

Room: 337
Start: 9:30 AM
Lincoln-Douglas

1

Venderbush, Sweyn
Stuyvesant

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Collegiate NM

Nicholas Monaco

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Scarsdale ZE

Zoe Ewing

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Winner: Scarsdale ZE debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff / Neg)

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Chetan Hertzig. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg wins framework on dropped
responses only neg has offense
under the NC

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Stuyvesant SL

Shannon Lee

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

NEG


Regis AW

Aidan Woutas

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Winner: Regis AW School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Daiya Massac. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Stuyvesant: Spreading through a plan is probably not gonna work out very well for you at Nationals

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

RFD: I can ~~not~~ ~~decide~~ vote specifically ~~on~~ on the answers to the AC advantage one → we can never assure that these parties that come into power will guarantee women's rights, and that seems to be the gateway issue into solving ~~of~~ all of these awful harms the AC has. Further, its CFL Nationals quals. He doesn't need any "theoretical justification" to ~~make~~ argue that you should affirm the ~~the~~ resolution.

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Regis MM

Matthew Majsak

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

NEG

Harrison KK

Kathryn Kenny

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.5

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

Signature: [Signature]

Other judges on panel: Carol Meltzer. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Hendrick Hudson MG

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

Matt Gofman

NEG

Harrison EA

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Elyssa Alfieri

Winner: Elyssa Alfieri debating on the Negative
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Paul F. Held

Other judges on panel: Paul Zhou. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very effective negative cross, ex. Elyssa had a clear strategy and pursued questions [(a) Arbitrary nation choice, (b) Ability and (c) U.S. Dominance] that set up her rebuttal.

Point Scale:	
30	- Surpassing; the level best
29	- Excellent, should qualify
28	- Good, might qualify
27	- Average, shouldn't qualify
26	- Below Average
25	- Far below Average
24 & below	- Offensive, rude
HFILL	Half points may be used
HFILL	No tied points, please
HFILL	No LPWs

Negative had superior organization and argumentation throughout.

Matt never addressed the threefold challenge to link democracy promotion with U.S. Rights, Achievement, and Justice.

Elyssa ultimately ~~was~~ non-demonstrating that her (1) sovereignty could encompass non-dominance. (2) That the backlash damage wasn't mediated by the affirmative. (3) And that she skipped logical steps in his argument.

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016


AFF
Hendrick Hudson MG
Matt Gofman

POINTS
(0 - 30)
27

NEG
Harrison EA
Elyssa Alfieri

POINTS
(0 - 30)
28.5

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

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Paul Held. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Note on 2nd contentions
which links to aff.

Also OV is conceded
but I think you kinda meet
#1 & 2 but maybe not #3.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Room: 327
Start: 9:30 AM
Lincoln-Douglas

1

Gofman, Irene
Hendrick Hudson

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Scarsdale ML

Michael Landau

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27.5

NEG

Stuyvesant KW

Kathy Wang

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

Winner: Scarsdale ML debating on the Aff
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Irene Gofman

Other judges on panel: Chris Fox. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Aff - better support for position,
defense of F.W.*

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Scarsdale ML

Michael Landau

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

NEG

Stuyvesant KW

Kathy Wang

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

Winner: Stuyvesant KW debating on the NEG
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Signature]

Other judges on panel: Irene Gofman. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF - good pace, I think you can make your links to resolution clearer sooner
- I feel like one of the things that was missing was a clear link (or at least) between stopping ISIS & democracy promotion.
- The same is true for framework, I think you spent a lot of time for a lot of specificity

NEG - some good questions in CX, in part how you will use those concessions
- great clear march down the flow in NR
- good wrap up
- you are a very clear speaker
- I'm not sure I buy completely the state & govt argument, though I see where you're getting at

Point Scale:	
30	- Surpassing; the level best
29	- Excellent, should qualify
28	- Good, might qualify
27	- Average, shouldn't qualify
26	- Below Average
25	- Far below Average
24 & below	- Offensive, rude
HFILL	Half points may be used
HFILL	No tied points, please
HFILL	No LPWs

RFD Ultimately, the NEG makes clear why democracy promotion specifically could be a problem, and was more thorough in her dismantling of AFF case. AFF had very little remaining offense, and needed clear links throughout.

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Stuyvesant KF

Katherine Fennell

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27.5

NEG

Harrison SR

Sarah Ryan

POINTS
(0 - 30)

30

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

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Alayne Ashman. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Harrison SR on the Neg side was outstanding. ~~Her~~ Both the contentions on the neg side and her responses to the aff arguments were incredibly persuasive. She also talked much more clearly and coherently than Aff. I also like the way she presented her arguments. I know that 30s should be rare but she deserved it.

Note on Aff side - Contentions and support were just not clear or persuasive enough

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

NEG

Stuyvesant KF

Harrison SR

Katherine Fennell

Sarah Ryan


POINTS
(0 - 30)

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.5

28

Winner: Stuyvestant KF debating on the AFF
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: David Landau. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: The ~~AFF~~^{NEG} & answer the ~~Q~~ T's
of peaceful way to transition, prevent
dictatorship. The aff clearly shows
why & imperialist.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Stuyvesant TC

Talia Coyne

POINTS
(0-30)

28

NEG

Monticello KC

Kieran Cavanagh

POINTS
(0-30)

28.5

Winner: Monticello KC debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Joe Quinn. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Need Lamar Baker ev.
- Need answer Phantom 2
- Need 2 reforms about the Aff does -> you say empirically (s)ed? -> what do you do? Education?
- I think the slave owners are the same as Muslim folk in the ME... kinda bites his Colonial Matrix ARG.

- You need a better Root Cause analysis
- Need better (s)! Bayslash
- Need 2 go 4 less & do better job of synthesis.
- Cannot Phantom 2 & Baker & Contextualize
- Your arg about (s) imperial & need better (s) analysis & framing.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

I voted NEG the only instance I set of weighing is in the Aff when Kieran says that the Aff is a short term (s) that results in more (opp.) in future bc ME Women set to be treated as females (Pol.) objects (Rational) I think this is conceded in the Aff to applies 2 any attempt 2 reconcile West w/ East. "Including Women" is short term, the US will push the way side after they achieve (win). ~~Power in the West~~

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF		NEG	
Stuyvesant TC	POINTS (0-30)	Monticello KC	POINTS (0-30)
Talia Coyne	<u>29</u>	Kieran Cavanagh	<u>28</u>

Winner: Stuyvesant TC debating on the Aff
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Signature]

Other judges on panel: Christian Quiroz. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF The excursions on the purpose of judgment was pretty unnecessary. Would devote more time to the particulars of M&P1 and your plan for advertisement is found.

CX Smart idea pressing him both on moral obligations + status quo. The slavery example was a little off, but it's good you go on the attack.

AR In a way this was quite impressive as you manage a great deal quickly. Focus on structure coherence is the right call, you can't Neg as quietist in accepting status quo & you need to address his claim that you do a nice job framing your side as the proper critical assessment of oppression.

AC

NEG
CX Effective and pointed. you drive at the particularities of M&P1's continued involvement/funding.

NC Clear and cohesive. Though Aff is right that your examples are overboard. Good attempt to change direction on Feminism + Poverty.

NR This was alright, but you need better offense than "she'll make it worse". Characteristic imposition of alien values as a form of systematic violence the Aff claims it minimizes. & you need to present stronger statistics.

Point Scale:
30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

RFD
Two things led to my decision: implementation and coherence of moral framework. While Neg came out strong against Aff's suggestion of 'grass roots' involvement in M&P1, he too readily accepted the mantle of status quo against oppressions he acknowledged did exist. So, when Aff brings this all together by saying her side represents a better critical assessment of systems of oppression, despite her overelaborate framework, she does offer a better reason to Affirm.

AC I'm not sure I understand why you're using self-determination as a condition for the aff, since you need to show why Lincoln-Douglas → another state (the U.S.) should impose its vision of democracy on the largest county. It might be better to look to a more general criterion, like one about stopping rights abuses, instead of imposing the U.S. only needing to side with the people instead of imposing on others; I wonder though, if the U.S. would need to apply some level of imposition to make this work. (Cx) Zoe, Lee caught about sending snippy ("Okay, same answer") here. (K) Why are you reading a complex Levinas framework at this tournament? I really don't understand the framework is saying - and if I don't think you establish why any U.S. policy is vitalizing. If there are real people dying and being killed by their governments, should the U.S. just stand by? What solutions do you provide for human rights abuses? I don't think this strategy is the right one for this tournament. (IAR) You need to work on your technical skills - you skipped over a lot of parts of the flow, like the framework. (NR) 3 min on framework is too long. (Crystal) you need to be more responsive to her.

Room: 337
Start: 9:30 AM
Lincoln-Douglas

Hertzig, Chetan
Harrison

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF
Collegiate NM
Nicholas Monaco

POINTS
(0-30)
27

NEG
Scarsdale ZE
Zoe Ewing

POINTS
(0-30)
28

Winner

Scarsdale ZE / Zoe Ewing

debating on the

neg
Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature

Chetan K. Hertzig

Other judges on panel: Sweyn Venderbush. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Point Scale:	
30 - Surpassing; the level best	→ what
29 - Excellent, should qualify	
28 - Good, might qualify	
27 - Average; shouldn't qualify	→ I'm
26 - Below Average	
25 - Far below Average	
24 & below - Offensive, rude	→ I don't
HFILL Half points may be used	
HFILL No tied points, please	
HFILL No LPWs	→ is

(RFD): I don't think a lot of the neg's arguments make sense, but I also don't see them being challenged by the aff. I think the neg clearly wins framework bc the aff doesn't answer it → [Levinas] means I look to the NC first, where neg says aff actions are rooted in imperialism. IAR misses the warrants in the cards. On the AC, I have to negate when the aff concedes turns about why affirming doesn't recognize self-determination. I don't think these are well-warranted, but they're not answered and they are extended.

Room: 333
Start: 9:30 AM
Lincoln-Douglas

1

Meltzer, Carol
Stuyvesant

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Regis MM

Matthew Majsak

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Harrison KK

Kathryn Kenny

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

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

Signature: Carol Meltzer

Other judges on panel: Phoebe Kuo. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

Room: 315
Start: 9:30 AM
Lincoln-Douglas

1

Massac, Daiya
Scarsdale

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Stuyvesant SL

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Shannon Lee

NEG

Regis AW

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Aidan Woutas

Winner: Stuy SL debating on the Aff
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Dan Messer

Other judges on panel: Bea Almeida. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Collegiate NM

Nicholas Monaco

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27.5

NEG

Stuyvesant KF

Katherine Fennell

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28.

Winner: Stuyvesant KF debating on the neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Irene Gofman

Other judges on panel: Paul Held. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Better organized, extended & supported.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Harrison SR

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

NEG

Monticello KC

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.5

Sarah Ryan

Kieran Cavanagh

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

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Phoebe Kuo. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

so the question becomes who is making people more equal, based on your agreement in the framework. I bet the Neg, while they are at times extremely compelling, did not fully explain all relevant aspects like "The Bush Admin" and dropped a significant number of AFF cards that proved strong. Ultimately AFF shows how pure deny procedure is effective and resisted far by the people, which Neg could use again as the result of systematic oppression over centuries, but that argument was never clear.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Harrison KK

Kathryn Kenny

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28.5

NEG

Stuyvesant SL


Shannon Lee

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

Winner: Harrison KK. debating on the AFF.
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: 


Other judges on panel: Joe Quinn. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: Voting on the DB: the AFF puts on the FW that is not answered by the neg.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs



NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Hendrick Hudson MG

Matt Gofman

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27.5

NEG


Stuyvesant TC

Talia Coyne

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

Winner: Hen Hud MG debating on the Aff
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Daiya Massac. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Wilderson arguments always confuse me (and I guess that's partly why I don't like them) because I don't understand how you can burn down an idea, so the Aff is very sketchy to me. I think that the strongest place that I could vote was on the Evans card and the Vincent card about performative contradictions being the reason so much racism exists in debate, etc.

Point Scale:
30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points; please
HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

NEG

Collegiate NM

Stuyvesant KF

Nicholas Monaco

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

Winner: Nicholas Monaco School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Paul F. Held

Other judges on panel: Irene Gofman. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

On the polling issue... Neg had a slight advantage. Aff never really showed why the U.S. citizen voters not wanting this policy should be overruled. But the aff did demonstrate the validity of the polling as a representation of what middle eastern voters want.

Point Scale:	
30	- Surpassing; the level best
29	- Excellent, should qualify
28	- Good, might qualify
27	- Average, shouldn't qualify
26	- Below Average
25	- Far below Average
24 & below	- Offensive, rude
HFILL	Half points may be used
HFILL	No tied points, please
HFILL	No LPWs

Aff won on basis of 2 issues: ① Aff claimed that the approach was a "New Paradigm" the offered Morsi example and even claimed in G that other countries could also promote democracy. Neg didn't challenge this effectively. ② Aff ~~was~~ showed that his side preserved both Global Justice + self determination too.

Finally, the neg focused only on 1st Aff counter team, saying little about the 2nd + 3rd counter team

Room: 329
Start: 11:00 AM
Lincoln-Douglas

2

Zhou, Paul
Stuyvesant

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Regis AW

Aidan Woutas

POINTS
(0 - 30)

26.5 ~~26.5~~

NEG

Scarsdale ML

Michael Landau

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27.5

Winner: Scarsdale ML debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Chetan Hertzig. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Vote neg on
Solvency takeouts/turns
to aff

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Harrison EA

Elyssa Alfieri

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29.5

NEG


Scarsdale ZE

Zoe Ewing

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.5

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

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Carol Meltzer. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg had strong case for what "Democracy"
from the US does -> without warrant
to back it up. No evidence to link
it other than statements.

Point Scale:
30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Historical study used on both sides. But, key line
for Aff = "Democracy is a process, not a product."
intervention where Human Rights Violations are occurring is
essential. These are not "general rights," these are lives,
which Aff hit on extensively.

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF
Stuyvesant KW
Kathy Wang

POINTS
(0 - 30)
28

NEG
Regis MM
Matthew Majsak

POINTS
(0 - 30)
28.5

Winner: Regis MM School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: David Landau. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Structural Violence = Violence that Structures
Physical Violence.
You should know the year of your evidence.
Your arg abt "qualified ev." Probst
Rouble T's your (en.) location arg.
I think your def is witness spec.
i/c analysis/clarification & clari
You from his supercilious arg.
I think your frames/explanation of
the Aff P's -> (Cond.) = Western Standard

You should talk abt the fact that
aid Cond's just hurts the least well-off
Your LWR is way
too repetitive, you
make pretty much two
argz -> The Aff = Prince of (S) of the
"solution v. no solution" arg. Your time would be
better spent preempting the LWR.

Point Scale:	
30	- Surpassing; the level best
29	- Excellent, should qualify
28	- Good, might qualify
27	- Average, shouldn't qualify
26	- Below Average
25	- Far below Average
24 & below	- Offensive, rude
HFILL	Half points may be used
HFILL	No tied points, please
HFILL	No LPWs

I use NLE I think the Aff fails & distinguish her
method of (C) Promo (Aid Condo) from (C) the
Sanctions implemented in I say that (S) of & against (S)
I raise P1.

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Harrison KK

Kathryn Kenny

POINTS
(0-30)

28

NEG

Stuyvesant SL

Shannon Lee

POINTS
(0-30)

07

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

Signature: [Signature]

Other judges on panel: Alayne Ashman. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF Clear, organized. your pillory of MG constitutions could turn against you; just b/c populations might largely oppose of democracy no sys- of gov., it doesn't mean they can't it imposed upon them by the US

C-X A nice, aggressive c.x. you bring Neg to accept the burden of question in the face of rights violations.

AR you try to get away with a lot here, and rightly put the US "involved" in the Arab Spring in place.

AC covered & claimed the causal link.

NEG C-X you miss an opportunity to question her premises. you give her settle all questions which she ties up to promote her case.

NC Be careful what responsibilities you are actually taking on. Is intervention the same as promoting democracy? question why this matters.

NVR This gets repetitive, and needs to give us reasonable reasons why Aff exacerbates problems beyond "Aff exacerbates problems".

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

RFD

The round really came down to a question of definition: what does it mean to promote democracy? Aff set the stage with a broad understanding including intervening in cases of genocide. Neg never really questioned this other than saying US should prioritize its own interest first. Reasoning with this, Aff better secured the rights + values debate along with a more convincing suite of practical solutions

Room: 337
Start: 11:00 AM
Lincoln-Douglas

2

Meltzer, Carol
Stuyvesant

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Harrison EA

Elyssa Alfieri

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

NEG

Scarsdale ZE

Zoe Ewing

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.5

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

Signature: Carol Meltzer

Other judges on panel: Christopher Rodeschin. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Room: 333
Start: 11:00 AM
Lincoln-Douglas

2

Massac, Daiya
Scarsdale

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Hendrick Hudson MG

Matt Gofman

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Stuyvesant TC

Talia Coyne

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28.5

Winner: Stuy TC School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Signature]

Other judges on panel: Bea Almeida. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Democracy will work
if it is for
the good of the
people

~~Wildfire~~

Which system
is best? Is
there one?
Like the US
seems to be
different.

~~Every~~
system
has
its
own
problems

~~Faulty~~
system
has
many
problems

- blame it

etc etc

broken
piece

~~Wildfire~~
Common
thing
is this

~~faulty~~

~~Faulty~~
has
everything

everybody
People think
not sure
non-alien
particular
to
wildfire

1. What
is necessary
- 2.
3. in common
4. GSK of Law
5. approach

PRUN -
What people
after that
to start

Army
apt

1. Things

in order

part. program

Victim

conclusion

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT


Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF
Stuyvesant KW
Kathy Wang

POINTS
(0 - 30)
27

NEG
Regis MM
Matthew Majsak

POINTS
(0 - 30)
27.5

Winner: Regis MM debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)
Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Christian Quiroz. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Somewhat of a sloppy round, and I ~~didn't~~ not particularly like the argument of either side. Gave it to Neg because while his responses and argument were not great, he did rebut the Aff argument and his argument were not sufficiently strong or ~~poor~~ persuasive. Neg was better on style as well.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Harrison SR

Sarah Ryan

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.5

NEG


Monticello KC

Kieran Cavanagh

POINTS
(0 - 30)

~~28~~ 29.5

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

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Chris Fox. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

(PC) Your case is really short - it's under 4:30. You want to fill the time. Part of the issue is that you have too many short and analytics; you need to provide development of each. **Hertzig, Chetan** Harrison *More*

Room: 329
Start: 11:00 AM
Lincoln-Douglas

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

NEG

Regis AW

Scarsdale ML

POINTS

POINTS

(0-30)

(0-30)

Aidan Woutas

27.5

Michael Landau

27

Winner:

Regis AW/Aidan Woutas

debating on the

Side (Aff or Neg)

School/Team

Signature

Matthew K. Hertzig

Other judges on panel: Paul Zhou. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

(In other words, you have to defend when you affirm is anti-pluralist by nature.) I think you need more analysis on why U.S. democracy promotion is good, as opposed to arguments about why democracy promotion is good in general. (NC) I really don't think this is the right approach for this argument. What does it mean to "respect the identity of the other"? How do we know if we've met this standard? Where do you show that it is the obligation of states and not the obligation of individuals? This seems to be a highly impractical standard. The argument that the U.S. is calling all Middle Eastern governments oppressive is really unwarranted. I also think the answers you make to the aff need to be more specific. (AR) try to be more efficient in your coverage of the flow, and spend more time on his responses. (NF) You need to be more responsive - lots of extensions throughout. (ZFR) Extend warrants, not just claims.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

(LPD): This round had almost no clash in it - or extensions of warrants. You both need to work on answering the other person/weighing. The aff is right that pluralism/respecting the identity of the other aren't fundamentally different, and I don't think neg is responding to the aff answers to the about the rights of victimizing people. Aff contentions, while not extended well, take out the words neg is going for, so I can't evaluate those and I have to vote on aff offense.

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Monticello KC

Kieran Cavanagh

POINTS
(0-30)

27.5

NEG

Hendrick Hudson MG

Matt Gofman

POINTS
(0-30)

27

1:37

Winner: Monticello KC debating on the Aff
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Signature]

Other judges on panel: David Landau. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

There was an incredibly annoying round to evaluate because it was a bunch of util args given with literally no weighing between them. ~~on top of~~ on top of that there wasn't even a util framework. None of these args were well impacted to the frameworks that were given.

I affirm b/c the neg puts a burden on itself to prove why US intervention is a net harm. Aff says these kinds of movements are happening regardless and that US involvement could maybe help. Since neg says ~~transition periods~~ transition periods are bad, seems like the US should be involved if they are helpful at all

Point Scale:
30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

lots of my own weighing but
it's what I felt like I had
to do given a lack of cogent ballot stuff

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Scarsdale ML

Michael Landau

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27.5

NEG

Harrison EA

Elyssa Alfieri

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

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

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Alayne Ashman. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Difficulty between Sovereignty +
International Law → who follows it?
Who requires it to happen?

- Winner is neg on stronger argumentative case,
focusing on US intervention specifically. ~~Aff~~
AFF did not address the US as true actor as
strongly.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Stuyvesant SL

Shannon Lee

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.5

NEG

Collegiate NM

Nicholas Monaco

POINTS
(0 - 30)

20

Winner: Stuyvesant SL debating on the Aff
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: 

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Rose Joyce-Turner. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

You should point the Aff
I respect state (SAR) → (Cred)
Aid = incentive, not
intervention, respects (SAR)
the best

Also point out the limit
I (SAR) ARS more → if (SAR)
restricted the other (SAR)
= @ risk as well as for
FPI.

Your NR → very too repetitive.

You should point
out that
we CII clause

T/S & Contradicts after answer to
the NR. If they need aid, doesn't
meanings if (Cred.) Violate (SAR)?

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWS

I vote Aff like the NR (SAR) I (SAR) but Skara
does good job in criticizing (SAR) in the abstract
w/o limit.

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Scarsdale ZE

Zoe Ewing

POINTS
(0-30)

28

NEG

Stuyvesant KW

Kathy Wang

POINTS
(0-30)

28.5

Winner: Stuyvesant KW debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Jaym F. Quinn

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Chetan Hertzog. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF The prefatory discourse on "intrinsic values" is not necessary. Give yourself more time to articulate your contentions.

CE Intervening in the case of dictatorship, while seemingly convincing, is a tough road to hoe. You might reconsider the meaning of promoting democracy, and align that more closely to US interests.

AR Don't waste time reading off cards. Respond to her points. And explain Bahrain!

AC Wish your speech was as much as brilliant as you said it would be. You double down on your evidence when you should attack Neg's prem. ses!

RFD

Neg made the values debate secondary to the principal question of "Why does the US need to be there to fix things?" Neg's policies were far more coherent as an actual cause of action. Aff never gave her evidence purpose.

I really wish you could have debated Bahrain...!

NEG CE was pretty good. Press US as agent of terrorism. Asking for an example con case, but just b/c she says "Bahrain" doesn't mean she has an argument.

NC pretty well covered. you need to better articulate your understanding of state agency.

NR you say what needed to be said: Aff's "evidence dump" -> besides the point. you characterize "fixing the mess" as "making it worse", and even construe the Neg as allowing ME countries to pursue their own ends.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Regis MM

Matthew Majsak

POINTS

(0-30)

27

NEG

Stuyvesant KF

Katherine Fennell

POINTS

(0-30)

29.5

Winner: Stuy KF debating on the NEG
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Bea Almeida. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Harrison KK

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Kathryn Kenny

NEG

Regis AW

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Aidan Woutas

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

Signature: 

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Phoebe Kuo. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very good ~~own~~ round. I thought good argument and responses were made on both sides, and I enjoyed listening to both. On balance, I thought that AFF was somewhat more ~~persuasive~~ persuasive and had more clear empirical evidence behind her arguments.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Monticello KC

Kieran Cavanagh

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

NEG


Hendrick Hudson MG

Matt Gofman

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.5

Winner: Hendrick Hudson MG debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: 

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Sweyn Venderbush. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Bottom line on this round is that I never got to the point where AFF was persuasive enough in his arguments + therefore never proved his contentions. NEG's responses were strong, though not as sophisticated as they could have been, but AFF never overcame them. I also thought that AFF made ~~some~~ certain statements such as "there probably can be good terrorism" that were difficult to accept.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Harrison KK	(0 - 30)	Regis AW	(0 - 30)
Kathryn Kenny	<u>28</u>	Aidan Woutas	<u>29</u>

Winner: Regis AW debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Signature]

Other judges on panel: David Landau. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Sectionalism
not sectionalism.

a sectional is a sofa/couch.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Stuyvesant SL

Shannon Lee

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.5

NEG

Collegiate NM

Nicholas Monaco

POINTS
(0 - 30)

~~28~~ 28

Winner: Stuy SL School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Christian Quiroz. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff 28.5

Neg 28.5 1:41

NR - has legit args. but it is allow the power & local power - have a better use of the flow & order you want to take.

Neg's rebuttal & lack of courage is overpowered by Aff in 1st & 2nd

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

I think you should go further with the "role morality" arguments about how the U.S. government has to prioritize obligations to humanity in general above the obligations that are based on their role as state actors. It's an interesting argument, but I'm not seeing that much of an explanation as to why it's true. I think there needs to be more discussion of why democracy is the same as protecting dignity and human rights.

Room: 305
Flight 2 Start: 1:35 PM
Lincoln-Douglas

Hertzig, Chetan
Harrison

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF
Scarsdale ZE

POINTS
(0-30)
28

NEG
Stuyvesant KW

POINTS
(0-30)
28.5

Zoe Ewing

Kathy Wang

Winner: Stuyvesant KW/Kathy Wang debating on the

neg Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Chetan K. Hertzig

Other judges on panel: Joe Quinn. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Point Scale:	
30	- Surpassing; the level best
29	- Excellent, should qualify
28	- Good, might qualify
27	- Average, shouldn't qualify
26	- Below Average
25	- Far below Average
24 & below	- Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used	
HFILL No tied points, please	
HFILL No LPWs	

NC You should strengthen your case - you have about 4:15 of the speech here, but you want more time than that to answer the aff case. I think you should give some good counterplan/counteradvocacy to solve for problems like human rights abuses. Should some other actor take action, or should the U.S./other actors stand by when these happen? You want to use more evidence in this speech to answer the aff's arguments. Use case links and other types of responses to generate more offense.

1AR You should work on improving time allocation - you spend a lot of time on the NC, but don't deal sufficiently with many of her responses to your case because you run out of time. 2AR You should crystallize/give voting issues here - you have time. 3AR Avoid making new applications/arguments.

2FD: I think the framework debate is messy, since there are arguments on both sides of the flow that aren't being answered. Neg says we have to look to sovereignty because state action is the resolutional question. This is conceded in the 1AR/2AR. Aff goes for ISIS/self-defense in 2AR, but I don't know which framework this links to. Neg's extensions of Detacour and Strindal plus Hannid show that a) the U.S. specifically fails when it intervenes and b) democracy promotion can happen without U.S. action. Aff should have extended case offense in 2AR here.

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Stuyvesant TC

Talia Coyne

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29

NEG

Harrison SR

Sarah Ryan

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

Winner: Talia Coyne debating on the Aff
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)
Signature: Paul F. Held

Other judges on panel: Irene Gofman. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

As the round crystallized the overarching questions became ① whether all must show sovereignty, ② if peace promotion was complimentary w/ democracy promotion or incompatible with it ③ type of moral obligation a country has.

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

The issue of hypocrisy as root cause of extremism ping-ponged without resolution.

The neg got a useful admission in Cox about women's rights not being the same as democracy, but didn't pursue it further in rebuttal.

Aff succeeded in providing her values provide for international policy to reduce structural violence.

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Stuyvesant TC

Talia Coyne

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28.5

NEG

Harrison SR

Sarah Ryan

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29

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

Signature: Irene Gofman

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Paul Held. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Scarsdale ML

Michael Landau

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Harrison EA

Elyssa Alfieri

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29.5

Winner: Harrison EA debating on the NEG.
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: _____

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Christopher Rodeschin. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

R F D



The aff & answer the double bind argument

- 1) US. stay & resource run thin
- 2) Roll out before there is any (S).

- AFF is also & answering (L) stand of why the U.S. is (C) to democracy promo.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Regis MM

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Matthew Majsak

NEG

Stuyvesant KF

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

Katherine Fennell

Winner: Regis MM School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: 

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Daiya Massac. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I generally don't vote on Wilderson args, but my problem with them at this tournament specifically is that you are NOT going to do well at all at CFL Nationals running a Wilderson K.

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Harrison SR

Sarah Ryan

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27.5

NEG

Stuyvesant SL

Shannon Lee

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28.5

Winner: Stuyvesant SL debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Irene Gofman. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg → good not to get "trapped" in solution on CX. Not LD focus to have solution to problem. Nice sticking to advocacy.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

+ Neg wins on case on "backlash" → surg giving rights or fighting for them is good, but how it's done is important → and how it's been done has ~~been~~ made things worse. Small projects vs. Long Term results: Aff's argument not strong enough.

\$ vacuum → also went neg → brought up in 2nd speech → good counter to Democracy Index.

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Scarsdale ZE

Zoe Ewing

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Hendrick Hudson MG

Matt Gofman

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28.5

Winner: (scribble) Hen Hud MG debating on the NEG
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: (signature)

Other judges on panel: Bea Almeida. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I think the Aff & Propers were ~~soes~~
 & a (D)T/ & (D)T. I think that
 if she either goes w/ the Aff & the (D)T/ or ~~sets~~
 ~~sets~~ the (D)T/ she wins but it's the i/c day
 Aff offense at the end of the debate.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF
Stuyvesant KW
Kathy Wang

POINTS
(0-30)
29

NEG
Harrison KK
Kathryn Kenny

POINTS
(0-30)
29.5

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

Signature: Jaym F. Quinn

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Daiya Massac. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF You make an interesting delineation of "promoting democracy" as allowing for conditional aid directed to democratic ends. your Cont III examples are vulnerable to relevancy claims by Neg.

CX Good pressure here, though you need to adept & respond to Neg's attempts to reframe the debate.

AR Nicely done. you summarize your case pithily as "Neg does no good, at least Aff does some good". you need to respond to her attacks on aid; if you are - proponent of aid; not fair to simply say "I'm doing sth diff."

AC valiant effort. where on this offense in Aff?

NBC CX Good to press checks on "nat'l actors."

NC Comprehensive - most importantly, you undercut the value of aid and re-draw the lines of argument to concern a global scale vs a Nat'l scale.

Point Scale:	
30	- Surpassing; the level best
29	- Excellent, should qualify
28	- Good, might qualify
27	- Average, shouldn't qualify
26	- Below Average
25	- Far below Average
24 & below	- Offensive, rude
HFILL	Half points may be used
HFILL	No tied points, please
HFILL	No LPWs

NR I found this pretty excellent - Casting Aid not as a privilege but a duty - not as a privilege but a duty of obligation by US. Points the case of Neg as an ability to draw lines + stand against.

RFD
This was a good debate - lots of nice clash in values as well as practicalities. The Round came down to two competing visions: Aff says US should be allowed to limit Aid to cases where democracy will likely be promoted; Neg casts cont. aid as cultural hegemony. While Aff made a strong first salvo in questioning the functionality of checks and suggesting nat'l aid is a good input, Neg more comprehensively controlled the terms of the argument and left Aff looking not only questionable in its benefits but reckless in its license. So, close - but I negate.

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

NEG

Monticello KC

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Scarsdale ML

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Kieran Cavanagh

28

Michael Landau

27.5

Winner: Monticello KC debating on the AFF
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Carol Meltzer

Other judges on panel: Paul Held. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

Room: 303
Start: 3:15 PM
Lincoln-Douglas

4

Massac, Daiya
Scarsdale

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Stuyvesant KW

Kathy Wang

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Harrison KK

Kathryn Kenny

POINTS

(0 - 30)

24.5

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

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Joe Quinn. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

Justification
state action

VI: (Chilly) → further MC
 on next row | is super
 degree

(Chilly) → a migration
 of students

on State → no way to
 involve a
 third party

CI: LS

is usually
 unchangeable

or: She says
 because an
 offer he
 says her
 fellow of culture
 year?

or: She says
 because an
 offer he
 says her
 fellow of culture
 year?

or: She says
 because an
 offer he
 says her
 fellow of culture
 year?

or: She says
 because an
 offer he
 says her
 fellow of culture
 year?

Bum / Culture
 (Chilly) → is the best
 model

Paternalism
 (2) is paternalistic
 model

Conventions
 AC does not
 intervene

- AC is a
 part of govt
 aid.
 supports her
 a helper

The USFE
 can choose
 where
 is culture
 programming

~~Paternalism~~ *

Hilary Clinton
 became
 first female

Manish / Culture x
 state law
 change

The US
 is not a
 federal
 country

Public
 meeting
 candidate

She says
 To me
 that is wrong

V: Mith
 presentation
 structure
 t = K2
 form is action
 ethics
 domain
 field
 2. approach
 1. domain

3. Knowledge
 (is not
 neutral)
 4. approach
 market
 not market
 Smith
 theory
 only one
 only one

11:11
 1. market
 2. market
 3. market

Salmon / culture
 old culture
 new culture
 old culture
 new culture

A. Trachten
 2. Graduate
 full time
 1.1

10:10
 all very
 on context
 form
 to handle
 care system
 attention

Room: 313
Start: 3:15 PM
Lincoln-Douglas

4

*Kuo, Phoebe
Collegiate

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

NEG

Regis AW

Stuyvesant TC

Aidan Woutas

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.5

Winner: Stuyvesant TC debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Phoebe Kuo

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Alayne Ashman. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Stuyvesant KF

Katherine Fennell

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29.5

NEG

Regis MM

Matthew Majsak

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Winner: Stuy KF debating on the Aff
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Signature]

Other judges on panel: Chetan Hertzig. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff Clarity of your topics/authors - slow down enough to say those clearly -
say topics much more clearly - take a breath
before + after each of them
unnecessarily rude in your ex
poor coverage of NC in inc

Neg - you had much better coverage in INC - esp
of opponent's position (misreading of time + flow in NC
could be a problem - remember which side + how much time
you have

Point Scale:	
30	- Surpassing; the level best
29	- Excellent, should qualify
28	- Good, might qualify
27	- Average, shouldn't qualify
26	- Below Average
25	- Far below Average
24 & below	- Offensive, rude
HFILL	Half points may be used
HFILL	No tied points, please
HFILL	No LPWs

These were clearly ~~done~~ d. student perception of what was happening in the
rd - both drop huge amount of each other's position
So, Aff thinks woman should not be mistreated, treated, should vote -
Neg says middle eastern mind-set won't be changed by us enforcing it's number
of having democratic election (which could include minorities, women, etc) - so
where is the improvement NO And will be given since B.E mind set clearly
won't change - Neither answer this? for me clearly - Aff & get charged
Solvung, Neg & get more of pts - I have no clear winner of the arguments -
Hence, Aff tries harder to cover more things - but both need to listen
better + make things clearer

(QC) Given that this is a CFL qualifier, you probably should not do the tournament you're trying to qualify for. You should read the case more slowly and clearly; you're going way too fast and not enunciating enough. I don't know why aid conditionality is necessarily the same as democracy promotion. Why can't the U.S. put conditions on aid that have nothing to do with promoting democracy? I think you should spend more time developing reasons for why the U.S. uniquely has the authority/right to promote democracy through aid conditionality. It seems to me that most of your arguments are reasons conditionality is good, rather than reasons the U.S. should be the agent to do it. (QC) You have to spend more time on the specifics of the case; I feel like you have a lot of answers to aid conditionality specifically. I think your case should provide some kind of counter-advocacy or deterrent so we have some way of combatting the harms that the aff discusses. There should be some means other than democracy promotion that can address the issues; for instance, the U.S. could try to promote human rights without promoting new government structures. (IAR) Again, you should go more slowly and enunciate. You have to do more to make developed extensions here. (NR) Set your timer correctly!!! (ZAR) You should try to crystallize the round/give voters. (LFD) The aff is ahead on the framework debate - the Wynder analysis on structural violence isn't answered, so I have to look to that. Neg doesn't have any offense under that framework. Further, I don't think neg is responsive to the aid conditionality advocacy. I think aff is ahead in terms of the solvency debate, although this is mostly because the neg isn't answering them, not because aff is extending them well. In any case, I feel like I have to affirm based on the extensions coming out of the IAR/ZAR in this round.

Room: 329

Start: 3:15 PM

Lincoln-Douglas

4

*Hertzig, Chetan

Harrison

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Stuyvesant KF

Katherine Fennell

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27.5

NEG

Regis MM

Matthew Majsak

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

Winner: Stuyvesant KF/Katherine Fennell debating on the Aff

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Chetan Hertzig

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Rose Joyce-Turner. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best	→ answering
29 - Excellent, should qualify	
28 - Good, might qualify	
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify	→ don't
26 - Below Average	
25 - Far below Average	
24 & below - Offensive, rude	→ ability
HFILL Half points may be used	
HFILL No tied points, please	
HFILL No LPWs	→ some

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF
Monticello KC
Kieran Cavanagh

POINTS
(0 - 30)
28

NEG
Scarsdale ML
Michael Landau

POINTS
(0 - 30)
29

Winner: Michael Landau debating on the Negative
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)
Signature: Paul F. Held

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Carol Meltzer. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

On the issue of the affirmative's plan: neg doesn't go far enough proving that the aff is too narrowly drawn on "Chenay picked." Michael doesn't prove his claim that an aff must include armed intention or else it is only assuming a partial resolution.

Point Scale:	
30	- Surpassing; the level best
29	- Excellent, should qualify
28	- Good, might qualify
27	- Average, shouldn't qualify
26	- Below Average
25	- Far below Average
24 & below	- Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used	
HFILL No tied points, please	
HFILL No LPWs	

The neg. talks several times about the "breadth" of experience in the mid east. But he fails to address the specific case study of Turkey.

The clash over whether democracy will occur without U.S. promotion goes to the neg. Affirmative, in final AR, resorts to an unpersuasive "if democracy is coming anyway, there is no harm promoting it" argument. ~~But, the neg doesn't~~
*Negatives today issues were more targeted on the real conflict in this round

Room: 315
Start: 3:15 PM
Lincoln-Douglas

4

*Gofman, Irene
Hendrick Hudson

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Harrison SR

Sarah Ryan

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29.5

NEG

Stuyvesant SL

Shannon Lee

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29

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

Signature: Irene Gofman

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Christopher Rodeschin. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Point Scale:

30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, should qualify
28 - Good, might qualify
27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Half points may be used
HFILL No tied points, please
HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Regis AW

Aidan Woutas

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

NEG


Stuyvesant TC

Talia Coyne

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29.5

Winner: Stuyvestant TC debating on the NEG
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Phoebe Kuo. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: the AFF & answer how he ↓ consigu
when the U.S. leaves these states
histon, proves that the Consigu are
& good.
The backlash (T) also goes unanswered...
How do you (S) for extremist.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs

NYCFL GRANDS AT STUYVESANT

Mar 12 - 12, 2016

AFF

Scarsdale ZE

Zoe Ewing

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Hendrick Hudson MG

Matt Gofman

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27.5

Winner: Scarsdale ZE debating on the Aff
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: 

*Please chair this round. Other judges on panel: Christian Quiroz. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I think the easiest place to vote (since I have no idea which k to evaluate over the other) is off the anthro k because you both seem to be blowing it up. From there, I do think that the anthro turns are a little bit undercovered, but the very first clear place to vote is the first anthro turn about "being the voice" biting back into the harms of the k. The second is the 2nd turn about Anthro being the root cause of all oppression is also clear

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, should qualify
- 28 - Good, might qualify
- 27 - Average, shouldn't qualify
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Half points may be used
- HFILL No tied points, please
- HFILL No LPWs