

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

North Carolina School of Scienc...

POINTS

(0-30)

28

Stella Wang

NEG

Myers Park SP

POINTS

(0-30)

27

Seungmin Park

Winner: NC School of Science debating on the Aff  
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Brightline over autonomy for adolescents being  
a positive vs a negative right, won by  
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.

Room: 213  
Flight 2 Start: 3:45 PM  
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

McCuaig, John

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Loyola Blakefield JM

Jack Morton

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

28

NEG

University IP

Isaiah Paik

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

Winner:

Loyola Blakefield JM

School/Team

debating on the

Aff

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.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Upper Arlington HW

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

28.9

Henry Wu

NEG

TJefferson VTa

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

28.2

Vishal Tandale

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

Signature: *Lisa Willoughby*

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG KICKS LP - CONCEDES NO  
OTHER OFFENSE IN CX THIS LEAVES  
MEDICAL COLLISION AS ONLY ARG REALLY  
ARTICULATED IN NR - @ CLEAR ANSWER  
TO HUAN (?) AND HARTMAN'S ROSATO EVIDENCE.

**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 CONVINCES ME THAT EVEN IF SOME ADOLESCENTS  
LACK THE ABILITY TO MAKE INDEPENDENT DECISIONS, HIS  
POSITION ALLOWS "PRACTICE" TO IMPROVE MORAL DEVELOPMENT

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

NEG

McDowell JK

POINTS  
(0-30)

Cary HJ

POINTS  
(0-30)

Justin Karns

28

Henna Judge

28.3

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF ALLOWS NEG TO DISTORT THE GROUND HE MAY DEFEND AND SHE CLAIMS THE STATUS QUO AS NEG. GROUND - AFF SHOULD CHALLENGE THE "SAFEGUARDS" AND PARENTAL OVERRIDES ARGUMENT AS OUTSIDE THE RESOLUTION B/C AS AFF GROUND.

**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.

ULTIMATELY B/C AFF PROVIDES NO RESPONSE TO THE DEPENDENCY & COERCION ARGUMENTS; THE CLAIM (UNWARRANTED, BUT AFF DOESN'T POINT THIS OUT) THAT "IT IS WORSE TO EMPOWER THOSE WHO CANNOT ENGAGE IN RATIONAL DECISION-MAKING" I VOTE NEG.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

T Jefferson JG

Jay Gupta

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

26

NEG

Ardrey Kell GD

Gayathri Das

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

27

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

Signature: James Lewis

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG: THE 2ND is too late for you to respond to make new responses to the AFF case.  
AFF: you should just look to OUTLINE VI's in your 2AR. DON'T GO DOWN THE FLOW.

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.

PARENT CONSULTATION = NEW ARGUMENT

NEG WINS. WHILE AFF WON THE FRAMEWORK DEBATE, AFF PERSUASIVELY SHOWED THAT JUDGES WOULD NOT RESPECT ADOLESCENT'S RIGHTS WITHOUT THE BENEFIT OF SOME SORT OF COMPETENCE FIRST TO GUIDE THEM. AFF'S FAILURE TO COVER THE AFF SIDE OF THE FLOW AND HIS MISHANDLING OF THE 2AR <sup>lost</sup> him a round in which he had a clear advantageous view framework.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

|                     |  |               |                          |               |
|---------------------|--|---------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| <b>AFF</b>          |  | <b>POINTS</b> | <b>NEG</b>               | <b>POINTS</b> |
| <b>Pinecrest MS</b> |  | (0 - 30)      | <b>Henry W. Grady CD</b> | (0 - 30)      |
| Michael Speiser     |  | <u>26</u>     | Conor Downey             | <u>28</u>     |

Winner: Henry W Grady CD debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_  
School/Team  
 Signature: James Lewis

Comments & Reason for Decision:

An... interesting round...  
 Broke down **ACTIVITY CLEARLY**. AFF never established moral source for his advocacy (while varying morality) therefore never proving an objective/universal obligation to affirm.

**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> |
| Pinecrest LW |  | (0 - 30)      |  | Marriotts Ridge DK |  | (0 - 30)      |
| Luke Wheeler |  | <u>27</u>     |  | Divya Kapoor       |  | <u>29</u>     |

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

Signature: Brandon Sweeney

**AFF** Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Work on enunciation. Your voice drifts off.
- You seem confused on Kant and your case.
- You asked good questions!
- You are dropping arguments on your case!!
- you do make decent 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 | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

- NEG**
- Be careful with your tone during CX; you sound snobby
  - Strong arguments overall in 1AR
  - Slow down on warrants under Framework
  - Excellent voters
  - Give me more impacts w/ extensions

• I disagree that talking w/ someone means they will ignore parents

RFD: I vote Neg because the AFF does not effectively uphold his case or attack his opponent.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Asheville CD

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

29

Chloe Dennison

NEG

Henry W. Grady GB

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

28

Grace Bridges

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

Signature: Brandon Sweeney

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- \* Bring a printed copy of case
- Overall good case and nice arguments
- The Ethics question was brilliant
- I wanted you to use that more.
- Good voters

NEG

- You need to expand on your arguments more.
- I can see great ideas but they lack analysis to warrant + give impact
- Starting at her C2 in your last speech, your arguments get way stronger.
- VC is getting confusing + emphasis change!

Point Scale:

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

Speech Times:

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

Both  
Excellent in CX

Although I buy the Negative's framework, I think AFF shows the importance of developing moral agency through autonomy. The CI has stronger impacts that ~~the~~ fulfill this framework.



# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Hendrick Hudson MG

POINTS

(0-30)

29.5

Matt Gofman

NEG

Henry Clay EA

POINTS

(0-30)

29

Emmet Allen

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

Low point win? No

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

① You both are super debaters. Its very difficult for me to make a decision, so kudos to both of 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 | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

AFF

NEG

- ① Loud and clear - good point bringing UN, good reference to UN which
- ② Good point of bringing parents reject modern medicine based on religion - good reference.
- ③ good use of data ~~and~~ research & stats to defend your argument.
- ④ Too aggressive in questioning.
- ⑤ Good argument against community decision making
- ⑥ You listened your opponents arguments well.

- ① Good cross examination.
- ② Good strong arguments.
- ③ Good point of bringing ~~needed~~ <sup>anti</sup> community ~~rather~~ rather than parents alone.
- ④ ~~You were not~~
- ⑤ You had less evidence and examples.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Pinecrest MW

Matthew Wheeler

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

~~23~~ 23

NEG

Lovett JM

John Marco Miele

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

~~22.5~~ 22.5

Winner: ~~Matthew Wheeler~~ ~~Pinecrest MW~~ Matthew Wheeler/Pinecrest MW debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Vivek Baraya

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This was a pretty average debate. I suggest both of you to watch some other debaters.

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.

Neg.

Aff

- ① Initial delivery - lacking energy, examples and references.
- ② You seem to have little knowledge of your subject.

- ① good catch on ~~contradictory~~ contradictory statements of your opponent.
- ② pointed questioning.
- ③ You were offensive once during the debate.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 2 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

Boca Raton Community BF

TJefferson SKo

Burke Findley

Shivam Kollur

POINTS  
(0-30)

POINTS  
(0-30)

28

28

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Muchosky evidence is clearly extended and shows  
that adolescents can make rational choices.  
Parental autonomy may be violated through  
the proffered arguments but it assumes parents are  
paying for procedures while adolescent autonomy  
will almost be violated.

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 1.38r

NEG 1.42r

North Carolina School of Scienc... POINTS (0 - 30)

McDowell AL POINTS (0 - 30)

Cory You 28

Alex Laufer 27

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

Signature: Tiffany Dacheux

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF about dec. making

Your study is probably good - but you only tell us that it has 96 subjects and is cited 550+ times - it is just one study? Completed once or over-time?

- You do well to mention that your study is peer-reviewed - He does not mention this about the study he cites.

1st contention is decently developed - make sure your discussion of incentives is clear in the sense that you are simply using it as an example rather than suggesting the use of some incentive.

Your argument that the Status Quo discourages family communication is interesting, and perhaps compelling.

Contention 3 worked for you here, but I found it rather tenuous ~~overstated~~ - lack of access doesn't imply suicide in every case obviously, but it does lead to problems

NEG

The issue I have with your case is this:

you tell us that govt is needed to protect rights and that we must limit these rights, But you don't seem to tell us what limited govt entails, only that we should have limits.

Govts exist in the SQ, and even a dictatorship has limits of some kind (act only in best interest of ppl, right?) so is this good enough?

AFF tells us that, for example, a democracy has limits and that countries all have govts.

You tell us that Govt = protection of rights but enumeration of rights = govt ~~intervention~~ intervention. How can this live together in harmony (I concede that it can, but you don't take us there).

You also dropped his 3rd contention, and mostly his 2nd contention but tells us that your Framework would solve. —

But, how would it solve for teen suicide? "Maybe" granting autonomy could lead to govt restriction of rights, but this doesn't ~~and~~ solve automatically.

**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 KM

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

29

Kyle Morgenstein

NEG

Henry W. Grady WT

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

30

Will Taft

Winner: Will Taft HWGrady debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Patricia Cloud

Comments & Reason for Decision:

OK, you almost feel like if you don't go one way you are a bad person. Anyway, although I appreciate Aff's argument that by defending a small minority of adolescents therefore it will benefit the whole, I just don't agree that it is debating the resolution as Neg pointed out. The value of morality won over ~~agency~~ agency. Aff was not able to disprove Neg's assertion that the adolescent brain is not fully formed and capable of making rational decisions. Even though some may be homeless. Even a homeless teen can make a bad ~~rat~~ decision with an immature brain. And for Aff gender re-assignment is very permanent.

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.

I appreciate the passion Aff displayed for his argument but I don't believe he fully convinced that a rational decision can be made by a teen regarding gender reassignment. Neg proved that more time and growth and guidance is necessary.

Great job 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>Cary ES</b> |  | (0 - 30)      | <b>Dallastown Area ND</b> | (0 - 30)      |
| Emily Stuelke  |  | <u>29</u>     | Nicholas Dolinger         | <u>27</u>     |

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I have chosen to affirm the resolution. The aff. proved she better upheld the agreed VC of popular consensus w/ the ability to allow doctors to choose or individuals to make their own choices, extending rights to 3/3 of people rather than 2/3 from neg.

**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 CX | 7 Min Neg | 8 Min CX | 4 Min 2AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

Aff \* You have wonderful presence. Calm, cool, and collected!  
 \* Missed a few opportunities to call opp. out in informality in his presentation and answers to your questions.

Neg \* Calm down, you are a bundle of energy! Find a way to calm yourself!  
 \* Don't refer to your value's definition as BS, or that part of it might be BS.  
 \* You were cocky after your constructive, and I think you underestimated her a bit.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

| AFF                  | POINTS    | NEG                   | POINTS    |
|----------------------|-----------|-----------------------|-----------|
| Loyola Blakefield JT | (0 - 30)  | Charlotte Catholic MM | (0 - 30)  |
| Joshua Turner        | <u>29</u> | Marissa Muller        | <u>26</u> |

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

Signature: Scott Findley

INC 5  
 2nd

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Morality  
 Autonomy (Good life) (Self determination) (Moral frame) ← state of being strong, to distress

- 1) capotes
- 2) un rights to make determination
- 3) reason-power of mind to think

- 1) Camp Choices ← Not Medically Autonomus ①  
 No conflict, just not Medical Autonomy  
 14 Same as adults
- 2)
- 3)
- 4)

Adol some decision skills as adults - ∴ some responsibilities

Thought if they had  
 Active Resistant  
 Cognitive Theory: 18 >

- 1) Contradiction  
 Human Rights laws ②  
 Adol - person comp. of themselves  
 Rights to self determination

Minors held accountable for actions ← does not mean morally right (slavery) → reflection of moral compass at the time ③

justice ← life saving treatment & parents say No  
 2) distribution ← infringe by not respecting rights of the individuals → if parent disagrees always  
 Not Autonomus if don't make choice ← concedes autonomy, why can't make medical choices ②  
 Responsible of ones action

- 1) burden rest w/ parents ① ← does not mean make all decisions ← missing warrants
- Emotional
- Financial

∴ Adol cannot make autonomous choice → not up to the responsibility to make the choices

- 1) Must be Autonomus to make Autonomus choices ② → if in jail cannot make autonomous choices (?) ← Scope limited to medical decisions

→ needs warrants for decisions (Not missing warrants for contentions) \*

Point Scale:

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

Speech Times:

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

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Millburn AA

Andrew Ahn

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

27.9

NEG

William G. Enloe WS

William Song

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

28.5

Winner: William G. Enloe WS. debating on the neg. Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: Allison Hays

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both did well!

Aff evidence - less convincing & clear

neg. - stronger presence, a bit unprepared w/ evidence & unorganized.  
manipulated evidence

**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

Dallastown Area OM

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

28.5

Ohanna Mohammad

NEG

North Carolina School of Scienc...

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

27

Lizzy Yang

Dallastown Area OM

Winner:

School/Team

debating on the

AFF

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

Signature:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: good presentation. Interesting choice of contention of choosing to run transgender and gay population as a marginalized group effected by lack of autonomy. Risky though. Weak crosser. Nice attack on opponent's framework but did not touch open the key contention of overall good and violation of payer's rights. ~~you dropped contention 3 of the~~

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: Weak crosser, have to see how the info is used good NC, touchy on opponent's narrow contentions. Violation of parent's autonomy as they are paying for the insurance. You dropped the two main contentions. The gap between wanting to be an adult for marginalized groups. Everyone's rights are violated in some way. Majority of highschooler won't have a job. The AFF says many do and can pay. (No evidence?)

Adolescent can make rash decisions that are irrevocable. You dropped the contention 3 of your opponent, which is important to her case.

Reason: In a close debate I am awarding the round to AFF because the NEG did not address all AFF contentions. Though the NEG won her framework, the AFF was not far behind.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST


Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF  
University RMc  
RJ McIntyre

POINTS  
(0 - 30)  
27

NEG  
McDowell DS  
Dan Song

POINTS  
(0 - 30)  
27

Winner: DAN SONG debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? YES  
School/Team  
Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both debaters were average compared to some of the other rounds I have judged. They each presented in my view a weak case and were not able to really pick up on contentions effectively. It was hard to make a decision on who actually won. In the end, I picked NEG as he presented a stronger evidence and a lot of the cards he rights were dropped by his opponent.

**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 13 Min CX  
17 Min Neg 13 Min CX 14 Min 1AR  
6 Min NR 13 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> |
| <b>TJefferson AC</b> |  | ( 0 - 30 )    |  | <b>Northwest Guilford HR</b> | ( 0 - 30 )    |
| Allen Cheng          |  | <u>29</u>     |  | Holden Ruch                  | <u>29.5</u>   |

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both AFF & NEG showed overwhelming amount of maturity and civility towards each other which this judge greatly appreciated.

Both sides were well-spoken, however, the NEG provided a better organized argument both in the NC and in the NR. NEG did not have full citation available for review in support of 1 contentions and did not provide substantive support of 3rd contention. The round came down to the definition of autonomy, which was better defended by the NEG.

**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

Loyola Blakefield CG

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

28

Chris Garliss

NEG

William G. Enloe VI

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

27

Vishnu Inuganti

Winner: Loyola Blakefield CG debating on the Aff 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.

ORAL :

**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 Aff framework requires that I look to Autonomy first
- ② Mutcherson ? Status Quo Arg prove that we need full Autonomy w/ more choices
- ③ No clear impact from NC that proves lives will be save.

# 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 NM</b> |  | (0 - 30)      |
| Daniel Kim         |  | <u>27</u>     |  | Nicole Moore                 |  | <u>28</u>     |

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Effectively, this debate comes down to a clash between criteria. Which creates more harm? Restricting free agency or providing complete autonomy. How can the NEG side guarantee the cooperation in the counter plan to the status quo? NEG persuades me on least likely to cause harm b/c AFF does not provide any warrants on harmful outcome in NEG world.

**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>Marriotts Ridge YL</b> |  | <b>(0 - 30)</b> |  | <b>University KL</b> | <b>(0 - 30)</b> |
| Yixuan Liu                |  | <u>28</u>       |  | Karchen Lhatoo       | <u>27</u>       |

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Great round!

- Aff - better meets V + Ke -
- good rebuttal - <sup>judicial system</sup> ~~parents~~ only after harm
  - homeless - no medical care
  - Children - medical care based on a parent belief <sup>only</sup>

**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 - Why not legalize tobacco + alcohol was a good argument.
- Why can't ~~homeless~~ make autonomous decisions?
- No link for deadly consequences from cultural conflict (big leap)

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

|                      |  |                 |                             |                 |
|----------------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| <b>AFF</b>           |  | <b>POINTS</b>   | <b>NEG</b>                  | <b>POINTS</b>   |
| <b>University AG</b> |  | <b>(0 - 30)</b> | <b>Loyola Blakefield JH</b> | <b>(0 - 30)</b> |
| Andrew Gilmore       |  | <u>30</u>       | John Huebler                | <u>29</u>       |

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

Signature: Ty Stuelke

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This debate was very close, but my decision for the round is Aff for a couple of main reasons. Aff's C2b was not addressed, which gave Aff positive ground early on. The largest variable in my decision was with the value clash. Neg provided a strong framework with warrants as to why maintaining a healthy community is important, and these warrants were not challenged. Likewise, the Aff framework of human dignity and autonomy had strong warrants that convinced me of its legitimacy. I chose Aff because Neg showed no interest to adopt the value of human dignity while also not proving that human dignity could not co-exist within a community. Aff accepts that community is important, but acknowledges that a community where individual rights do not exist is not desirable. Neg would have stood much stronger if he proved either that individualism would definitely destabilize society or that individualism can exist within certain bounds, and that medical choices were outside of said bounds.

**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.

Overall this was a fantastic debate!

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

**AFF**  
**Loyola Blakefield AB**  
Aidan Bissell-Siders

**POINTS**  
(0 - 30)  
29.50

**NEG**  
**North Carolina School of Scienc...**  
Tejal Patwardhan

**POINTS**  
(0 - 30)  
29.80

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both speakers were extremely eloquent and presented their arguments competently. (Rate of speech was somewhat fast and some points were lost i.e. not heard clearly).

Community + Collaboration did not prove why autonomy was wrong clearly.

Autonomy did acknowledge the need for some collaboration but was not quite clear.

Both speakers made their points somewhat exotrially.

Both speakers need to

- ① decrease rate of speech
- ② make points clearer + more concisely
- ③ Be more precise in rebuttal.

**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> |
| Boca Raton Community OL | (0-30)        | Asheville LB  | (0-30)        |
| Omar Lopera             | 28.2          | Lizzie Berlin | 28.5          |

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

Signature: Monty Crawford

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Omar interesting offensive case. Work on enunciation as I had trouble understanding you more than I should have. Slowing down some will help that. At least slow down when giving contention tags so I can get them down. Good job on IAR & reconstruct case but you left neg little time to address neg case, need to watch allocation of time. I'm sure that 5 year old reason makes it hard to follow your argument through.

**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.

Lizzie Good work. Excelled neg construct. Try to work to avoid long pauses. Would also like to see more development of your values & criteria. P.S. you were analog not the lat drive.

Aff presents a depiction of adolescent that is inherent ability to reason but neg in court & around shows no way to limit that as aff says 5 year old can reason no way to determine or limit acting on aff. Neg also correctly shows that there are negative external consequences from medical decisions (vaccines etc). Aff needs to show under his framework that adolescent has full mental capacity & does not do so - rather accept a reasony standard but then neg does not address several by neg counterexamples. Neg comes round

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Cary PM

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

28.0

Patrick Mulqueen

NEG

Lovett JB

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

28.2

James Bronsted

Winner:

Lovett JB

School/Team

debating on the

Neg

Side (Aff/ Neg)

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

Signature:

Monty Crawford

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Patrick would prefer to see more development on value / criteria + link in  
your off case. Need to give more time on my case  
on common knowledge. in IAR, wct time issues.

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.

Lovett - James, excellent my constructive, good job on sub my constructive & rebuttal well organized presented

Reasons for vote neg. Aff offers justice & promotes welfare of Adol. Society but they  
argue on values to warrant & endorse well taken. Neg does good job of linking  
moral & commentarian to resolution & warrants. I do accept my  
value / VC. Aff fails to attend fully to & commentarian to my contention & my  
concern me my contention stand. Neg attacks on off contention grounds  
of arbitrariness & lack of support also well taken. Neg argued that consequences  
invoiced commentarian well taken as well.

# FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

NEG

Cary GJ

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

Pinecrest CO

POINTS  
(0 - 30)

Grace Jin

29.5

Caroline O'Connor

28.7

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

Signature: Allison Hays

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both did an excellent job!

Aff. presented very convincing  
"evidence", <sup>very</sup> well-argued,  
enunciated, nice ~~speech~~ rhythm

Neg. great argument, well-argued  
but less organized, not backed  
w/ much evidence

**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

T Jefferson KV

Kaushik Venkatesh

POINTS

(0-30)

28.5

NEG

Marriotts Ridge QC

Quinn Crawford

POINTS

(0-30)

28.5

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

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Mia Berman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I Affirm on the K  
CP almost won but in the end still  
ageist b/c only applies to kids

**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

Providence SK

Sanjana Kapur

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Gilmour SW

Sebastain Williams

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29.5

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

Signature: Mia B

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Negate on the Ableism K  
- be careful of saying "normal," neg - also collapse to K  
- Aff - push in CX harder about Ableism and ROB

**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.