

Room: 1472
Start: 1200
CX

2

Stearns, Christo

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Wylie QS		
1A	Christine Quinto	28.8	2
2A	Megan Snopik	28.7	3

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Westwood KY		
2N	Ananth Kumar	28.9	1
1N	Jeffrey You	28.2	4

The better debating was done by the Neg from Westwood KY
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: ☒

Signed: CDJ

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Aff
- CI in 2AR had a defense of how you still access the state. That's prob. a contradiction.
 - New extrapolation of the aff in 2AR.
 - Most of 2AR was new extrapolation and explanation

Neg
• Bomers should be weaponized more

REFD: I vote neg on FW. I don't think the aff has any warranted impact analysis before the 2AR.

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Donna VA		
2	Amanda Valle	29	2
1	Brianna Alvarez	28	4

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Westside LR		
2	Aymen Labidi	29	1
1	Rohith Raman	28	3

The better debating was done by the Neg from Westside LR
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: P: 3:59 P: 2:57

Aff: not clear on how case meets topic
Historical violence towards
Mexican Americans.
disad - loss of hegemony.

P: 25 sec. + 0:12

Neg: Structural Violence.
b/c ↑ immigration.
- disad. grid failure

← Util →

Ac1 - very difficult to follow, super fast
argument won in NC2
- disad of ↑ immigration

Aff: Topicality of argument is questionable

Neg: Topicality of extinction is also nongermaine

BUT

Room: 1512
Start: 1200
CX

2

Sanchez, Gabriel

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Jesuit College Prep CR		
	Kyle Cribbins	2	28.3
	Joshua Ramos	1	28.5

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Borger BN		
	Pearson Bailey	3	28.0
	Lars Nelson	4	27.8

The better debating was done by the Aff from Jesuit CR
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The aff outweigh both disads. The neg never explains the impacts of the DA's and their I/L chain is shoddy at best. I think that without a specific explanation as to why immigrants consume more or why ~~immigrants~~ white right-wing people cause extinction, I default to aff

Room: 1354
Start: 1200
CX

2

Meuller, Eric

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Westwood BS		
	Vikas Burugu	28.5	1
	Daniel Shi	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Alief Kerr EN		
	Queen Eche	27.5	3
	Hillary Nguyen	27	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Westwood
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1NK Fw args need to be clearer. Run it more like (T) make it more coherent & easy to follow. Confusing. Speaking style makes coherence a little more difficult. Very choppy.

2AC Your args should be better organized. Do a better job on case. You should have sit down w/ 1.5 mins left. NEVER Good CX.

2NC Do more to specifically answer 2AC LBL. More of a group & jump theory of 2NC. Hard to follow. Combined w/ INC it makes neg strategy more incoherent.

1NR Hard to follow. Structure of neg attacks are confusing and need better organization.

1AR Good job of compartmentalizing & being organized. Good impact debate.

2NR Frame your offense and twice. Explain how defence makes offense solve.

2AR Be more substantive & organized. Good offense/Defence talk.

Room: 1442
Start: 1200
CX

2

Bartlett, Austin

TFA CX DEBATE 2019
Alief Taylor High School
March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Jesuit College Prep BM		
1	Justin Burns	28	2
2	Jack Martin	28.5	1

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Ridge Point SV		
1	Nyima Sanneh	25	4
2	Apoorva Verghese	25	3

The better debating was done by the Aff from Jesuit College Prep
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The aff and its existence is a counter to the logic of the two DAs the neg reads. The neg doesn't address the faulty racist logic of their arguments and as the decision maker I have to reject them. There's not a well warranted scenario the neg puts forth that I can vote for when you don't address its representations.

Room: 1353
Start: 1200
CX

2

Courville, Jason

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Greenhill AE Samar Ahmad	29	2
2	Christopher Eckert	29.7	1

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Reagan GP David Gutierrez	28.2	4
2	Kathryn Pham	28.8	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from GREENHILL AE
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: COURVILLE - KINKAID

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF WINS VS (K)

1) FRAMEWORK = INTELLIGIBLE, COHERANT POLICY
ADVOCACY GOOD

A) PORTABLE ADVOCACY SKILLS

B) GOOD, ISSUE-SPECIFIC DATA ON IMMIGRATION
POLICY ACTIVISM

2) ALT DOESN'T RESOLVE THE NEG LINKS

- STATE INEVITABLE

- FUTURITY INEVITABLE

- DOESN'T BAN STATE NOR
FORCE QUEER UNINTELLIGIBILITY

Room: 1533
Start: 1200
CX

2

Stringer, Heathe

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE


POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Katy RN		
①	Ethan Ross	29	3
②	Mark Nicholson	28	4

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Midway BW		
②	Stephen Bender	30	1
①	Benjamin White	30	2

The better debating was done by the neg from Midway BW
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- 1A- your Milet 17 card feels a little power-tagged - where is the warrant that burners is wrong?
- 2IN- AI scenario link? I don't understand its purpose (probably not baby universe scenario either - is this all from the link turn evidence?)
- 2A- as your case is not directly attacked, and one could argue concede case completely solves - you shouldn't spend 3 minutes on it. Focus on where the clash ~~is~~.
- 2NR- really amazing - good work here
- 2AR- definitely ran out of steam there. Your speech left me needing quite a bit more.
- RFD: voted neg on baby universe chance to wipe out universe outweighs human extinction

Room: 1462
Start: 1200
CX

2

Wilczynski, Soph

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Alief Kerr LG		
	Mike Ly	28.4	4
	Hannah Ghebrelul	28.6	3

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Reagan BL		
	Rema Bhat	29.4	1
	Emma Li	29	2

The better debating was done by the NEG from REAGAN BL
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

A/N
7:56 3:55
1:12

white supremism link ~~was~~ → off
only reentrenches xenophobic logic via
liberalism, & impx of kritik + case
whereas all has a role of ⑤

Room: 1320
Start: 1200
CX

2

Jennings, Nichol

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Pebble Hills LG		
2	Bryan Liston	27.4	3
1	Audrey Gutierrez	27.3	4

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Dripping Springs VM		
2	Varun Verma	28.4	2
1	Mason Mohon	28.5	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from Dripping Springs VM
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: NO

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~5:02~~ ~~1:50~~ 1:22
READING NEW IMPACTS IN THE 2AC
AND NOT USING THAT TIME TO ANSWER
YOUR OPPONENTS ARG'S IS A BAD
SOLUTION.

Aff needs to answer the FX ① Violation
2AC CX is damning. They could have
gone for ① in the 2NR.

NEED TO ANSWER THE KRITIK WITH
MORE THAN JUST WEAK NO LINK ARGS.
YOU ALSO DON'T ANSWER FRAMEWORK.

NEED A PERM ON THE KRITIK -

~~OFFENSE~~
~~vs.~~
~~Defense~~
~~Paradigm~~
RFD

Vote Neg
Conceded Alt ③
= Any chance
of ④ =
NEG BALLOT

- ① Russia Blaming
- ② Tech Workers
Lo(weaker)
- ③ Security Rhetoric
- ④ Utilitarianism.

Aff Claims to
③ Aff
Aff doesn't
③ Due to Serial
Policy Failure.

~~7:11~~ 1:41

you had two options in
this round. you chose the
Path of greater resistance.
It didn't matter but you
have a conceded violation on ①
with no Counter-Interp.

The kritik is okay should
have focused more on
the Russian threat ①
in 2NR

Be careful w/Securitization
Rhetoric ①. Your Russian
Blaming ① and has a lot
of Securitization language

Room: 1315
Start: 1200
CX

2

Cupo, Hazel

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Kinkaid HK		
	Amy Ho	29.4	2
	Dani Knobloch	29.5	1

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Round Rock BT		
	Arvind Balaji	28.7	3
	Akhsheiy Tangutur	28	4

The better debating was done by the Aff from Kinkaid HK
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Hazel Cupo

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted aff on the permutation and the abusers disad to the alternative.

Room: 1563
Start: 1200
CX

2

Williams, Gabriele

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
Greenhill KW		
1A Joshua Kwon	28.5	2
2A Timothy Wegener	29	1

NEGATIVE

POS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
Tuloso-Midway JX		
IN Vada Janak	27.5	3
2N Jennifer Xac	27.5	4

The better debating was done by the Aff from GHill
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Jedruil Williams

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

A - Good IAC, cut down on the teaming stuff and focus on more substance	IN - Base DA and T were fine, but the National DA is totally non-sense
2A - DAC was fine and made the arguments it needed to	2N - You need a better explanation of the DA Link and impact story - Bunch of New case Arg in the 2N, don't do that
2FD: I vote aff, T, DA, and case flows are a wash for Neg	

Room: 1373
Start: 1200
CX

2

Watson, Steven

LC

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	North Lamar HH	26	2
1	Garrett Holzwarth	26	
2	Zach Huffman	27	1

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	LC Anderson KL		
2	Ron Kiehn	24	3
1	Maxton Lynch	23	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from North Lamar HH
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Steven Watson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A) When speaking, make sure to pronounce, there were many places where you were incomprehensible. Good line of questioning in C-X. Good ~~roadmap~~ roadmap, great logical appeal to Neg's arguments.

1N. your speaking faded during the end of your breaths. No applied attacks in 1N. Handled questioning in C-X well. Need to listen to your opponents response. Be aware of fidgeting + mumbling in rebuttal. At this point evidence matters less than your ability to make + defend significant arguments. focus less on reading and make significant clash.

2A. Wonderful pronunciation in your speech but try to avoid becoming monotone. Very informal ~~roadmap~~ roadmap, covered all Neg arguments. Great job addressing questions in C-X. A metaphor could have helped with ICE discussion (without authorization) (No agency can act). A little more eye contact could also help with persuasion.

2N. Good line of questioning in C-X. Clear speaking will be aware of fidgeting, good application of arguments. Dropped T's, started to mumble in spreading towards the end. Some good logic here but saying that they only claimed abuse caused you to not take into consideration their arguments; the "abuse" statement was secondary. (Aff clearly stated why ICE had no authority) Reason for decision: Aff maintained stock issues handily and effectively defended against neg attacks.

Consider professionalism when deciding. (Both 1A + 2A)

Room: 1376
Start: 1200
CX

2

Lopez, Armando

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Midway JK		
1	Gawon Jo	27	4
2	Ivy Koh	30	1

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Chapin DH		
1	Cody Drake	28	3
2	Jonah Hormel	29	2

The better debating was done by the Aff from Midway JK
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg concedes case - no offense (reasons to vote neg) coming from case turns, etc.

L7 AFF wins on case

C.P. - Neg reads a CP that is noncompetitive/not mutually exclusive, and ~~don't~~ doesn't respond to the AFF's permutations, or how it solves for the AFF's specific structural impacts

L7 AFF
wins on
CP.

① - Some waffling here: is the Neg arguing that disabled immigrants don't constitute a substantial amount of all immigration (INC), or that the AFF is not redacting a substantial amount of legislation (2NC, INR)? Can't have both unless you're reading 2 distinct ① violations. AFF does a good job responding with we-meet, counter interp, and the arg that dismissing disabled immigrants as "insubstantial" proves the harms they lay out.

Room: 1504
Start: 1200
CX

2

Nix-Buckner, Kri

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Central GK		
1	Alesandra Gutierrez	30	4
2	Bailey King	30	3 _{1st}

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Lampasas KM		
2	Sena Kucukkarca	30	2
1	McKenzie McLendon	30	1

The better debating was done by the Aff from Central GK
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: ☒

Signed: Krista Nix-Buckner

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1AC - great summary of case in 1AC CX. Neg both asked good questions as well.
1NC - wow, Really interesting strategy! makes me excited to hear how y'all will work this in the 2NC. Kind of skews the Aff burdens, but I like it.

Aff > Ed, Argumentation key to Debate. Can do both.

Voting Aff on the Perm, RoB

Room: 1552
Start: 1200
CX

2

McCullough, Hunt

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Jesuit College Prep HT		
	Adam Hall	29.2	1
	Chris Tran	29.1	2

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	PSJA Southwest CG		
	Samantha Ceccopieri	28	4
	Ethan Greeno	28.3	3

The better debating was done by the Aff from Jesuit
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: H. Tran MR

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff is the rez, meets neg T interp

Case outweighs risk of econ turns

Room: 1374
Start: 1200
CX

2

Baez, Alejandro

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
Hebron BL		
Xain Bhagwandin	29.2	2
Aly Lalani	29.3	1

NEGATIVE

POS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
Hendrickson KV		
Bekla Kouakou	28.6	3
Victoria Vidaurri	28.5	4

The better debating was done by the Aff from Hebron
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD - Aff wins A.B. is antithetical
that the K & solve the aff - enough distinction
G/H the K & the aff for me to award
voting on a prem of no DA

Room: 1556
Start: 1200
CX

2

Chen, Sean

TFA CX DEBATE 2019
Alief Taylor High School
March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Coppell AK		
2	Vanuli Arya	28.4	4
1	Arnav Kashyap	28.8	2

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Hendrickson CF		
2	Alejandro Castaneda_Zuni	29	1
1	Mahnoor Faheem	28.7	3

The better debating was done by the NEG from Hendrickson
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Sean Chen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

CP solves majority of case, Base DA outweigh
Solvency deficits

Room: 1349
Start: 1200
CX

2

Magocha, Nyasha

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Clear Lake NV		
1	Avineet Nanjappa	25.5	4
2	Dhyuti Venkataraman	26.5	2

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Leander CT		
2	Sofia Childress	27	1
1	Benjamin Townsend	26	3

The better debating was done by the neg from leanders
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff - always read a perm to the K, ALWAYS
↳ they read no alt to the K and dropped it in the ZNC, that gives the K no competitive adv
to the aff & solvesolvency
1 AC - slow down on tags please!

Neg - learn your link ev better & learn how to contextualize it to the aff w/o using unnecessary
jargon
↳ also, you do not have an alt (which for me, as a judge who likes Ks - it's important),
nowhere in your ev does it state you're generating a new pedagogy nor did
the INC state the alt
↳ know your K
- neg has burden of proof to provide a solid explanation for why the Rena model is pref.

RFD: alt solves the mpx of the aff

↳ the link of fear merging (w/ deportation & immigration) and the commodification of immigrant
labor through "immigration reform" are two substantively large solvency deficits to the
aff

Room: 1515
Start: 1200
CX

2

Abdelhady-Khalil

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Hightower TS		
	Kevin Tran	28.3	3
	Hemant Sai	28.2	4

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Reagan DL		
	Idalina Du	28.8	2
	Andy Liu	28.9	1

The better debating was done by the Neg from Reagan DL
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: K olw's and turns the case.

Room: 1322
Start: 1200
CX

2

Hodgkiss, Colin

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Heights AG		
	Alfonso Arreola	29	2
2A	Tavia Gabrysch	30	1

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Harlingen South VG		
	Christian Villarreal	29	3
	Ramiro Gonzalez	28	4

The better debating was done by the Neg from VG
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: yes

Signed: Colin Hodgkiss

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

There needs to be more work on framing in the 2AC

Also, why do you not go for a single Cap good turn that the 2AC read? I would have probably bought them.

Essentially there are a lot of underdeveloped arguments that you don't go for on Cap that you should.

"Case" isn't a specific location on case. The K is really vague. Both speeches throw events around as if they are inherently impacts to Cap with no explanation of how Cap generates these conditions.

- Side note, I'm further confused when you don't explain how imperialism plays into the argument on the K.

RFD: I vote neg on a risk of the impacts. I think the aff makes a mistake in not doing more to ensure util is bad. It means that I buy that util eventually leads to mass death, which turns the case, 2nd, it means that I'm very cautious in determining that util is a safe way to vote.

Room: 1511
Start: 1200
CX

2

Martin, Kinsey

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	
	Robert Vela ZS
2	Thalia Zuniga
1	Ethan Salinas

POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
27 km	3
28	
26	4

NEGATIVE

POS	
	Houston Memorial AD
1	Isabel An
2	Olivia Du

POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
27.5	2
28	1

The better debating was done by the Neg from Houston Memorial AD
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I vote neg here on Cede the political turn; Aff doesn't have enough of a response except blippy defense responses that don't prove the turn wrong.

Room: 1580
Start: 1200
CX

2

Holland, Justin

CARMONA

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Sudan MS		
	Arissa Moore	29	1
	Makayla Serrano	30	2

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	London SA		
	Matthew Sun	27	4
	Emily Abrego	28	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from Moore / Serrano
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Both teams watch use of prep time
- Both teams spent too much time on whether new AFF cases are good or bad for debate. This is just a comment and does not weigh on my decision.
- AFF wins because they effectively countered all NEG arguments.

Room: 1355
Start: 1200
CX

2

Erdman, Julian

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Houston Memorial ZS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Bailey Zhang	27	2
2	Diana Salha	26	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Lovejoy CL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Jack Czyz	27	1
2	Mitchell Laman	26	4

The better debating was done by the Neg from Lovejoy CL

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: 35

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

ZAC - odd roadmap in the ZAC. Answer the case line by line when doing the overview. That is more efficient. Need to work on organization. You don't read the right framework in the ZAC. You should be reading policy making good FW & State good. The extinction 1st impact framing is more applicable to the Apoc rhetoric theory stuff. You jump all over the cap flow. I don't hear a perm ever on the k. I don't hear impact turns on why cap is good. kinda played the cap flow very defensively like much of the ZAC. Need to answer all case arguments in the ZAC. Need to be careful with ZAC interp to Apoc Rhetoric.

AR - Need to make strategic decisions here. Seeing as ZAC concedes no internal link to the 1st & 3rd Adv you should kick them & go all in on Adv two. Need to extend the risk of solvency. Good cross application of the solvency to meet ROB, need to be done in the ZAC though. Need to point out that Neg doesn't mean ROB because they don't warrant how Cap solver SV just also that isn't real because we have never escaped Cap. Need to identify that cruel optimism DA on case is a solvency deficit but not a reason to reject the Aff.

ZAR - Need to only focus on Adv 2 & extend a risk of solvency to have a chance to win the round. ~~Need to focus on Adv 2 & extend a risk of solvency to have a chance to win the round.~~

RFD: Aff doesn't supply adequate reasons as to why the state is good. As a result I vote Neg on "Cruel optimism" DA that state increases structural violence. Neg wins.

INC - Don't know why the Apoc rhetoric theory is necessary for the round. Weird attempt to generate offense. Also, your case attacks ~~are~~ all seemingly sound like k links that you are trying to use as solvency turns. That's kinda lazy. Need to work on organization & signposting on case flow. You go everywhere. You don't have to read framework for the k in the INC.

ZNC - odd strategy call in Neg block. I think the k flow should definitely be in the ZNC. Need to be more responsive to ZAC responses to Apoc Rhetoric. Need to be careful with perm con. Need to provide reasons to prefer on your framework. Also, you should present a clear interp on framework. Also, give me votes for your Framework. Be careful with ROB being solving SV with a cap k. You won't solve SV ~~without~~ without cap. that's hard to justify.

INR - You have to make a decision at some points. You say you don't have to defend the alt to your k. Where's that in your interp? How does that meet your Rule of the Bullet? Then you say the k solves the Aff? So you can't defend alt when its convenient & then avoid it when it isn't. You uncover the cap k substantially which is what you are really winning. Need better analysis on Cruel optimism DA & how that really impacts out. Also, I think the alt might link.

ZNR - ~~Need to kick the k correctly~~ You have to reanswer & extend the answer to the counterstarts of the counter interp. You can't just say that I did that earlier. You shouldn't be extending ROB that is not a good look for y'all. Y'all have no access to solving/meeting the ROB.

Room: 1347

Start: 1200

CX

2

Bonnette, Bonnie

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

irony - Le making argument that PIC hurts communication when he speaks too fast to be understood

AFFIRMATIVE

POS Reagan LV
2A Tai Le
1A Anand Valavalkar

POINTS Max = 30
RANKS
4 26
3 27
(10)

NEGATIVE

POS Melissa GS
1A Anna Gressett
2A Alex Sullivan

POINTS Max = 30
RANKS
28 2
30 1
(10)

The better debating was done by the Neg from Melissa GS
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Bonnette

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I am pretty sure that my paradigm indicates that I am okay with a moderate level of speed. The 1A was not clear on taglines vs. arguments and 1A went too fast with the taglines, so I missed parts of both sets of arguments.

2A started off speaking so fast that I threw my paradigm and refused to flow the first few minutes - I had NO idea what he was saying. I have to be able to follow the arguments in order to weigh them in the round. I am a traditional judge and I flow on paper. You have to be able to adapt to your judges. That is good advice for all four debaters. The neg coach spent several minutes clarifying my paradigm, but no one bothered to ask me about speed. I said in paradigm disc. that I accept PICS. Wasting time on "PICS bad"

RFD

I reject the PICS bad argument and the restriction/revelation I want. As a policy maker, I want to see policy being developed. I voted on the drops in democracy/engages by Aff and on Neg argument that repealing Assets clause leads to lack of health care & assistance to immigrants. Aff was not clear to effectively counter it.

Room: 1350
Start: 1200
CX

2

Marriott-Voss, M

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Hebron HP		
	Sameer Haq	28.7	1
	Krish Patel	28.6	2

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Clear Springs PH		
	Jordan Pavelko	28.1	4
	Kevin Huang	28.2	3

The better debating was done by the Aff from Hebron
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg doesn't have an interp
or offensive standards on
framework

Aff was subject formation
only aspect

Room: 1375
Start: 1200
CX

2 O'Bannon, Camero

TFA CX DEBATE 2019
Alief Taylor High School
March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Winston Churchill AV		
2A	Gloria Alcala	27.5	2
1A	Gaby Valdez	28.5	1

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Central KG		
2N	Hannah Kim	26.5	3
1N	Davian Garcia	26.5	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from CHURCHILL
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

PLEASE DON'T STEAL PREP. FLASHING SHOULDN'T BE A
5 HOUR PROCESS.

RFD:

INC KIND OF GIVES AWAY THE SCORE WHEN
THEY CONCEDE IN CX THAT (A) IT WOULD BE
WRONG TO MAKE LATINX PEOPLE DEFEND USFG,
AND (B) THAT THE (K) ISN'T REALLY COMPETITIVE.

I THINK AFF WINS (1) / FW ON A NUMBER OF
POINTS - ^{NEG} ADDRESS THEIR RESPONSES TO FAIRNESS
& EDU. STANDARDS. OR THEIR C/I.

Room: 1510
Start: 1200
CX

2

Clarke, Kevin

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS

Hebron KL

Sunil Krish

Gavin Loyd

POINTS
Max = 30

RANKS

28.9

1

28.8

2

NEGATIVE

POS

Winston Churchill DA

Norman Davis

Ralph Anderson

POINTS
Max = 30

RANKS

28.4
~~28.4~~

4

28.5

3

The better debating was done by the Aff from Hebron KL
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: 1502
Start: 1200
CX

2

Crady, Leslie

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Princeton BD		
	Eden Burke	30	1
	Taylor Dougherty	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Hightower GK		
	Isabella Gandara	28	3
	Snehal Kumar	27	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Princeton
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

Leslie Crady

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff. I did not care too much for your remittance link turn because it talks about the immigrants returning home to teach the skills they learned to help Mexico's economy from collapsing, then it means we are losing our workers again. Make sprz to emphasize it's B they said back.
Aff did a better job w/ remittances argument - can prove that Mexico eco is declining now.
Aff does good job pointing out that the CP does not provide / give them more workers.
Aff. liked when you said by helping the small farms (Trump supporters) this will instead help his base.
PFD: Aff wins on T
Remittances BA, permed CP;
stronger evidence.

Neg needs to attack framework earlier on if you want me to look @ that.
Neg lost T (not by much) when the neg keeps referring to a 2-part plan. You also agreed in CX that it would lead to IPR in the end.
Negs arguments w/ the CP had too much to do w/ large farms. You need more evidence that directs more w/ small farms?
H2A.
Neg. needs to prove why perm will not work.
Neg. needs to give a time frame for the T argument.
Amuedo - Dorantes 10 cards - "IPR status might ~~facilitate~~ facilitate" "amnesty might cause..."
not my favorite evidence to prove something

Room: 1554
Start: 1200
CX

2

Smith, Jesse

MARKHAM J

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Princeton JR		
2	Alexis Jones	27	2
1	Hannah Rodriguez	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Morton Ranch VL		
2	Melanie Viesca	25	3
1	Hector Luviano	25	4

The better debating was done by the Aff from PRINCETON JR
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: J. All

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A - I could understand your spreading, but your voice levels were a bit too low at times making it unable to be understood, & inhibiting communication.

Your IAR was very good. This was the first time in the round where I actually was brought along with each arg/refutation.

Both: Please look up more often & work on more professional presentation techniques.

2A - I would lower your stand so that your computer isn't hiding your face throughout the entire speech.

This severely inhibits communication w/ the audience.

When your spreading sounds like nothing more than a hum, there's no way you're adequately communicating.

Both watch being rude in CX. There's a big difference between being strong & being rude.

At the end of the day, this was one of the most convoluted and confusing rounds I've ever judged. There was a major disconnect between your arguments & actually communicating those arguments to me. Ultimately, it came down to the fact that there's no real reason to reject the Aff given lack of on-case clash.

T- Neg showed that Aff clearly isn't solving for immigration to the US. Aff is untropical.

↳ NEG

DA - Backlash } Both of these DAs are very similar & both accomplish the same point. Trump-Bashing.
DA - Base } There are many, many more args that could be run rather than basing most of our time on a subject that is irrelevant. Ultimately, Aff showed how generic these args were & that there was no way the impacts would come to fruition.

Framework/On-case - I do agree w/ Neg's only on-case arg that just because they come to the US, that all structural violence will be removed from their lives. This is a completely unrealistic view & there's no way for Aff to solve for this.

↳ NEG

Good Job & Good Luck!

*You can't use leftover CX time for prep.

1N - Be careful! your speed was inhibiting your communication by causing you to stutter quite a bit.

Once you slowed down, you did a great job.

*Never ask to leave for the restroom during the round unless you're literally about to throw up.

*LET YOUR PARTNER TALK! There is absolutely NO reason you should be answering & asking every CX question for her.

2N - I wouldn't use the stand if it's going to cover up your entire face while speaking as it massively inhibits your communication. Work on organization of speech so that there's not so much silence during your speech. Also, use all your time. Having 2 min left in the 2NC is not going to win debate rounds. Feel free to run more on-case args.

I would really appreciate one of you standing up at the podium for CX guesting. Also, don't let open CX give you an excuse to show who's obviously the weaker partner.

Even if your speeches are done, please stay off your phone during Aff Prep

Room: 1344
Start: 1200
CX

2

Gilbert, Evan

TFA CX DEBATE 2019
Alief Taylor High School
March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Greenhill RT		
1	Ethan Rothstein	29.1	2 2
2	Shaurya Tathgir	29.2	1 1

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Reagan EM		
2	Jocelyn Epstein	29	3 3
1	Tashya Makani	28.9	4 4

The better debating was done by the Aff from Greenhill
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff meets the interp on T

Room: 1507
Start: 1200
CX

2

Coltzer, William

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Guyer IM		
	Misbah Imtiaz	29	2
	Hasan Mubarak	29.1	1

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Louis E. Brandeis BO		
	Henry Barajas	28.5	4
	Akruti Obhrai	28.6	3

The better debating was done by the aff from Guyer
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: *

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The neg inter can't resolve any of their offense - I agree w/ aff DB
about inter case allows for present in context of that restriction and
you want or if total immigration which is overlimiting.

Room: 1577
Start: 1200
CX

2

Cosio, Jake

J.

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
Heights PW		
Alex Poll	29	1
Thomas Williams	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
J. W. Nixon AB		
Daniella Aguirre	27	3
Angie Bravo	27	4

The better debating was done by the Aff from Heights PW
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

this round is really messy. Neg really needs to words an organization to make it easier to follow and understand.

House trade: Neg drops 2AC answers is the block to lower of a really long extension. This
Narrowest reduces the ~~the~~ risk of the DA substantially.

T: Conceded by neg is the cross of the 2NC. T is only a question of the
plan that only → if you say the plan text is topical then the aff is ~~the~~ topical.

Case: Machines - defense
Lobby - defense
Appo - defense

more of which takes out the aff
I feel citizenship is the only offense on the case flow, but is not
impacted well at all. This makes it really difficult to see how
the aff is bad to try if we have even a small chance of
solving aff ~~impacts~~ impacts.

I vote aff.

Room: 1351
Start: 1200
CX

2

Holmes, Davy

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Barbers Hill MD		
1	Wesley Mosley	28.2	1
2	Gustavo De_Toni_Uchoa	28.1	2

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Borden County ISD CG		
2	Madi Cole	28	3
1	Katie Gray	28	4

The better debating was done by the Aff from Barbers Hill MD
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff- Read a counter-interp on topicality.

Neg- You need a better terminal impact to your DA, or at the very least you should argue that the DA ~~turns~~ the case. Also, you cannot ignore the aff's framework.

I think the Aff has a pretty good risk of solving some stigmatization and discrimination faced by those with disabilities. The neg is mostly defensive and doesn't provide an alternate framework for evaluation.

Room: 1508
Start: 1200
CX

2

Hutchinson, Will

TFA CX DEBATE 2019
Alief Taylor High School
March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Westwood BG		
2	Vineeth Bandi	28.9	1
1	Aaron Greisdorf	28.8	2

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Athens LH		
1	Gavin Lott	28.4	4
2	William Honea	28.5	3

The better debating was done by the Aff from Westwood
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Will Hutch

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff interp creates a more ethical model for debate

Room: 1352

Start: 1200

CX

2

Iyer, Subbu

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Elkins IJ		
2A	Samir Idrees	27.2	4
1A	Joshua John	27.5	3

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Tuloso-Midway BR		
2N	Jenna Barrera	27.6	2
1N	Joann Robledo	27.7	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from TULOSO-MIDWAY
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

Subramaniam Iyer

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*neg wins with DA + twens case
any*

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Kinkaid PP		
2	Spencer Powers	28.9	1
1	Sahar Punjwani	28.7	2

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Banquete WG		
2	Tia Whitman	27.1	4
1	Isabel Gonzalez	27	3

The better debating was done by the Aff from KINKAID
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

THE NEGATIVE STRATEGY IS FLAWED BASED ON A MISUNDERSTANDING OF THE AFF (THAT THE AFF ISN'T A U-VISA) AND THAT IT'S METHOD DOESN'T FOREIGN CONSULAR OFFICES (NEITHER WOULD U-VISA BY THE WAY). THE DA'S BEING READ DON'T LINK TO THE AFF. WHILE I COULD VOTE ON THIS ALONE, I THINK THE RISK OF A LINK TURN ONLY MAKES THIS DECISION EASIER, ESPECIALLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE FRAMING DEBATE. I THINK THAT THE AFF MAY DECREASE BACKLOGS BY DECREASING RESTRICTIONS. (USCIS DA) I THINK THAT THE CONSULAR OVERSTRETCH DA HAS SOME MAJOR INTERNAL PROBLEMS. I'M LESS CONCERNED WITH THE TOSS & GAO EVIDENCE THAN I AM ABOUT THE TOTAL LACK OF AN INTERNAL LINK. I THINK I CAN VOTE ON NO RISK HERE. W/ NO C, I DON'T HAVE TO WORRY ABOUT THE FRAMING DEBATE THOUGH I THINK ONLY THE AFF IS DOING ANY COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS.

Room: 1401
Start: 1200
CX

2

Remaley, Mason

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Liberal Arts and Scie PS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Ian Poe	30	2
2	Adam Scott	30	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Coppell BR	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Vishvak Bandi	29	3
2	Rahul Rajamani	29	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Liberal Arts and Scie
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I think the neg ~~has~~ has a hard time ~~defending~~ up for the aff in this debate. I don't think the K has a real substantive link I can sink my teeth into in the 2nd that isn't ~~admittedly~~ answered by the aff. Conceding for aff in the 2nd may have been a mistake as the aff was able to portray that info from that makes sense at least to me. My biggest problem with the K at the end of the round is that it seemingly ceased to be about the aff and was only about itself. Specifically I saw a real lack of cross applications to the aff besides a tiny bit of link analysis.

Room: 1348
Start: 1200
CX

2

Johnson, Pamela

LC

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Andrews FB		
	Sarai Flores	27	2
	Jakob Barton	26	3

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	LC Anderson CM		
	Brett Cryan	28	1
	Purav Maheshwari	26	4

The better debating was done by the Neg from LC Anderson CM
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: ☒

Signed: Pamela Johnson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- IAC: Plan text needs more specificity because "substantially reduce immigration restrictions" is not the something the aff wants to do. I would include more framing in the IAC because the aff lends itself to a lot of different frameworks, but never picks one.
- 1NC - The link chains of the DA's would have been better fleshed out if you picked fewer and focused on the impacts. More context makes the DA's more persuasive.
- 2AC - The first CP was dropped. Spend less time on-case to cover all of the off-case. The first half of the 2AC was on on-case, but a lot of the off-case was dropped. on the 1-engage with the voters.
- 2NC - The coverage on the 2NC was really good. Before the speech don't ask questions like "did you read a perm?" → gives the aff the opportunity to make one up and look like you didn't read/listen.
- 1NR - Don't forget to say that you're kicking out of stuff during the speech.
- 1AR - 1AR is too late to make a perm on the first CP.
- 2NR - I would have picked IDA and ran with it as the net benefit. Also, don't kick out and then kick back in to your CP after the speech. Kicking out of that CP after spending the majority of the debate on it would have lost you the round.
- 2AR - I can't assume mutual exclusivity. If you don't explicitly say "perm," I won't perm the CP for you.
- RFD - The Neg's CP outweighs because of the lack of contestation of net benefits from the aff + the lack of explicit aff perm.

Room: 1326
Start: 1200
CX

2

Conner, Alden

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Woodlands MR		
	Keagan Mirazee	29	2
	Aakash Reddy	29.2	1

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Mt. Pleasant CT		
	Connelly Cowan	28.8	3
	Taryn Thurman	28.4	4

The better debating was done by the aff from Woodland
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I vote aff b/c the humanist redress DA impact turns
the negs framework which is the only NB to the K.
I think that even if the K could solve portions of
the aff that ~~the~~ the negs introduction of FW makes
me skeptical of if it would ever approach the
metaphysical question of Slack being.

Room: 1560
Start: 1200
CX

2

Ribera, Claudia

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Greenhill CW		
	Sam Charnes	29.2	2
	Alex Witheiler	29.3	1

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	PSJA Southwest LS		
	Sofia Leal	28.0	4
	Mariano Salcedo	28.1	3

The better debating was done by the Aff from Greenhill CW
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Claudia Ribera

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff - great job with cross-ex!
- can leverage the aff more on the base da

Neg - you should NOT concede case and impact framing.
- need to line by line the aff responses on every row
- really good job at being clear!

Decision - I vote affirmative. T and Base da goes away
b/c conceded terminal defense and offense on both
flows. There is no link to the Base DA.

Room: 1366
Start: 1200
CX

2

Morrow, Cody

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Westwood DL		
1A	Shea Dombrowski	28.4	4
2A	Hannah Liu	28.5	3

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Jesuit College Prep AK		
2N	Ashik Amar	28.6	1
1N	Logan Kim	28.6	1 2

The better debating was done by the Neg from Jesuit
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: intervention is not inevitable b/c ^{us} Unipolarity is decreasing now. Plus, sq = too few translators which erodes credibility in our intel leaving the US more hesitant to intervene elsewhere.

Room: 1371
Start: 1200
CX

2

Brannen, Christo

La

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Greenhill RH		
	Nikhil Ratnam	28	2
	Sophia Hurst	29	1

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	La Vernia NE		
	Brandon Niday	28	3
	Josh Elsik	28	4

The better debating was done by the

AFF or NEG

from

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: The Neg never addresses Aff framing.
As a result, I find that Aff case leaves the
least risk of legal violence toward immigrants
despite the thin warrant provided.

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Dulles YP		
1	Robert Yang	27.5	4
2	Shaan Parekh	29	3

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Liberal Arts and Scie EW		
2	Jackson Eckel	29.5	1
1	Kate Wang	23.5	2

The better debating was done by the Neg from LASA
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: M. Sato

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

C.R. solves most of the case - Aff fails to make screening distractions a factor in weighing the Disadvantage gained by Aff v. Neg.

Neg controls uniqueness on D.A. resulting in 10 @ for potential offense
Risk that fight over policy = I/C to D.A. - Aff no Link & Link turn evidence wouldn't disrupt that event

Room: 1447
Start: 1200
CX

2

Garcia, Andrew

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Lindale JS		
2	Zachary Jones	28.0	4
1	Joshua Smith	28.5	2

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Elkins RS		
1	Kirthivel Ramesh	28.5	1
2	Anik Shah	28.0	3

The better debating was done by the NEG from ELKINS R.S.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: NEG WIN THAT CAP IS ROOT CAUSE OF
STRUCTURAL OPPRESSION/VIOLENCE. PERM STILL
4/ THROUGH INCLUSION OF NEOLIBERAL
REFORM MECHANISMS. NEG WINS BECAUSE IS
METHODOLOGICAL COMPARISON AND THAT
~~WAS~~ UNFLINCHING MARXISM > THEN STATE-
BASED SOLUTIONS

Room: 1346
Start: 1200
CX

2

Dimmig, Brenden

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS South Texas Acad BP

Briana Boughter

Kush Patel

POINTS

Max = 30

RANKS

28 UN

1

28 LAR

2

NEGATIVE

POS

Dulles LS

Adrienne Li

Ashley Sheng

POINTS

Max = 30

RANKS

28 LAR

28 EAS

3

The better debating was done by the

APB
AFF or NEG

from

South Texas Acad
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

NO

Signed:

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

CP: No explanation to how CP ③
IAC; Synthetic to IAR/2AR ③ defect

DA: Dropped De-Pol

CASO: Brash + about You're characteristics

Room: 1377

Start: 1200

CX

2

Ramsey, Alec

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Liberal Arts and Scie GR		
	Danielle Gu	29.8	3
	Dhruv Ruttala	28.7	4

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Coppell RD		
	Shreyas Rajagopal	29.3	2
	Het Desai	29.4	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from Coppell
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Debate = ? of research
- Sullivan = offense
 & answered by
 aff
- & ! calc by 2AR
 aff come the 1AR

Room: 1324
Start: 1200
CX

2

Harrison, Bennet

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Winston Churchill MB		
2	Alexandra Myers	28.5	1
1	Benjamin Brody	28.4	2

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Prosper RW		
2	Jordan Ramsey	28.2	3
1	Addison Wellenberger	28.1	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Winston Churchill
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The presentation resolves many reasons state is bad, and the alternative cannot resolve exclusions of queer people based on the good moral character standard.

Room: 1368
Start: 1200
CX

2

Johnson, Clark

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Hendrickson GS		
1	Trey Gutierrez	29.1	2
2	Dylan Scott	29.3	1

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Jesuit College Prep FJ		
1	Giovannie Ferrer-Falto	28.8	4
2	Ethan Jackson	28.9	3

The better debating was done by the Aff Hendrickson from Hendrickson
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: Perm o/w CP
aff has mult. structural claims
which o/w the OA so I think
the round is risic ok (S) deficit
and I think the CP (S) the
tech leadership scenanno now does
is (S) labor shortages to the degree
the aff does.

Room: 1559
Start: 1200
CX

2

Gerst, Crayton

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Jesuit College Prep HM		
2	Riler Holcombe	1	29.5
1	Jack Moore	2	29.5

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Lovejoy SM		
2	Tajvir Singh	29	3
1	Andrew Mao	29	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Jesuit College Prep
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF wins Reason DA reps turn K
from overpopulation DA flow

AFF wins because team no
sufficient answer to Shmidt support.

AFF wins Util tons

Room: 1558
Start: 1200
CX

2

Lipton, Adam

TFA CX DEBATE 2019
Alief Taylor High School
March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Jesuit College Prep MW		
	Jack Madden	28.3	3
	Pete Weigman	28.5 28.5	1

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Liberal Arts and Scie CU		
	Katherine Chacon	28.4	2
	Roman Ugarte	28.3	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Jesuit
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I think the risk is not distinct
from the aff or rather has
no net benefit. Only impact extended
is the aff. Risk aff as
same points best
methodology.

Room: 1531
Start: 1200
CX

2

Stolte, Preston

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Reagan CV		
	Anna Chavez	28.9	1
	Jamie Volz	28.7	4

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Jesuit College Prep GN		
	Jack Griffiths	28.8	3
	Garret Nagorzanski	28.9	2

The better debating was done by the Aff from Reagan
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: ☒

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Oral

Room: 1372
Start: 1200
CX

2

Rizvi, Ali

TFA CX DEBATE 2019
Alief Taylor High School
March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Andrews SB		
	Journey Sais	28.4	3
	Jordan Barton	28.3	4


NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Hendrickson YD		
	Joseph Yeh	28.6	1
	David Do	28.5	2

The better debating was done by the Neg from Hendrickson YD
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

OK.