

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF 2r
St James GK

POINTS
(0 - 30)

24.5

Gibeom Kim

NEG

SandHoke Early College NK

POINTS
(0 - 30)

21

Nicholas Kyle

Winner: Gibeom Kim School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: T. Dacheux

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

Make sure to speak-up

BOTH - Try not to use all CX just clarifying pts.
Some is OK, but you need to gain ground during CX by figuring out potential flaws in arguments

Make sure to at least touch upon all arguments in 1AR. You have the right idea to read cards and explain them - think about how to cut them so you can get to all points adequately

Your opponent dropped all of his contentions and yours in his NR. Thus, you win those

The AFF VC is preferable due to being well-developed and supported, so you win framework too.

Nice job - good analysis and great professionalism!

NEG

Make sure to speak-up and to speak clearly

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.

Review a few of the words in your speech to make sure you understand them and can pronounce them correctly. Its no big deal if I know what you're trying to say, but there is no guarantee that I will be able to understand if mispronounced not explained well.

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.

I can see that you are tired and maybe frustrated. Please think about the following -

- 1) You seem to have a natural speaking presence. This is an asset to you as a debater.
- 2) Its important to do the best you can - even if its not going to be awesome - so that you can make changes for next time
- 3) It gets better, trust me 😊

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF 2:10m
Thomas Jefferson HSST AK

POINTS
(0 - 30)

NEG 1min 5
Northwest Guilford CD

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Amitesh Kotwal

27

Capri D'Souza

25

Winner: Amitesh Kotwal School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: T Dacheux

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF-

The Death Penalty is no longer permitted in the US as per a Supreme Court decision - I can't remember the year, but the decision effectively affirmed the lack of cognitive ability for kids to appreciate consequences and therefore penalties like life in prison and death are a violation of the Constitution's prohibition against "cruel and unusual punishment" (and maybe 14th amend. - I can't recall).

- This really wasn't topical since you meant it as an example only, so it doesn't affect the debate, but it would be good to know this / check date on card vs. this decision by SCOTUS

NEG-

Your responses to some of his CX were good will others were quite confusing.

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.

Your case is organized OK, but some parts are better than others

- 1) develop contention 1 more since this is your best point

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.

- 2) Contention 2 is lacking in connections explicitly to the RES - I get your pt but I don't think it worked.

- 3) Make sure your responses get to the heart of the issue rather than touching anecdotally upon it

Cont. 3 - You win without much effort

Both -> save yourselves time - don't argue value or VC if it's the same.

2 - You approach w/ evidence and thus win

- Nice Delivery, Poise, etc for both of you.

1 - could be dev. more to be more powerful, but it still stands
- this trumps her Cont 1

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Cary CF

Chelsea Fang

POINTS
(0 - 30)

25

NEG

Marist MC

Mackenzie Childs

POINTS
(0 - 30)

26

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

Signature: James Lewis

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG won framework

NEG showed that AFF's solvency is compromised by fact that adolescents may not actually receive the treatment that they choose. NEG also shows that affirming will violate parental rights.

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

Henry Clay SA

Shelby Amato

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

NEG

Providence BS

Bennett Stillerman

POINTS
(0 - 30)

26

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

Lowpoint win? NO

Signature: James Lewis

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG made a factual error by dropping her opponent's observation, which provided a safeguard against irrational decision making by adolescents. NEG's burden was then to show an absolute barrier against inability of adolescents to be rational. ~~NEG~~ AFF showed that adolescents can be rational and can provide benefits while minimizing the harms of regulating.

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

St James JG

Jason Grate

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

NEG

SandHoke Early College AB

Austin Bell

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

Winner: Jason Grate School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Linda Greever

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Good debate. Decision was close but
aff ~~was~~ did win base on autonomy concepts
Both very professional!

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

Andrey Kell AM

Anna Marsicano

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27.5

NEG

Henry W. Grady AO

Alex Opasahl

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

Winner: Marsicano Andreykell debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Patruin Cloud

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Very very close. Neg did not push through her argument of consequentialism hard enough. Deontology was brought up but never followed through on.

Aff's study that stated adol. and adults showed equal ability at decision making proved to overrode Neg's argument since she did not discuss.

Neg did say adol. make bad decisions but Aff replied w/ even adults make bad decisions. And vcrtenon of Aff earned she proved Negs ve was subjective

End of a long day both girls did well.

Aff. do not leave time on the clock.

||

Point Scale:

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

Speech Times:

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

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Asheville EH

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Northwest Guilford AY

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

Eli Hardwig

Anna Yang

Winner: Eli Hardwig Asheville School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Patricia Cloud

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Interesting take. He did not base his argument on saying that just transgender ado. could win for Aff. He stated that Aff reso. was an ideal and if he could prove rightness in 1 instance that would carry. His argument of human rights and dignity and founded up w/ possible course of puberty blockers. This removed long term consequence argument from Neg. It also defused Neg's arguments regarding decision making. Neg failed to fully support her case. And when aff ~~stated~~ caught neg w/ adol. dont understand that negated autonomy. Mostly Neg did not address Aff 1st + 2nd contentions. They carry.

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.

Sorry late and thoughts are not flowing.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		NEG	
Marist LM	POINTS (0-30)	Thomas Jefferson HSST NB	POINTS (0-30)
Liam Mullican	<u>28</u>	Naman Baraya	<u>30</u>

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF presents good evidence, e.g. several warrants, but it is questionable how some of them tie to the stated value criterion. So AFF may show that Adolescents can make decisions, but what shows that they ought to? NEG does an outstanding job of laying out VC based on saving lives with strong warrants on eating disorders, STD's & drug abuse. NEG does a superb job defending in cross ex, though should not have conceded the point on "case by case basis" for involuntary hospitalization. AFF attempt to argue that self ownership's infringement then invalidates value of lives saved doesn't work. NEG wins across the flow on solidity of framework and supporting evidence. Outstanding performance by 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 | 14 Min 1AR | 6 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Centreville BK		(0-30)	SandHoke Early College JW	(0-30)
Brian Kim		<u>28</u>	Jasmine Walker	<u>27</u>

Winner: Centreville BK debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF provides a stronger framework with a stronger logical foundation. Agreed with AFF Assertion during cross ex that NEG criterion doesn't provide an objective framework to measure against the value of morality; it is critical to be able to clearly defend both value and criteria along with the relationships between the two. NEG left 2 minutes on the clock during rebuttal - don't ever give up. So much time - keep giving examples, use cases, scenarios, etc. AFF is correct that ethics of care with case by case approach can only tie to morality. If you articulate how this criteria would support/increase the value.

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 SZ

Sunny Zhang

POINTS

(0-30)

27.8

NEG

Thomas Jefferson HSST RM

Rachel Ma

POINTS

(0-30)

28

Winner: THOMAS JEFFERSON HSST RM debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: *L Willoughby*

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RATHER Muddled Round - work to
MAKE ARGUMENTS SPECIFIC TO YOUR
OPPONENT'S @ JUST SOME VAGUELY RELATED
IDEA

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 RESPONSE TO DOUBLE BIND
ARGUMENT THAT AFFIRMING FORCES
A CHOICE B/W FAMILY RELATIONS & AUTONOMY - I CHOOSE
TO PRESERVE THE FAMILY INTERACT

STRANGELY BOTH DEBATERS CONCEDE THE VALUE DEBATE
WITH LITTLE OR NO COMPARATIVE B/W MORALITY & JUSTICE
BUT THEN DEBATE EXTENSIVELY @ THE CRITERION, AND YET
NEVER IMPACT THIS ARGUMENT. WHY DOES WINNING YOUR
CRITERION MEAN THAT I REJECT YOUR OPPONENT'S TRY SHOWING
HOW USING THE CRITERION AS A WEIGHING MECHANISM
FAILS TO ACH. EITHER VALUE. NOT DOING SO INVITES JUDGE
INTERVENTION.

MUCH IN THE "STUDIES" DEBATE GOES UNWARRANTED - WHY IS
A STUDY BASED ON HYPOTHETICALS WORTHY THAN ONE USING IMAGING?
WHY DOES IT MATTER IF I INCLUDE 10-13 YR OLDS? EXPLAIN!

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Asheville IG

Ilze Greever

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27.5

NEG

Cary JT

Justin Tunley

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27.4

Winner: ASHEVILLE IG

School/Team

debating on the AFF

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

Signature: *L Willoughby*

Comments & Reason for Decision:

JUSTIN - TRY TO LIMIT YOUR RHETORIC IN CX - ASK QUESTIONS
AVOID SHOUTING AT EACH OTHER

Point Scale:

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

AFF BETTER CONVINCES ME THAT
AUTONOMY PRESERVES IDENTITY AND
DIGNITY - NEG NEVER RESPONDS TO
THE ARGUMENT THAT ADOLESCENTS
NEED DECISION MAKING POWER IN ORDER TO
DEVELOP REASONING (PIAGET)

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 ASSUMES LIFE IS PARAMOUNT~~
NEG ASSUMES LIFE IS PARAMOUNT
AND REJECTS VALUE TO LIFE/DIGNITY/IDENTITY WITHOUT
A WARRANT TO SHOW WHY WE MUST PRESERVE LIFE AT
ALL COSTS

WORK TO FIND A BETTER WARRANT FOR WHY WE SHOULD
NOT RISK ALLOWING AUTONOMY - IMPACT THE ARGUMENT.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Northwest Guilford AW

Alex White

POINTS

(0 - 30)

26

NEG

Centreville AL

Andrew Lee

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

Winner: Centreville AL School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both cases need some work -
Very basic & really aren't saying
much. There was not much a
rebuttal.

voted neg because case was stronger & better refuted.

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 | 2 Min CX | 4 Min 1AR+ | 5 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.

Room: 205
Flight 2 Start: 8:15 PM
JV Lincoln-Douglas

6

Speiser, Christina
~~Berman, Mia~~

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Cary OS

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

Oonagh Stevans

NEG

SandHoke Early College GK

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

Gabriel Kranenburg

Winner: Cary OS School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~Aff~~ ^{NEG} had difficulty rebutting
↓
dropped my arguments -
Oral criticism given -

Point Scale:

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

Speech Times:

Speech times: 8-Min Aff | 3-Min CX | 7-Min Neg | 3-Min CX | 4-Min 1AR | 6-Min NR | 3-Min 2AR | 4-Min Prep.

AFF have great potential - Keep going with debate!
^{at} NEG

I look forward to judging you in Varsity next year!

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Cary EK

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29.5

Enoch Kuan

NEG

Cary NJ

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27.5

Noah Jabusch

Winner: Cary EK School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff upheld value structure more completely + strongly, even when neg conceded his own value.
Really come down to scope of the neg case - aff did a superb job of calling it out immediately and demonstrating that the neg world didn't address V/VC through the main issue of rights of the individual.

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.

Enoch - your case was very solid and you did a great job rolling with the punches of a perhaps unexpected neg. At times your rebuttals were somewhat disorganized - remember to flow!

Noah - really interesting neg. Seriously, very unique. If you concede your value, make sure to have a very good reason why. Your values differed for a reason!

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Pinecrest AE

Anire Egbe

POINTS

(0-30)

25.5

NEG

SandHoke Early College BJ

Brenna Johnson

POINTS

(0-30)

25

Winner: SandHoke Early College debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? yes

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pinecrest -
convinced by value
evidence - justice isn't really
a value
you need to give verbal
citations - as far as I
can tell you have no
actual warrants

SandHoke -
don't give up time in the
1st speech - your analyses
and attacks need to be more
substantive
you gave up way too much time
in this speech - nearly half of it
that's the reason for the low speaks.

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.

clin voting Neg & have primary here to lack
of warrants and evidence provided by the Affirmative. The
Neg makes decent arguments that are only attacked
with attempts at overarguing. The aff U/C strikes was a ~~lot~~
off so I default to negs which is better exposed.
While it seems important that ~~people~~
would want to be self determined decisional capability for
adolescents can't be denied. Collective decision making also weighed
heavily.

FORENSICS EARLY BIRD AT WAKE FOREST

Sep 11 - 13, 2015

AFF

Northwest Guilford HC

POINTS
(0-30)

22.5

Haleigh Cadd

NEG

SandHoke Early College AM

POINTS
(0-30)

22

Alysson Miller

Winner: Haleigh Cadd / NW Guilford debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Point Scale:

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

AFF

NEG

- good start → good choice of value - Justice
- good point linking morality & Justice
- good example - for juvenille on Philly.
- You need to have eye contact when reading from paper.
- good defense during cross examination
- good questioning

- ~~do not examine~~ ~~could have done~~
- You could have pushed your opponent more during cross examination.
- good value criteria.
- good examples.
- You should ~~be~~ take some leadership position when you are being ~~are~~ cross examined.
- You need to bring more evidence
- great argument w/ to child labor laws.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 6 Min Aff | 3 Min CX | 7 Min Neg | 3 Min-CX | 4 Min 1AR | 5 Min NR | 3 Min 2AR | 4 Min Prep.