

Room: 1352
Start: 830am
CX

TRIP

Lucas, Anna

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

Dulles YP (Robert Yang & Shaan Parekh) vs. Jesuit College Prep MW (Jack Madden & Pete Weigman)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Jesuit College Prep MW

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Dulles YP

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Anna Lucas

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- I think ZAC made a mistake not reading Bessire → put it higher up or that card
↳ or at least challenging notions of ontology as a prerogative to policymaking
if the alt is not an advocacy of tri-con how do you access prior claims of ontology?

INR I think INB evidence contains some ableist language although it doesn't explicitly mention disability →

IAR answers to ontology are kinda new → missing from ZAC

2NR
I missed the perm ext too → but, I would answer it anyways b/c you know they are going to sneak it back into the 2AR

happens too late in the debate for me to be able to flesh out → your IAR/2AR exploration is weak & their ev is in context of antagonisms not pragmatic

AFF:
king ev seems to be in context of political empowerment not ontological questioning

I think you are lack a piece at ev that says why pol knowledges → ontological change

king ev doesn't explain why law is the prior question to ontology but Hughes 12 says the opposite → they turn your public charge arguments and you don't really answer the prior question turn

the language turn was but I looked and didn't find explicitly ableist language like you said in IAR & even so you'll didn't explain why it's inevitable

2AR:
Why doesn't subject formation matter if you concede its a prior question?

2AR extinction o/w is not explained

Decision:
I voted NEG on the basis of you lost on FCU: I want to know why discussions must start w/ the state → the ZAC isn't good at answering prior ontological questions & the 2NC answer the pragmatic turn → the IAR isn't sufficient on why the plans desire to create change is good → why does pragmatism o/w you also don't really answer the root cause arguments which puts me in a hard spot

also I didn't hear a perm in the IAR but even if it was there you're missing

Room: 1352
Start: 830am
CX

TRIP

DiPiazza, Philip

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

Dulles YP (Robert Yang & Shaan Parekh) vs. Jesuit College Prep MW (Jack Madden & Pete Weigman)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Jesuit College Prep
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Dulles
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: ABP

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Case turns are non-unique. High probability that ACP solves border logic/policing.
Also, ACP 5 border deaths - no response by neg.

Big links on 15 are unprecise, undeveloped, and lack impacts. Link turn makes more sense, and Alt doesn't resolve border deaths, so plan outweighs.

Room: 1352
Start: 830am
CX

TRIP

Clarke, Kevin

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

Dulles YP (Robert Yang & Shaan Parekh) vs. Jesuit College Prep MW (Jack Madden & Pete Weigman)

AFFIRMATIVE

Jesuit College MW

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Dulles YP

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the

AFF
AFF or NEG

from

Jesuit College MW
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: *K. O. G.*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: 1354
Start: 830am
CX

TRIP

Rizvi, Ali

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

Liberal Arts and Scie EW (Jackson Eckel & Kate Wang) vs. Elkins RS (Kirthivel Ramesh & Anik Shah)

AFFIRMATIVE

Elkins RS

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Liberal Arts and Science EW

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Ali Rizvi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

APP

- Check the Flow for Proper Arguments

- IAR was too much Block Reads - & Clash.
implicit Clash is not good.

- Answers to PW are contradictory.

- Extension of Rob in IAR or 2NR

NEG

- OFFENSIVE Nuggets not found in 2NR. Put them in the 2NR.
 - Negative Turn
 - Gender Turn
 - State inevitable → use these in the 2NR.

- Push No 5 on the APP more.
 - ↳ explain Pragmatism more.
 - ↳ Say how this is problematic.
 - ↳ Mixed positions.

- Extend the Subject Position arguments.

Room: 1354
Start: 830am
CX

TRIP

Melin, Eric

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

Elkins RS (Kirthivel Ramesh & Anik Shah) vs. Liberal Arts and Scie EW (Jackson Eckel & Kate Wang)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Elkins RS

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

LASA EW

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Subject formation turned:

topic education ✓

Counter-interp under limits + allows for aff's that would use the state

Room: 1354
Start: 830am
CX

TRIP

Sanchez, Rafael

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

Elkins RS (Kirthivel Ramesh & Anik Shah) vs. Liberal Arts and Scie EW (Jackson Eckel & Kate Wang)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE


Elkins RS

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Liberal Arts & Science EW

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: 1373
Start: 830am
CX

TRIP

Remaley, Mason

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

Coppell AK (Vanuli Arya & Arnav Kashyap) vs. Reagan DL (Idalina Du & Andy Liu)

AFFIRMATIVE

Coppell

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Reagan

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I ended up voting aff, at the end of the debate the aff
comes out ahead of the frame debate with a superior idea
dropped making for

CP doesn't solve aff points a clear picture
and the point goes aff

DA doesn't have a stable link for me
the aff points a clear picture so to say the da
doesn't link

Room: 1373
Start: 830am
CX

TRIP

Brannen, Christc

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

Reagan DL (Idalina Du & Andy Liu) vs. Coppell AK (Vanuli Arya & Arnav Kashyap)

AFFIRMATIVE

Coppell AK

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Reagan DL

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the

Off
AFFIRMATIVE

from

Coppell AK
TEAM OF CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

While neg is more convincing on their Util framework, I find that I agree with the Aff that there is 0% probability on Neg DAs. I agree with the Aff that they meet D. Evaluating the Aff through Util I agree with Aff that they can meet a Util standard. 0% risk of harm and an injustice corrected? I'll vote that everyday. Aff ballot. C has no solency.

Room: 1373
Start: 830am
CX

TRIP

Lopez, Armando

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

Coppell AK (Vanuli Arya & Arnav Kashyap) vs. Reagan DL (Idalina Du & Andy Liu)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Coppell AK

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Reagan DL

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Aff from Coppell AK

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Kicked args - Base DA, (1) LPR, (1) Restrictions (?)

Impact framing - Excellent clash on this. This is some of the best framing for both ideas I've seen all year. I'm inclined to flow this Aff because the neg doesn't really respond to the historical substance of the Aff's framing - that Consequentialism has been used historically to justify oppression of indigenous peoples, and that util calculus filters out history itself. Neg needed to do a better job explaining how their util/conseq. analysis corrects for that historically oppressive character - saying it "includes" Native lives isn't enough.

Wall DA - "Plan popular" goes conceded, and I buy that the neg's Ligh story is weak. Not enough risk of Biodiversity Loss or curters to buy DA in spite of this.

CP - Perm: Do both is legitimate to me - even if it weren't, a fallen DA offers no Net Benefit.

Room: 1375
Start: 830am
CX

TRIP

Hodgkiss, Colin

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

Hendrickson CF (Alejandro Castaneda_Zuni & Mahnoor Faheem) vs. Katy RN (Ethan Ross & Mark Nicholson)

AFFIRMATIVE

~~Katy RN~~ Hendrickson CF

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

~~Hendrickson CF~~ Katy RN

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Car Ad

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A - Don't talk over your partner during CX.

RFD: I vote AFF. I buy the perm on the CP, I don't think there is a reason why they are mutually exclusive. As for the DA, I think it is a problem that there is no explicit threshold, it makes it more difficult for me to weigh the DA against the essentially guaranteed impacts of the AFF. Finally, the framing practically makes it impossible for me to justify voting neg because I'm buying that their approach needs to come 1st.

Room: 1375
Start: 830am
CX

TRIP

Dimmig, Brendel

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

Katy RN (Ethan Ross & Mark Nicholson) vs. Hendrickson CF (Alejandro Castaneda_Zuni & Mahnoor Faheem)

AFFIRMATIVE

Hendrickson

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Katy

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD

2 things
1) EC does more
2) 1/2 term disad w/ moral
OB (1) OIW CP.

Room: 1375
Start: 830am
CX

TRIP

O'Brien, Chris

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

Hendrickson CF (Alejandro Castaneda_Zuni & Mahnoor Faheem) vs. Katy RN (Ethan Ross & Mark Nicholson)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Hendrickson CF

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Katy RN

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Chris O'Brien

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD

Aff is way too ahead on the sheets the ZAR goes for, with extended link here analysis, & perm/solvency drops from the block. Aff was proving based on dropped analysis & w the USR+ZAR extend. Aff won through solving the optimal scenario & winning choice of case.

Room: 1377
Start: ASAP
CX

TRIP

Mithani, Aly

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

Reagan EM (Jocelyn Epstein & Tashya Makani) vs. Hebron HP (Sameer Haq & Krish Patel)

AFFIRMATIVE

Reagan

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Hebron

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: Aff doesn't justify their use of fiat.
ZAR concedes role of judge to be anti-
ethical decision maker. ZAR also concedes
that cede the political is non-unique for black
bodies.

Room: 1377
Start: 830am
CX

TRIP

Chen, Sean

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

Reagan EM (Jocelyn Epstein & Tashya Makani) vs. Hebron HP (Sameer Haq & Krish Patel)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Reagan EM

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Hebron HP

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Sean Chen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Hebron wins on the
kritik.

Room: 1377
Start: 830am
CX

TRIP

Johnson, Clark

TFA CX DEBATE 2019

Alief Taylor High School

March 14-16, 2019

Hebron HP (Sameer Haq & Krish Patel) vs. Reagan EM (Jocelyn Epstein & Tashya Makani)

AFFIRMATIVE

Reagan

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Hebron

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the

Neg
AFF OR NEG

from

Hebron
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed:

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RED: I think that the aff concedes multiple links to the K that makes the scholarship of the IAC and make it hard for the aff to ~~win~~ ~~the~~ ~~aff~~ the aff. ~~the~~ ~~aff~~ also ~~the~~ ~~aff~~ severely with many ~~the~~ ~~aff~~ which means that the conceded ~~the~~ ~~aff~~ makes all their offense ~~the~~ ~~aff~~ and I think that the ~~the~~ ~~aff~~ links independently ~~the~~ ~~aff~~