



Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Lewis (Xavior Lewis)

Fitzgerald (Aidan Fitzgerald)

AFF

NEG

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

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.

This is Neg

This is AFF

Sat in seats &

associate w/ inverse I wrote reflections

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

NEG effectively demonstrates that determinism may be permeated by logical fallacies. During constructive crossfire, he questions why disprovability/provability issue would render free will incompatible and demonstrates that Neg DOES NOT HAVE to prove fw scientifically, only as compatible theory allowed by science.

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

NEG makes compelling argument for parameters to define relationship of causation to "science" + "freewill." Furthermore, this is the 1st argument I have heard here that acknowledges he is not burdened to prove or disprove freewill but to prove "science leaves no room for freewill"

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

The arguments were quite compelling, and the techniques and strategies of the presenters were clever, consistent, effective. Furthermore, each was professional AND effectively aggressive. That said, while I found NEG's argument to be strong, and his ability to control, quite literally, the question/crossfire & great, AFF's succinct delivery and shutdown styles address of the resolution itself resulted in a well-made and unique (even as it is the most logical) argument for "science leaves no room for fw." He proves that

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:

FW falls outside scientific parameters and that he only must demonstrate that, not disprove FW's existence.

Signature: Treasure L. Ingels



Room: 215
 Round 13 Start: 4:30 PM
 Start: 4:30 PM
 National Speech and Debate Tournament
 Jun 19 - 23, 2017



Judge: Ries

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Lewis (Xavior Lewis)

Fitzgerald (Aidan Fitzgerald) ✓

AFF

NEG

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

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:

• THANK YOU FOR YOUR
 POLITENESS

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

• I LIKED YOUR USAGE OF
 ANALOGIES

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

ULTIMATELY THIS CAME DOWN TO WHOSE RESOLUTIONAL ANALYSIS I WAS MORE PERSUADED BY, IN COMBINATION WITH THE EVIDENCE. A LOT OF NEG'S SCIENCE WAS DROPPED, & I WAS PERSUADED THAT ALL THE NEG HAD TO DO WAS SHOW THAT SCIENCE AT LEAST OPENS THE DOOR TO EXIST. SINCE AFF ONLY USED DEFINITIONS TO SUPPORT HIS CASE BY THE END OF THE ROUND, I HAVE NO SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE TO BELIEVE THERE IS NO FREE WILL. THUS, I VOTE NEG

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: [Signature]



END OF THE ROUND, I HAVE NO SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE TO BELIEVE THERE IS NO FREE WILL. THUS, I VOTE NEG

JOHN TEMPLETON
 EDUCATIONAL



Lewis (Xavior Lewis)

Fitzgerald (Aidan Fitzgerald)

AFF

NEG

Winner: Lewis

on the side Aff

Entry Name or Code

Side (Aff or Neg)

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:

AC- Interesting that you spend most of your time trying to win by definition, which means Neg just has to change the definition.
 AR- Your analysis on the definition of free will is very good, so that probably is the best interp, but I think you are conflating the study of free will and the observation of the instance of free will. In any case, you still mostly try to win by definition which I find problematic.
 AC- Smart to condense to your key argument on the Framing flow. I'd like to hear more on why your interp is superior, but you give me reasons that if I accept your interp then I vote Aff.
 AR- I really need more on why to accept you def of free will over his. You are clear on why that is a voter, but why are you getting your definition.

NR- Some of the biological experiment evidence was pretty interesting, but I wasn't sure it was conclusive whenever an experiment like the brain wave study is done there are always questions of procedure and interpretation. Interesting yes, not sure how much it helps ultimately.
 NR- Smart to start with Framing since that is his chief argument, that likely decides the round.
 NR- I like that you've identified the critical point of the round but you then move on and don't explain how the other arguments we voters.
 NR- I just don't understand how you think that we won't advance in science is a turn to specifically not being able to prove free will. I was shocked you didn't spend more time on Framing since that is 100% of his offense at this point.

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

RFD: I'm surprised it came down to the definition debate. Neg def of having options seems incomplete. You'd then also have to prove there were always multiple options, but that could just be incomplete science. Neg advances a notion of science explaining things that were unexplained, which seems to overstate and disprove the concept of multiple options. I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:
 So, I find the Aff definition more comprehensive and clear. Free is without constraint, that is its definition. So if there were constraints, those experiments didn't prove or disprove free will. They proved ~~it~~ in a controlled environment, the controls can influence results.

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)	

Speech Times and Order:



JOHN TEMPLETON
 FORD STATE

Since I'm buying the Aff definition more, that gives Aff control of the round. The next part is what is science where we have agreement. So, regardless if free will is true, or just not yet to be disproven, science can't be the determiner. If anything I guess only a concept of free will can determine free will. The definition of free will does more than science can. Interesting debate. I'd prefer to not vote on just the definition, but this is what I was forced to do.

Room: 217
 Round 13 Start: 4:30 PM
 Start: 4:30 PM
 National Speech and Debate Tournament
 Jun 19 - 23, 2017



Judge: Ken King

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Newell (Anna Newell)

Roy (Rebecca Roy)

AFF

NEG

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

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:

Science indicates that all actions are caused by experience or upbringing.

insanity and self defense indicate that in those instances we do have free will, meaning that in other instances we do.

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

Neg framework was articulated but she just needs to show an instance of free will, this was unarticulated. Thus the arg that environment influences choice, doesn't cause choice, leads to a Neg ballot

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: [Signature]





Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Newell (Anna Newell)

Roy (Rebecca Roy)

AFF

NEG

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

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:

The argument on the "mind re-writing history" was a strong one. Excellent evidence - clearly explained in case.
 (and analysis)
 This evidence is not extended in the round, however.
 The story of the aff case was fairly solid initially, but under attack, it was not maintained.

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

Very nice work on the negative rebuttal speech.
 Also, solid work in c-x after rebuttal.
 And the consolidation did exactly what needed to be done.
 Avoid saying "whole entire" - just one of those words will do.

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

The turn on criminal justice was very strong, and the negative's focus on complex rather than simple decisions was also excellent analysis.
 The negative showed there are several indictments to aff ~~so~~ evidence story that means there is considerable doubt - about saying no free will.
 Aff needed to maintain case better - neg. controlled the round.

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)	

Congrats to both of you!

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

Signature: Fred Robertson





Judge: Harvey

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Newell (Anna Newell)

Roy (Rebecca Roy)

AFF

NEG

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

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:

A little too much preface. Try and avoid going down rabbit holes in CX. Too much time explaining. Keep your flow clean. You don't want to get lost reaching a point. Be careful of the claims you make, credibility is finite. No significant justification you can't say something like "we don't control our arms"

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

Don't read definitions if they're the same as your opponents. Conclusions need to be clearly signposted. There are to plant your feet. Too much description of the study in contentions. Be careful of "non-physical" there are not scientific words. Watch filter words such as "unlike". Don't try and go too fast, slow down to let the words flow

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

The Aff gave me three points to vote on Criminal justice/forensic psych, Neuroscience to environmental controls. Neg won two of them. To the first, the foundation of the crim justice system, as narrated by Neg, is that we do have free will, and even narrowing to forensic psych, if we don't have free will in one circumstance the implication is that we have free will in the others. To the neuroscience piece, the veto action piece obviated it, it's the burden of the Aff to show that these signals come from something other than conscious thought, it did not.

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]

