

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Lovett JB

James Bronsted

POINTS

(0-30)

27

NEG

Henry W. Grady GB

Grace Bridges

POINTS

(0-30)

26.5

Winner: JAMES BRONSTED / LOVETT SB debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

① Good strong debate, good arguments.

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.

AFF

- ① loud and clear presentation.
- ② good argument on parents withholding medical int from kids
- ③ good defense in initial cross examination
- ④ Very organized.
- ⑤ Good point about when life is on the line.
- ⑥ Your spreading was not very clear.

NEG

- ① good questioning
- ② loud and clear presentation
- ③ Very few evidences, references to research studies.
- ④ Could not elaborate the details on the research mentioned (2012).
- ⑤ You did not take up issues with decision taken when life is on the line.
- ⑥ Your defense was weak.
- ⑦ Your arguments had very strong emotional appeal.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>	<b>NEG</b>		<b>POINTS</b>
Henry W. Grady WT		(0 - 30)	Pinecrest MW		(0 - 30)
Will Taft		<u>29</u>	Matthew Wheeler		<u>26</u>

Winner: Will Taft School/Team \_\_\_\_\_ debating on the aff Side (Aff or Neg) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature: [Signature] Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I have chosen to affirm. the resolution. The aff. provided a key observation in the affirmative world. Aff. proves his world doesn't mean unchecked, but the respect to think. Opp. (Neg) doesn't ever truly clash or negate this establishment

**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: 5 Min AFF | 3 Min OX | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min OX | 4 Min AFF | 5 Min RR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

Aff \* Excellent questioning!  
 Free speech in response to U9/11 example  
 got opp. to admit limitations w/ life and death.  
 You had to shift your weight back & forth between your feet. Find a comfortable stance

Neg \* Use your question time! you had 40 seconds left to ask questions.  
 \* Strong body language. Your stance & gestures are very presidential.  
 \* You used 3:30 of your prep. I encourage a debater to always use full prep time even if it is just to breathe!

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>	<b>NEG</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
University AG		(0-30)	North Carolina School of Scienc...	(0-30)
Andrew Gilmore		<u>28</u>	Stella Wang	<u>28</u>

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**AFF:** Good constructive based on classical philosophy. Cross X weakly defended. Gave an opening on self-harm. Cross X attack was well done and highlighted the speculative nature of the role of peer pressure in medical decisions. Strong rebuttal on point about argument hanging on free will; i.e. how can it be maximized as a criterion if it is deduced.

**NEG:** Great opening constructive and good Cross X of AFF case. Good catch on questio. of self-harm. Question the argument that peer pressure is a) worse than parental override or b) relevant to medical decisions. Your VC demands a maximization of free will. If so, wouldn't an adolescent medical decision influenced by peers have more free will than the decision being made by parents? - That's the case right there.

**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 value criteria simply doesn't carry.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

	1.40 r		2:36 r
AFF		NEG	
T Jefferson KV	POINTS (0 - 30)	Cary GJ	POINTS (0 - 30)
Kaushik Venkatesh	<u>28</u>	Grace Jin	<u>27</u>

Winner: T Jefferson KV School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Tiffany Dacheux

Comments & Reason for Decision:

## AFF

Good delivery and poise  
Your CX questions were very good (seemed pointed in the right direction) and were also interesting.

I think you did well at linking her framework and yours together in such a way as to show that her contentions are points for you.

- wise choice to focus only on rational adolescents - not sure why she brought up the issue of mentally disabled teens versus competent teens

The AFF's stipulation that only rational teens be given autonomous choice allows him to claim Judicial Bypass as a solution for his side as well.

He can thus sidestep those teens who make poor choices, and carries the round.

## NEG

- Your point about parental influence (Contention 1b) is a very good one, and probably the most important issue to consider in a real world, BUT there is one issue I can't get past → kids (and adults) may defer to their parents (or other ppl they love) but, as you said, they choose to do this for their own reasons (to prevent tension, to show respect, etc.). This still constitutes a calculated choice on the part of the teen, ~~and it's not a choice~~

- Essentially, it is what they want, right?

- Your explanation of Judicial Basis means kids get the healthcare they want - they may need an adult / judge / etc to make this come to fruition, but ~~you~~ the process doesn't mean the adult helps choose

- He/she determines the rationality of the kid, but not the actual outcome of the decision making once the choice is given to her/him.

### 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.

One contradiction → if all teens are underdeveloped and thus incapable of making decisions (you said this a lot) how can some be determined to be rational through Judicial Bypass? Clarify your language here to make a stronger case.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>		<b>NEG</b>		<b>POINTS</b>
Millburn AA		(0-30)		St James DK		(0-30)
Andrew Ahn		<u>29</u>		Daniel Kim		<u>26</u>

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

Signature: Patris O. Jessee

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- 1) On ~~your~~ technique, your execution of the round was superb, especially ~~in~~ your demand for more analysis & internal warrants from your opponent's cards
- 2) I would have loved a bit more clash about where parents' rights over their children's care (if indeed these rights exist) begin and where they end.

NEG

- 3) Make sure you can readily justify the specific application of your cards to the resolution as your opponent's claim that your cards apply more to children rather than to adolescents went unanswered.
- 4) Your attacks on AFF's C2 + C3 relied too heavily on a presumed optimism of parental wisdom in the care of their children. Parents may indeed want the best for their children, but given the highly specialized field of medicine, they may resist the best medical science has to offer for a whole host of reasons, wrongly thinking they are doing what is best.

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.

AFF wins for reasons 1, 3, & 4.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Marriotts Ridge YL		(0-30)	North Carolina School of Scienc...	(0-30)
Yixuan Liu		<u>30</u>	Tejal Patwardhan	<u>29.5</u>

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

Signature: Brandon Sweeney

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- I love the uniqueness in your case
- You held your own when being questioned
- Nice CX questions. I like the train of thought occurring
- I think you can make the Hartman argument analytical so that you don't need evidence.
- Strong arguments against the community values.

NEG

- Good CX questions
- Your arguments are risky, and I think your opponent is really finding the holes.
- ZUR was much better w/ explanations
- Good strategy w/ definition debate, but you could prioritize else where
- Expand on the autonomy of unborn child. Strong 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 | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

Both  
Love the intensity in CX but keep it ~~other~~ civil

RFD: I vote aff due to the arguments against the community. If I don't agree w/ a groups beliefs, they shouldn't have a say. If there were limits clearly placed, I think the interdependence argument could have helped. Overall, excellent debate

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Northwest Gullford HR	(0-30)	Gilmour SW	(0-30)
Holden Ruch	<u>28.5</u>	Sebastain Williams	<u>29</u>

Winner: Gilmour SW debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Prca. Aff's responses to Neg FV are inadequate. Ultimately, while the Neg case is extremely suspect and I would have voted on Aff theory fairly easily due to Neg running a kritik plus traditional ML, Aff doesn't do a good enough job of telling me how to handle the situation.

**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

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>		<b>NEG</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
William G. Enloe VI		(0 - 30)		Pinecrest MS	(0 - 30)
Vishnu Inuganti		<u>27.5</u>		Michael Speiser	<u>28</u>

Winner: PINECREST MS School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: *Lisa Willoughby*

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF FAILS TO CHALLENGE NEG OBSERVATION THAT HE HAS BURDEN TO SHOW NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ADOLESCENT & ADULT -

**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.

ABSENT A DEFENSE OF JUSTICE AS

**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.

A RESOLUTIONAL VALUE, YOUR 2AR INTRODUCTION OF INJUSTICE AND DEHUMANIZATION AS WEIGHING MECHANISMS PROVES INSUFFICIENT

CHALLENGE THE NEG'S SEEMINGLY CIRCULAR INTERPRETATION OF THE PAGET "ADULTHOOD" IF NEG IS CORRECT THIS LEAVES NO GROUND FOR THE AFFIRMATIVE TO DEBATE




# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>		<b>NEG</b>		<b>POINTS</b>
Boca Raton Community OL		(0 - 30)		Hendrick Hudson MG		(0 - 30)
Omar Lopera		<u>27</u>		Matt Gofman		<u>28</u>

Winner: MATT GOFMAN School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

It was not very clear for me to understand Aff's opening speech. Unfortunately his computer did not work and he had to read the case from his phone - the resulting confusion may have caused it.

Also no evidence was presented by Aff in support of his opening arguments. NEG was able to show strong evidence and effectively made strong counter arguments to Aff's contentions. Aff dropped response to key value criteria of NEG and several other key issues. In rebuttal AR, Aff presented new evidence which is not relevant.

**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	NEG	POINTS
Marriotts Ridge QC		(0-30)	Cary HJ	(0-30)
Quinn Crawford		<u>29</u>	Henna Judge	<u>28</u>

Winner: Marriotts Ridge QC School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Ty Stuelke

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The warrants for the aff framework were not attacked, so today's round was judged under the affirmative framework. The affirmative case linked into this framework and provided relevant cards to support his case, so the win goes to affirmative.

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.

## Advice

Aff - it is generally better to attack the logic of your opponents argument than it is to try to disprove the validity of cards. You did both, but I felt you spent too much time on the sources themselves.

Neg - if a constructive spends over 3 minutes on a framework, it should be clear that it needs to be directly and thoroughly addressed. By not adequately rebutting the Aff Framework you lost a lot of ground from the start.

Overall this was a great round!

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>		<b>NEG</b>		<b>POINTS</b>
Pinecrest CO		(0-30)		Dallastown Area ND		(0-30)
Caroline O'Connor		<u>29</u>		Nicholas Dolinger		<u>27</u>

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

Slow down - I didn't really like the speed but you were very clear

Name your contention instead of just giving 5 justifications

Good CX responses + questions - really nailed down on his case

Good eye contact

Nice 1AR, you did a good job bringing up points on your side that he dropped & making attacks on his case which is difficult.

Argument against criterion was good

agree Neg can't link into values

Neg

Good CX

Eye contact during speech & CX

For me, your case was too focused on framework that could've been described in 30 sec.

That said, your attack on her framework was very thought out.

Didn't really buy the argument about making doctors make all decisions

Really good NRs - should've spent more time addressing her specific points earlier in the round

Voters - I was looking for something more contention level along w/ framework but all you gave me to vote off of was 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 | 4 Min Prep.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Boca Raton Community BF	(0-30)	North Carolina School of Scienc...	(0-30)
Burke Findley	<u>29.1</u>	Lizzy Yang	<u>29.0</u>

Winner: BOCA RATON BF School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: *William Caugherty*

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Delivering  
pace was brisk, but  
certainly comprehensible

case

excellent!

Interesting CO on risky  
behavior angle

**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.

**AFD**  
In the opinion of the judge, this was a fairly "even" debate. The critical issue was certainly identified by both debaters, as who maximizes benefit and whether or not giving autonomy mitigates risky behavior, or if it leads to it. I was convinced, only narrowly, by a preponderance of the evidence that granting autonomy lead to better decision making. The 2AR was organized well enough on the question of evidence to convince me.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>	<b>NEG</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
<b>McDowell DS</b>		<b>(0-30)</b>	<b>University IP</b>	<b>(0-30)</b>
Dan Song		<u>27.4</u>	Isaiah Paik	<u>28.8</u>

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

Signature: Monty Crawford

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Dan** Very good off constructive. Good setup of value criteria & excellent contention. In cross you should be prepared to say why you value morality. Also need to be stronger in response to cross. Excellent job on 1AR response to value & my contention but you run out of time before you could read off contentions. Manage time better. Also work on calming down some when give speech. Excellent rebuttal but need to work on presentation.

**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.

**Isiah** Excellent, excellent cross-examination. At cross rebutted my construct as well. I like the confusion on UK, excellent job in controlling response to cross as well. Would have liked to have seen more of a response to unelaborated on my speech / 1FF 25 tech. Well organized, presented & argued on my rebuttal.

**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** won value criteria debate. In cross aff unable to show why we should value morality & how we define autonomy & off den and implicit attack on my criteria on confusionism of primary welfare. Neg content in story to her have a bright line line on. Neg argument presented arguments & comparison were more persuasive. While aff is right that we should have done more on story that is not enough to outweigh my benefit & other arguments. Neg argument that off contentions on autonomy not sufficient to overcome clearly some age when autonomy consent = decision. I agreed that contentions 2 on off value of consent 2 on neg. Neg also more persuasive in presentation by far.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Loyola Blakefield JH

POINTS  
(0-30)

28.5

John Huebler

NEG

McDowell AL

POINTS  
(0-30)

28.4

Alex Laufer

Winner: Loyola JH - John Huebler debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

John Outstanding off construction. I liked the virtue ethics off contention that argument & presentation was excellent. Make sure you have a better description of virtue ethics for your Excellent IAR. Watch the some who have more time to address my case (although the work the time spent on my case by neg). Arguments were powerful to write my + would have been even better if you more time to them. Need to work on organizing your 2AR better as 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.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 17 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR1 | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

Alex I do not agree that virtue ethics is an absolute rule or criterion. I think virtue ethics is just standard choice among values. Be careful when dealing with it. I would like to have seen more time spent on my case. The time spent on my case is almost all by const. an officer. I failed to show for nothing anyone should be prepared to answer how many people in your counter-study. You have an excellent speech style.

I vote for aff on the virtue/VC debate. Aff offer moral/Virtue ethics + my offer moral. I maintain my integrity commentarian. No argument virtue ethics is a subjective. I need this against virtue ethics as a legit moral criterion. I don't vote solely on this but find virtue ethics fine & agree that my was prepared to respond. Aff is correct in saying argy that my fails to address by warrants of virtue ethics. Aff attack on common law will fail. Aff show common law suffer from some problem alleged by neg. Aff arguments on bad commentaries & different moralities are well taken. Don't mention legal my down aff study only but 96 people but does not have of 96 but + as aff point out, does not say show my enough on how my in his study. Aff point on delay on moral principles currently cover my concerns. Aff did not open to single my constitution but today off framework and aff way on balance on that framework

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>	<b>NEG</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
<b>Lovett JM</b>		(0 - 30)	<b>Dallastown Area OM</b>	(0 - 30)
John Marco Miele		<u>28</u>	Ohanna Mohammad	<u>27</u>

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

Signature: Angeline Morales

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF wins framework debate — delinks NEG's Util → Morality value structure ; wins SDM — not-Neg — exclusive 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.

AFF

try not raising your voice during cross ; don't try speaking over your opponent  
→ your questions / answers are cogent, a calm delivery will only enhance that.  
good speech organization  
went through opponents case thoroughly

NEG

• good diction; pace  
• work on cross-ex responses, you get a little flustered  
• cross-check philosophies for contradictions  
• Util is hard to justify as a VC for Morality, consider changing your value structure

Great debate for both of you

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>		<b>NEG</b>		<b>POINTS</b>
<b>Charlotte Catholic MM</b>		(0 - 30)		<b>Thomas Jefferson HSST AC</b>		(0 - 30)
Marissa Muller		<u>26</u>		Allen Cheng		<u>27</u> <i>27 LB</i>

Winner: Thomas Jefferson AC debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

You had 3 minutes left in the AC, try to use all of your time

The affirmative ultimately fails to demonstrate why showing that adolescents can choose automatically means they are autonomous. Choice without impact is still choice but it prevents the pursuit of interests and moral goods. Without that there is no compelling reason to vote aff because adolescents won't be autonomous.

**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

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>		<b>NEG</b>		<b>POINTS</b>
<b>Asheville CD</b>		(0-30)		<b>Loyola Blakefield JT</b>		(0-30)
Chloe Dennison		<u>28</u>		Joshua Turner		<u>26</u>

Winner: Asheville CD School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AC  
 Social Relationships.  
 Not required to prove  
 court case.  
 V. Justice  
 VC. Protection of  
 individual rights  
 I. override preferences  
 Dont identify w/  
 same religion.  
 High likelihood  
 of survival.  
 Bi: Bad medical care  
 due to no disclosure  
 In No disclosure is  
 better  
 Good at the choices  
 Not possible  
 reciprocity of  
 healthcare  
 Intentionality in  
 approach

There is neither first nor solvency  
in Lincoln-Douglas debate.

The AC does not commit the is-ought  
fallacy or the strawman fallacy. Actually,  
the NG is closer to is-ought than  
the AC.

The Aff only needs to prove a general principle, not a universal  
law.

Shared decision making remains Aff ground because the  
adolescent makes the final decision.

If adolescents under their parents are comparable to African-Americans  
in the Jim Crow South, isn't that a bad thing?

The CP doesn't clash with the Aff, and the  
neg never shows that the AC is either impractical or 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 | 14 Min Prep.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>		<b>NEG</b>		<b>POINTS</b>
Pinecrest LW		(0 - 30)		Asheville LB		(0 - 30)
Luke Wheeler		<u>26</u>		Lizzie Berlin		<u>28</u>

Winner: Asheville LB debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
 School/Team  
 Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: Good presentation of framework and VC/value in Aff Constr.

Weak Con - ex. focus on your contention as well, but let us listen to rebuttal.

Rebuttal is based on adolescents can consult their parents.

People who will human will outweigh the ones who rebel.

while argument of buy told what to do change them as a person is good but doesn't flow with your 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 | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

Neg Good attack on opponent's contentions.

In cases where privacy and liberty of minors is violated the system allows for it to be protected. - Not Rebutted by opponent.

95% - 5% -> not contended by opponent.

Att. rebutted the consult part. / Why would he need the attorney.

Reason: Both ~~press~~ Aff and Neg were even on framework, but it came down to who best defended their contentions in lieu of their framework. Aff had a weak case but didn't tie his argument well. Neg wins this round

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF  
Loyola Blakefield CG

POINTS  
(0-30)

29.5

NEG  
Northwest Guilford NM

POINTS  
(0-30)

29

Chris Garliss

Nicole Moore

Winner: Chris Garliss debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: Good work on Freedom/VC and framework self-expression, and for the "person" is key for your case. I think you need to force the issue around this more.

Exact age for autonomy. / Is Consultly a adolescent real autonomy good cross-ex of Neg. / ~~Get~~ Response to cards by opponent. Respectfully adolescents for who they are. You missed the point of ~~aff~~ making sure you force the issue of autonomy ~~shouldn't be~~ <sup>restricted</sup> ~~alluded to it~~ <sup>you</sup> ~~ok~~.

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 cross-ex → Is Gay-deconversion ~~as~~ a medical choice. Autonomy needs to be restricted? Good attack on baseline framework of the opponent. Good work on negating the evidence and dropping contention 3 (Gay-deconversion) of the opponent. Since you had contended that you win if you prove autonomy needs to be restricted in your opponent's framework, the decision will come down to that in a judge's mind even after adding up objective points.

REASON: The Aff wins this round because of work on framework and contentions. The Neg however could not sufficiently prove that autonomy needs to be restricted even in the framework of morality and rationality. ~~The~~ ~~you~~ Neg needs to ~~make off~~ ~~concede~~ to address contention 1 and Contention 2 and ~~lost~~ the opportunity of having one of them dropped.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		NEG	
Cary KM	POINTS (0 - 30)	Henry Clay EA	POINTS (0 - 30)
Kyle Morgenstein	<u>29</u>	Emmet Allen	<u>28</u>

Winner: Cary KM / Kyle Morgenstein debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Logan R

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Kyle: <sup>1</sup> AC was very good/strategically structured.

↳ I would work on making arguments for why debate should be restricted.

② Observations are unaccounted for

③ Role of Ballot could've been extended better.

④ DMtg you really did a moment of silence

Emmet: ② Work on explaining why he can't defend 1 case.

③ Question strat: Why not just engage with Trans debate?

④ Underview drop crucial; I don't think you should've let it be.

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 Underview: I look to inclusion society excludes.
- ② Dehumanization warrants in AC dropped
- ③ NC fails to fight the singular case ~~argument~~ <sup>argument</sup> not sufficient,
- ④ Shared Consent preempted by O2

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS (0-30)	NEG	POINTS (0-30)
Providence SK	<u>28</u>	University RMc	<u>27</u>
Sanjana Kapur		RJ McIntyre	

Winner: Providence SK (Sanjana Kapur) debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

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:
- ① I buy the analysis that behavioral studies are better than brain studies
  - ② Autonomy Precedents go extended with no offense
  - ③ Neg never demonstrates a clear societal affirming harm to regulation.
  - ④ Garfield evidence trumps NE cont 1

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Loyola Blakefield JM	(0-30)	McDowell JK	(0-30)
Jack Morton	<u>26</u>	Justin Karns	<u>24</u>

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

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

INTERESTING POINT, GIVEN THAT MANY  
IN THE-BASED PHILOSOPHERS SEE THE  
COMMUNITY AS THE CENTRAL OF VIRTUE  
DEVELOPMENT INTO A VIRTUOUS INDIVIDUAL  
(NVI)

**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.

~~AFF successfully showed the importance of virtue~~  
Both sides agreed on the value of morality  
② AFF showed the central importance of developing the capacity to be virtuous to morality. NEG failed to respond to his arguments that community values can violate morality and that individuals ought to go against those norms when they do so.  
③ AFF showed that adolescents have the necessary competence to make their own decisions and that the best way for them to be virtuous is through practice.  
AFF wins

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>		<b>NEG</b>		<b>POINTS</b>
<b>University KL</b>		<b>(0 - 30)</b>		<b>Loyola Blakefield AB</b>		<b>(0 - 30)</b>
Karchen Lhatoo		<u>28</u>		Aidan Bissell-Siders		<u>28</u>

Winner: Aidan Bissell-Siders Loyola Blakefield debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Ian Miller

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Oral critique given*

**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)
Cary PM		Thomas Jefferson HSST JG	
Patrick Mulqueen	<u>29</u>	Jay Gupta	<u>29.5</u>

Winner: Thomas Jefferson HSST JG debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Exceptional debate, but the choice came down to the integration of evidence. The NEG handled his and the AFF's evidence with unparalleled finesse.

**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

Upper Arlington HW

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

27

Henry Wu

NEG

William G. Enloe WS

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

18

William Song

Winner: William G. ENLOE WS School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: James Lewis

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CLOSE ROUND. NEG wins because AFF  
never really answered his argument  
that moral development is a long term  
process and that adolescents need  
to be protected against themselves in  
order to become fully developed moral  
actors.

**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

Ardrey Kell GD

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

30

Gayathri Das

NEG

Cary ES

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

27

Emily Stuelke

Winner: Ardrey Kell School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The AFF had stronger evidence for her value criterion in this match up. Both debaters had strong constructive statements, but the limited ~~focus~~ <sup>insight</sup> the NEG demonstrated with her definitions allowed the AFF to outshine her during cross and the rebuttals.

**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

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>	<b>NEG</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
Marriotts Ridge DK		(0 - 30)	Thomas Jefferson HSST VTa	(0 - 30)
Divya Kapoor		<u>28</u>	Vishal Tandale	<u>28</u>

Winner: Marriotts Ridge DK debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team  
Signature: Mia Berman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg should add in Framework justifications

Aff should add in more weighing/reasons to prefer evidence

I Affirm because the Aff wins the framework and argument that just because decisions aren't read doesn't mean they aren't autonomous

**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

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>		<b>NEG</b>		<b>POINTS</b>
Myers Park SP		(0 - 30)		TJefferson SKo		(0 - 30)
Seungmin Park		<u>28</u>		Shivam Kollur		<u>27.5</u>

Winner: TJefferson SKo debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win?   
School/Team  
Signature: Mia B

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Negate on K  
- Good try Aff w/ K response! Ask more in CX about it in future  
- Neg if you're going to run a K, commit + don't bite in

**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.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS (0 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (0 - 30)
Henry W. Grady CD		North Carolina School of Scienc...	
Conor Downey	<u>29.5</u>	Cory You	<u>27</u>

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

Signature: Ian E Miller

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*oral critique given*

**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.