

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Myers Park SP

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

NEG

Cary ES

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

Seungmin Park

Emily Stuelke

Winner: EMILY STUECKE / CARY debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Vivek Baraya

Comments & Reason for Decision:

good and positive 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.

- ① good examples
- ④ Absolute parental authority - good argument.
- ⑤ Good arguments overall.
- ⑦ Good pointed cross questioning.
- ⑩ good example on tying that adults also can make irrational decision
- ⑫ You listened to the opponent's arguments well.
- ⑬ Good cross examination
- ⑭ Well prepared.
- ⑮ You listened to your opponent arguments very effectively.
- ⑯ Good difference between medical procedure and medical choices.
- ⑰ Good value criteria - rationality.
- ⑱ good point of ability to constantly able to make right decisions.
- ⑲ Good point separating ~~abuse~~ autonomy on medical decisions and other rights.

Room: Trailer 7
Flight 1 Start: 6:00 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

6

Berman, Mia

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

McDowell DS

Dan Song

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27.5

NEG

Cary GJ

Grace Jin

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

Winner:

Cary GJ

School/Team

debating on the

Neg

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? _____

Signature:

Mia Berman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I regret b/c parents influence violators out
- be careful w/ the transgender args.

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: Trailer 7
Flight 2 Start: 6:00 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

6

Berman, Mia

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Henry W. Grady WT

Will Taft

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28.5

NEG

Marriotts Ridge YL

Yixuan Liu

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28.5

Winner: Marriotts Ridge YL debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win?
School/Team
Signature: Mia B

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.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

McDowell AL

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Alex Laufer

NEG

University AG

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27.5

Andrew Gilmore

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff makes persuasive and intuitive argument as to why I should evaluate the morality by intent and means. Negative spends too much time on an elaborate framework debate rather than continuing his questioning of the Aff's implementation in the NR, leading to the Aff winning the mature minor rule 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 | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Henry W. Grady CD

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29.5

Conor Downey

NEG

T Jefferson KV

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

Kaushik Venkatesh

Winner:

Henry Grady CD

School/Team

debating on the

Aff

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

No

Signature:

Monty Crawford

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Conor Loved the aff constructive. Very persuasive, well reasoned, well prepared. Outstanding. That was probably best IAR & have judged some I do not know when great job.

Point Scale:

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

Speech Times:

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

KV - Well reasoned neg, but you left little time to address aff's neg constructive. I left neg points unanswered.

Both sides value morality, aff VC is neged as ends + neg VC is preserve autonomy. There are essentially same VC although neg dia not adequately called meaning aff arg as treaty admitted or end in themselves + neg VC seems to even lean off to agree w/ aff arg of behavior over neuro science. Aff wins values + control level debates.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Cary HJ

Henna Judge

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27.5

NEG

Millburn AA

Andrew Ahn

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28.5

Winner: Millburn AA

School/Team

debating on the Neg

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? No

Signature: Monty Crawford

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Henna - I thought it was a well reasoned + interesting + persuasive off constructive. Great speaker + great style. Need more detail on 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 | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

Andrew - Try not to interrupt answers to cross questions, especially where, as here, the ~~questions~~ answers were not running long. Good response to 1982 study. The response to religion issue was missing + response to banner issue not well taken. Neg can do better. Core neg strong.

On value criteria, neg wins in showing that the issue is more than adolescent, even if adolescent is often most concerned, neg correct that other officials well as to go neg on framework. On content level, neg wins battle of studies. Neg did better job showing me why to prefer his studies. Neg showed decision maker resolve religion issue, a core argument on roads do not work also holds.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF .52

NEG 2:03

University IP

POINTS

(0 - 30)

Upper Arlington HW

POINTS

(0 - 30)

Isaiah Paik

28.5

Henry Wu

28

Winner: Isaiah Paik

School/Team

debating on the AFF

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? _____

Signature: TJ Dacheux

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~Handwritten scribbles~~

~~Handwritten scribbles~~ (Sorry for scribbles - long day! Not enough time btwn rounds!)

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.

The ~~major~~ major question of the round came to

VC - promoting autonomy versus ethics of care

- essentially, the question is do we look towards the rights of the individual first or his place in an interlocking web of relationships.

AFF argues that one must be auto. first before rel. matter

NEG suggests that rights only have meaning in a society and that ~~care~~ care is pre-req
AFF clearly defines autonomy as "sphere to set and pursue own ends w/o interfering w/ others"

- in this sense, one ~~does need~~ (does need) to be autonomous or can be autonomous prior to relationships. ~~Autonomy~~ Autonomy ~~which~~ takes place w/in a society and thus benefits those ~~related to it~~ in the society

AFF - Contention 2 Stands

Contention 1 is shaky, but stands, esp on 1b

NEG - Contention 1 was not explained well in the context of the resolution, or was perhaps gone over too quickly - it didn't resonate

Contention 2 makes sense intuitively, but you argue that involving parents can promote autonomy (how?)

Plus, AFF allows for parental involvement it just limits scope

CP is not developed enough for me - I like the concept and think it could be a winner, but ~~my use of this CP~~ over AFF. It's also

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF 2:30r

Henry Clay EA

Emmet Allen

POINTS
(0 - 30)

25.5

NEG 2r

Loyola Blakefield CG

Chris Garliss

POINTS
(0 - 30)

23

Winner: Emmet & Clay debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Tiffany Dacheux

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

AC was read a little too quickly in some places for the ~~rebuttal~~ arguments to be 100% received...

2nd Contention could be worded better → it was hard to understand where you were headed with this.

I don't know if you needed definitions for all of the terms you defined - consider which ones could make/break your case

NEG

NC delivery was halting at times, though you seemed like you knew where you wanted to be and what you meant to say.

- Your prepared section was good, but your responses afterwards almost didn't match up with the debate - it seemed like you kind of gave up!

I think your FW could work, but you let it all go - no clear responses to his attacks no coherent attacks on his points

I think Contention 2 could be a really good area to develop

AFF wins on FW and thus 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 | 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

Gilmour SW

Sebastain Williams

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28.5

NEG

Pinecrest MS

Michael Speiser

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28.9

Winner: Michael Speiser debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg)
Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I have chosen to agree on morality & morally relevant distinction, but the aff case was lacking connection between contentions and morality, while the neg had contentions that upheld morality & morally relevant distinction.

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

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

Aff → * Thank you for being specific, but in the future be prepared to answer questions on when adulthood begins.
* You claimed that in order to win must prove moral agency.

Neg → * I respect how calm & collected you are but I think you may be a bit too "cool." It almost makes you appear uninterested.
* Strong response during questioning because you never want to concede part of your case.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Andrey Kell GD

Gayathri Das

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29

NEG

Boca Raton Community BF

Burke Findley

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

Winner:

Gayathri Das

debating on the

Aff

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? _____

School/Team

Signature: Lauren Dale

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I have chosen to affirm the resolution. The neg. kept pushing the idea the aff. case didn't apply to adoles. when she clearly established an age group early on and again in her 2nd contention. Neg also and aff. also agreed the neg. must prove inability to make rational decisions as an adoles. was needed to win, which he was unable to do.

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 2NR

Aff * Excellent attack on why to link intl international law & morality.
* Be careful when you answer the "so I win the round if..." questions arise.

Neg -> good vacerone example!
* take deep breaths. I know you have a lot running through your mind but wait when a judge or opp. isn't ready.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
North Carolina School of Scienc...		(0 - 30)	Cary KM	(0 - 30)
Tejal Patwardhan		<u>29</u>	Kyle Morgenstein	<u>30</u>

Winner: Neg Kyle Morgenstein debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Scott Findley

NEG: doctor will not do procedure they disagree with. If child goes behind parents back then repercussions
 Comments & Reason for Decision: Still exist! Supports human worth by recognizing mental capacity of child and allowing them to make decision when mature
 ← 12-18 yrs, Adol sign less = variability err on side of incompetence (parents holding hand crossing the street) at point no longer need to

Reality Integrity
 even against minor parents

14-18
 State of ones health effects body
 Med. Prof. provide medical info
 where authority figure - effect body
 Self- must take as important

add. do not have same maturity as adults, ∴ case by 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.

⇒ right to make final say about their body - Morality
 ⇒ must consider all debater are competent

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.

16. Respecting human worth - decision about own body - right not privilege
 1) family abuse ↔ most minor doctrine does not address it parents are the problem (India) ← ought to be

← Checks & balance doctor will not do all procedures

2) Reproductive Health → parents should not have to know
 Services need, high rates of infection
 HIV ← if child is mature enough the parent will not know
 State fails to exercise good judgement (foster care) - confidentiality
 spread - effects pop. as whole

3) Gender Transition → add should be able to define their gender ← bias exist in Aff & Neg world
 parental abuse and abandonment → ← can be kicked at if go behind parents back ✓
 difficult to obtain care
 respect

Moral and legal requirement vs entitlement ← moral obligation
 Autonomy - freedom of control ← do not have to get permission from doctor
 - Not elective choices -

18 Societal welfare → Suffering & harm (him)

19. Minority right to make
 1) Privilege not right (Privilege is granted) ← born w/ the right → express right to body, about medical choice
 presumption of minors cognitive development
 rely on parents to fill in the gaps
 case by case basis ← what if don't have parents → still go to doctor ← state makes bad choices
 Medical community to evaluate and determine maturity ← who is the doctor to decide → doctor are train to decide
 who harm to patient

When autonomy to be invoked
 mature at varying rates. - evaluated by doctor - doctors can intervene → Safeguard

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF
Marriotts Ridge QC
Quinn Crawford

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

NEG
North Carolina School of Scienc...
Stella Wang

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

Winner: Quinn Crawford debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: Patrick O. Jessee

Comments & Reason for Decision:

note

AFF

1) Excellent work insisting that either definition of adolescence works for your side and that evidence regarding adolescent competence must be specific to medical choices.

2) I wish you had critiqued Aff's justification of morality as it seems to imply that people of all ages, including children, should have autonomy. Also, how specifically does dialectical reasoning produce inescapable & obligatory principles.

3) I was confused on how you tried to turn the abortion argument, as adolescents might choose to exert peer pressure according to your subpoint A against the norms of the adults, ^{which would in effect} lower the abortion rate.

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 and from Aff's voters as well.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Pinecrest CO

Caroline O'Connor

POINTS

(0-30)

28

NEG

Loyola Blakefield JM

Jack Morton

POINTS

(0-30)

27

Winner: Caroline O'Connor debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Patrick O. Jessee

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD:

The crux of this debate revolved around informed debate. I accept NEG's concept of virtue ethics, especially in regards to medical professionals, & I accept NEG's definition of autonomy, that it means the rational controlling of repetitive nature, but once the doctor, the expert, imparts her wisdom to the patient, the patient may indeed achieve the capacity to make a rational decision, controlling his repetitive nature, imparting autonomy, which gives the debate to the affirmative. What a fascinating contest - I admire both of your approaches, but AFF's demonstration of patients' capacity & desire for self-determination when it comes to medical choices, under the status quo of informed consent, wins 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.

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

Marriotts Ridge DK

Divya Kapoor

POINTS

(0-30)

27

NEG

Loyola Blakefield AB

Aidan Bissell-Siders

POINTS

(0-30)

30

Winner: Loyola Blakefield AB

School/Team

debating on the

Neg

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

No

Signature: Justice

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

I began to feel that you were carrying your opponent's case for him. This case was full of self-contradictory arguments and fallacies, e.g. - a study w/ a sample of art is frighteningly subject to errors and over-generalizations.

Neg

Quite possibly the best-reasoned soundest LD case I've ever heard. Perfection.

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.

Justice Karen
~~McCarty, John~~

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

William G. Enloe WS

POINTS

(0-30)

29

William Song

NEG

Hendrick Hudson MG

POINTS

(0-30)

29.5

Matt Gofman

Winner: Hendrick Hudson debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO
MG
Signature: Karen Justice

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - did you really need to see the card or were you grandstanding? Neg correctly drew the conclusion that it was a meta-study by U of Md.

Impairment and incompetency are NOT the same thing
I don't think a sample of 94 + a sample of 24 is necessarily more accurate, certainly not enough to prove causation over correlation
I do not believe one can prove a case on exceptions
don't see how you carried thru human dignity

Neg - I do see how you must be the agent here pro or con. you stated it much better in rebuttal and it than you did in your construct
excellent deconstruction of Aff case; good job finding contradictions in Aff's logic
Although Neg's up/uc were rather weaker than I would have liked them to 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.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

TJefferson VTa

Vishal Tandale

1:30

POINTS

(0-30)

25

NEG

McDowell JK

Justin Karns

1:30

POINTS

(0-30)

26

Winner:

McDowell JK

School/Team

debating on the

Neg

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

Yes

Signature:

[Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

* develop your understanding of autonomy + how your VC links to morality.
 note-agency != autonomy lol.
 VC + standard are same
 - ~~beat case~~ what was re privacy bad arguments
 - seriously warrant has evidence.

fresh out your rebuttal arguments.
 dont just say not true/read cards speak warrant
 its not in your burden to argue for 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 | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

RFD - oral critique

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

William G. Enloe VI

2.00

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Vishnu Inuganti

NEG

Cary PM

2.00

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

Patrick Mulqueen

Winner:

Enloe VI

debating on the

Aff

Low point win?

Yes

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature:

[Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

could have put his CIR better. w/ the word financial guilt argument

use better evidence to do well in development argument

Studies that are done are better w/c better tech.

~~Person was not ready~~
Second ^{subpoint} ~~point~~ ^{point} ~~point~~ ^{point} ~~point~~
seriously non unique.
you argue that state should be forced to ~~the~~ make decision which shoots you ^{in the foot}

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.

RFD oral critique given.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Northwest Gullford NM

Nicole Moore

POINTS

(0-30)

~~28~~ 29

NEG

Loyola Blakefield JT

Joshua Turner


POINTS

(0-30)

29

Winner: NICOLE MOORE debating on the AFF
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? Yes

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff and Neg presented very strong debate arguments and cases. It was hard to differentiate the two and in the end the decision was very close. Both of the debaters used strong counter arguments and addressed the respective 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 | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

I would vote for the Aff as the candidate was able to prove a better value criteria and defend it. Also the Neg conceded key point of capacity decision making and could not defend the issue of the central framework that the right issue only comes in when there is no consensus.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS (0 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (0 - 30)
Henry W. Grady GB		Pinecrest LW	
Grace Bridges	<u>29</u>	Luke Wheeler	<u>27</u>

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

Signature: Caroline Lee

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ultimately aff is tenacious defense of V/VC won her the round. Thorough understanding of natural rights! ins & outs and pertinence to the topic at hand. Raised excellent questions in CX + followed up in rebuttal to which neg couldn't cover in his case.

Neg provided solid evidence but the theory in his argument could've used some fine-tuning— don't depend on a few cards to carry your case, esp after your opponent pokes holes (or tries to) in them!

(other details covered in 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 | 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)
Charlotte Catholic MM		St James DK	
Marissa Muller	<u>27</u>	Daniel Kim	<u>27.5</u>

Winner: St. James DK debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both aff and neg wrote cases designed to throw the other off and so as a result most of the debate was on technicality and not the resolution.

Although the aff constructed a solid case, she didn't engage the arguments of the neg even when they were appropriately topical. However, the neg didn't fully address key aspects of the aff's case in a way to best

maximize resolution-centered debate. Much time was lost on misdirection.

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.

Daniel — your case was built very well but it didn't fully engage the points of the aff. You would've scored higher if you called the aff out on the implications of "autonomy" — her case framework implies action ("autonomy inherent, self-directed value in living") even though her definitions didn't. Call the aff out on that.

Marissa — Your aff is the most unique response to this resolution I've seen. Excellent job w/ it. The reason I made this decision was on topicality — I felt like it didn't engage the neg enough to sustain relevant debate. Don't be afraid to throw the neg a bone.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF
Dallastown Area ND
Nicholas Dolinger

POINTS
(0-30)

28

NEG
Asheville CD
Chloe Dennison

POINTS
(0-30)

27

Winner: Dallastown Area ND debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO
Signature: James Lewis

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG dropped AFF's framework analysis, AND DIDN'T PROVIDE THAT CONVINCING OF AN ACCOUNT FOR SOCIETAL WELFARE.

Point Scale:

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

STILL A CLOSE MARGIN, AFF WINS BECAUSE

1) NEG failed to quantify, weigh harms of Affirming -> I have a vague sense of what they are,

2) AFF showed that experience is a better teacher of virtue than observation

but don't really have a solid handle on how the grammar of affirming limits autonomy. That was NEG's job...

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

Asheville LB

Lizzie Berlin

POINTS

(0 - 30)

~~25~~

25

NEG

TJefferson AC

Allen Cheng

POINTS

(0 - 30)

~~26~~

26

Winner: TJefferson AC debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: Jan Lewis

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG was convincing that adolescents don't have the necessary capability for rational decision making. ~~Aff rebutted~~ NEG showed that his world was better in that it might spare adolescents from having to learn from mistakes and give them the possibility of learning from the experience of others

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

Northwest Guilford HR

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Holden Ruch

NEG

Dallastown Area OM

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Ohanna Mohammad

Winner: Northwest Guilford HR debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Holden: AC is unique and strategic; I like it. A problem, its way too defensive. (especially C1) (mostly C2). Steinberg is great as a response to brain issues. Maybe write something new w/ importance - US specificity arg weird.
- No FW extension? Why 4 4 4?

Ohanna: I question the counterplan strat; why not just dedicate to a full blown CP
Uffll fw needs justification

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:

ORAL

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

North Carolina School of Scienc...

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Lizzy Yang

NEG

Providence SK

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Sanjana Kapur

Winner:

NCSSM LY

School/Team

debating on the

AFF

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? _____

Signature: Brandon Sweeney

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

Slow down on tag lines
Misunderstood contradiction at first. CX really helped
- Don't get backed into a corner. I understood your points, so just clarify.

NEG

Nice job testing her link story:
- You had the clearest explanation of shared decision making thus far.
- Your 2NR was much stronger than the 1st. nice improvement.

Point Scale:

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

Speech Times:

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

RFD: I vote AFF because her impacts stand throughout the entire round, and she is able to deconstruct the Neg side effectively. Neg misunderstands a few of AFF's major arguments

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

University KL

Karchen Lhatoo

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.5

NEG

North Carolina School of Scienc...

Cory You

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

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

Signature: Brandon Sweeney

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF:

- Very well-spoken.
- Good job not backing yourself into a corner.
- Excellent IAR!

NEG:

- Slow down on tags!
- Don't sound like a jerk when asking questions. I know your strategy so just go with it.
- Strong arguments during IAR

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 Negate because I buy the case-by-case arguments. I think it adequately solves some of the initial harms brought up by the AC.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Loyola Blakefield JH

John Huebler

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.4

NEG

Boca Raton Community OL

Omar Lopera

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27.6

Winner: Loyola Blakefield JH debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

B/C NEG DOES NOT ~~SEE~~ RESPOND TO
 AFF REJECTION OF HIS CHARACTERIZATION
 OF VIRTUE ETHICS AS DEONTOLOGICAL AND
 NEVER DEMONSTRATES A REASON WHY I WOULD
 NOT WANT TO UNIVERSALIZE THIS PRINCIPLE,
 I ACCEPT THE AFF F/W. MOREOVER NEG.
 F/W IS SPECIFIC TO U.S. AND. ALLOWS FOR THE POSSIBILITY
 OF MEDICAL LAWS THAT CALL FOR REJECTING MEDICAL LAWS
 I SEE AFF AS SUPERIOR F/W
 ON THE CONTENTION LEVEL AFF DEFEATS THE NEG.
 INDICT ON STEINBERG AS @ ACCOUNTING FOR THE
 IMPACT OF EMOTION.

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

Lovett JM

John Marco Miele

POINTS
(0-30)

28.2

NEG

University RMc

RJ McIntyre

POINTS
(0-30)

27.6

Winner: Lovett JM

School/Team

debating on the

AFF

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? NO

Signature: Willoughby

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I ACCEPT AFF F/W B/C IT IS > SPECIFIC TO RESOLUTION & NEG INDICTS DO NOT HOLD.

AFF PERSUADES ME THAT B/C DOCTORS WHO ARE IN THE BEST POSITION TO EVALUATE IT BELIEVE THAT ADOLESCENTS DO HAVE THE CAPACITY TO MAKE MEDICAL DECISIONS.

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.

GOOD (BUT NEW IN REBUTTAL AND NOT IMPACTED) ARGUMENT NEG. ON AFF WORLD MEANS ADOLESCENTS ARE ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS THAT VIOLATE BIOMETHICAL OBLIGATIONS - THIS COULD BE A VERY DAMAGING ARGUMENT

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

TJefferson SKO

Shivam Kollur

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Pinecrest MW

Matthew Wheeler

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

Winner: TJefferson SKO debating on the AFF Side (All or Neg) Low point win? 28

Signature: Bryan

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: He apparently has done good job preparing, a lot of good supporting information. Good presentation and able to answer questions clearly. But at beginning, crammed with a lot of "big concept", only later, approached in a more practical ways.

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: relax, right to the point, attentive to his opponent content, very practical approach. But tends to repeat only few key points.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS (0 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (0 - 30)
Lovett JB		T Jefferson JG	
James Bronsted	<u>26</u>	Jay Gupta	<u>29</u>
Winner: <u>T Jefferson JG</u>		debating on the <u>Neg</u>	Low point win? <u>29</u>
School/Team		Side (Aff or Neg)	
Signature: <u>[Signature]</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: very ^{well} prepared. open paragraph is right to the target, cited good examples. But he tends to read without eye contact.

Point Scale:

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

Speech Times:

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

Neg: good listener, not only able to present his preparation material clearly, firmly. But also able to use AFF side, dissecting AFF's citation to support his own point of view. Very confident, clear speech.