

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Ardrey Kell GD		(0-30)	Cary PM	(0-30)
Gayathri Das		<u>27</u>	Patrick Mulqueen	<u>25.5</u>

Winner: GAYATHRI DAS / ARDREY KELL debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg)
 School/Team

Low point win? No

Signature: Vivek Baraya

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF (Gayathri)

- moral authority (Aldoscent)
- Contraception - choices
 - ↳ good data: unwanted
- Reduction in pregnancy
- Access to formal physiological treatment
- Sexual reassignment.
- State can decide
- strong questioning.
- good arguments on Court being able to decide
- good defense on marriage of adolescent.
- No evidence on puberty can be delayed.

Neg (Cary) Patrick.

- * maximizing well being of a adolescent → good point.
- * good evidence on adolescent not able to make suitable decisions.
- * No specific counter arguments against aff.
- * good arguments on adolescent marriage age.
- * you need to be more firm when you are explaining your point.
- * good argument on ability to decide because an adolescent can die.

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

Both of you didn't bring any evidence during cross examination.

- * Good defence on cross examination
- * You evaded several questions rather than explaining your stand.

- * you could have pushed the religious argument - same as parents as child further.
- * good questioning on countries of universal health care decision.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Marriotts Ridge DK		(0 - 30)	Northwest Guilford HR	(0 - 30)
Divya Kapoor		<u>28</u>	Holden Ruch	<u>29</u>

Winner: Northwest Guilford HR School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ms. Kapoor... I'm surprised you didn't leverage Human History, i.e. that for 99% of recorded history, what we now call Adolescents were adults. Great Cross, Mr. Ruch - but you missed opportunity to press on exact age at which autonomy begins. Mr. Ruch...

Point Scale:
Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:
Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

I have serious trouble w/ the idea that Adolescents are not autonomous at all; i.e. we ~~are~~ harm them morally by allowing them to make decisions. Both arguments have serious holes - Neg is right that Aff Definition argues autonomy for a 2 yr. old, while Neg ignores the harm to adolescents who do possess rational Decision making, i.e. Autonomy. Extremely close round. Hinges on weight between harm that adolescents will do to themselves vice done to them by their parents making the decision.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		NEG	
Myers Park SP	POINTS (0 - 30)	Marriotts Ridge YL	POINTS (0 - 30)
Seungmin Park	<u>27</u>	Yixuan Liu	<u>29</u>

Winner: Marriotts Ridge YL debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG: Fantastic cross examination - clearly identified key potential weaknesses in AFF case. Very strong defense during AFF cross w/ NEG. NEG defends well and attacks well. Decision rests on basic analysis of the flow - NEG is simply better at attacking AFF positions and defending her own. Excellent coverage on the flow. Dropped Nothing, Defended everything - extremely good ad hoc defense. NEG best outstanding intellect and vocabulary.

Point Scale:
Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:
Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 13 Min CX | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

613, 713, 963

1

Baraya, Vivek

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF
Marriotts Ridge QC

POINTS
(0-30)
29.0

NEG
Henry W. Grady CD

POINTS
(0-30)
29.5

Quinn Crawford

Conor Downey

Winner: Conor Downey / Henry W. Grady debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- ① good voice - loud & clear
- ② very structured - good quotes.
- ③ good data to prove your point - research data.
- ④ good argument on faith based medical healing.
- ⑤ good defense / strong counter argument.
- ⑥ Your opponent had better cross questioning ability.
- ⑦ You have very good counter arguments.

- ① ~~well~~ You heard your opponent arguments very well.

Point Scale:
Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

- ② strong cross examination
- ③ good presentation - loud and clear.
- ④ Good arguments on agents & not having maturity.
- ⑤ good arguments on several times.
- ⑥ good cross questioning and defying opponents research statistics.
- ⑦ good defense of argument.
- ⑧ good summarization.
- ⑨ good data references and references to the research.

Speech Times:
Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

I liked you sharing your cases to each other and without fear - and trying to make this a good debate.

I made Negative win because of better arguments, good defense of his own points and better cross examination

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Upper Arlington HW		(0-30)	Pinecrest MS	(0-30)
Henry Wu		<u>28</u>	Michael Speiser	<u>28.5</u>

Winner: Michael Speiser/Pinecrest MS debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF (Feedback)

Good speaking. Well organized case and contentions.
Lack of strong evidence on contention 2 allowing the opponent to attack contention 2.

- Good cross-ex / attacking central point of community good.
- Q: what is giving back to community? Includes the Neg framework.
- Asserby Independence (Use of opponent framework).

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 14 Min Prep.

Neg (Feedback)

Obviously Spreddy in NC. Good cards though.

Cross-ex = good challenge to ~~ex~~ evidence to contention 2.

Overall good cross-ex.

State as an ~~inspary~~ enforas body.

Is giving back arbitrary? Showed what objective is under the framework.

Balance between autonomy and community good.

No moral standard.

REASON: The decision came down to who best defended their framework and attacked opponents contentions. ~~the~~ The Aff failed to establish the moral standard (guidelines) and also respond to the opponent. The Neg demonstrated that autonomy would cause harm to his framework and went unchallenged by Aff.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

William G. Enloe WS

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29.

William Song

NEG

Boca Raton Community BF

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29.

Burke Findley

Winner: Boca Raton Community BF debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff: Good flow. Value: Morality system of morality. Value criterion: Human dignity. Good references to meta-studies. Good contentions, especially contention 3. No response from opponent ~~from~~ on content 3.

Need to supply framework better.

Point Scale: Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

- > good cross-ex.
- > lay term skills as a response to opponent's point of short term risk taking.
- > Responded to ~~per~~ content of fear of pain. | immoral?

Speech Times: Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

Neg
-> Decent cross-ex. Should have attacked the framework more and contention of fairness. Attacked the framework in NC good example, infection of vaccine etc. Good attack on fairness. (Opponent's) permission vs right. Good Summary: Debating the meta-analysis.

REASON: | ~~Contention on International~~

The Negs supported his framework better and had argued against Aff's contention. ~~for~~ Aff had a cogent argument but his responses to Neg were weak.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Thomas Jefferson HSST AC		(0 - 30)	Loyola Blakefield AB	(0 - 30)
Allen Cheng		<u>27</u>	Aidan Bissell-Siders	<u>28</u>

Winner: Loyola Blakefield AB debating on the Neg Side (Aff of Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

FJ AC: Extend AC, ~~misdirection~~. Utilize what you have in it. Explain in detail
- Work on SAR time management
- Utilize Freeman more

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

by AB: Don't waste time on things that are fine.
Don't make as many cross apps, iffy strat.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

RFP: ① Etzioni / Sayer in NC FW = Communitarianism First
② ^{NC} Extension give tangible harms to community
③ No clear AC offense.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Boca Raton Community OL	(0 - 30)	University IP	(0 - 30)
Omar Lopera	<u>28</u>	Isaiah Paik	<u>17</u>

Winner: Boca Raton Comm OL debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Logan Parke

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

RFD

- ② Koorsgard = Practical Reason
- ① NC Never 2) Proves why Morality is bad 2) Shows tangible harms
- ③ Velleman justifies All Actions

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Henry W. Grady WT		(0 - 30)	Loyola Blakefield CG	(0 - 30)
Will Taft		<u>28</u>	Chris Garliss	<u>27</u>

Winner: Henry W. Grady WT debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Marcia Ly

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Close round!

AC: Solid Case!

NO: "Resolution is flawed" is a little abusive; nihilism - This (what?) Jan 15th (contestant)

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

1AR: Time-management =

ran out of time to thought address

neg's contention; Nice - Extended much of Aff's warrants

1NR: Any evidence about adolescent retention? You say there are many, but do not provide evidence? OK read some later - dropped his grad cont. & his observations, which could hurt.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

2AR: Nice analysis of the round; effecting extended and won the framework

debate and the contention level debate (the meta-analysis was important), and you countered the doctors take autonomy effecting - even steered it.

2NR: TRY to support better; Better address his warrants at the value framework level

KPDs

for these reasons, Aff win.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

University KL

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29

NEG

Charlotte Catholic MM

POINTS

(0 - 30)

26

Karchen Lhatoo

Marissa Muller

Winner: University KL debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Marcia Log

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AC: How many youth die of
fairly healthy? This seems
more like abuse or neglect.
Any evidence the child wanted
a different outcome? Any
evidence the child would be
more natural than parent?

1AR: Good extension of
VC & wants to understand
Dignity. Nice analysis of
neg case.

2AR: Nice VOTERS;
Good analysis!

Aff was much more
responsive, had a much
more substantive case, and
won the framework and
contention level debates.

Good questions on C-Ex!

NC: More variety
of arguments -
the idea that
tears aren't responsible, so
they are not autonomous decisions
is becoming redundant.

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30
point scale with decimals. Think of
it as a grade with a 2 in front. So
a 95 or an A+ quality debater be-
comes a 29.5.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX
17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR |
6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

1NR: Over 1 minute left and
did not deal effectively with
his waiver in framework & his
1st contention
Don't relent to answers in
C-Ex that damage your case -
such as "abused parents
forced children"? You said
"sure"??

2NR: Repetitive need more
variety of responses.
Seems like you may need more
prepping for this topic; not
very responsive.

RAD

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Northwest Guilford NM		(0-30)	North Carolina School of Scienc...	(0-30)
Nicole Moore		<u>26</u>	Tejal Patwardhan	<u>29</u>

Winner: NCSJMTTP School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff talks about a legal standard, but this is a card about doctor asking questions. I don't see any connection to a legal standard. You need to know your ^{studies} cases & how they were conducted.

Point Scale:
Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:
Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

Neg- Strong case - much better job of upholding v + vc.


- Need to explain Gton anyway, its importance better
- good job pointing out flaws in AFF case.
- also, excellent job working to show why communication is a strategy.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Loyola Blakefield JT		(0-30)	North Carolina School of Scienc...	(0-30)
Joshua Turner		<u>25</u>	Cory You	<u>27</u>

Winner: NCSSM - CY debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF - Can was very vague - need more specifics
- Skiping spec did not apply to neg argument

Neg - Cannot argue for ~~past~~ some advertisement
Can't argue that UNO club is outdated - is the contribution then outdated? - add a better definition

- Neg - Stronger case. Weighing was better, but could be stronger.

Neg better achieves value.

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:

Speech Times: ~~6 Min Aff~~ 3 Min CX
17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR |
6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS (0-30)	NEG	POINTS (0-30)
Dallastown Area OM		Asheville CD	
Ohanna Mohammad	<u>28.7</u>	Chloe Dennison	<u>27.8</u>

Winner: DALLASTOWN AREA debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO
School/Team

Signature: *L. Willoughby*

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG NEEDS MORE EVIDENCE TO PROVE
THE RISK OF "DAMAGE TO WHOLE SOCIETY"

YOU ALSO NEED TO ADDRESS THE CRITERION
CHALLENGE - HOW CAN YOU UPHOLD
INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS/WELFARE WHEN YOU
ALLOW ANY - EVEN 1% TO BE DENIED THEIR
AUTONOMY

AFF MIDDLES THE "BAN CONVERSION THERAPY" ARGUMENT - YOU
SHOULD ARGUE THAT THIS IS NOT MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE WITH
AN AFFIRMATION

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX
17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR |
6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

2:51

Room: 208
Flight 2 Start: 4:30 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

1

Willoughby, Lisa

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Pinecrest LW		(0-30)	Henry Clay EA	(0-30)
Luke Wheeler		<u>27</u>	Emmet Allen	<u>27.3</u>

Winner: Henry Clay E.A School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Lisa Willoughby

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG.
I THINK THE WORLD YOU WANT IS COMMODIFIED
⊖ COMMODIDIZED

AFF - YOU SHOULD ASK HIM HOW A NEG BALLOT
WOULD = A REJECTION OF CAPITALISM OR
NEG LIBERALISM

I THINK YOU HAVE CONFUSED THE NEG POSITION
WHICH TO SOME EXTENT HE WANTS YOU TO DO.

PAY ATTENTION TO MY PRE-ROUND PHILOSOPHY - I BELIEVE IT IS
THE JOB OF THE NEG TO FORCE A CHOICE - I.E. TO
CLASH WITH THE AFFIRMATIVE - HE IS NOT DOING THIS, BUT
YOU NEED TO MAKE AN ISSUE OF THIS TO WIN THE BALLOT.

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		NEG	
Hendrick Hudson MG	POINTS (0 - 30)	Gilmour SW	POINTS (0 - 30)
Matt Gofman	<u>27</u>	Sebastain Williams	<u>26</u>

Winner: Aff Hendrick Hudson MG debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? N

Signature: Scott Findley

Comments & Reason for Decision: Aff framework stronger w/ context UN in a community (global). Aff context "3 what Neg context "3 strong, expected more support to break down Aff case. Religious groups are committed

UN: Rights for self, universal
 c) Morality
 c) fulfill Govt obligations
 1) Autonomy
 c) child right to express autonomy
 More autonomy for citizen
 Adults make wry decision
 c) Shows child able to make decision
 Same as adults
 2) Right to care closest of Parent's beliefs
 c) Religious groups reject care
 deaths results
 3) teens need practice making decisions
 c) free & full development
 c) ↑ responsibilities

Point Scale:
 Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:
 Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

← primarily western body → Roman's leg
 ← many failures (Rwanda) → No alternative, nothing partent
 ← only select cases → Govt only agent capable
 ← western greader
 ← Hypothetical
 → adults make bad decisions
 → allow to start to get experience
 ← Mental capacity not wisdom
 ← assertion about ideology → impx Rules ← only 1 example
 ← did not show child disagreed →
 ← context of community for autonomy → must learn ← more will die if
 ← does not show growth for autonomy
 ← more bad decisions
 → derive morality from community as a whole
 ← No better universal system
 ← sick community then allowed to die
 ← what are the moral norms
 ← need to be able to decide as individual → some autonomy

Aff: UN is the largest collaborative community →

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS (0-30)	NEG	POINTS (0-30)
Henry W. Grady GB		Cary ES	
Grace Bridges	<u>27</u>	Emily Stuelke	<u>29</u>

Winner: Cary ES Emily Stuelke debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Scott Findley

Comments & Reason for Decision: Aff supported Neg arg that adolescence brain is still developing and thus need to delay
Neg did refute Neg definition scope is Medical procedures.

Adol - young person develop into adult ✓
 self ownership → are self owners, Neg has not shown when fully developed → supports Neg arg about delaying
 - right v have access

- Neg. rights (rights against other doing something to you) ← causes more harm (A)
 - pos. rights (doc of entitlement) (B) → final stages and similar (constant not the same)

1. Must look to neg rights
 1C uphold rights ← neg better upholding rights ← adol don't have cog ability

1) Natural rights → becoming autonomous
 (B) = final stages of development ← not fully developed (C) ← supports neg
 - encourage to test skills ← should not allow when not ready to make the decision
 - dole to retire → similar, grow up decisions (D) ← not fully developed, able to make consistent rational decisions (E)

2) Promotes neg. rights ← make them harm themselves → cognitive ability to make decision
 respect for autonomy
 enough info to make decision ← still go of gut instinct (D) ← want to make decision last go of instinct, not look at options (E)
 ← adol want take outside info

intention - self directed freedom
 Medical procedures (surgery schedules in advance) (D)(risk?) (E)

1 individual welfare
 1C rationality

1) impulsive decisions (D) ← still early 20s, always developing → need to delay beyond adolescence
 c) still reaching maturity (C) (E)
 not able to make these decisions
 biological to make impulse/rational (B) →

c) psychological study to make informed decisions (A) ← happens to adults
 - preference for parents to make the decision
 - added stress

wanting to be more in charge, don't know how
 early 20's brain fully developed

Point Scale:
 Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:
 (B) Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Lovett JB		(0-30)	Thomas Jefferson HSST KV	(0-30)
James Bronsted		<u>26</u>	Kaushik Venkatesh	<u>27</u>

Winner: Thomas Jefferson KV School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

No clear distinction between frameworks when it comes to evaluating impact, and neither debater actually provided a definition of "autonomous".

The shared decision-making option seems like the best method of ensuring a good outcome while respecting the autonomy of all parties involved.

None of the evidence about adolescent autonomy is particularly compelling or conclusive, so the whole grain-imaging vs surgery issue is a wash.

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		NEG	
Thomas Jefferson HSST JG	POINTS (0-30)	Millburn AA	POINTS (0-30)
Jay Gupta	<u>29</u>	Andrew Ahn	<u>28</u>

Winner: Thomas Jefferson JG debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

No where is it made clear how community autonomy differs from respecting the value system of the patient in how they are intended to.

There is no impact to adolescents making bad or irrational decisions.

on 2A on the AC argues that bad decisions are not sufficient grounds to reject rights claims.

Allows autonomy medical choice is better for moral development and causes no harm.

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

McDowell JK

POINTS
(0-30)

26.8

Justin Karns

NEG

William G. Enloe VI

POINTS
(0-30)

25.5

Vishnu Inuganti

Winner:

McDowell JK

School/Team

debating on the

Aff

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

No

Signature:

Monty Crawford

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Justin Excellent framework construct & well presented contentions. Speech was well presented & well argued.

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

Vishnu your framework was not very developed. Stated but not warranted. your Neg construct a minute short. Need more substantive attacks on aff contentions. Not a bar chart. Need to work on organization of neg rebuttal. Try to avoid long pauses. you are much more persuasive standing up.

Aff wins framework debate. Both side value morality. Aff values util & neg values "communal autonomy". aff did an excellent & thorough job warranting the util & apply to the resolution. Neg spent little time warranting communal autonomy & aff did excellent job showing merit of neg VC flawed aff. Aff correctly state neg did not contest his aff's which flew through. Neg does not adequately state contention one which relates to competency. Argument on religious + immunities as well as child care law argument not sufficient attack. Aff attacks on neg argument strong. Neg did not fully warrant development of their argument or fully explain how communal autonomy would

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

University RMc

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27.2

NEG

Thomas Jefferson HSST VTa

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27.1

RJ McIntyre

Vishal Tandale

Winner: University RMc debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RJ + contentions. Good defunctal choices. Interesting contentions. Good 40 sec left in off speech. Good job not coming on cross arguments. Good job they arguments in 1AR but they were up there and need 4 min but left 50 sec on clock. Real more in depth a body on NEG content. More in depth support of yours. Many arguments very variants.

Vishal I prefer clash on value contentions over just conceding 10VC. + only 1 day contentions but debate. Contentions by conceding no case were well presented, well warranted & interesting. Very good job.

Point Scale:
Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:
Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

Aff wins framework debate. Aff red framework of U=Sex is total welfare & U= minimum adolescent health. Neg concedes framework, later attempt to claim it equals util. but affirmably argues somewhat different. She is only one to look into conceded VVC. Aff argument that child abuse 14 year old can make informed decisions in hospital. Defusion of adolescent as 14-18 not challenged. Aff response to neg Pre Frontal Cortex argument well founded. Neg concedes PF not developed to 25 but cannot explain why 24 year old can make decisions but 14 cannot. We can put 3 neg is good but aff response that covering parts elsewhere & disallow 15 well-founded + neg does not show me it is sufficiently different than neg. Water plan is exclusive but does lean somewhat off but not enough to carry.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Asheville LB

Lizzie Berlin

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28.5

NEG

University AG

Andrew Gilmore

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29.5

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

Signature: Irene Kuo

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF did not address one contention of neg
AFF did not uphold value with enough
substance.

NEG framework was stronger; addressed all
AFF contentions and ARs.

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS (0 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (0 - 30)
McDowell DS		Pinecrest CO	
Dan Song	<u>28.5</u>	Caroline O'Connor	<u>28.0</u>

Winner: McDowell DS School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
Signature: Irene Kuo

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG did not substantiate contentions!
AFF provided examples to support contentions

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

~~KIA~~ Kyle
 122 170

1

Kallathi, Diva

~~Berman, Mira~~

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Cary KM

Kyle Morgenstein

POINTS
(0-30)

29

NEG

McDowell AL

Alex Laufer

POINTS
(0-30)

28

Winner: Cary KM School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

neg -> AC -

1) more justification on why upholding queer rights = moral (but links are good)

2) ~~talk as to what~~ you said queer body = underrepresented as something justifying

3) you could have but morality is ~~subjective~~ better

4) you shouldn't have "conceded" ~~justification~~

Voters
 1) authenticity doesn't engage

*since CP was alt. you should have hit the NC first

- more justification as to why ~~bioethics~~ bioethics need broader context

- I would have addressed ~~reality~~ more you only hit solvency and autonomy bad on your NR for ~~the most part~~

- address us ~~but~~ about LD needing to have social ~~change~~

- didn't buy that in ~~that~~ you have to do whatever we where's

justification. didn't address adolescents w/o families.

address violation of parental autonomy better
 voters drama
 3) immoral.

Point Scale:
 Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:
 Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

- CP dropped
 - didn't address trans family link

- didn't address identity is needed for community

bad theory

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

North Carolina School of Scienc...

POINTS
(0 - 30)

26

Lizzy Yang

NEG

St James DK

POINTS

(0 - 30)

25

Daniel Kim

Winner:

~~NCSSM~~ NCSSM Lizzy Yang

debating on the

Aff

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? _____

School/Team

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

framework set up autonomy of thought - but harder on autonomy of body and link into resolution. beyond "resonance of body"

- misinterprets the autonomy thing again w/ saying parents have all autonomy

* justify your cards
* don't rely on rhetoric and twisting argument - create clash

- tell me why justice + morality are the same.

- don't waste time explaining that you're going to attack her this is clear.

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

* justify your cards don't just read them

'I have a card that says liberty only applies to adults' - 10-11. yeah ok why but the filter words.

- if the argument falls the evidence falls. * work on substantive debate + clash!

Voters
Boil down to M vs Just. just is upheld autonomy still exists

- dropped Aff's CR + O3
- didn't tell me why, despite autonomy existing medical autonomy had to be taken away at end.

- didn't address objectification

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Cary GJ

Grace Jin

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

NEG

Loyola Blakefield JM

Jack Morton

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Winner: GRACE JIN School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF presented a stronger value proposition and framework
NEG's ideas were not clearly organized and
needs to provide a stronger rebuttal to key
contention points. AFF was able to
counter better on the key claims

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

North Carolina School of Scienc...

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Stella Wang

29

NEG

Lovett JM

POINTS
(0 - 30)

John Marco Miele

28

Winner: STELLA WANG School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff presented a stronger framework. NEG quoted a lot of data points, however was not effective with key rebuttal. In a specific instance, NEG challenged the Aff claim on being very specific with the abortion issue, however the same ^{specific} issue was used in the TORO argument.

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

used 2:21

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

2 min left

AFF

Loyola Blakefield JH

POINTS
(0-30)

27

John Huebler

NEG

Cary HJ

POINTS
(0-30)

25

Henna Judge

Winner:

John Huebler

School/Team

debating on the

AFF

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? _____

Signature:

Tiffany Dacheux

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

You get a little jumbled in your words at times and this seems to cost you valuable time (in 1AR, you ran out of time to fully address all of her points!)

Why is Harvard so great? (It probably is, but you only tell us that its well-regarded and not the credentials of the directors of the study, the breadth/depth of the study, etc.)

if time) Tell her we can't use courts since
a) patient could be dead; b) pushes liability on Dr; and/or c) assumes that Dr. will always recognize this discrepancy.

NEG

Don't let AFF steal your CX - he's trying to cut your points off (and he did) - tell/ask him to stop, and hold him to it.

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

I'm wondering WHY you waited until NR to lay out your data/studies... evidence is good, but ill-placed.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

-AFF does well to point out this mistake.

Your attempt to disprove/refute his framework is a good try, but we'll need more substance to give it weight.

What are the special benefits that kids have that can be lost if granted autonomy?

This could be an interesting point

His points on patient involving aiding treatment all deal with scenarios applicable only to adults! Tell him this, investigate reasons why the results might be different for kids.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS (0 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (0 - 30)
Providence SK		Thomas Jefferson HSST SKo	
Sanjana Kapur	<u>27</u>	Shivam Kollur	<u>26</u>

Winner: Providence SK debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Ty Stuelke

Comments & Reason for Decision:

It was clear to me that both sides agreed that the main voting issue was whether or not adolescents were rational agents. In the end I found the arguments and evidence from the AFF to be more convincing. AFF focused on the study of 46 subjects, while Neg focused on Neuroscience. The Neg did not provide evidence as to what degree an underdeveloped prefrontal cortex would impact decision making, while the aff's study showed tangible results.

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		NEG	
Pinecrest MW	POINTS	Dallastown Area ND	POINTS
	(0-30)		(0-30)
Matthew Wheeler	<u>28</u>	Nicholas Dolinger	<u>27</u>

Winner: Pinecrest MW School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Ty Struelke

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I felt that the Neg presented a stronger framework, so my decision was made based on who better upheld it. While the card regarding individuals not wanting a choice was strong, the AFF presented the case that 2/3 of people could choose to let the doctor make the decision and that thus preserves the wishes of the remaining 1/3 of the population. This point stands not due to the intrinsic value of autonomy, but because it allows for a larger majority to be satisfied.

Point Scale:

Please rate the debaters using a 30 point scale with decimals. Think of it as a grade with a 2 in front. So a 95 or an A+ quality debater becomes a 29.5.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.