

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Thomas Jefferson HSST RM

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Rachel Ma

30

NEG

Centreville AL

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Andrew Lee

29

Winner: Centreville AL debating on the NEG
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Susan Daugherty

Low Point Win

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF - Love your style! Very assertive, fast but comprehensible, great decorum.

NEG - Very easy to listen to - love your analysis!

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.

Incredibly great round & thoughtful analysis and synthesis of evidence.

Really appreciate ~~the~~ argument stemming from ^{AFF} V. and its definitions emphasizing the benefits of promoting independent health care ~~not~~ decision making as a basis for sound health care decision making in the future.

However, ^{NEG C, A} ~~card~~ card stating the PMA proves prefrontal cortex isn't developed ~~properly~~ in adolescents gave me pause for consideration & is more recent (quant. vs qual evidence)

Also autonomy means, as my partner out, that the adolescent alone makes the decision and in terms of making a life + death decision in healthcare, you can make a wrong decision if you intend to achieve life but foolishly decide on a course that promotes death. This, as NEG pointed out, doesn't allow the educational forum for trial + error decision making, is high-risk, and isn't moral. For this reason NEG wins - but up and v.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

SandHoke Early College AB

Austin Bell

POINTS
(0-30)

28

NEG

Providence SZ

Sunny Zhang

POINTS
(0-30)

29

Winner: Providence SZ School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Albert Ahn

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Adolescence - puberty → maturity
 Human rights - legally protected
 Value prop - human agency
 Judith Butler citation
 Cont 1 - transgender youth
 150k-300k youth; (Lele Alcorn)
 Cont 2 - forcing → unnecessary psych. stress
 Jesse Green articles
 Deborah Bach - 17y.o. to conservative parents
 Cont 3 - med. choice and transgender youth
 Cont 4 - West patriarchal influence
 1990 - Butler
 b. youth → use for dehumanization
 X-exam: 2nd content - 3 prongs - do not use people as a means to an end.
 Value premise: human rights
 invidible rights (focus) - human agency -
 can't restrict of rights allow people to be who they want to be
 transgender has increased in past 5 years.
 4 content - dehumanized; oppression
 second content - not only gay that feels this way
 Opp. case - 3 prongs - univ. law of nature
 cont 2 - don't use as a means to an end
 cont 3 - kingdom of ends - act morally;
 Def. case - restate - trans is most prevalent problem in adolescents today
 Holocaust example. Most eminent problem in textbooks today is transgender problem (rights).
 Cont 1 - biggest problem to adolescents.
 Cont 3 - helps transgender youth; general population. This was one of the better and more engaging LD debates. I really appreciated the wealth of citations that were built into both sides. Keep up the great work and good luck!

X exam - adolescent definition; human agency definition; what about children how did first content link to framework? Third content link to framework?
 Equality presumption retaining. Words of John Locke. Legal system → children are property of parents. Adolescence is plural → hence general.
 Value premise - justice; full autonomy can be disruption to legal adolescent medical autonomy is not universal applies at maturity; liberty does not apply to youth. Cannot generalize. Not developmentally appropriate. Lack life experience.
 3rd prong - moral community, kingdom, moral law
 Attack: not allow special cases; does not address adolescents in general
 transgender - not linked - how about non-transgender youth - larger group.
 Content 2 - isolated? adolescents - plural
 Content 4 - he is using as parents as a means to an end; benefits more people. Linking to the resolution.
 Attack defense: 1st - transgender are any ce. suffering; use Holocaust example - not trying to kill transgenders. Use LD as theoretical discussion
 Autonomy is not universal. Third content - Kingdom of ends. more parents suffering
 Voting issues: value criterion - who can uphold these rights better? Help as many people as possible.

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

Reason for decision: Neg presented a more sustainable position while undermining the "narrowness" of the aff position. Both debaters did an excellent job! engaging LD debates. I really appreciated the wealth of citations that were built into both sides. Keep up the great work

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Asheville EH

Eli Hardwig

POINTS

(0-30)
29.5

NEG

Thomas Jefferson HSST NB

Naman Baraya

POINTS

(0-30)
28

Winner: Asheville EH debating on the Aff
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: *[Handwritten Signature]*

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Negative wants me to compare directly on quantity of lives saved. They lose because

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's risk of trans suicide outweighed the only negative evidence that actually speaks to a solid fatality number.

Room: 216
Start: 11:30-AM 10:30 AM
JV Lincoln-Douglas

3

Cabana
Rau, Kenneth

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Henry Clay SA		(0 - 30)	Centreville BK	(0 - 30)
Shelby Amato		<u>30</u>	Brian Kim	<u>28</u>

Winner: Henry Clay SA School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Rau Kenneth Cabana

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF
really strong presentation during AC
-X responses were really clear
Don't look at opp during CX
Good CX questions -
IAR ~~prep~~ organization was hard to follow - I suggest going Framework/ observations -> NC -> AC & talking about CX arguments throughout. That said, your ~~major~~ points were solid and you spoke very well

Neg
- During CX don't look at opp.
- Good questions
- Good responses
*OFF time roadmap - Don't waste speech time giving a roadmap after the time has started.
- Go down the flow - organization is hard during the NC and you did a good job covering the important points but it was a little hard for me to follow
- She didn't really respond to any of your case - you should've taken more advantage of that.
- Don't buy the observation - I would cut it.

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

Marist MC

Mackenzie Childs

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

NEG

Northwest Guilford CD

Capri D'Souza

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29

Winner: D'Souza NW Guilford debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Patricia Cloud

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The resolution states adolescents
Aff narrowed her focus to girls and
their equality. This made her
argument difficult to support when
she never addressed the other half of
adolescents → males.

Neg did include both sexes in her argument
based on morality and how the neg
world would better suit.

although Aff had good reasons for her stance they were
too narrow and Neg brought this up. I believe Aff lost
sight of the resolution in her desire to argue for equal
rights for girls on a global scale. She never fully did
away w/ Neg's 1st content. her 2nd cont. And neg fully showed
the flawed logic of Aff's case.

Aff creative way to think about the resolution just too narrow.
Neg you were very skilled at dismantling the opposition's
case.

Good 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.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Providence BS		(0 - 30)	Cary JT	(0 - 30)
Bennett Stillerman		<u>28</u>	Justin Tunley	<u>27</u>

Winner: AFF Providence BS School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Scott Findley

Comments & Reason for Decision:

14-19
desirability
Self directed freedom

- Justice ← prove more just
- Util (greatest # people) ← same

Orphaned children
• aspirin / jail
• individual liberty
Self determination

Mental Health ← doctors making decision ① → we all have mental problems
↑ demand on mental health services (Adults)
Suicide (2nd) ← it so are they capable? → inherent will to live ← how many suicides (↑ # suicides)
↳ need / reluctant to seek help

Reproductive Health
HIV
Anti risk strategies

Vaccines ②
Religious convictions (Parents) (~~missed text on neg card about death of child and parent charged~~) picked up 242

Not Enough Experience ← Aff, doctor still give information to make decision ③④
10-18
Self Governing agent
Diagnostic, ~~the~~ treatment

- Justice
- Max well being of Adol. ← same

Special class ← everyone has right to own body (opinion) → brain under construction
protection from themselves
to young & immature (still developing) ← does not mean can't make decisions ④
- high risk behavior

17 yrs old - claims (intel refused) now happy ← 1 example, ①, ②
parents influence - ∴ unable to make autonomous decision → parent is responsible (can support)

State should make the decisions ← physician make bad decisions too → Experience weights more than → cannot to cohesion
Adults - more experience
↳ why are Special class if we all make bad 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.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

SandHoke Early College BJ

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

Brenna Johnson

NEG

Cary CF

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29

Chelsea Fang

Winner: Cary CF debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Linda Greever

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very close debate! Both sides did a great job. Felt the aff case was ~~so~~ better.

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.

Brenna Johnson

Did a good job addressing opponent's questions. Focusing your case

was good however some global information for all adolescents initially than focusing on your example would ~~be~~ ~~be~~ be beneficial to your case.

Chelsea Fang

Did good job at delivery and able to back up information when questioned.

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

SandHoke Early College AM

Alysson Miller

POINTS

(0-30)

29.5

NEG

St James JG

Jason Grate

POINTS

(0-30)

28

Winner: AFF/SandHoke AM debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Karen Justice

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Wow! great debate, both sides.

Aff

- a really solid case

- thoroughly upheld

- I would caution you to argue transgenderism as an example in your case. It is resolutimal but not the resolution

Neg

- could tell you didn't believe your own case. Had a way to overcome your own biases.

- Excellent eye contact and delivery

- I'm not convinced that you upheld either your BP or your VC

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

SandHoke Early College GK

Gabriel Kranenburg

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

NEG

Pinecrest AE

Anire Egbe

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28.5

Winner: Pinecrest AE debating on the NEG
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Caroline fu

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg upheld value of consequentialism in scope of the resolution and was able to quickly identify shortcomings of aff's contextualization in debate. Aff did a great job poking holes in neg's case but it ultimately come down to neg's value being clearly defended and promoted through his case plus undisputed shortcomings of aff value (human rights) scope.

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

St James GK

Gibeom Kim

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

NEG

Northwest Guilford AW

Alex White

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27.5

Winner: Northwest Guilford AW debating on the NEG
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Marcia L

Don't be afraid to use prep time to prepare for rebuttal.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AC: Framework is very long and a little redundant; could not understand your observation; you should slow down so that you can more clearly articulate. Clarity is an issue.

1AR: Better extend your contentions; good use of evidence to buttress your argument that teens can make rational choices

2AR: You made some good points, but they are muddled, and you are not presenting a clear, cohesive narrative through the rounds. Very fragmented and lacking in emotional appeal or clarity.

NEG: Try to be ready when Aff & judge are ready so the round is not delayed.

NC: Try to limit hand gestures so they are not too distracting; good evidence of brain scans & argument analysis.

For the value framework debate, you should focus on why we prefer Quality of Life as a VC over respecty people as end in themselves. Then, move to contentions debate. Try to support and say which contentions you are addressing.

2 NR: Try to better organize rebuttal. Did Max live? That would've been important to tell. Excellent response about the studies - that the studies on adolescents are not really under emotional pressure in a study, so it doesn't really show the impact of the Amygdala when upset.

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: 210
Start: ~~11:30 AM~~ 10:30 AM
JV Lincoln-Douglas

3

McCuaig, John

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

SandHoke Early College JW

Jasmine Walker

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

NEG

Henry W. Grady AO

Alex Opasahl

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

Winner: Henry W. Grady AO debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff: Good use of info
& warrant + great preparation.
Work on clarity with your
opponents + interaction.

Work on Interaction & flow
- organization will help keep
you thought & speech on track, fluidly

Neg: Great preparation
did a great
job carrying
points across.
- excellent
refutation
(Varsity level)

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.

Room: Trailer 6
Start: ~~11:30 AM~~ 10:30 AM
JV Lincoln-Douglas

3

Thomas, Dawn

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Cary EK

Enoch Kuan

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28½

NEG

Northwest Gullford AY

Anna Yang

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29½

Winner: Northwest Gullford AY debating on the NEG
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both presenters were eloquent and prepared. However speaker for NEG presented more research based evidence to support points made. Cross examination was appropriate for both but NEG had more evidentiary support.

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
Marist LM	(0-30)	Thomas Jefferson HSST AK	(0-30)
Liam Mullican	<u>27</u>	Amitesh Kotwal	<u>28</u>

Winner: Thomas Jefferson AK debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF - work on articulation - Some of your
Constructive was mumbled & difficult
to understand.

- if parents don't pay - who would? Do you have 4,000 for an MRI?
- why can't parents help to develop their child's autonomy?

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 - Strong case -

- add not rational
- parental autonomy - violated most pay for procedure they may not agree to.
- why let children practice autonomy of their life
(nice job at weighing evidence - clearly stronger)

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF	POINTS (0-30)	NEG	POINTS (0-30)
Ardrey Kell AM		Asheville IG	
Anna Marsicano	<u>28</u>	Ilze Greever	<u>29</u>

Winner: Asheville IG School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Brandon Sweeney

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Excellent Reading
- Definitely add some more arguments and/or evidence to make your case longer.
- Defended yourself very well in CX
- Awesome questions
- Good flow coverage. I want you to expand on your arguments more. You draw me in then stop. Use all your time for that.
- Extend your evidence! You have great stuff use it

- Watch your body movement - a little too much
- Great CX questions
- Excellent Case reading - however, if AFF's case was longer, you would have run out of time
- Strong arguments in 1NR
- 2NR was amazing. Good voters and explanations
- Good use of definition, but you need to make that argument in the 1NR

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 on the difference between adults & adolescences. I think AFF has good arguments, but Neg was stronger.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		NEG	
Cary NJ	POINTS (0 - 30)	Northwest Guilford HC	POINTS (0 - 30)
Noah Jabusch	<u>26.5</u>	Haleigh Cadd	<u>26</u>

Winner: Cary NJ debating on the Aff
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Noah -

- lack warrants in your AC for several of your arguments.
- good job in CX
- you have some solid ideas, but I need evidence to back up these ideas
- don't fall in suicide trap
- I'm not sure what you mean by "save lives who infringe on agency"
- you at times seem to talk yourself out of your case

Haleigh -

- you don't have to walk me through everything in detail. "I will give you evidence for this... because of this evidence that I just read" - just get to it.
- you have to respond to aff's case in your 1st speech - it needs to be about 1/2 Neg case and 1/2 rebuttal.
- some of rebuttal arguments contained logical fallacies
- relying too heavily on "common knowledge"

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.

- you need to respond directly to the ~~aff~~ response to your arguments.

Aff provides sufficient argumentation against the neg's case. Neg fails to attack Aff in 1st speech and attacks in 2nd speech are insufficient. While the V/VC was somewhat of a wash - I vote aff because the case maintains logical consistency.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

SandHoke Early College NK

Nicholas Kyle

POINTS

(0 - 30)

25

NEG

Cary OS

Oonagh Stevans

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29

Winner: Oonagh Stevans debating on the NEG
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Patrick D. Jones

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff
1) If your opponent claims that transgender youth do not represent adolescents as a whole, you can counter that if they are capable of autonomy, why are other adolescents not also inherently 'incapable'?

2) Make sure you address the value clash in your 1AR

NEG
3) Fabulous case especially on you build in legal protections on the NEG side

4) Be careful not to assume transgender youth will be currently protected under the law from their parents' refusal for medical interventions

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.