



Room: 519  
 Round 12 Start: 2:30 PM  
 Start: 2:30 PM  
 National Speech and Debate Tournament  
 Jun 19 - 23, 2017

*Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries*

Roy (Rebecca Roy)

Morrison (Adrian Morrison)

AFF

NEG

Winner: Roy on the side Aff  
Entry Name or Code Side (Aff or Neg)

**Other judges on panel: Melissa Kirk, John McGrory. Please do not start until all judges are present.**

**Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will**

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

*Vote aff because central thesis of the conditioning argument isn't challenged, especially in rationale.*

**Speech Times and Order:**

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min
(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)	

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: Grady Wiedeman



Room: 519  
 Round 12 Start: 2:30 PM  
 Start: 2:30 PM  
 National Speech and Debate Tournament  
 Jun 19 - 23, 2017



Mikayla Findlay  
 McGrory, John  
 Chaminade

*Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries*

Roy (Rebecca Roy)

Morrison (Adrian Morrison)

AFF NEG  
 Winner: RRoy on the side AC  
Entry Name or Code Side (Aff or Neg)

Other judges on panel: Melissa Kirk, Fred Robertson. Please do not start until all judges are present.

**Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will**

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Strong analysis on def resolution burdens  
 He misinterprets conditioning  
 predetermined by BIO & CONDITIONING

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Aff oversimplification is a defense not necessarily good offense though  
 Aff drops first contention  
 FREE WON'T and you don't use it in rationale

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):


I don't buy that a world w/o free will is either random (never argued by aff) or against self interest. I buy self interest is conditioned  
 I vote on SOCIAL CONDITIONING total (sans bio)

**Speech Times and Order:**

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min
(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)	

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

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



Room: 519  
Round 12 Start: 2:30 PM  
Start: 2:30 PM  
National Speech and Debate Tournament  
Jun 19 - 23, 2017



*Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries*

Roy (Rebecca Roy)

Morrison (Adrian Morrison)

AFF Roy on the side Aff NEG  
Winner: \_\_\_\_\_ on the side \_\_\_\_\_  
Entry Name or Code Side (Aff or Neg)

Other judges on panel: John McGrory, Fred Robertson. Please do not start until all judges are present.

**Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will**

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

*Damn smart opening question in CX... and all pt CX. Pushing him into restating case without clarity of answers or expansion. Case + Rebuttal just structurally smart and closing answers for Neg.*

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

*CX evasive at best. I know the holdover from PF is to ask for cards, but it only seems you could be doing far more work analytically than this kind of time burn would necessitate. No response to Aff FW lols. Minimum burden with simple two answers.*

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

*Neg fundamentally misconstruing or misunderstanding the conditional arguments in how they relate to science, and setting up Aff as weak strawman in thinking Neg must defend themselves or act against self interest. Def of free will without Neg response until a CX blip collapses much Neg ground by failure of Aff performance. Neg consolidation still offers no answer to wholly reasonable Aff FW of "even if freewill exists, does science have the space for it?" or "if there is space, does freewill fit the bill?"*

**Speech Times and Order:**

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min
(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)	

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

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

*Neg's response to former is a bust, and Aff painting solid story of how science accounts for the phorom of "free will" by causing to another mystical realm.*



JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION



*Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries*

Lewis (Xavior Lewis)

Newell (Anna Newell)

AFF

NEG

Winner: Newell on the side Neg  
Entry Name or Code Side (Aff or Neg)

Other judges on panel: Laura LaChappelle, Brett Ries. Please do not start until all judges are present.

**Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will**

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Don't use "she" it's "my opponent" at least in majority of the time. Slow down & signpost as you're going through, not rebutted. Determinism can be a scientific concept & a sociological concept. The PIE activity was super smooth, it worked very very well. Don't pack up while you're near of panel is speaking.

Good self maintaining part of opposing throughout round. Be careful w/ CX questions, it'll be explained verbally, but rule No. 1 is do no harm (to your case)

[RFD]

Had the one piece of evidence presented by neg been checked as immaterial, it would have been an Aff ballot

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Xavior laid out a very clear framework, "if something can't be proven w/ empirical evidence, then it cannot exist in scientific body of knowledge (no room)". I accepted her framework, but it opened the door for Anna to argue that there was empirical evidence regarding free will, which started regarding coroner delirium. Once her evidence was provided, under her called Framework, there IS room for free will in the body of scientific knowledge

**Speech Times and Order:**

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min
(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)	

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]



Room: 520  
 Round 12 Start: 2:30 PM  
 Start: 2:30 PM  
 National Speech and Debate Tournament  
 Jun 19 - 23, 2017



Bro. John McGroarty  
 LaChappelle, Laura  
 Jackson



Lewis (Xavior Lewis)

Newell (Anna Newell)

AFF  
 Winner: Newell on the side Neg  
Entry Name or Code Side (Aff or Neg)

Other judges on panel: D. Harvey, Brett Ries. Please do not start until all judges are present.

**Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will**

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

You speak too fast. Your 2<sup>nd</sup> obs doesn't fly. You have been asked to defend a position. You're trying to say we can't prove it. You are giving an infinite regress. No treaty, dispositive. You've been moving towards it. We can prove it by... ~~you need to take~~ interesting ~~and~~ attempt to turn on "leaves no room", but she did it answer the way you want it.

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Good overview, Good case. Your rebuttal la-dou your ideas well. Free will & totally uninfluenced. Ask more questions. Increase by questions about gravity. Use distinction between influencing a forcing actions.

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Today, the Aff's definitions & observations tried to define the Neg out of the debate rather than ~~what~~ to define the topic for clarity. Neg showed what "leaves room for" meant was quite clear. Neg argued well, using gravity as a good example. Neg presented a clear, direct understanding of the topic & defended much. Neg's explanation of free will was more reasonable.

**Speech Times and Order:**

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min
(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)	

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: John McGroarty



Jordan Bakken  
~~Charles Fisher~~  
 Ries, Brett  
 Watertown

Room: 520  
 Round 12 Start: 2:30 PM  
 Start: 2:30 PM  
 National Speech and Debate Tournament  
 Jun 19 - 23, 2017



*Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries*

Lewis (Xavior Lewis)

Newell (Anna Newell)

AFF

NEG

Winner: Newell (Anna Newell) on the side Neg  
Entry Name or Code Side (Aff or Neg)

Other judges on panel: D. Harvey, Laura LaChappelle. Please do not start until all judges are present.

**Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will**

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

- Good job showing + explaining why her ~~case~~ fits under your case.  
 - Great pts about ~~caused~~ effect + how our choices are caused from past experiences. This is a strong pt!!!

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

- Great point about gravity !!  
 - Good job not going the road during the 2nd question segment by wanting you to go down.  
 - Great of getting team to agree on the gravity pt!!!

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

RFD: The vote came down to ~~caused~~ effect vs. leaving room for it. The reason why I am voting Neg is because the example of gravity grow science can still leave room for something if it has not been proven otherwise. If the Aff would have shown that science has proved it doesn't exist then Aff would have won.  
 Great debate! Good Job + Good Luck

**Speech Times and Order:**

Affirmative Constructive	.....	5 min
Negative Constructive	.....	5 min
Question Segment	.....	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	.....	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	.....	4 min
Question Segment	.....	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	.....	3 min
Negative Consolidation	.....	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	.....	2 min
Negative Rationale	.....	2 min
(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)		

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

