

Room: HS 228
Flight 1 Start: 2:45 PM
LD

1

Almeida, Beatriz

27TH KAISER DEBATE MONTICELLO HS NY

Oct 10 - 11, 2014

AFFIRMATIVE

Scarsdale LS

Lauren Singer

52

POINTS
(0 - 30)

RANK

29

NEGATIVE

Lexington JS

Jessica Sun

POINTS
(0 - 30)

RANK

28

1.50

Winner: Scarsdale LS debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg)

School/Team

Low point win? _____

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- you're very repetitive → especially
in the 2AB. → say something once
and move on.

- explain your arguments

better → your

CI is super

unspecific and gets super
confusing after a while

← work on sign posting! →

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -
Good, should break 27 - Average,
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average 24 & be-
low - Offensive, rude HFILL Tenth
points may be used

RFD: I vote aff theory → ~~even~~ even though I
buy that she doesn't extend her stuff, she make
a lot of turns that are good (like the accounting
one).

27TH KAISER DEBATE MONTICELLO HS NY

Oct 10 - 11, 2014

AFFIRMATIVE

Bergen County Academi...

Suzan Kim

8:00
POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)
28

NEGATIVE

Regis PC

Paul Castaybert

2:02
POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)
28

Winner: Bergen County SZ debating on the AC Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- your case is interesting! It scared me and fascinated me at the same time
- don't say "judge" during your speech.

- don't be so repetitive —
- say something once and move ~~on~~ on

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -
Good, should break 27 - Average,
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average 24 & be-
low - Offensive, rude HFILL Tenth
points may be used

RFD: AC extensions are clear and the neg
doesn't really take out all of the
AC offense

Room: HS 202
Flight 1 Start: 2:45 PM
LD

1

Chocolate, Peter

27TH KAISER DEBATE MONTICELLO HS NY

Oct 10 - 11, 2014

AFFIRMATIVE

Albany Academies LB

Leland Ben

POINTS RANK

(0 - 30)
27.5

NEGATIVE

Harrison AEI

Amr El-Azizi

POINTS RANK

(0 - 30)
29

Winner: Harrison AEI debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

A priori:
The AC ~~the~~ doesn't matter
if you don't answer the 4 pts
on the fw. Even if health is a
matter of ~~the~~ community (which
it probably isn't), it doesn't matter since
your ~~fw~~ & only violates comm good, but can't
be achieved. Should've conceded to pluralism and
linked dialogue as AC voter. oppression also
mis-communicated. Voted on marginalized key
to ~~fw~~.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -
Good, should break 27 - Average,
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average 24 & be-
low - Offensive, rude HFILL Tenth
points may be used

Room: HS 202
Flight 2 Start: 2:45 PM
LD

1

Chocolate, Peter

27TH KAISER DEBATE MONTICELLO HS NY

Oct 10 - 11, 2014

AFFIRMATIVE

Harrison SO

Sammi O'Reilly

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

28.5

NEGATIVE

Scarsdale ZE

Zoe Ewing

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

28

Winner: Harrison SO debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Peter Chocolate

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Self ownership links directly
to AC fw since C2 is
mis handled. further, too distraught
another warrant.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -
Good, should break 27 - Average,
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average 24 & be-
low - Offensive, rude HFILL Tenth
points may be used

Room: HS 214
Flight 1 Start: 2:45 PM
LD

1

Evans, Paris

27TH KAISER DEBATE MONTICELLO HS NY

Oct 10 - 11, 2014

AFFIRMATIVE

Hill MH

Max Holmes

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

~~27~~ 27.5

NEGATIVE

Scarsdale GA

Gustaf Ahdritz

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

~~28~~ 28

Winner: Scarsdale GA
School/Team

debating on the Neg
Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? _____

Signature: Paris Evans

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Affirmative makes case concerning equality of opportunity
- Negative side uses Jacob's Card to counter the Affirmative framework
- Negative had a more supported framework & gave a more compelling argument, while Affirmative didn't have enough arguments to counterargue negative
- Negative brought up counterplan of mandated choice & spoke of the negatives of Presume Consent such as backlash & the Harvesting of Organs
- Negative Framework Stronger

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -
Good, should break 27 - Average,
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average 24 & be-
low - Offensive, rude HFILL Tenth
points may be used

27TH KAISER DEBATE MONTICELLO HS NY

Oct 10 - 11, 2014

AFFIRMATIVE

Lexington CL

Christine Lee

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

27

NEGATIVE

Harrison EB

Evan Burger

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

28

Winner: Harrison EB debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg)
Signature: [Signature] Low point win?

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Christine Lee - I love Rawls, and love the veil of Ignorance, but definitely try to read more into Rawls - his argument is very vague & allows for a lot of things that YOU value to be not valued if someone else, say your opponent, thinks they are not beneficial.

- Your IAR is scattered & does not do a great job explaining why your framework precludes his case. That being said, excellent job using what he said in CX about just societies to at least extend your VC, & not weigh it. You get a bit stuck on his turns, and in doing so don't respond to his case.

- I don't think you're articulating the whole "after death thing"

2:57 Evan Burger
strong case but I think you get lost in relating the VOI. the veil is impossible, thought exercise, not thing that people can method by which a theoretical just society might occur.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 - Good, should break 27 - Average, shouldn't break 26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average 24 & below - Offensive, rude HFILL Tenth points may be used

Of course it is a an actual do, but a

- oh dude. gov. vs jst society! This is an interestingly worded resolution, and there's a lot of room here for you to argue that gov. is req. for just society

- unicorns & rainbows! sounds like a fun debate to me!

- root cause of illness is a bit of a wash on.

- nice extensions of your standard justifications, but finish the extensions of your contention/Jacobs w/ a link to values/weighting.

Both: **WEIGH** your arguments!

RFD: Vote neg off extension of overview on all & neg's framework precluding. This allows his Jacobs cards to have a winning value thing

Room: HS 211
Flight 2 Start: 2:45 PM
LD

1

Ference, Charlotte

27TH KAISER DEBATE MONTICELLO HS NY

Oct 10 - 11, 2014

AFFIRMATIVE

Bronx Science GM

Gabriel Manak

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

28

NEGATIVE

Harrison MZ

Matt Zinman

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

28

Winner:

Bronx Science GM

School/Team

debating on the

aff

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? _____

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1:10

Things for you both to read up on

① Differences b/t Bentham & Mill
(They are pretty diff. in regards
for this resolution)

② Yes, util is ends based. Always.

Matt - I think your understanding of util
is shaky, and perhaps not when you want to
be convincing. Your
while humorous,
not warranted

linked back to a framework.
You need to tell me why
something is important if
it seems to be your only offense.

I like where your second speech you
but those arguments EASILY could have
been in your first speech! If you
decide that you only are going
w/ one and a half offense, go for
it every chance you get

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -
Good, should break 27 - Average,
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average 24 & be-
low - Offensive, rude HFILL Tenth
points may be used

turns,
are
or

Gabriel - strong case - I like the
research argument as it relates
to util, but be careful to explain
what it is util is valuing in this
instance. Explain more at the end
of your case this justification for
why only aff gets stem cell benefits.

- nonunique arguments save
you some time.

RFD: neg has one
offense which, though
humorous, is extremely
frayn mk.

Room: HS 200
Flight 1 Start: 2:45 PM
LD

1

Glover, Loukas

27TH KAISER DEBATE MONTICELLO HS NY

Oct 10 - 11, 2014

AFFIRMATIVE

Lexington EJ

Eric Jensen

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

28

NEGATIVE

Regis AA

Andrew Aoyama

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

28

Winner: _____

~~Regis~~ Regis
School/Team

debating on the _____

Neg
Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? _____

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff ^{defense} ~~argued~~ far - his ^{was} lack of ignorance ~~was~~ not strong enough
to defend against Neg. arguments

Aff did respond to some of ~~the~~ Neg's arguments

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -
Good, should break 27 - Average,
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average 24 & be-
low - Offensive, rude HFILL Tenth
points may be used

Room: HS 200
Flight 2 Start: 2:45 PM
LD

1

Glover, Loukas

27TH KAISER DEBATE MONTICELLO HS NY

Oct 10 - 11, 2014

AFFIRMATIVE

Lexington MZ

Matthew Zhang

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

28

NEGATIVE

Bronx Science AM

Alex Mazon

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

28

Winner:

Lexington

School/Team

debating on the

Aff.

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? _____

Signature: _____

Loukas Glover

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Aff had stronger args. for both Aff. and Neg. framework.
→ ~~Neg~~ ^{Aff} gave a better reasons to support that
he increases organ donations to most which both
agreed
~~reached~~ would win the round

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -
Good, should break 27 - Average,
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average 24 & be-
low - Offensive, rude HFILL Tenth
points may be used

Room: HS 323
Flight 1 Start: 2:45 PM
LD

1

Lau, Carolyn

27TH KAISER DEBATE MONTICELLO HS NY

Oct 10 - 11, 2014

AFFIRMATIVE

Scarsdale BS

Brian Sussman

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

27

NEGATIVE

Harrison RP

Raffi Piliero

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

28

Winner: Harrison RP debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg)
School/Team

Low point win? _____

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- Drops Neg responses to spike
- No extensions of case
- IAR was mainly defensive
- As much as I hate speed, not a big fan of this shell
- ↳ No clear reason to vote

NEG

- Ext. of Rawls
↳ Co-opt AFF FW
- Ext. of CP
- Ext. of Minorities

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -
Good, should break 27 - Average,
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average 24 & below -
Offensive, rude HFILL Tenth
points may be used

Comments:

NEG CP IS A
Little Risky b/c
IF YOU FORCE SOMEONE
TO DO SOMETHING ITS
PRESUMED THEY'D DO IT
Also the whole
debate re: minorities
is a little unclear
what oppression is
caused or solved
by the NC/AC
Also the converse
isn't what people
say it is.

RFD:



27TH KAISER DEBATE MONTICELLO HS NY

Oct 10 - 11, 2014

AFFIRMATIVE

Harrison EA

Emma Abramson

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

27

NEGATIVE

Scarsdale AC

Alec Carroll

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

27.5

Winner: Scarsdale AC debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

NEG

-AFF needs to start by eliminating CP solvency

-why do we care about mandated choice slipping through the cracks?

-An extension of the AFF observation would have been interesting

-Drops AFF Observation at the top of AC

-Extension of CP offense

-WHY does Presumed consent violate Auto/EF more than more than Mandate choice?

-Try to make a few less assumptions

Point Scale:


30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 - Good, should break 27 - Average, shouldn't break 26 - Below Average 25 - Far below Average 24 & below - Offensive, rude HFILL Tenth points may be used

Comments:

-AFF's #1 question should be: "How is mandated consent different from Presumed consent? and why doesn't it affirm?"

-Equal Freedom, not equality, and autonomy ~~are~~ ^{are basically} the same

-None off aff offense matters unless they can get rid of the CP!!!



Room: HS 209
Flight 1 Start: 2:45 PM
LD

1

Powell, Brendan

27TH KAISER DEBATE MONTICELLO HS NY

Oct 10 - 11, 2014

AFFIRMATIVE

Bronx Science AS

Agniva Sinha

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

27

NEGATIVE

Harrison IT

Isabella Tosto

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

28

Winner: Bronx Science AS debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? Yes

Signature: Brendan

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Agniva:

- hard to understand speech, quiet and mumbling
- rocking back and forth and foot tapping distracting
- the attitude (ie eye rolling) is not endearing and distracts from legitimate points
- much better in later speeches

Isabella:

- good clear structure and coherent delivery
- be careful about absolutist position on autonomy - example of conscription is not compelling

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -
Good, should break 27 - Average,
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average 24 & be-
low - Offensive, rude HFILL Tenth
points may be used

Aff wins on util. argument on 1) inherent clash between people's autonomies and 2) challenges assumptions on rights of dead.

Room: HS 209
Flight 2 Start: 2:45 PM
LD

1

Powell, Brendan

27TH KAISER DEBATE MONTICELLO HS NY

Oct 10 - 11, 2014

AFFIRMATIVE

Harrison KR

Kate Ryan

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

29

NEGATIVE

Scarsdale SK

Spencer Keats

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

28

Winner: Harrison KR
School/Team

debating on the AFF
Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? No

Signature: Brendan

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Spencer

- you should
use questions
to do more
than fill in tags

- be more familiar with your
plan — there's probably
an enforcement mechanism

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -
Good, should break 27 - Average,
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average 24 & be-
low - Offensive, rude HFILL Tenth
points may be used

AFF wins on the "perm" because Neg never establishes
what would happen in the admittedly rare cases where
people do not comply with the mandate.

Room: HS 231
Flight 1 Start: 2:45 PM
LD

1

Thomas, Dustin

27TH KAISER DEBATE MONTICELLO HS NY

Oct 10 - 11, 2014

AFFIRMATIVE

Scarsdale GZ

Gillian Zipursky

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

28

NEGATIVE

Regis JA

Jack Aiello

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

28

Winner:

Scarsdale GZ

School/Team

debating on the

Aff

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? _____

Signature: _____

Dustin Thomas

Comments & Reason for Decision:

* Gillian: ~~the~~ Contention 4 isn't offense under your framework, so don't phrase it like offense. Run this as an underview.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -
Good, should break 27 - Average,
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average 24 & be-
low - Offensive, rude HFILL Tenth
points may be used

Jack: Your framework "is util + autonomy w/o any convincing warrants for either. Most of your Framework "justifications" are one sentence assertions. Find either cards or developed analytics to win the FW.

Both: Stop saying "I outweigh" and instead use util weighing metrics like magnitude, time frame, scope, reversibility, etc. You leave it up to me to weed through all this offense you two never actually clash on.

RFD: Aff. Aff wins reductionism → util → max lives. The ~~45~~ 45 more deaths per 1000 seems insignificant, even if your authors use the term "significant," the 30% extra people who get organs seems to save more bodies & so I affirm.

Room: HS 231
Flight 2 Start: 2:45 PM
LD

1

Thomas, Dustin

27TH KAISER DEBATE MONTICELLO HS NY

Oct 10 - 11, 2014

AFFIRMATIVE

Lexington KZ 1

Kassie Zavaliagos

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

28.7

NEGATIVE

Harrison JW

Jack Wilson 2

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

28.5

Winner:

Harrison JW

School/Team

debating on the

Neg

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? ☒

Signature:

Dustin Thomas

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Jack: I know you're from Harrison, but every response you'll ever make against an AC isn't necessarily a turn. For instance, your #3 argument about people wanting to follow the norm so they decide not to opt out isn't turning anything. You say it "creates a loss of trust with the institution," but this wouldn't be a turn to ↑ organs. So what if they can't challenge social norms...?

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -
Good, should break 27 - Average,
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average 24 & be-
low - Offensive, rude HFILL Tenth
points may be used

Kassie: Have a better strat for the IAR, you seem to be trying to go for everything while the main question is who gets more organs.

Jack: You need to make a wider variety of arguments and try to work on not repeating yourself, it will save you so much time.

RFD: Neg off the CP. Your evidence is a little shady since it says "has the potential", but it's the only comparative evidence between the two systems since Silva is comparing opt-out and opt-in, not opt-out and mandated like the CP defends

Room: HS 208
Flight 1 Start: 2:45 PM
LD

1

Young, Adam

27TH KAISER DEBATE MONTICELLO HS NY

Oct 10 - 11, 2014

AFFIRMATIVE

Hendrick Hudson MG

Matt Gofman

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

28.8

NEGATIVE

Harrison AE

Adam Eljamal

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

29.8

Winner: Harrison AE debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team
Signature: Adam Young

Comments & Reason for Decision:

No wishes between
mechanisms — look to Neg's position
arg which seems to come first
look to his flow

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -
Good, should break 27 - Average,
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average 24 & be-
low - Offensive, rude HFILL Tenth
points may be used

Room: HS 208
Flight 2 Start: 2:45 PM
LD

1

Young, Adam

27TH KAISER DEBATE MONTICELLO HS NY

Oct 10 - 11, 2014

AFFIRMATIVE

Bronx Science WD

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

Winfred Darko

27

NEGATIVE

Harrison MR

POINTS RANK
(0 - 30)

Madeline Rawson

28.6

Winner: Harrison MR debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Adam Young

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff needs to extend warrants and make
implications of those arguments in later
speeches - neg was off of conceded
weighting between both stanzas

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, late-elim level 28 -
Good, should break 27 - Average,
shouldn't break 26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average 24 & be-
low - Offensive, rude HFILL Tenth
points may be used