

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Loyola Blakefield AB

Aidan Bissell-Siders

POINTS
(0 - 30)

30

NEG

Hendrick Hudson MG

Matt Gofman

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Winner: Loyola Blakefield AB

School/Team

debating on the

AFF

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

No

Signature: Brandon Sweeney

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- Some explanations could be shortened to save time and become more clear.
- Defended yourself in CX excellently
- I enjoyed your warrants for autonomy
- Slow down on Tags, authors, and impacts. Speed otherwise was fine!
- Nice questroning! I loved the train of thought occurring
- Overall strong arguments on 1AR, some needed more explanation

NEG

• Awesome CX questions!

~~• Solid IJR~~

- Solid IJR

- You avoid answer his questions a little too much. I know you don't want to set yourself up, but it makes you look bad.

- Don't just stop your speech. You had a whole minute left, which could've been used for voters

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: I vote AFF because he does a clever job of weighing the arguments. Both sides were extremely strong in their warrants. Neg did not provide voters, which hurt him in the short term.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Thomas Jefferson HSST VTa		(0 - 30)	William G. Enloe WS	(0 - 30)
Vishal Tandale		<u>27</u>	William Song	<u>28</u>

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

Signature: Patricia Cloud

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff's case was based on the assumption that autonomy is the vital ingredient to an adolescent making good decisions medically for themselves.

Neg essentially asked the question just because they can make those decisions should they? The answer was no.

Aff repeatedly told us that adolescents have a right to privacy and autonomy and that in studies they could make good decisions. Neg rebutted w/ that what about impulsivity and irrationality and he also brought up that the adolescent brain is not fully formed.

Aff never fully proved why the aff world would be right. Neg proved that there are very many detrimental outcomes from adolescents not being guided in decision making by adults.

Both debaters argued well.
Aff spread way too much on aff construct

Bring more to the table of Why adolescent decision making in medical decision will be good long term. Neg showed that bad decisions can have lasting impacts.

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

Henry Clay EA

Emmet Allen

POINTS
(0-30)

28

NEG

Lovett JB

James Bronsted

POINTS
(0-30)

26.5

Winner: Emmet Allen Henry Clay School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Patricia Cloud

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff kept up his point that a large portion of humanity is the power one has to choose what is valuable. He stood by his value and even when neg tried to diminish it he returned and emphasized.

Neg gave an interesting counter plan and although he said it would take care of the problem Aff shot his argument down solidly. Thus winning the debate.

Both spoke well. Aff don't get rattled. Stay on point.

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

Pinecrest MS

Michael Speiser

POINTS

(0-30)

29.5

NEG

Thomas Jefferson HSST JG

Jay Gupta

POINTS

(0-30)

29

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very complicated round, oral k,
ultimately, Neg agrees to value
of morality, but concedes AC
arguments that morality must
come through individual subjectivity.

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.

Because Neg agrees on value and doesn't clearly articulate why theory education comes first, Neg fails to meet agreed-upon standard.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Thomas Jefferson HSST KV

POINTS

(0-30)

29

NEG

Pinecrest LW

POINTS

(0-30)

28.5

Kaushik Venkatesh

Luke Wheeler

HSST KV

Aff

Winner:

School/Team

debating on the

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? _____

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg drops virtually all of the AC; I think they were blindsided and totally didn't get. AC, while mildly critical, was clear, straightforward, and self-consistent.

Neg needs to work on understanding and answering critical arguments. Neg also can't make brand new kritiks/theory in the NR.

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

Cary HJ

Henna Judge

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Myers Park SP

Seungmin Park

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Winner: Myers Park SP School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Nathan Arrington

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg showed that competency exists among both groups and that protection of rights isn't needed if group is not being oppressed

- VC protection of rights was
- parents reach same conclusion
- safeguards already in place for neglect
- undue burden legally on parents stands

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

Neg

- Do structural barriers conflict with autonomy i.e. parents can make same court reputation as a medical physician?
- Vaccination is early childhood but reputation that small things could still go to court still stands

- If autonomy does not require informed consent for a choice, how is withholding info immoral or unethical, since the infringement on a person's right to use that info in the choice is what is being infringed upon?
- Death rate stat is real world but also separate from med decisions, so her study seemed more directly applicable, even if in a controlled environment

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		NEG	
North Carolina School of Scienc...	POINTS (0 - 30)	Ardrey Kell GD	POINTS (0 - 30)
Cory You	<u>28</u>	Gayathri Das	<u>27</u>

Winner: NC School Science Math CY debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Nathan Arrington

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff upheld rational autonomy in mind and proved through medical cards that ~~children~~ adolescents are rational in a medical context giving reason to make exception

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


Neg

- Mentioned inspiring studies in medical context, but doesn't tie econometrics evidence, despite bolstering behavior argument, lack medical context, or is the relationship tw drinking and smoking that context?
- Neg framework lays gaining ability ~~through~~ through testing as not defaulting on adolescent having a right

- Counterplan provided good defence but made it hard to side w/ your points when no offense struck that ~~children~~ adolescents are not rational when comparing neuro study to behavioral medical study

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Asheville CD		(0-30)	University RMc	(0-30)
Chloe Dennison		29.5	RJ McIntyre	29.5
Winner:	University RMc		debating on the	Neg
	School/Team			Side (Aff or Neg)
	Signature: 			Low point win? Very close

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: Cogent argument. weak responses to cross-ex. Enforce framework more. Shouldn't give weapons for opponents. NE
 Good challenge on ~~exp~~ definition of experience
 weak response on framework initially, but good comeback on rebuttal. Ben

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.

NEG: good cross-ex touchy upon important points

Response to experience. You should have said living cortex exposes to larger set of things. You mentioned Rivet, ~~too~~ but missed in rebuttal.
 Good response to ~~recount~~ order not taking a long line.

Reason: This came down to how well each supported their framework. and how they challenged the opponent's contention
 This is a very close debate, but I am awarding to Neg primarily because he better supported his framework and his contention of experience and scientific argument of - underdeveloped cortex went much alleged.
AFF should not feel bad about losing.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF
Marriotts Ridge YL
Yixuan Liu

POINTS
(0 - 30)
29

NEG
Loyola Blakefield JH
John Huebler

POINTS
(0 - 30)
27

Winner: Marriotts Ridge YL debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: Good flow and contentions. Nice response to cronex without getting cornered. Key is response to autonomy is impossible. Very good cronex. Attacky hypotheticals vs real, but messy the "ought" part of resolution, you lose some points here. Good responses to attack of autonomy being a flawed value and also point out that all contentions were not addressed.

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.

Neg: Good cronex. good attack on value criteria of autonomy. Main content: Autonomy is impossible, even if exists is in context of Neg framework. Not a good response to cronex, but brings "ought" was great. Very muddled response to uphold your framework. Community overruling value over autonomy is flawed as was your opponent's response.

Need to use your prep time wisely. You shouldn't give out too many ends to tie for the AFF, because AFF gets to close. Can do little better with organizing thought.

Reason: This came down to framework and who best ties the contentions together to uphold it. The AFF upheld framework best and tied the her argument best in AR. Go Responses to contentions are better.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF
Charlotte Catholic MM
Marissa Muller

POINTS
(0 - 30)
27

NEG
Henry W. Grady WT
Will Taft

POINTS
(0 - 30)
30

Winner: Henry Grady WT School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Brandon Sweeney

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- Make your case ~~longer~~ longer
- You have an interesting way of arguing the resolution, but you lack offense
- He took over your CX by reading evidence. Take control!
- Your 1AR had good arguments, but your main point hinders you
- Good logic but you need stronger arguments.

NEG

- Excellent questions. You are on the right track
- Beautiful rebuttal
- Try not to jump around but you did sign post
- Excellent QNR

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.

RFD! On the basis of brain development, Neg tells me a better story of the negative consequences of too much autonomy. AFF's response isn't strong enough to deter me from this point. Also, AFF's interp is avoiding the debate, giving Neg all of the ground to attack.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
St James DK		(0 - 30)	Upper Arlington HW	(0 - 30)
Daniel Kim		<u>27</u>	Henry Wu	<u>29</u>

Winner: Upper Arlington HW debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team
Signature: Mia B

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Oral

- vote on Ethic of care Ne
- Neg also proves morally relevant distinction

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	NEG	POINTS
University IP		(0 - 30)	North Carolina School of Scienc...	(0 - 30)
Isaiah Paik		<u>28</u>	Stella Wang	<u>28</u>

Winner: University IP debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team
 Signature: Mia Berman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

ORAL
 - vote on the NC FW, AFF weighing peer pressure vs no free will at all

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.

6, 7, 4, 1, 6, 3, 5

6, 3, 7, 3, 6, 3

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Loyola Blakefield CG

Chris Garliss

POINTS

(0 - 30)

26.5

NEG

University KL

Karchen Lhatoo

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28.5

Winner: KAR CHEN LHATOO / UNIVERSITY School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Vivek Baraya

Comments & Reason for Decision:

General: You both were respectful to each other.

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.

Aff

- (i) Loud and clear - good!
- (ii) good argument on personal space.
- (iii) Did not provide much research studies or examples.
- (iv) Your defense on cross examination needed to be stronger.
- (v) You should have been more forceful and pointed in cross examination.
- (vi) You gave up on your time in cross examination.
- (vii) good argument on morality being a higher value than communal happiness.

Neg.

- (i) Good cross examination.
- (ii) Simple and good arguments on cigarettes and alcohol.
- (iii) good value: communal happiness.
- (iv) well, clearly spoken arguments.
- (v) good backup defense: on judicial overturn of extreme decision.
- (vi) good quotes, well done research.
- (vii) You listened to the ~~cross~~ your opponent arguments well, so were issues. well prepared.
- (viii) good evasion of the cross examination.
- (ix) good summary to end your argument.

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

William G. Enloe VI

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

NEG

Northwest Guilford NM

POINTS

(0 - 30)

26.5

Vishnu Inuganti

Nicole Moore

Winner: Vishnu Inuganti / William G. Enloe debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

general: very close debate.

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.

AFF

NEG

- ① No eye contact. You were reading to yourself, not to audience
- ② Good data.
- ③ ⑪ You were not in control of your subject compared to your opponent.
- ④ good cross examination, you had data to backup your cross examination points
- ⑤ Good cross examination on scientific evidence of Neurological Science.
- ⑥ You were able to close the argument better than your opponent.

- ① Good cross examination
- ② You listened to the arguments well.
- ③ Good argument on already having restriction on autonomy.
- ④ You could not defend the argument on 76 combination of studies.
- ⑤ You got annoyed when you were cross examined.

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		NEG	POINTS
Northwest Gullford HR		(0-30)		Cary KM	(0-30)
Holden Ruch		<u>29</u>		Kyle Morgenstein	<u>29</u>

Winner: Cary KM School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Low Bin

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The round comes down to the issue of privilege vs right
and what the affirmative needs to uphold.
Evaluate ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~round~~ ^{round} in terms of harms
and benefits to social welfare.

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.

The definitions the negative provides are better
sourced and more clearly articulate the distinction
between privileges and rights.

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.

The abuse argument is new in the 2AR.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS		NEG		POINTS
North Carolina School of Scienc...		(0 - 30)		McDowell JK		(0 - 30)
Tejal Patwardhan		<u>27</u>		Justin Karns		<u>25</u>

Winner: North Carolina School of Science debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: RW JP

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The negative case is mostly theoretical and rooted in assumptions about western practices, and so is unable to address the problems exposed by the affirmative. Only the aff has the capacity to at least begin to solve the massive human crisis of child abuse etc.

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		NEG		POINTS
Boca Raton Community BF		(0 - 30)		Cary GJ		(0 - 30)
Burke Findley		<u>27</u>		Grace Jin		<u>29</u>

Winner: Cary GJ debating on the neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
 School/Team _____ Signature: Kenneth VJZ

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff Similar frameworks neg
 Cmt. morality vs justice

Neg. deconstructs Aff's arguments

very effectively. Adolescents make risky decisions.

Neg. rebuts Aff's subpts very well
 breaks aff's link to value/citation

Aff became difficult to understand in second speech - had a difficult time defending subpoint C.

NR has a good pt. about primacy of physical well-being - Aff's argument for autonomy hurts physical well-being

Excellent pt - medical autonomy hurts adolescent. Other autonomys are OK. 'not a right but a privilege

Neg - Great eye contact, Elocution, and Use of Hands

Fun Debate to Watch!

Why do adolescents engage in risk-taking activities?

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	NEG	POINTS
McDowell AL		(0 - 30)	Marriotts Ridge DK	(0 - 30)
Alex Laufer		<u>29</u>	Divya Kapoor	<u>28</u>

Winner: McDowell AL School/Team debating on the Pos Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature]

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

① Framework Extension in AC (kernel (?) specifically)

② CZ on AC → Decisions shape Identity

③ Intermediate → end goal for society, NC does concede

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS		NEG		POINTS
Thomas Jefferson HSST SKo		(0-30)		North Carolina School of Scienc...		(0-30)
Shivam Kollur		<u>29</u>		Lizzy Yang		<u>29</u>

Winner: Thomas Jefferson School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - Said I didn't like speed — work on judge adaptation. Some of your words were kind of swirred/hard to understand. Good CX.
Good 1AR - solid, nice eye contact.

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.

Neg - Have prewritten CX questions. I could see where you were headed but you could make more of an impact if you knew exactly what you were going to say.
Roadmap during your first speech - didn't know where you were on the flow at some points in your speech. I wouldn't do an overview for NR
When you say "he drops my point...." and don't tell me where it is I don't know where to write it.

Absolute autonomy

I think I got what you were trying to say about absolute autonomy not being realistic —> It took you a while to explain it though. Too much time was spent on this idea. Abs, your criterion is max autonomy so it seems like you could easily want the same amount of autonomy as your opp.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

1:30

AFF

NEG

Cary ES

Marriotts Ridge QC

Emily Stuelke

Quinn Crawford

POINTS
(0 - 30)

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

30

Winner:

Marriotts Ridge QC

debating on the

Neg

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

Yes

Signature: _____

[Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- find a definition that works for you b/c not 10-19 for adolescents
- dont let him waste your cross et time w/ rambling after clarification questions
- Hit him on the well - shouldn't look to ~~well~~ age.

~~that into~~ why is it bad that you can't ~~escape~~ escape social contract.

adolescents can survive w/ no parental permission btw.

why does that matter?

- Voters
- ① Value
 - ② VC
 - ③ Competency
 - ④ Counterplan

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	
University AG	POINTS (0 - 30)	Pinecrest MW	POINTS (0 - 30)
Andrew Gilmore	<u>26</u>	Matthew Wheeler	<u>27</u>

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

Signature: Angeline Morales

Comments & Reason for Decision:

-AFF: don't cut off your opponent during cross-ex
 * remove driving analogy + "training"
 * good focus on value
 * good diction - clear
 * be careful with making assertions you can't justify

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.

-NEG:
 * good pointing out contradiction in opponents case, but don't repeat it multiple times
 * explicate your value premise more -> morality is a broad spectrum, specify a philosophy -> don't use util as your criterion, it can't really be applied universally without settling a lot of exceptions

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Loyola Blakefield JM

Jack Morton

POINTS
(0-30)

29.5

NEG

Henry W. Grady GB

Grace Bridges

POINTS
(0-30)

29

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Loyola -
I like your reasoned/ logical
defining and the development
of your FW in the AC

Grady -
- I'm not sure I buy you pushing on this idea
that an exception means we ought
not affirm. His adult rationalization is
sufficient in this explanation
- like your autonomy approach
- somewhat right and unfocused
AR

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.

U buy the aff FW and recognize the need to develop moral agents' virtues. The diggs responds that they are impulsive and prone to risk behavior as well as ~~that~~ that we have a need to protect their future selves since ~~there are~~ 2 agents 1 - medical decision making is rarely done in the same manner as social situations and 2 - there is no future self. Therefore since there is no future self to protect; the best we can do is promote the current self.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Pinecrest CO		(0-30)	Dallastown Area OM	(0-30)
Caroline O'Connor		<u>29</u>	Ohanna Mohammad	<u>28</u>

Winner: Pinecrest CO Caroline O'Connor debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Scott Findley

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1418
 Autonomy ← (A)
 - good life
 - pre req for goals
 morals
 ← can't link into agreement to Aff
 ← can't link into (abusive) → respect self
 c. medical autonomy (respecting) ← (A)
 consistency w/ minor rights to make decisions ← Aff just says Autonomy is good/interdependence ← (3)
 'child vs surgery' → Has does this link into other contentions and framework?
 Improve communication of parents & doctors ← (1)
 removes powerlessness
 Goal setting of treatments ← (2)
 Doctors opinion relevant in decision (A)
 Positive adjustments (w/ depression) (coping skills)
 High level & thoughtful by Addressee ← (6)
 (why is self determination good?)
 ← same as Aff, who best achieves
 ↓ Morality
 respect independence (public assurance)
 state defines stds
 values / good & bad
 Util
 ↓ Adol at risk individuals (6) ← all autonomous actors make bad decisions → neg missed
 (decrease has nothing to do w/ org) about ability to make a decision
 ↓ Shared decision making (1) (3) (4) ← counter plan (conditional or not) → more educated about health decisions
 decision aids (2)
 ↑ \$ savings
 good relations (4) ← Aff, act as Adol make / confirms the decision (same as Aff) [not - did not present shared 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.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Henry W. Grady CD

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Conor Downey

NEG

McDowell DS

POINTS
(0 - 30)

26

Dan Song

Winner:

Conor Downey

School/Team

debating on the

AFF

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

no

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF. interesting case - well defended -
Clearly showed right are near bus / Crit
Use humor w/ news story
(eng to self)

better
not
both
values

- please subjective.

- Showed abstract more rational than abstract -
redundant behavior

- let him answer? in CR - you kept with him off

Neg Very Confusing! You were talking too quickly and

sounded like you were hyper ventilating

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 12 Min CX
17 Min Neg 13 Min CX 14 Min 1AR 1
6 Min NR 13 Min 2AR 14 Min Prep.

N
2:35
#33

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Dallastown Area ND

Nicholas Dolinger

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.6

NEG

Asheville LB

Lizzie Berlin

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.2

Winner: DALLASTOWN ALCA ND debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG CONCEDES THAT HER "OVERRIDE" ARGUMENT ESSENTIALLY AFFIRMS THE RESOLUTION AND THE STEINBERG EVIDENCE THAT ARGUES ADOLESCENTS DO POSSESS THE CAPACITY TO MAKE DECISIONS ABOUT "INFORMED CONSENT" IN MEDICAL SITUATIONS

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 SHOULD ARGUE THAT SOCIETY GRANTING ADOLESCENTS THE AUTONOMY TO OPERATE A MOTOR VEHICLE INCURS A MUCH GREATER RISK OF INFRINGING ON THE RIGHTS OF OTHERS, THAN ANY MEDICAL PROCEDURE.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Millburn AA

Andrew Ahn

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Providence SK

Sanjana Kapur

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Winner: SANJANA KAPUR debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

School/Team

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG had a stronger framework and value proposition. NEG articulated the case well and offered a pointed rebuttal. AFF tried to base his entire argument on his opponent supposedly conceding to his primary contention which was not the case. AFF also could have strongly countered Contention #2 and 3 of his opponent which won't the case.

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

Cary PM

Patrick Mulqueen

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

NEG

Loyola Blakefield JT

Joshua Turner

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.5

Winner: _____

Cary

School/Team

debating on the _____

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? _____

Signature: _____

Irene K

Comments & Reason for Decision:

(oppose)
 Neg did not address AFF value of justice ✓
 Neg did not answer CX and missed AFF's point of justice in the question.
 AFF did not oppose Neg's 2nd contention
 Both sides had limited substance to support claims.
 Very close debate.
 AFF speaker more organized.

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	NEG	POINTS
Lovett JM		(0 - 30)	Boca Raton Community OL	(0 - 30)
John Marco Miele		<u>28</u>	Omar Lopera	<u>27</u>

Winner: Lovett JM School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: Good defense on cross-ex. Good constructive, but ya left 38 seconds on the clock - speak slower and use some emphasis - or add more content. Excellent cross-ex attack of the crux of NEG argument. Good summary from a flow standpoint - i.e. covering all the bases, but speaking style could be much more pleasant. Good isolation on medical context and addressing issue of nothing magically changes when you turn 18. Good rebuttal on utilitarianism.

NEG: I don't buy the idea that adolescents don't deserve autonomy because they are still different than adults. You are lacking warrants to support several points with respect to:

- a) flu shot example
- b) harm to child in face of negative news
- c) identity vs. decision-making

Very poorly framed attack of AFF framework and contentions. I think you are very confused about the relationship between utilitarianism & autonomy. It seems to me your whole case is hinged on just two points: 1st above about difference I don't buy at all. 2nd is that identity precludes moral basis for autonomy. Don't buy that idea at all.

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.

Decision based on better Framework, better warrants

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Gilmour SW		(0 - 30)	Thomas Jefferson HSST AC	(0 - 30)
Sebastain Williams		<u>29.5</u>	Allen Cheng	<u>28.5</u>

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff was able to uphold value of autonomy in the context of the resolution and offered substantial evidence empirically & concretely within framework to substantiate his case, while the neg did not fully explain the context of his own value & it pertained to all agents of the resolution. Aff won the debate through defense of moral agency in adolescents pertaining to individual autonomy on the whole.

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.

SW - excellent dedication to VC throughout the debate. Really showed in spread. By the time you crystallized there really wasn't a lot left to clear up. AC's point about suicide/lethargy was a good one to consider - put it into your rebuttal (or case) next time.

AC - the structure of your case was outstanding. INP was extremely well put together, but you could've saved time on the independence point by tying utilitarianism in explicitly rather than depending on VC to extend ostensibly. make the link between morality and the duty of parents to take care of their kids clear too. Lots of good points, just don't falter in execution.