(YOU STRUGGLED AT TIMES READING
YOUR CONSTRUCTIVE)

STATUS AND DENIES LOW INCOME
+ PRE- EX. CONDITIONS FROM OBTAINING U.S.

WHAT KIND OF H.C. ? -

CAPITALISM IS BAD?

YOUR CROSS EX. WAS EXTREMELY WEAK

SOFT POWER

'SUPERBUGS' - WHERE IS CARO ??

WHY IS PH

(PHARMACISTS DO NOT WRITE
PRESCRIPTION - DOCTORS DO)

(SOMETHING ABOUT MARIJUANA, HEADACHE THAT
MAY EXPLAIN SOME THINGS)
(LIKE SPEAKING PTS)

NEG

#1) UHC - REDUCES QUALITY / LONG WAIT

#2) FREE MARKET - COMPET.

#3) FAZIO - REDUCES INNOVATION
LACK OF REWARD UNDER UHC.
NEW DRUGS EVAPORATE UNDER UHC.
COMPETITION PROVIDED NET BENEFIT

CANADIAN MODEL FLAWS DONE WELL

'WE SHOULD HAVE FREE MKT SYSTEM
HUGE MISTAKE BY AFF'

* FAZIO - NEW DRUGS KEEP ONE STEP
AHEAD OF ANY SUPERBUG

* AFF CLAIMS MORE (NEW) DRUGS WILL
PROLIFERATE SUPERBUGS NOT SUPPRESS THEM

RFD THE AFF CONT THAT THE USA WILL "LOOK BAD" AND HAVE A
"BAD IMAGE" IN INT'L ARENA IS RECK. ARGUMENT. THE LACK OF HC FOR
LOW INCOME WAS BETTER CONTENTION - THE SOFT POWER LINK IS A STRETCH
WHY WOULD PHARMACEUTICALS BE IN CONTROL w/o UHC, WHICH IS STATUS QUO NOW!
IN STATUS, WHERE ARE THESE SUPERBUGS, LACK OF SOFT POWER NOW!
VOTER: AFF CONCEDED FREE MKT - SLAM DUNK * WE ARE BEING KICKED OUT
AFF NEVER TURNS FAZIO OF INT'L ARENA NOW ??
AFF NEVER TURNS CONT. #1

Room: ~~224~~
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

130

5

Elisetty, Abhi

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Lexington TM

Max = 30

Teddy McKenna

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College SC


Max = 30

Sarah Cogan

26.5

The better debating was done by the AFK from Lex
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: 235
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

5

Singh, Sunpreet

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Lexington HK

Max = 30

Hannah Kwon

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis RM

Max = 30

Ryan McEvoy

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, off of the ^{neg} fw and
the clean extentions out of C1.

Room: 205
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

5

Cumming, Jay

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Collegiate NE

132

Max = 30

Nathan Ewing-Crystal

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Pingry AK

Max = 30

Amol Kapoor

28

The better debating was done by the Aff from Collegiate NE
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:

RFP:

Skep

Room: 133
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

5

Kapoor, Akhil

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Monticello PM

Max = 30

Patrick Miraglia

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science BR

Max = 30

Bill Reisman

28.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from Bump Science
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 debate was more of std + framework debate. While Aff pushed for Utilitarianism + sensibility, Neg devalued Autonomy + ~~coercive~~ ^{coercive} power relationship.
- Neg devalued that universal healthcare leads to loss of autonomy + coercive power relationship which way ultimately lead to lower utility/benefit is aggregate, thereby contradicting Aff's std.
- Aff misinterpreted the coercive power struggle and its impact on autonomy.

Room: 114
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

5

Walker, Rachelle

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS
November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College BL 10

Max = 30

Ben Laufer

28.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis BK 20

Max = 30

Barrett King

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from Hunter College BL
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:

OK

Room: 229
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

5

Kudron, Joella

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Monticello DT

Max = 30

Dustin Thomas

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills CG

Max = 30

Claudia Greenspan

28

The better debating was done by the Neg from Claudia Greenspan
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

- Use your time wisely. Also, make sure you're clear when speaking quickly

RFD

There is no doubt that

Aff won this case, as Neg's responses to the AC were not substantial. However, the problem I have with giving Aff the round win is that extinctions plays a much bigger role than Aff thought. Both agreed framework is util, in which case only the ends matter, not time frame. Aff I WAS actually disappointed you didn't run ~~an~~ an argument about killing people infected w/ AIDS, like you suggested in CX. It would have made for an interesting round. Because extinction is impending and inevitable, and Aff had trouble responding to that, I had to go Neg. Only the ends matter in util, and Neg convinced me we're all going to die if we guarantee UHC.

Neg

- very unclear once you started reading your case, it got better toward the end of the NC
- when you stop prep time, don't sit at the desk for several seconds to keep prepping. That's cheating.

Room: 430 224 Go to 130 & get them
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

5

Pritt, Jacob

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science ES

Max = 30

Ean Steinberger

27.6

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Stuyvesant SV

Max = 30

Sweyn Venderbush

28.8

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:

Only negative rights are justified under
deont so

① everything is permissible

or

② action of force

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Fiorello LaGuardia LM

Max = 30

Lena Mandell

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Fordham Prep DJ

Max = 30

David Joannides

29

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

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

Signed: Pat Luccarelli

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff V = morality and C = protect least well off in society.
Neg V = government legitimacy and max government efficiency

RFD
I ~~dropped~~ dropped the ~~Aff~~ Neg case that a government couldn't be held to a moral standard. Therefore, gov't can only be held to the standard of doing the best for the people

2) Neg wins on weighing of benefit. I believe that the Neg case that a universal health care system would overwork itself → ~~be~~ harming everyone - especially the least well off.

So, with Aff causing misery and economic failure → I have to give the decision to Neg

Nice job!!

Room: 213'
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

5

Crichton, McLean

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science SG

Max = 30

Sam Goree

26

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College AM

Max = 30

Alberto Malaney

26

The better debating was done by the AFF from Bronx Sci SG
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 - I do think you leave yourself exposed + make AFF's job in 1AR much easier. You have one argument that you make for your framework, contributions + rebuttals. Moreover, you are mislabeling TERMS. There is a difference between a defensive argument + an independent offensive argument when you respond to a case. All your eggs are in the proverbial basket. AR - I think you need to have more of an attack plan going into this round. Take care of NC premises then make your extensions. You rely too much time on h.s. case. NR - You need to tell me whose you are making these arguments very difficult to follow.

RFD I affirm. I have a really hard time finding any moral harm to come out of this round. But on the one hand, I have Neg's idea of each side developing its own system which is subsumed by AFF's definition. Neg gives no reason, then, why the imposition of util is actually bad. Using Kamm of AC, I at least can figure out that we should be valuing human beings with the provision of health care.

Room: 112
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

5

Ashman, Alayne

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills LL

Max = 30

Lexi Leib

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Stuyvesant DW

Max = 30

Dillon Wu

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from Stuy DW
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: so why haven't (T) happen of egalitarian...
why try system where lives are proven to be lost.
what are ppl's moral worth. what are the response to the (T)... you
can't just say did answer. you also need to answer the racism T
he puts on the AC, which shows you & have moral worth.

NEG: Good, but you need to provide more reasoning in ext on
why autonomy = moral. before she can link into VI.

R. F. D. The AFF & answer multiple turns.
esp this racism turn which destroys
the VI.

Room: 233
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

5

Gofman, Alli

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Harrison PG

Max = 30

Patty-Jane Geller

29.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Needham MG

Max = 30

Matt Goldberg

28

The better debating was done by the

Aff

from

Harrison

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Alli Gofman

A:106

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

oral.

Room: 228'
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

5

Leszczynski, Pau

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills JA

Josh Altman

Max = 30

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Collegiate AO

Andrew O'Donohue

Max = 30

26

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: _____

HEN HUD

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

THIS DEBATE ROUND IS COMPLICATED BUT NOT COMPLEX. ITS
A SIMPLE Kant vs BENTHAM (util) DEBATE THAT NOVICES DO, BUT
WITH TOO MUCH SPEED and weird arguments meant to convolute.
the very, painstakingly simple arguments that are in this round.

NO REASON FOR AC TO IMPACT TO NUCLEAR WAR

NEG AND AFF: DO YOU REALLY BELIEVE HAVING/NOT HAVING
UNIVERSAL HEALTH CARE WILL/WILL NOT LEAD
TO NUCLEAR WAR

THE AFF AT LEAST TOUCHED ON SUBSTANCE, THE NEG
DIDN'T EVEN TRY TO

Q/RAC

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

1781

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Monticello PC

Max = 30

Peter Chocolate

28.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Regis PM

Max = 30

Peter McGahren

27.5

1125

The better debating was done by the Aff from Monticello PL
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:

I've studiously avoided the literature on this but ~~that may~~ be the issue but the heteronormativity argument made no sense to me.
While the case is interesting it almost seems to me like your trying to adapt a difficult advocacy.

• He is not linking into utilitarian
• If seems you should handle the agency as the taxpayer is worried to do something he may feel morally repugnant.
• You might have wanted to have ~~that~~ debated interp. if you want to emphasize ~~the~~ ^{debated} ~~the~~ ^{in regards to} ~~the~~ ^{status} ~~the~~ ^{isn't}

RFD: I vote affirmative because ~~that~~ in NC there is not enough on how universal healthcare is worse if you are giving women choice in abortion through pay. Meanwhile Aff achieves his standard through mutual constraint of poor and rich women. Thus, I affirm.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills OD

Max = 30

Ofir Dinstein

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science AF

Max = 30

Aeshah Farrouq

27.5

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

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

Signed: C. Bendi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

- You are an Excellent Speaker! ~~10~~
If you are going to run utilitarianism,
you must know what it means -

UTIL = Greatest good for greatest number of people.
Good standard for the AC, but when
you are asked about it, it is hard for
you to explain yourself. Do some more
research and get a better understanding.
Overall SUPER AC 😊

- The bottom of AC went completely
dropped & the only thing that you
extended was Deng. You impacted
this well but you had a lot of
important arguments which went
dropped and could have easily
won you the round. I think
you need a better understanding of
what your case says.

TIMER

NEG

You have a very long NC, you are a fast, yet
very articulate speaker. You may want to consider
cutting down the NC a bit in order to make it through
the AC in 1AR.

→ You went a little "Black Crazy" on the Util
structure. You were running out of time in 1AR. Get
read 3 blocks against Util and give general
overview then make the Euro turn. These are great
blocks, but they don't mean anything if you
drop the remainder of the NC.

- Nice job extending 2NR! The arguments that
I was left with to vote on were very
well extended

Good round - the Util/Autonomy debate
was good, I wish that I had more
to vote on besides the
two arguments 😊

RFD given in oral.

You are both Great
Speakers!

Room: 204
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

5

Olivieri, John

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Lexington CD

Max = 30

Caroline Dugan

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science BA

Max = 30

Benjamin Adegbite

26.

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: Neg drops most of AFF's cases
and evidence, misinterprets STD
AFF claims that cyn is defined by function
which is unaddressed, and that gov
emotion is 2 fold 1.) will of people 2.)
uphold constitution → Even if uphold
constitution & (M) (which is stretch)
def of ought defines (M) by function -
Neg Drops Economic 'li' arguments
+ Savvy lives argument 48k apc
and response to pay physicians equally
many no less DR.
Neg STD of respect Ratimuly seem to apply
to (M) & government actors but even
if I grant neg STD it would seem
that Savvy lives, also save the expression
of rationality. ultimately, AFF is able
to extend almost entire case to STD of (M)

Room: 131
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

5

Curtis, Henry

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Hunter College DL

Max = 30

Danny Li

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science SS

Max = 30

Shai Szulanski

28

The better debating was done by the Neg 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:

AC- Good case, but you have :35 left, use it!

NC- Great job on the AC, but spend more time linking societal ~~principle~~ to util

IAR- You do a good job ~~of~~ on AC framework, but put something on the DA instead of wholly banking on beating util

NR- Great strat, but you should lead with the DA, its much stronger than the turns, spend more time explaining how extinction links to AC flw

ZAR: Good extension of framework, but you don't answer why his turns don't ~~link~~ link in, specifically Best.

RFD: Contention turns show AC decreases coverage for certain Patients

Room: 208'
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

5

Holmes, Wendy

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Collegiate MA

Max = 30

Matthew Agar-Johnson

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale LM

Max = 30

Larry "Thug" Milstein

29.5

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Er

Scarsdale → undermined the and turned
A.F.F. Standard.

Room: 234
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

5

Tablan, Alex

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Monticello LS

Max = 30

Lucas Smith

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

NFA JH

Max = 30

John Hordines

28.5

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Lucas, I understand that you're itching to run theory, but I would hold off on making threats during CX, i.e. you shouldn't repeatedly say "if you say this, I'll run theory on you." For some judges, this may be a little off-putting.

I vote Neg b/c I don't see the Aff sufficiently beating back the double-bind argument, so I look to some vague form of a self-interested/ end-based calculus. Super bugs was clearly extended (Aff should have made offensive turns on contention level). Also, the quick extension of Aff offense was never explicitly connected back to a breach in the contract, which is key if I were to look at the AC fw. I'll reiterate from what I said - the doctor shortage issue is a gradient, not black and white.

Other than that, this was a great round! Both of you are excellent debaters!

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Harrison AG

Max = 30

Amy Geller

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Stuyvesant SH

Max = 30

Samantha Hom

29.5

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

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

Signed: Cen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Aff value is a just government that gives each person their due and the standard is preserving the ability to use autonomy. The Neg's value is morality and its standard is respecting individual's ability to pursue their ends. The Aff asserts the Neg standard is the same as the Aff's standard, but the Neg disagreed. The Aff then argued that the Neg standard is too vague and can't be measured. I looked at both approaches.

The key point made by the Neg is that the Aff framework is societal not individual, the Neg's is. ~~They also took the Neg framework~~ The Aff rejects this and I confirmed that the Aff standard was individual. So both standards are very similar and either side can win off the other standard.

The Aff case argues for single payer system and the Neg argues that system harms autonomy and works as a transfer of wealth or taxation; the Neg advocates a free market. But even if true the Neg fails to explain how this helps those w/o HC today. However the Aff equally fails to address the harms for the single payer system on all those who pay for HC. So we have two imperfect solutions that cause harm to someone. The Neg solution harms fewer and offers a way to respecting

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NFA AS

Max = 30

Aamer Shikari

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science ID

Max = 30

Isis Davis-Marks

27

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

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

Signed: Nicole Cata

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NC: I was ready to buy the Aff argument about why the NC was nonunique (we are taxed "against our will" all the time), but Aff didn't respond in 2AR to Reg's reply about how the problems will be exacerbated if we affirm.

Disad: I don't think the 2AR arguments are responsive to the 2NR extensions and impacts (US is leader in medical innovation; extinction impacts).

AC: Aff extends WHO card about definition of VH and derives an impact (stops financial catastrophe). Regardless of whether I use consequentialism or utilitarianism, I have to weigh arguments on my own. I look to the impacts on the disad and negat.

Room: 226
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

5

Hertzog, Chetan

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

search for objective truth. **AFFIRMATIVE** **POINTS** **NEGATIVE** **POINTS**
and focus on what's subjectively valuable. You should do a lot more work on the polls. First off, under 2000 people is not large enough to represent what Americans want. Second, not everyone who saw the website voted in the poll.

Scarsdale RG

Rahul Gosain

Max = 30

27.1

Hunter College JC

Joanna Cohen

Max = 30

27

The better debating was done by the **AFF** from **Scarsdale RG**
AFF **NEG** **TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME**

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

Signed:

Chetan K. Hertzog

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

of reasons why polls conducted months ago can't give us reliable information about what people want now. **(P)** You case has a lot of problems! **(1)** How do states gain the financial ability to provide health care to all of its citizens? States routinely rely on the federal government for bail-outs in public education and other goods - how would the provision of care avoid this harm? **(2)** How do states coordinate quality of care standards? What happens when some states provide high-quality health care and others low? How do you justify those inequities? **(3)** How can states get the necessary information about impending health crises from place to place? What happens when an outbreak of disease occurs - does each individual state just deal with it in its own way? That seems highly inefficient. **(4)** Why are you spending so much time on the Fed + not dealing w/ her case more? So many issues you could raise. **(5)** You need to weigh! **(2A)** Kind of one-not. **(1D)** This round is an example of the "three ships passing" syndrome. The aff extends **(Jawyer)** and **(List)** to say we're trapped within our own frameworks that prevent us from viewing issues objectively (why this doesn't apply to people answering polls, I don't know). If I accept this and look to polls, I have the affirm of **(Turnbly)**. Neg's states argo might be true, but they don't explain why people want states to offer care. **20 Affirm.**



MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science DM

Max = 30

56 Daiya Massac

26

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale SF

Max = 30

Steven Friedman

28

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

Aff: Preflow before you walk into round!

AC Differentiate more clearly between arguments/Advantages. you never paused or gave me any indication of transition. I had to piece it together myself.

NC Some of the A2: util was a little redundant. ~~then~~ you would have had more time w/ efficiency.

IAR If you're going to go all in on turns to the NC, you need to actually make turns to the NC. At best you had one piece of offense, but that was very ~~redundant~~ tenuous.

2NR Inefficient, but you hit everything you really needed to

IAR you just sort of ignored the 2NR... you need to be much more specific to 2NR arguments and do explicit weighing b/n claims.

Room: 230
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

5

Struver, Zack

CARTER

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

Scarsdale GT

Garrett Tanzer

POINTS

Max = 30

~~27~~ 27

NEGATIVE

Livingston High JX

Jessica Xu

POINTS

Max = 30

27

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

You are both very good at abusive definitions, turning arguments in extreme and out of context ways, and responding to only the things you wanted to hear. ~~It~~ It was as if you shared a strategy of finding what ~~you~~ technicalities ~~you~~ could exploit to make it look like you won. What you weren't strong on was debate and direct clash which made my job harder. Aff included occupation in his definition of things you ~~can't~~ be discriminated against for meaning ability to pay shouldn't preclude you from healthcare. When called out, he abusively changes his stance to access to HC w/o obligation to participate. Neg should have wiped the floor with him on this. Instead she's in such a rush to extend ~~cards~~ the ancillary cards that she breezed right over it and didn't have time to make this into the one thing this round should have gone down to. Big Shame. So I'm left with Autonomy and where the gov. can/should wield their power, Aff weakly argues that Govt gets its power from the will of the people who use their autonomy to do so. In my mind, no one won this round, Aff just lost a little less here.

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Lexington AH

Max = 30

Adam Hoffman

29.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale CB

Max = 30

Charlie Blatt

29

The better debating was done by the Aff

Aff
AFF or NEG

from Lexington

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Anna Lucia

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- Construct well laid out and well warranted (SPS advocated ~~that~~ AIC well explained)
- Cross ex of neg → good (great analogy made w/ regards to neg's argument that it's unfair to pay for coverage that wasn't caused by them — ~~highway~~ damage tax analogy was great)
- Burden of neg met with argument that all people will derive benefit just from annual check-up
- Excellent argument → about ~~that~~ SPS will help small businesses who can't afford to provide insurance → thus helping to rejuvenate economy
- Moreover SPS advocated by aff does not result in new taxes → since ~~that~~ that would simply be redeployment of funds ~~from~~ to new system
- Reuters story → 45,000 lives lost every year due to no health insurance → ~~aff~~ excellent point

Neg

- INR — coverage of AIC good, but try to ~~not~~ manage time so that all arguments are addressed in opponent's case
- good point about quality of healthcare going down under NHC
- Burden set up by neg → was met by aff w/ checkup argument and in aff world no new taxes since it was a redeployment of funds
- aff was never endorsing Canadian system → just used it as example to show U.S. ~~was~~ is inefficient w/ its resources

→ Since burden was put on by neg ~~and~~ dropped argument about how SPS will help small businesses thus helping economy, and aff world saves 45,000 lives → ballot for aff

Room: 128
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

5

Schneier, Holly

MALCOLM A. BUMP MEMORIAL TOURNAMENT

Hendrick Hudson HS

November 9-10, 2012

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Lexington MH

Max = 30

Michael Heyang

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Byram Hills AJ

Max = 30

Amos Jeng

27.5

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: _____

Holly Schneier

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I believe AFF won this debate. He linked into his VC of Establishing General Welfare very solidly, & thoroughly through his contentions which he carried through across the flow. While it would have been an even stronger case if he elaborated further on General Welfare itself, this was adequate & linked clearly bk to value of morality. He did a good job supporting NEG's attempts to dispel "ought" indicates desirable state.

NEG made an interesting argument for "moral obligation" as opp'd to "desirable state" but did not prove this. I ~~don't~~ didn't feel his point about "morally perfect actors" worked. On the contention level, I don't think ^{too much} burden on nations ^{due to} this health care was ^{just w/ France Ex.} proven. More imp't, I don't think he refuted ^{AFF's point that} his plan for "HC only for poor" exists ~~now~~ currently & is inadequate. Thus I voted AFF.

Room: 206'
Start: 2:00
Varsity LD

5

Cancro, Peter

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

Lexington JS

Max = 30

Julia Sun

28

The better debating was done by the Neg from Lexington JS
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 ~~schools'~~ schools' names to

Peter P Cancro@gmail.com

And I will reply w/ my flows, comments, and RFD
saved to an excel workbook