

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS (0 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (0 - 30)
Northwest Guilford NM		McDowell DS	
Nicole Moore	<u>28.5</u>	Dan Song	<u>29</u>

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

Signature: *Andrew for*

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg established stronger connection between implications of resolution and their pertinence to neg value/VC.  
Discussion of autonomy through social contract theory lens really sold it plus some superior points extending through the flow (such as the acting impulsively despite adolescents knowing better point). Neg argument proved more relevant to scope of resolution implications holistically.

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)
TJefferson SKo	<u>29</u>	University AG	<u>28</u>
Shivam Kollur		Andrew Gilmore	

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

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 Role of the Ballot
- ② Clifford → Post Fiat
- ③ Incremental changes some.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS (0 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (0 - 30)
Dallastown Area ND		Upper Arlington HW	
Nicholas Dolinger	<u>29</u>	Henry Wu	<u>28.5</u>

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very good values debate from 2 very capable speakers. Ultimately the decision came down to the argument that holistically + rhetorically better addressed the resolution - though mostly theory-oriented in nature (which at times was superior, and seriously, Henry, excellent job), neg's premise / V of care didn't hold in practice like aff's virtue ethics did in the 1/2AR. Ideally situational and theoretical evidence/discussion play into strong rebuttal and from where I sat, aff's case presented a stronger orientation w/ each.

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
Pinecrest MS		(0 - 30)	T Jefferson KV	(0 - 30)
Michael Speiser		<u>27</u>	Kaushik Venkatesh	<u>26</u>

Winner: ~~Jefferson KV~~ Pinecrest MS debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Linda M. Leuty-Greever

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Good debate. Aff won due to supporting his own criterion and values throughout the round.*

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  
*You did a unique approach and would have been even better if you just ~~slow~~ spoke a little slower in the very beginning so the judge could totally absorb ~~the~~ your message. Speaking was very good.*

Neg  
*Very good speaking you did a good job but I felt that you did not completely convince me about your issues over his.*

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
University IP		(0 - 30)	Henry W. Grady CD	(0 - 30)
Isaiah Paik		<u>26</u>	Conor Downey	<u>27</u>

Winner: Henry W. Grady CD debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Linda Grever

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Good Debate. Both sides did well. Decision was based on the definition of agent. AFF accepted neg's definition which did not really support AFF 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 | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

AFF

Neg

Really good speaking skills. If you disagree with a definition you need to redefined the definition. Did a great job autonomy and defending ~~this~~ this point.

Good point about cannot generalize a small study with a single ethnic group and all same sex to ~~the~~ all adolescents.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

<b>AFF</b>		<b>POINTS</b>	<b>NEG</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
North Carolina School of Scienc...		(0 - 30)	William G. Enloe VI	(0 - 30)
Stella Wang		<u>28</u>	Vishnu Inuganti	<u>28</u>

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

Signature: Nathan Arrington

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff won ~~made~~ warrants of argument on psych card due to medical context, winning the rationality argument and solving for right through framework as well as showing impact

**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

• 5:30 time, no can build on case, perhaps flourish more the autonomy framework.

• Case could benefit from hard data on negative impacts of risky behavior to give weight to societal impact argument  
• Attack on opp VC that Kant was ind rights and she needs to use a collectivist ideology on group welfare doesn't make sense because protecting

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

NEG

TJefferson AC

POINTS

(0-30)

Boca Raton Community OL

POINTS

(0-30)

Allen Cheng

28

Omar Lopera

27

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

Signature: Nathan Arrington

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Aff had more reasonable framework for ethical evaluation.*

**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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better aff framework makes it easy to understand but hard to write down all necessary points of framework</li> <li>• AR2 attacks could have been more direct</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neg case does not effectively state how status quo in current legal settings makes an ethical question or call for a newly established right invalid</li> <li>• Basing contractarian ethics off existing law just doesn't seem to address ethics of case</li> </ul>

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
TJefferson VTa		(0-30)	Pincrest LW	(0-30)
Vishal Tandale		<u>27</u>	Luke Wheeler	<u>25</u>

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG  
 You slur your words quite a lot when you speak; making it difficult to understand you.  
 You only used 2:30 of your 2NR. Its difficult to agree that you dont have time to address all of his arguments when you dont use half of your time.

The aff better establish both that privacy is the prominent value and that he meets the standard set for utilitarianism.

Adolescents are capable of making beneficial decisions and even if they dont use it, privacy rights should be protected.

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

AFF	POINTS (0 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (0 - 30)
Pinecrest MW		University KL	
Matthew Wheeler	<u>26</u>	Karchen Lhatoo	<u>29</u>

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

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg wins the value debate after arguing autonomy is merely a means to an end and receiving no response. As a result, the only relevant argument is the Negative contention 2, stating that ~~Aff~~ would result in cultural conflict. Aff's C1 and C2 are made irrelevant due to failure to answer Negative's objections. Ultimately, Aff did not successfully attack the NC or defend their own positions.

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

AFF

William G. Enloe WS

POINTS

(0-30)

William Song

26

NEG

Cary KM

POINTS

(0-30)

Kyle Morgenstein

27.5

Winner: KYLE MORGENSTEIN / Cary KM 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:

**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.

- ① Respect & human dignity - value.   
 Good, loud and clear presentation.
- ② Good arguments on stigma for mental patients.
- ③ You brought the issue of vaccination, this is not a adolescent issue.
- ④ Your arguments were not responding to your opponents ideas.
- ⑤ Your argument were very philosophical, theoretical without support of data.
- ⑥ Your ideas were not substantive.

- ① Good presentation - loud & clear.   
 good
- ② Societal welfare -> value.
- ③ You had lot of ideas on implementation of your idea.
- ④ good arguments counter arguments of each points of your opponent.
- ⑤ You extended the debate platform by bringing new ideas.
- ⑥ You need to bring in more evidence to your arguments.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS (0-30)	NEG	POINTS (0-30)
Henry W. Grady GB	<u>28</u>	Cary PM	<u>27</u>
Grace Bridges		Patrick Mulqueen	

Winner: Henry W. Grady GB debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team

Signature: Mia Berman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff wins FW and is the only one that links in.

More evidence comparison please!  
~~aff~~ ;)

**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

Asheville LB

Lizzie Berlin

POINTS

(0-30)

27.5

NEG

Boca Raton Community BF

Burke Findley

POINTS

(0-30)

28

Winner:

Boca Raton Community BF

School/Team

debating on the

neg

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Mia R

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Negate off the Aff  
Don't give up!  
Evidence comparison :-)

**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

Hendrick Hudson MG

POINTS

(0-30)

Matt Gofman

27

NEG

Ardrey Kell GD

POINTS

(0-30)

Gayathri Das

30

Winner: Ardrey Kell GD School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Laura Cabana

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

Really strong presentation — good eye contact  
 Interesting case — different from the other  
 AFF's I've heard

Good CX — Questions picked apart her case  
 Once you address values on one side of  
 the flow don't go over it again — IAR is  
 too smart for that — end was rushed

Too fast for me

Neg

- Good CX questions — ~~strong~~
- Formal assessment is an interesting idea
- Case was well organized & unique
- Good job answering his CX questions — you stood your ground well
- Really good 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 | 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
Henry Clay EA		(0 - 30)	Marriotts Ridge YL	(0 - 30)
Emmett Allen		<u>28</u>	Yixuan Liu	<u>30</u>

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

Signature: Laura Cabana

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

- Interesting case - never heard the drug argument
- Humanity valued b/c it's a preveg....
- 1AR really didn't address negative side of the flow - watch your timing
- Lots of defense w/ very little offense - spent a lot of time being preemptively defensive

Neg

- Good CX - very intense
- Nice nailing down on the drug argument & values
- Strong NC - doctors making final decisions is interesting
- Great NR - clearly went down the flow, easy to follow, comprehensive voters, stressed important points

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>
Gilmour SW		(0 - 30)	Loyola Blakefield JH	(0 - 30)
Sebastain Williams		<u>29.5</u>	John Huebler	<u>29.3</u>

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

Signature: Wm Caugherty

Comments & Reason for Decision:

de 1. min

case

cx rebuttal

int  
very organized  
1AR, especially on  
the attacks on communitarianism

very interesting  
CX on both  
AFF & NEG  
CAS  
communitarianism

response to Q31  
was thoughtful  
on point of DOLS violated  
an tony any how

**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

In the opinion of the judge this was a very interesting debate. ultimately, I vote AFF, I believe the NEG did not adequately deal with AFF points on oppression of the individual and the tactical mistake of dropping AFF contention 2 was harmful as well.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

T Jefferson JG

POINTS

(0-30) 29.6

Jay Gupta

~~29.6~~

NEG

Loyola Blakefield JM

POINTS

(0-30)

Jack Morton

29.5

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

Signature: William Caugherty

Comments & Reason for Decision:

de'iving:

case:

ex' rebuttal:  
watch time on NE

I appreciated  
the civility  
of tone in  
this 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.

**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

In the opinion of the judge this was a philosophically interesting round. I liked the unanced level of debate. Even though the NEG did a fine job of making the framework debate thoughtful, I did ultimately think that the Jeharch witness example was contradictory, and also believe NEG dropped a number of important arguments. I vote AFF



# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

NEG

~~2:00~~

Cary HJ

2:00

POINTS  
(0-30)

28

Charlotte Catholic MM

POINTS  
(0-30)

Marissa Muller

27

Henna Judge

Winner: Cary HJ

School/Team

debating on the

Aff

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

Yes

Signature: Marissa Muller

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~  
- explain the responsibility but more b/c you were both unclear as to what kinds of responsibility

oral

- DON'T let her go off on tangents during cross

critique

**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 1-3 Min CX | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 3 Min 2AR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

contention / extended  
weak justification

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Loyola Blakefield JT

POINTS  
(0-30)

Joshua Turner

31.90

29

NEG

Millburn AA

1:30

POINTS  
(0-30)

Andrew Ahn

30

Winner: Millburn AA School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NS

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

why does  
- I-law link into morality  
- let your opponent ask 's in cross.  
- if you're running I-law be consistent  
- credibility of source doesn't show be why moral esp b/c you didn't say why credible.

you didn't ask death what happens if there's no compromise reached, but it's fine  
- your framework assumption was weak  
you literally just said "I'm doing the right thing"  
- your little catchphrases are funny

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)	Lovett JB	(0-30)
Alex Laufer	<u>29</u>	James Bronsted	<del>28</del> <u>27</u>

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG was not able to articulate his views clearly in the rebuttal rounds. Aff presented a stronger framework and NEG was not able to offer an effective counterplan and address key framework ideas raised in Aff's case like confidentiality and right to bodily integrity. Aff addressed an effective rebuttal to NEG, had clearer views and offered a crisp summary.

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: 8 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

Loyola Blakefield AB

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

26

Aidan Bissell-Siders

NEG

Henry W. Grady WT

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

28

Will Taft

Winner: Henry W. Grady WT debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? N

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF  
Talky first. hard to flow. Lot of words for a very basic argument. Diminishes the value of argument. I had asked you to tell me if you are spready. I am not sure you want the opponent to use a counter evidence against your study that has a small sample size. Here you might be playing into his hands. Good come back on - cross-ex! Nice work on attacks. Neg content. Vis-avis yours, but weak support of your own 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 | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

NEG: Good cross-ex! Good speaks. Flow in the back. Basic utilitarian framework. Good content and point the distinction of evidence of capabilities between adults and children in the context of medical decision. Making rash decisions earlier can devalue future autonomy. You have provided evidence that emotional part of the brain is well developed. Evidence in NR.

REASONS: Both upheld their simple frameworks well. Both had evidence supporting their claims. But the Neg's contentions were better supported by the framework and the Neg did a good job including Aff's argument in his own. By virtue of somewhat closely superior arguments. ad-better response points. speaker

I have to award NEG

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Cary GJ	(0 - 30)	Lovett JM	(0 - 30)
Grace Jin	<u>29.5</u>	John Marco Miele	<u>29</u>

Winner: Cary School Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature: Irene Kuo

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both AFF and NEG were very well-prepared and delivered well-organized frameworks.  
AFF provided better supporting information for own framework and points against NEG's framework.  
NEG did not address all parts of 2<sup>nd</sup> contention of AFF and ~~failed to~~ conceded AFF's defns and one key point that countered the NEG 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.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS (0-30)	NEG	POINTS (0-30)
University RMc		Marriotts Ridge QC	
RJ McIntyre	<u>29</u>	Quinn Crawford	<u>29.5</u>

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

Signature: Irene Kuo

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both sides provided well-spoken deliveries. NEG provided a better-researched and supportable framework. In AFF's concession of NEG's defn of adolescent, supporting information was not comprehensive enough. Also, AFF conceded NEG's first contention which was in direct conflict with the AFF 1st contention.

**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>
<b>St James DK</b>		(0 - 30)		<b>Northwest Guilford HR</b>		(0 - 30)
Daniel Kim		<u>26</u>		Holden Ruch		<u>29</u>

Winner: Northwest Guilford HR debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: James Lewis

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CLEAR NEG WIN

- 1) NEG showed the unrealistic/unworkable Aff's interpretation of KANT is
- 2) NEG effectively show how brain science shows that adolescents can't ~~not~~ meet the standards for rational thought
- 3) NEG shows the moral relevance of scientific evidence of the limitations of the adolescent brain.

**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>
North Carolina School of Scienc...		(0-30)		Pinecrest CO		(0-30)
Cory You		<u>26</u>		Caroline O'Connor		<u>27</u>
Winner: <u>North Carolina School of Science CX</u>		debating on the <u>AFF</u>		Low point win? <u>YES</u>		
School/Team		Side (Aff or Neg)				
Signature: <u>James Lewis</u>						

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: YOU WENT ALMOST 2:30 IN YOUR 1AR W/OUT ADDRESSING THE CENTRAL CLAIMS DESPITE OF THE ROUND. ~~W/OUT~~ HIS HINDERS YOUR EFFECTIVENESS AND MAKES YOU MUCH MUCH LESS PERSUASIVE. ~~W/OUT~~ THAN FOCUSING

**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.

This was one of those rounds which makes you wonder if debate is good for smart, bookish kids. Rather than engaging in substantive discussion they are capable of they lost themselves in the world of extensions, turns and evidence babbles. NEG was the better debater but failed to answer some key framework ~~arguments~~ → therefore losing the round.

AFF rightly sensed that this debate came down to framework. Because NEG never answered AFF's claim that our rights/autonomy derive from a larger societal context RATHER than the family AND refused to grapple with the very real existence of bad families/bad communities AFF wins.



# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Cary ES

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29

NEG

Marriotts Ridge DK

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

Emily Stuelke

Divya Kapoor

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

Signature: Marcia Long

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Both very articulate - best round yet!*

*AC: I like the "Cassandra" anecdote; you have 45 seconds left - link back more to the social context: "minorities don't think differently than normal people" is a little offensive and not necessarily true.*

*NC: I like the Relational Autonomy argument, but I would prefer some clarity on the cases when the adolescent does not agree w/ parents, a clinician.*

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.

*1AR: Nice analysis of her advocacy and emphasis on the "final say"*

*1NR: I like Neussbaum & your analysis of evidence*

*2NR: "Final Say" is not a new argument, lol @ You say the Aff is a very "messy model," but the neg seems messier. More impact as to the harms "absolute" autonomy*

*Did not persuade me that "absolute" means "No discussion & that is how we interpret the word."*  
*This Round is coming down to a definitional debate over what it means to be autonomous - does it mean just giving input or does it mean having the final say?*

*The biggest clash is the UC on caring autonomy, Even though relational autonomy is the UC on caring autonomy, Aff could link just as well!*

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

North Carolina School of Scienc...

POINTS

(0 - 30)

Lizzy Yang

29

NEG

Asheville CD

POINTS

(0 - 30)

Chloe Dennison

28

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

Signature: Marcia L

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AC: Solid case; not sure if you'd ever have time to extend the dozens of warrants you provide in the framework.

NC: solid case; Good rebutt against second contention by mentioning "split second" decisions in medical arena, but how prevalent are they? Dropped quite a bit in framework; Need a stronger response to contradictory idea in cont. #1 of Aff.

**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.

1AC: Yes, she dropped a lot of warrants but you should clarify the impact made; Nice analysis about her experienced points, especially of grand parents & vaccine - smart.

JAK: Framework allots not exactly responsive to her warrants. Nice coverage, but very fast - little too hectic - did not really get to crystallize a clear wrap.

2AC: Better crystallization of major points of Clash-off w/ the framework & her 1st & 2nd contentions stand. RFD

Good Round!!  
Neg is very articulate as well!

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
North Carolina School of Scienc...	(0 - 30)	Providence SK	(0 - 30)
Tejal Patwardhan	<u>29</u>	Sanjana Kapur	<u>27</u>

Winner: North Carolina School of Science debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: Angeline Morales

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF wins both framework and contention-level debates.

- AFF does not advocate for adolescents to cut off parents and/or alternate guidance, only that they have final say
- NEG does not respond to the kids without parents impact, relies on unwarranted assumption of universal parental beneficence
- Morality ≠ Justice
- NEG did not link Util framework to contentions
- AFF concisely refuted NEG's NC while effectively defending her own 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 | 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
	(0-30)		(0-30)
McDowell JK		Myers Park SP	
Justin Karns	<u>30</u>	Seungmin Park	<u>29</u>

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

Signature: Brandon Sweeney

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- Remember to slow down on author's names.
- Excellent case reading
- You asked good questions. Try to push him more
- o Fantastic IAR
  - o you extended and made impacts, which is great!
  - o nice job using CX against him
- When young voters tell me where on the flow to cross apply

NEG

- o Nice train of thought on CX
- o I think you apply gov's role really well.
- I understood your speech very well (4NC)
- o Solid 2NR!

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 NEG because he is able to show a greater loss of lives in regard to affirming. IF a child rejects treatment, they are more likely to harm themselves. Also, the idea that we can force vaccines and achieve the same consequential benefits. AFF needs to strengthen the links of his C2 + C3 to saving lives. IF AFF weighs those arguments more, he would have had it.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

<b>AFF</b>		<b>NEG</b>	
Dallastown Area OM	POINTS (0 - 30)	Loyola Blakefield CG	POINTS (0 - 30)
Ohanna Mohammad	<u>28</u>	Chris Garliss	<u>27</u>

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

Signature: Brandon Sweeney

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- Very interesting case!
- Still unclear about the domination piece
- I thought you were on the offense during the framework debate, but you did not make as strong of arguments against his case.
- You dropped C3. That was a good argument (Ok you do this in the 2AR. It needs to be in the 1AR)

NEG

I am honestly confused about what you are arguing for with communitarianism. If you talk about influences but what is the linkage. Why do I negate?

- Thank you for trying to state your author's names. I missed some but that was my fault and it didn't harm you.

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.

I vote AFF because the benefits in the AC are better upheld. I am missing the linkage between the community and the Neg arguments.