

Room: 1351
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Remaley, Mason

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Andrews SB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Journey Sais	29	2
	Jordan Barton	26	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Prosper RW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Jordan Ramsey	30	1
	Addison Wellenberger	28	3

The better debating was done by the Nos from Prosper
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 dar cores was too late on the K floor to truly have to resist behind it. At the end of the day the only thing the Aff has on the K is the palm but after the round I am left confused on what it specifically does and means. The 4 lines do not expanded and it seems that the aff took around it without a clear extension of it. At the end of the day the nos has unexplained links, alt, impacts and a cease turn on xenophobia in various moments. That turn was contested in an inefficient way not by saying robot rather by saying we must resist C (when the Zapatistas are). I would have liked to see how the dar was more case V.K. compared to the dar didn't give you much to work with. Also, for the nos, why did the dropped Rob visit after the speech it was in.

Room: 1442
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Marriott-Voss, M

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Coppell AK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Vanuli Arya	28.6	3
	Arnav Kashyap	28.8	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Hebron KL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Sunil Krish	28.7	2
	Gavin Loyd	28.5	4

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Oral

Room: 1561
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Brannen, Christo

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Lampasas KM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Sena Kucukkarca	30	1
1	McKenzie McLendon	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Chapin DH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Cody Drake	26	4
2	Jonah Hormel	28	3

The better debating was done by the

aff
AFFIRMATIVE

from

Lampasas KM
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NFD: Ok... So the Aff ran a pretty squirrelly satire
a ft. The Negative never runs anything on case.
Case is dropped. I view the Argument based
on counter-interpretations. The Affs framework
is never touched, so based on their framework
I find them to be topical. I bet a ft to Aff lots
in the absence of a Neg response as well.

Room: 1372
Start: 2pm
CX

5

McCullough, Hunt

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Greenhill CW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sam Charnes	28.7	1
2	Alex Witheiler	28.6	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Reagan DL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Idalina Du	28.1	4
2	Andy Liu	28.3	3

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: Hat/M

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Plan says "Legal Immigration", Debate just defines what that means

Room: 1377
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Stanley, Dane

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Clear Lake NV	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Avineet Nanjappa	28	4
2	Dhyuti Venkataraman	29	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Reagan LV	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Tai Le	28	3
2	Anand Valavalkar	28	2

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Global Warming - automation ↑ carbon out.
Pandemics -
Economic Loss - loss in ag. profitability

Extinction: Trump lashes out after loss
of base. / terrorism.
counter after 2021

I am voting for the Aff because the sole argument made, on rather in opposition to the Aff. case, was extinction through the President's use of unchecked nuclear war. The cards used for this were flimsy at best, one being President Roosevelt in WWII (this might have had more to do with the whole world being at war, and the impending threat from two world powers seeking global domination). The affirmative also had the preparation to counter the extinction CP. Overall, my decision rested on the debate over the CP, the ACI was more or less dropped ~~to~~ except for opening and closing statements.

Room: 1533
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Nix-Buckner, Kri

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

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

NEGATIVE

POS	Tuloso-Midway JX	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Vada Janak	25	4
2	Jennifer Xac	27	3

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: 5

Signed: Krista Nix-Buckner

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

INC - I told you to label the off case, twice, and you didn't.
Stop skipping around. Sign Post.

DA goes AFF, N/A
Case goes AFF, NO offense
Framework was a wash
Cap K, voted AFF on the
Impact Turn

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Wyllie QS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Christine Quinto	28.5	2
2	Megan Snopik	30	1

NEGATIVE

POS	PSJA Southwest CG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Samantha Ceccopieri	26.5	4
2	Ethan Greeno	27	3

The better debating was done by the Aff from Wyllie QS
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 - Neg does a decent job arguing for Stenier's intent; however, the education O/w arguments made by the Aff go conceded. Per my paradigm, I'm not sure fairness is anything more than an internal link to the education. Aff may not be T, but I'm not convinced that matters.

K - Not sure how this links or how the Aff is competitive. I buy that a proliferation of resistance strategies is good, in keeping w/ the ethic of the IAC.

Cosc - No offense on the case flow means that all of the thesis level stuff flows Aff. This gives them access to perms on the K flow and the DAs on both the K and T flows. Also grants access to perf-con.

Room: 1462
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Lucas, Anna

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

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

NEGATIVE

POS	Donna VA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2N	Amanda Valle	27	4
1N	Brianna Alvarez	27	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from Borden County ISD CG
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

IAC give IAC interview, it's an inefficient use of time leading IAC CX → ask offense questions (otherwise it's free speech)

INC signpost
CP → no net-benefit
DA is not-textual to aff
y'all can't win another arg as CP w/ no net-benefit, it's not a reason to reject Aff
avoid DA
ICE still accesses warrants to VL of nation collapse Evidence
Aff have to @ for ICE
Aff have to present definitions in IAC → not abusive

2AC if ~~aff~~ us already committed plan is unnecessary - squo @
Extensions are overkill → just xt. IAC as Q/V w/ more efficiency

Better perm is just PPB

- mutually exclusive, can do both at same time → Double Bind
- if aff is significant enough to @ (4000 people) that CP does too → ICE deportation → those who enter & end up at detention centers stay, ↑ immigration (successful) to U.S.

2NC/1NR
Organize your arguments + don't read arguments that don't apply to aff
Brain Drain Turn - so the translators ~~don't~~ have an obligation to stay??
dangerous thing to say
Nation collapse Turn - contextual to aff & actually xenophobic

I think y'all are just pulling arguments & seeing what sticks → fuck about what is actually strategic & contextual to the Aff

Why can y'all say "moral highground" but also → reject immigrants → doesn't compute at all for me → please explain

Why one translators keep to survive???

1NR
Thank you for taking no prep.

2NR
you have no standards or voters on T-LPR
T-substantial is a really (didn't give IAC ev) bad arg → it's just not abusive to not read definitions in IAC and y'all didn't ask about them in CX.

You just reiterate neg block and don't xt offense & drop their args

2AR
- say aff doesn't @ → just say no brigantine
- arguments are great [2 14 steps] even tho ~~some~~ flawed system still exist

organization/redundancy + time efficiency needs a little work → NEER had 0 offense → wouldn't need all 5 min.

Room: 1349
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Boswell, Israel

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Katy RN	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Ethan Ross	27	4
1	Mark Nicholson	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS	South Texas Acad BP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Briana Boughter	30	1
1	Kush Patel	28	3

The better debating was done by the

AFF OF NEG

from

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed:

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

APP - Very interesting approach. I like the Philosophy behind this, ~~that~~ We establish what we create in our minds (Not real) should not have boundaries ~~or~~ and should mimic our universe. Global Crises. Nuclear War. Structural Violence? (AI Impact)
Topicality is always a voter. I like how you took this approach w/the USIS (EB) Exemption and not eliminate.
Decision: This was the most interesting debate - was I was almost convinced on Topicality but the Neg decided to drop that claim (T). To me this is about perception. Since Neg dropped (T) my vote goes for Affirmation.
Negation - Very well structured. Good call on T argument but to me I don't feel its strong enough just yet. Good reasoning about excluding other fictional universe. Good effort for talking about how it limits the resolution. Good attack on the AI but Percentage us more people is questionable. Good job distinguishing imperial reality. Too stick to abuse and attack on Case Scenarios. Clash! Good Job (Framework) Good job!

Room: 1348
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Bonnette, Bonnie
LC

I really enjoyed
this debate!

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE


POS	Athens LH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1A	Gavin Lott	30	1
2A	William Honea	30	2

NEGATIVE

POS	LC Anderson KL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2N	Ron Kiehn	30	3
1N	Maxton Lynch	28	4

The better debating was done by the Neg from LC Anderson 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:

1N - you would have been better off reading 3 off case arguments and developing them well. I have the feeling that you just knew everything you had at me, hoping something would stick. I guess you plan to kick half of them. The problem with that strategy is the fact that you flew through those arguments, and I missed more than half of what you said. Please read paradigms before rounds!

- And I was right

- I find it amusing that the 1AR used my exact words (paradigm) in her argument.

- I agree that the Neg put an unfair burden on the Aff. I wish Aff 1AR had not ignored topicality. They would have won my ballot with any kind of response there.

RFD

This decision was extremely difficult for me. When the canel boiled down to Topicality vs. Conditionality, I was faced with a conundrum. As a policy maker and traditional judge, I ultimately had to go for T.

Room: 1369
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Holland, Justin

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	London SA	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Matthew Sun	29	2
1	Emily Abrego	27	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Tuloso-Midway BR	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jenna Barrera	30 29	1
1	Joann Robledo	29 30	3

The better debating was done by the

Neg
AFF or NEG

from

Tuloso Midway
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1 AC slow down on tag lines
Be prepared to run against Restrictions @
Give a clear indication on when you
change to a new part of your
case
Adv → Framing
2 AC watch out for like and
uh
Your USMCA card is out of date

1 NC make sure everyone is
ready
consider altering base DA to include
Islamophobia New Zealand attack
Bring up the Iraq war for
diversionary war impact

2 NC spend more time on your
case arguments instead of Framework
Be careful of "like"
~~Framework~~

Ⓢ The neg was Ⓢ because they proved the fact
that dissection cannot solve for the Aff. They also proved
the Aff to be unfactual and the Base DA still stands

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Jesuit College Prep GN	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jack Griffiths	29.5	1
1	Garret Nagorzanski	29.5	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Sudan MS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Arissa Moore	27.5	3
1	Makayla Serrano	27.5	4

The better debating was done by the ACC 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:

Neg - consider adjusting your block strategy and ZNR choices. Splitting the block doesn't mean reading completely new arguments in the ZNR, ~~etc~~. It means taking the args in the INC and dividing them between the two Neg Debaters. For example (since the INC was Netism DA, Terror DA, and Topicality) the ZNR could take ① and one of the DISADS, and the INR could take the remaining DA. Then in the ZNR, you need to collapse into only those arguments that ~~are~~ are necessary or sufficient. Ex: topicality is SUFFICIENT, but not NECESSARY - you don't NEED to extend ① into the ZNR to win the debate (if you have other arguments). But if you DO win the ① debate then you don't need anything else.

Trying to go for ALL the arguments in the ZNR is never a good idea because you don't have enough time to fully develop your impacts, weigh them against the AFF, and answer ALL of the INR responses/offense.

Room: 1344
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Garcia, Andrew

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Houston Memorial ZS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Bailey Zhang	27.8	3
	Diana Salha	27.8	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Jesuit College Prep BM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Justin Burns	28.0	1
	Jack Martin	27.9	2

The better debating was done by the NEG from JESUIT BM
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:

RFD: AFF CONCEDES XI D2; TERMINAL (?) T/3/2/6. NEG
WINS THE IMPACT (2/2/2/4) THAT SEMI-CONDUCTOR TURN
SUPERCHARGES (?) MAGNITUDE; PROBABILITY OF DA. C2CE
CAN'T O/LIETH.

Room: 1509
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Alaniz, Jose

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

ERDMAN

6:30 left
5:26 left
7:09 left
6:08 left
5:44 left

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Guyer IM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Misbah Imtiaz	28.8	4
2	Hasan Mubarak	29.2	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Greenhill RH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Nikhil Ratnam	29.6	2
1	Sophia Hurst	29.8	1

The better debating was done by the Neg from Greenhill RH
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 wins Cap debate.
Aff is form of Cap.

Room: 1472
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Johnson, Pamela

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Leander CT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sofia Childress	29	1
2	Benjamin Townsend	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Central KG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Hannah Kim	27	4
1	Davian Garcia	27.5	3

The better debating was done by the Aff from Leander CT
AFF & NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Pamela Johnson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- 1AC - The plan is good, but the impacts of the plan mainly stem from mass legalization of SW, not just the plan. It's not really clear why the plan is key.
- 1NC - More contextualization on the DA + K linker. The DA's brink card is from 2010 → more recent evidence needed. The K's alt needs to be more fleshed out. Case was underpowered.
- 2AC - There wasn't direct engagement with the DA's impact.
- 2NC - The impact on the DA was dropped. Framing was dropped too.
- 1NR - The impact analysis on the K was good, but the alt still lacks clarity. There is no description of what the post-alt ~~world~~ world is like and why the world of the aff is worse.
- 1AR - Good job covering it all. Framing could have been prioritized more.
- 2NR - Pick one off-case to go for because keeping all of them in the 2NR spreads the analysis thin.
- 2AR - Framing should have been prioritized.
- 2FD - I voted Aff because the risk of solvency o/w the vague impacts of the DA. Also, the perm on the K solves.

Room: 1554
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Johnson, Clark

La

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Lovejoy CL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jack Czyz	28.2 28.3	3
1	Mitchell Laman	28.4	1

NEGATIVE

POS	La Vernia NE	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Brandon Niday	28.3	2
1	Josh Elsik	28	1

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: structural ~~idea~~ fairness o/w procedural
fairness, w/m ② ~~ground~~ offense ~~idea~~
native edu comes 1st b/c concealed ontology
Chalmers

Room: 1515
Start: 2pm
CX

5 O'Bannon, Camero

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Louis E. Brandeis BO	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2A	Henry Barajas	28	4
1A	Akruti Obhrai	28	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Reagan GP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1N	David Gutierrez	29	2
2N	Kathryn Pham	29	1

7:24

The better debating was done by the NEG from REAGAN
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: I THINK THAT AFF IS FAR BEHIND
ON ① AFTER 2AC - PERILS OF PUTTING
ALL THE ① VIOLATIONS ON BOTTOM.
1AR DOESN'T PUT THEM OVER THE EDGE - THEY
NEED A COUNTER INTERP. NOT PERSUADED
BY 2AR'S (ALL NEW?) VOTE FOR ETHICS > TOPICALITY.
AFF IS A REDUCTION OF (A RESTRICTION ON?)
AN EXCEPTION, WHICH IS DIFFERENT FROM
A REDUCTION IN A RESTRICTION (?).

Room: 1508
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Lipton, Adam

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Alief Kerr EN	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Queen Eche	28.5	2
	Hillary Nguyen	27.5	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Round Rock BT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Arvind Balaji	28.5	1
	Akhsheiy Tangutur	28.2	3

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AH ⑤ CASE

Room: 1376
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Achtsam, Bensen

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Dulles YP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Robert Yang	29.5	1
2	Shaan Parekh	29.0	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Melissa GS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Anna Gressett	29.0	2
2	Alex Sullivan	28.8	4

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

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

Signed: Bar [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff wins 100% of case (!)s and wins extinction

o/w.

Hezbollah DA flows aff with spirack or that should have triggered DA. Brink set too low.

Neg win root cause argument but dropped links & kick out of aff so there is not a clear world where gender violence doesn't exist.

Room: 1324
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Stearns, Christo

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Hendrickson GS		
1A	Trey Gutierrez	29.05	3
2A	Dylan Scott	29.15	4

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Woodlands MR		
1N	Keagan Mirazee	29.06	2
2N	Aakash Reddy	29.7	1

The better debating was done by the Neg from Woodlands MR
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: I think the neg won that I have an imperative to surrender to Blackness on the FW level. This means I flip the script on fairness to punish systems of whiteness. Even if I don't vote on the neg's FW interp, the aff's counter-interp is to weigh the psychological violence on reporters against the violence of anti-blackness. This leads me to vote negative b/c of the battle fatigue argument

Room: 1326
Start: 2pm
CX

5

O'Brien, Chris

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Barbers Hill MD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1A	Wesley Mosley	28	3
2A	Gustavo De_Toni_Uchoa	27.9	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Winston Churchill MB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1N	Alexandra Myers	29.3	2
2N	Benjamin Brody	29.5	1

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

REF

2AC puts all too far behind on the Kitch intensions of the link + alt debate. 1AR follows up with more decision errors on what to choose to cover, + 2NR does an adequate job of shutting them all out from accessing the perm. Raising that with the multiple chopped pieces of offense on the K link + impact debate, the K flows neg. Disputed + extended case solvency + advantage offense to the neg solidify the perm debate. RV1 or 2 not ever given voters. Neg won on Agamben.

Room: 1552
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Dimmig, Brenden

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Dripping Springs VM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Varun Verma	29.4	1
2	Mason Mohon	28.6	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Clear Springs PH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Jordan Pavelko	28.4	4
2	Kevin Huang	28.5	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from Dripping Springs VM
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 Block:

Both speeches were good, but all the arguments were the same. Either split arguments up or each make their own arguments. That makes better use of the IWR.

ZAC: - Group arguments
- Choose the impacts you go for
"ST" flow

Room: 1558
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Hutchinson, Will

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Dulles LS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Adrienne Li	28.7	3
1	Ashley Sheng	28.6	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Reagan EM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jocelyn Epstein	28.9	1
1	Tashya Makani	28.7	3

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

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

Signed: Will Hutchinson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

TVA resolves aff offense about the pedagogical value of the NAC and avoids the limits disad - doesn't affirm state

fairness is a controlling impact w/o it no one would debate

Counter interp is unlimiting
A lot of 2AR args on FU were not in 1AR

Aff - impact defense to fairness

Neg - more time on TVA

Room: 1352
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Stolte, Preston

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Hebron HP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Sameer Haq	28.3	4
	Krish Patel	28.5	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Jesuit College Prep AK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Ashik Amar	28.7	1
	Logan Kim	28.5	2

The better debating was done by the

Neg
AFF or NEG

from

Jesuit
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

FW: NO answer to TVA/Chatterjee er,

Room: 1347
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Magocha, Nyasha

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Elkins IJ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Samir Idrees	28.5	3
1	Joshua John	28.5	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Central GK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Alesandra Gutierrez	29	1
2	Bailey King	27.5	4

The better debating was done by the aff from Elkins
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: *good aff & IAC + cross *

*good line by line on ZAC but you can include an OV of the aff on top of your ZAC flow → case should always be 1st

Neg: *good INC
↳ you need a better explanation as to why anarchy is ~~not~~ ^{just} a method of dismantling the oppressive state then using the state
*ZNC - please sign Post on case properly, the flow was messy on case

RFD: ~~didn't~~ didn't vote on T - voted Aff
coming out of the ZNR there are two fundamentally flawed aspects of the K that force me to ~~not~~ ^{pref}
to the world of the aff vs. the world of the alt.
↳ transition wars + revolution of properly answered + enough were is done on the method debate 4
me to not aff down

Room: 1563
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Yang, Elmer

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Hendrickson YD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Joseph Yeh	29.1	2
2	David Do	29.3	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Princeton BD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Eden Burke	28.5	3
2	Taylor Dougherty	28.3	4

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

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

Signed: Elmer Yang

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

IAC: Good clarity but slow down or emphasize

import. phrases esp. when cards are

2-3 min. long

Effic. IAC coverage on Cap but you get

bugged down & try to extend too much
FW

Perm was shadow extended... I like your analysis of philanthropy

2A: Make a perm on Cap - other than

that 2AC v Cap was good

Good speed

2AR hit all points - I went more Aff

Context to debate

IN: Good speed & clarity

Good TNC story

Need better Cap link - more offense

Case answers didn't answer case

More nuance across board

Multip. root cause is oxygenation & contradicts

2N: Use all 2NC time - at this stage, every sec. matters

Needs more nuance on Cap

→ use examples

Point out no perm

Right 2NR but you're too behind

RFD: I vote Aff b/c FW for Asian Americans weaponizes Model Minority against Black Debaters. 2AC C/I of Inst. change resolves sufficient amount of FW that I can comfortably default Aff

Room: 1375
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Abdelhady-Khalil

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Greenhill RT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Ethan Rothstein	28.5	3
	Shaurya Tathgir	28.7	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Liberal Arts and Scie PS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Ian Poe	28.6	2
	Adam Scott	28.4	4

The better debating was done by the APP 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:

RFD: APP ⑤ OLW's a risk of a link. APP gets
to weigh implementation, debates a game so
Fairness always

Room: 1401
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Martin, Kinsey

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Borger BN	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Pearson Bailey	26	3
2	Lars Nelson	26	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Hightower TS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Kevin Tran	28	1
2	Hemant Sai	28	2

The better debating was done by the Neg from Hightower TS
AFF. NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg needs to collapse to a cohesive strategy in the 2NR.

I vote Neg on presumption

Room: 1502
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Jimenez, Valenti

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE


POS	Pebble Hills LG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Bryan Liston 28	30	3
1	Audrey Gutierrez 27	30	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Robert Vela ZS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Thalia Zuniga 30	30	1
2	Ethan Salinas 30	30	2

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

oral

In the end, I will out weigh w/ Aff's advantage over potential hate groups getting NW etc.

Room: 1511
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Chen, Sean
LC /

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

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	LC Anderson CM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Brett Cryan	27.3	3
2	Purav Maheshwari	27.2	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Lindale JS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Zachary Jones	27.8	2
2	Joshua Smith	28.0	1

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

voted neg on the PA, could have
voted neg on case turns as well.

Bad CAC & 1 AR coverage.

Room: 1346
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Batik, Mark

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Midway JK		
1	Gawon Jo	29	2
2	Ivy Koh	28.8	1

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Winston Churchill DA		
1	Norman Davis	28 ^{AB}	4
2	Ralph Anderson	28 ^{AB}	3

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

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

Signed: Mark Batik

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I don't think the Neg wins a link to the K b/c of the lack of an explanation as to why the Aff uses a rights versus benefit model. I think the Aff is closer to the benefit model. There's no real answer to the reality that the Aff and K are parallel to each other ideologically. The Aff is not presented as a superior mechanism to challenge biopolitical control. The Aff has a pretty unchallenged framework of how I should evaluate the round as ~~an~~ ^a challenge to status quo ethics.

Room: 1559
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Vaziri, Cameron

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

RIBERA

MUELLER

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	North Lamar HH		
	Garrett Holzwarth	28.5	3
	Zach Huffman	29	1

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Reagan CV		
	Anna Chavez	28	4
	Jamie Volz	28.5	2

The better debating was done by the APP from N. Lamar
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed:

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Ethics debate goes aff - I think aff is winning root cause. Their evidence is better. APP perm evidence is more specific. Case on the K. Games 1st.

Room: 1371
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Jennings, Nichol

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Westwood BG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Vineeth Bandi	29.2	2
1	Aaron Greisdorf	28.8	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Jesuit College Prep FJ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Giovannie Ferrer-Falto	28.9 28.93	3
2	Ethan Jackson	29.3	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from Jesuit College Prep FJ
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:

7:12

6:50

I think this Olson
Card is a really good
Card to Answer a
"you don't get a k"
But not ideal in this
Round.

RFD

So this round is a bit
difficult but... the
Rebate is a game
that game is not
outside the confines
of a classroom.

Thus I think the
affs spillover claims
fail, however we can
learn skills such as
decisionmaking within
the classroom. That's
all we can garner
from the game. Thus
I vote Neg.

4:08
INC: there is zero transition
speed/time change. No pen
time for the Pw debate.

Room: 1512
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Willis, Walter

J.

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Hightower GK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
②	Isabella Gandara	26.7	1
①	Snehal Kumar	25.3	2

NEGATIVE

POS	J. W. Nixon AB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
②	Daniella Aguirre	28	3
①	Angie Bravo	27	①

The better debating was done by the

Aff
AFF or NEG

from

Hightower
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Walter Willis

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Organization & BPs hurt the 2 NC. You need a lot of args ahead of what I ended up with in your speech doc. Like microarguments - who that came I have no idea what the context is or what this means? Also you are not answering the source 2AC answe. What do I do about that? N - These T arguments are presented with poor formatting. This results in confusion. ~~microarg you are using off's answe~~ ~~but what does it mean?~~ Also your extension 1AC was insufficient.

I was surprised JWR went all in on all 3 T args. I thought JWR had dropped the off's answe in all three and this was your weakest part of the debate. They need to work on ① Answering arguments on the flow ② proper extensions. ③ Organization & sign.

Room: 1560
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Goyal, Ritik

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Houston Memorial AD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Isabel An	28.5	4
1	Olivia Du	28.6	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Hendrickson CF	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Alejandro Castaneda_Zuni	28.8	1
1	Mahnoor Faheem	28.7	2

Aff
6:53
6:48
2:03

Neg
3:55

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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Explain

Neg wins collapse inevitable, no transition
ways, risk of war from econ collapse <
risk from econ growth, disease
Impact unanswered

Oral

Scout

1AC: E-B5

INC: Base, Infrastructure PTX, Parole CP, Latex CP, SC CP, Dedev

2NC: ~~Base~~ Latex CP, Dedev

3NR: PTX

2NR: Dedev

Room: 1510
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Hodgkiss, Colin

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Lovejoy SM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Tajvir Singh	29.1	4
2	Andrew Mao	29.2	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Mt. Pleasant CT	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Connelly Cowan	30	1
1	Taryn Thurman	29.3	2

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

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

Signed: Colin Hodgkiss

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Good round ya'll

RFD: I vote aff. The aff makes the argument that I have an ethical obligation to reject genocide which means that any risk that might occur is a reason why I prefer the aff. Ultimately I think there are too many questions asked of the CP to justify voting on it. The user's DA is a little too sketchy for me to feel off weighing it against the risk of genocide. I'm never given a threshold for the private prison, which is up against cultural erasure.

Room: 1580
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Bartlett, Austin

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Jesuit College Prep CR	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Kyle Cribbins	28.5	3
2	Joshua Ramos	28.5	4

NEGATIVE

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

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

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

Signed: C

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Evaluating the framework flow the scholarship of the IAC is probably bad b/c of the cooptia link means I shouldn't weigh the !s of the IAC but also means I should endorse the disorientation of the settler.

I don't find the perm compelling enough to overwhalm ~~the~~ the link.

Room: 1350
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Wilczynski, Soph

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Liberal Arts and Scie IJ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sruthi Ilangovan	28.7	3
2	Monica Jones	28.8	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Greenhill AE	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Samar Ahmad	29.4	1
1	Christopher Eckert	29.2	2

The better debating was done by the NEG from Greenhill AE
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
7:37/4:26
2:30

procedural fairness o/w
subject formation

Room: 1366
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Conner, Aiden

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Winston Churchill AV	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Gloria Alcala	28.4	4
1	Gaby Valdez	24.1	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Reagan BL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Rema Bhat	24.4	1
1	Emma Li	29	3

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

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

Signed: Aiden Conner

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

and

Room: 1354
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Morrow, Cody

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE


POS	Jesuit College Prep HM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2A	Riler Holcombe	28.6	3
1A	Jack Moore	28.4	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Westwood BS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2N	Vikas Burugu	29	1
1N	Daniel Shi	28.9	2

The better debating was done by the Neg from Westwood BS
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: I think the negative is ahead on the ontology debate and that the aff is a change in form but not content. So whiteness continues to ^{be} affirmed and protected by the Affirmative project that's is the Ansa, 2005 evidence. The DAR needed to make more argument choices, such as not going for your ^{the} moots the IAC arg's."

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE


POS	Harlingen South VG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Christian Villarreal	27	4
2	Ramiro Gonzalez	29.5	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Westwood DL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Shea Dombrowski	29	2
1	Hannah Liu	28.5	3

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This was a close round, but in the end after applying the Mendoza Card, I feel the AFF was the best policy option. I thought the Neg. could have pushed the T debate more. I did feel the Aff in the ks needed more work. I felt they were too general. I really wanted you to go into the MPs of the Mindsets. I felt the AFF was also sloppy, but thank both teams for a good debate round. Neg, I felt ran too many args., instead of focusing on giving me one really good reason to go against the AFF. Neg > also, I wanted you to push how the Courts don't solve and part of the state's sovereign Move!

Room: 1353
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Harrison, Bennet

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Greenhill KW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Joshua Kwon	28.4	2
2	Timothy Wegener	28.5	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Liberal Arts and Scie EW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Jackson Eckel	28.3	3
1	Kate Wang	28.2	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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

A | N
4.00 | 3.54

Aff counterinterp @ a more limited topic that includes refugees and refugees, which the aff wins is a good discussion for the topic. Zur focuses too much on the WMA / plan text in vacuum args without comparing the vision of the topic stated at by the competing interps

Room: 1507
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Lingel, Dan

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Liberal Arts and Scie CU	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Katherine Chacon	28.7	2
2	Roman Ugarte	28.0	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Elkins RS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Kirthivel Ramesh	28.3	3
1	Anik Shah	28.3	4

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

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

Signed: D Lingel

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF turns capitalism (R) - case outweighs
and may solve all the impacts. ZNR
just repeats ZNC and does not clash
with IAR arguments.

Room: 1531
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Ramsey, Alec

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Kinkaid HK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Amy Ho	29.3	1
	Dani Knobloch	29.2	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Westwood KY	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Ananth Kumar	29.1	3
	Jeffrey You	29	4

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:

Perm

Room: 1556
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Sanchez, Gabriel

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Hendrickson KV	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Bekla Kouakou	4	28.1
2	Victoria Vidaurri	3	28.2

NEGATIVE

POS	Coppell BR	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Vishvak Bandi	2	28.7
2	Rahul Rajamani	1	28.8

The better debating was done by the Neg from Coppell BR
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 doesn't really paint a distinction between reading 1 and 2 conditional advocacies. The aff's impacts rely upon the "model of debate" created but I don't really get a reason why 2 Condo is necessarily a worse model of debate. The aff is also not making claims of abuse so it's really hard for them to win a substantial risk of the impact.

Room: 1447
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Chen, Yao Yao

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Coppell RD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Shreyas Rajagopal	29.0	1
1	Het Desai	29.0	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Kinkaid PP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Spencer Powers	28.8	4
2	Sahar Punjwani	28.8	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from Coppell RD
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: ϕ impact to T-restrictions

case + pathology PA + unfairness good

o/w low to no neg offense

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

Thank you for participating in speed/debate. Use this skill to do good things...

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	PSJA Southwest LS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1A	Sofia Leal	29	1
2A	Mariano Salcedo	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Banquete WG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2N	Tia Whitman	28	4
1N	Isabel Gonzalez	28	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from PSJA Southwest LS
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Sue Jane Sullivan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Funding... might want to check this. To say it's just an act or bill will not suffice as to pass this will lead to bea bureaucratic costs.

Not a proponent of "No New in 2N" so I'll allow new arguments to DA. I would not want to hear a Great flow to 2AC... excellent clash to Neg's attacks. FWU=NPO.

Ms. Gonzalez, thank you for explaining/applying each DA after reading.

Do think you could have gone after those advantages, Neg, a bit more. Good efforts w/solvency, but Neg AFF was ready.

SOLVENCY... BACKLOG

Aff → USCIS DA arguments

Neg → CIR DA arguments

(But if incremental is small, then where does backlog come from?)

great refutation in 1AR by Leal

AFF turn possibility (not given in round so not used as voter)

Aff... takes the round w/better clash w/regard to solvency arguments in the debate

VERY STRONG REBUTTALS

AFF... this is where you win.

Aff → 20/20 successful in explaining Neg. Trump election viability contradiction. Neg, in 1N, says

Trump will win and that his re-election hurts, has negative impacts because he will be seen as a "free thinking moderate"

Room: 1315
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Williams, Gabriele

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Midway BW		
1	Stephen Bender	27.5	1A
2	Benjamin White	28.5	2A

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Heights AG		
2N	Alfonso Arreola	28.5	1
1N	Tavia Gabrysch	28.5	3

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

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

Signed: Gabriele Williams

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: I vote neg on the DA

Room: 1322
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Holmes, Davy

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Team	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Andrews FB		
2	Sarai Flores	28.2	3
1	Jakob Barton	28.1	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Team	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Liberal Arts and Scie GR		
2	Danielle Gu	28.9	1
1	Dhruv Ruttala	28.6	2

The better debating was done by the NEG from LASA GR
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 wins that their model for debate is superior. A more limited topic leads to better class, which allows for more in depth education.

Room: 1320
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Winn, Bryan

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Morton Ranch VL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Melanie Viesca	27	4
2	Hector Luviano	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Alief Kerr LG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Mike Ly	30	1
1	Hannah Ghebrelul	28	3

The better debating was done by the Key from Alief Kerr LG
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:

1AC - Good well structured AC
2AC - Not sure I agree with your
strategy you the CAP-K response.
1AR - Pessimistic the CAP-K kills
your AFF Adunk tape. Good
response on Brain Drain & Case.
You need to answer the Inherency
argument

1NC - your cap K is somewhat circular
in nature. Also, was there a Buckley
DA in your case arguments
2NC - Why waste all of 2NC on
the cap K?? if you bring FW in
2NC - AFF has the right to counter in
1AR - It would be not innovative
field??? where is the warrant
on the 5000 cap increase??

Agree with FW argument.
CAPK - Answers too late. If you
had made these in 1AR you might
have had a chance

Good Summary in 2NRP. Don't Buy
the FW Argument, The whole idea of
Policy Debate is Practical not Theoretical

RFD - Aff's attempt to prove the Cap K kills any offense
they had in their case. I will give AFF the Brain
Drain Aff, but overall Neg outweighs all of
Aff's impacts.

Room: 1577
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Mithani, Aly

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Jesuit College Prep MW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Jack Madden	28.6	2
2	Pete Weigman	28.7	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Heights PW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Alex Poll	27.6	3
1	Thomas Williams	27.5	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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF is topical. Neg has no counter-interp.
No in round abuse.

2:43
N: 3:43

Room: 1374
Start: 2pm
CX

5

Gilbert, Evan

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

ARP: 7:05 - 5:07
Neg: 5:08

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Hebron BL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Xain Bhagwandin	29	3
1	Aly Lalani	29	4

NEGATIVE

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

EG.

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:

TVA (S) aff 3 aff over limits
topic which (+)'s affs edu claims
b/c can be no clash.