

Room: LS119  
Flight A: Start 8:45am  
LD

1

Abell, Nathan

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speed

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Winston Churchill CD**

Claire Daviss

27.5

**Colleyville Heritage BB**

Bekah Boyer

26

The better debating was done by the Aff from Winston Churchill CD  
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: I affirm on the SB and the action of Walden(?) at the bottom, through the AC still and analysis of m. perm.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Law Magnet JR

Seven Lakes Sd

JAQUELINE RIOS

20

Steve delperdang

26

IF YOU ARE GOING TO RUN THIS POSITION, YOU MUST BE PREPARED FOR A BURDENS/ADVOCACY DEBATE.

The better debating was done by the NEG from SEVEN LAKES SD  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: MTJ

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

IAC ADVOCACY IS CLEAR: REJECT THE RESOLUTION. INTUITIVELY, THIS POSITION APPEARS TO SUGGEST THAT I NEGATE. IN FACT, AC ARGUMENTS ABOUT REJECTING THE RHETORIC OF VIOLENCE, AVOIDING OBJECTIFYING PEOPLE, AND PROMOTING DISCOURSE THAT RECOGNIZES THE INDIVIDUALITY OF THE HUMAN SPIRIT FURTHER PROMPT ME TO NEGATE, AS DOING SO WOULD REJECT THE PROPOSITION THAT KILLING INNOCENT LIFE IS UNSUPPORTABLE DEVOID OF CONSEQUENCES.

(AS IMPOSED BY THE RESOLUTION) + SIDE CONSTRAINT

AFF ATTEMPTS TO DANCE AROUND HER ADVOCACY BY PUSHING FOR SINGULAR FOCUS ON DISCOURSE IN CX. IT BECAME OBVIOUS DURING THIS TIME THAT THE CRITIQUE WAS WRITTEN BY SOMEONE ELSE (PRESUMABLY A COACH) SINCE AFF'S ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF DISCOURSE, WHETHER HIGH SCHOOL LD TOUNDS ARE THE APPROPRIATE FORUM FOR SUCH ARGUMENTATION, AND HOW THE AC ADVOCACY SUPPORT THE RESOLUTION ARE, AT BEST, ILL-EXPLAINED. EVEN AT THE END OF IAR, I AM UNCLEAR HOW AFFIRMING THE RESOLUTION ENHANCES RHETORIC.

IAR SAYS, "IF THE RESOLUTION IS INHERENTLY OPPRESSIVE, I HAVE THE RIGHT TO REJECT IT." TRUTH BE TOLD, I AM FINE W/ THE ARGUMENTS RUN BY THE AFF IN THIS ROUND IF SHE WERE NEGATIVE. SAYING THAT I SHOULD REJECT THE RESOLUTION BECAUSE IT TRIVIALIZES HUMAN WORTH, FOCUS ON RHETORIC + DISCOURSE, AND ULTIMATELY AFFIRM ~~ADVOCACY~~ CONFOUNDS ME, AS AFF NEVER EXPLAINS HOW THE NEG PERPETUATES IMAGINED VIOLENCE. PLAINLY PUT, THE CRITIQUE'S LINK SEEMS VIRTUALLY NONEXISTENT, AND NEG SPENDS 13 MINUTES EXPLAINING WHY REJECTING THE RESOLUTION PROMOTES A LOVE ETHIC BY ELUCIDATING THAT HUMAN LIFE IS SACROSANCT.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speed

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Greenhill TT

Kingwood GA

Tanya Thanawalla

27.5

Geoff Alexander

27

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

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

Signed: MR

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG CASE IS WAY TOO LONG. AFTER READING IT, YOU LITERALLY HAD ENOUGH TIME TO MAKE ONE ARGUMENT AGAINST THE TOP OF AFF CASE.

IAR, IN MY OPINION, GROSSLY MISHANDLES THE NC. RATHER THAN ARGUING THE MERITS OF NEG'S DESCRIPTIVE TAKE ON THE TOPIC OR THE LOGIC UNDERPINNING SUCH A STANCE, AFF EXCLUSIVELY MAKES THEORY RESPONSES, I.E., SKEWS GROUND, HARMS EDUCATION, DENIES CLASH, ETC. MAKING SUCH ANSWERS IS (ARGUABLY) NECESSARY, YET THESE RESPONSES ARE NOT SUFFICIENT TO DISMANTLE NEG'S POSITION.

NEG'S STANCE SEEMS FAIRLY STRAIGHT FORWARDED + EASY TO ADDRESS: INNOCENTS ARE, IN ESSENCE, IGNORANT, MEANING THAT THEY DO NOT COMPREHEND FULLY THEIR PLACE IN THE WORLD. INSTEAD OF OFFERING A COUNTER-DEFINITION OR EXPLAINING WHY AFF'S INTERPRETATION IS SUPERIOR, ARS CHOOSE TO DEBATE THE STANDARDS ASSOCIATED WITH WHAT AFF PETERS TO AS NEG'S "CRITIQUE."

ZAR ARGUES THAT NC'S TRUE POSITION - THAT TAKING INNOCENT LIFE IS "AMORAL" (NOT "IMMORAL," AS AFF REPEATEDLY STATES) - KILLS HER GROUND BECAUSE NEG ENDORSES AC ARGUMENTATION. I STILL DO NOT FOLLOW THIS POINT.

IT GOES UNREFUTED THAT LOGIC IS A SOCIAL CONSTRUCT, THAT KILLING INNOCENTS IS AMORAL.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speed

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Pace Academy MM

Albuquerque Academy KC

Michael Melia

27.5

Kate Cygan

28.5

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

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

Signed: JP

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: Aff ~~aff~~ frame work is taken out by  
dropped Scanley card that says utility  
don is flawed b/c of a lack of  
focus on individual benefits. Neg wins  
case w/ criterion extension and fact  
that AC leads to totalizing conceptions  
of society.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speed

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Blake SM

Newtown High School ( AA

Susie Marshall

~~26~~ 26 JB

Akshay Agashe

27.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from Newtown  
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 wins perm argument that we can  
call affirming permissible but not moral  
and negate thus making the AC neg  
ground.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speed

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**New Trier Township XX**

**Plano East SS**

Chris Conway

28

Shilpa Sethuraman

29

The better debating was done by the Aff from New Trier XX  
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:

- ① Neg standard not well developed; Aff standard is impacted by the terrorism argument
- ② Neg gives lots of voting issues, but fails to tie them into a coherent standard

# HEART OF TEXAS

## St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Monticello MT**

**Winston Churchill LB**

Matthew Thomas

28.5

Lynn Bimler

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from Monticello MT  
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:

Ultimately I vote on the argument that if the word 'to' means toward than the Aff is neither killing nor saving meaning this must be morally permissible. At the end of the round the negative offense is very unclear as I was not sure from any impact analysis where she wanted me to vote for her. I don't vote on the risk of extinction argument b/c I think the negative effectively answers this w/ this same 'to' analysis? the conditionality argument. Finally, I think Aff answers the side constraint argument w/ the dropped positive rights are necessary for negative rts analysis.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speed

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Scarsdale DD**

**San Ramon Valley AS**

Daniel Daks

27.5

Amanda Swenson

26.5

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

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

Signed: Neil Conrad

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The NC/INR completely concedes the moral catastrophe/extinction argument that is explicitly labeled pre-standard. This issue precedes all others — it is morally permissible to kill one innocent person to save the rest of humankind.



# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speed

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Law Magnet LM

Crowley DL

Lorena Nanez

25

Daniel Lumpee

28.5

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

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

Signed: Neil Conrad

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Not ~~once~~<sup>once</sup> does the affirmative clearly articulate a ballot story - i.e. what it means to vote affirmative and why the AC is worthy of such a vote. At times, the negative is guilty of assuming that voting affirmative means to consider the resolution true on the merits of the arguments presented in round, but the IAR and 2AR never explain the problems with this assumption. Ultimately, there is no reason to affirm and plenty of conceded negative offense on both flows.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

St. John's MJ

Matt Joyce

28

Westwood AA

Abhay Agarwal

29

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RED

① I'm look @ ON. 1<sup>st</sup> neg says to, aff I say I shouldn't. ON alone is enough to negate. neg says even McIntyre & consensus rears a context, but topic is necessarily void of a context. ∴ based off young affirming violates the impartiality of a context & morality. I don't have hear enough from aff to start to think McIntyre answers this. that's sufficient to negate

② I'm also voting off so KLOM. I call anything - including AC moral-intact call it immoral, b/c doing otherwise particularly in a consensus driven system precludes

Room: N216  
Flight A: Start 8:45am  
LD

Dessi, Katie

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems: speed

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

St. Vincent De Paul EP

Ethan Pawson

Elkins JS

Joey Schwartz

The better debating was done by the Neg from Elkins JS  
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 When you were done reading the case proper, you have 1:30 -- and then you summarize your case -- both contentions, but particularly the 2nd need serious work in terms of depth of analysis.

Neg I'm not sure if it's an issue of poor articulation or some venous acoustics in the room, but your words had a tendency to run together making understanding you difficult at times. Otherwise, structurally, this is one of the best NCS I've heard on the topic. In terms of your response to his framework, I thought it was serious overkill -- all the reasons he says his way = preferable are non-unique reasons yours is acceptable. That is predictability & clash are insufficient ways to adj. b/w frameworks.

AFD NR is correct. There isn't any offense coming out of AR -- no proactive reason to affirm. I do have a few places I can negate though: ① the idea that negating = rejecting AC & AE = utility -- if reject utility or give utility to affirm then negate ② utility bad b/c -- subjective calculation of good -- no external standard for "and" -- actors really only act for themselves -- never even

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speed

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Walt Whitman EM

Emily Massey

32  
28.5

Anderson MV

Madeline Vuong

28

The better debating was done by the AEE from Walt Whitman EM  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

OAL

# HEART OF TEXAS

## St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speed

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**Los Altos JW**

Jing Wang

POINTS  
1:00  
28

**NEGATIVE**

**Meadows JL**

Jordan LaMothe

POINTS  
28

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Rf D

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedily

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Dulles KG**

Kiwi Gupta

28

**Southlake Carroll RB**

Ryan Bennett

29

The better debating was done by the NEG from SOUTHLAKE RB  
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 THE DEBATE ABOUT  
THE IMPACT OF MORALIZM HAVING  
NO CONTENT. SO, I NEGATE.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Plano TL**

**Marcus EK**

Tomas Lorinc

27

Evan Kirkham

27

The better debating was done by the NEG from MARCUS EK  
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 IS DECISIVELY  
WINNING THAT LACK OF PROOF  
THAT SOMETHING IS MORAL  
GOOD  $\Rightarrow$  NEGATIVE. THE LINK  
1. THIS IS GRANTED BY  
BOTH DEBATE. SO I NEGATE.  
PLUS, EVEN IF NEG DIDN'T WIN  
CURRENT DEBATE, HE IS BEATING  
THE ONLY IAR OFFENSE, AND  
WINNING THAT HE SHOULD DEFAULT  
NEGATE.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speed

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Mountain View DK

Strake Jesuit College PT

Daniel Khalessi

29

Paul Tyger

29

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

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

Signed: J. Ryan Graham

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Oral  
RFD: I feel the Keegan analysis ~~seems~~ alters the AC burden and there is no AC offense linked to this burden. The AC does an excellent job of defining the negative burden but ultimately the AC is able to use defense as offense (based on the def. of negate & the argument that ~~for~~ <sup>there</sup> is no negative resolution, i.e. AC burden of proof). So I negate on lack of AC offense & the altered burden (I feel I could have negated off Richardson but I feel more comfortable w/ Keegan).



# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speed

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Stony Point TH**

Tyler Haulotte

28

**Alief Kerr JT**

Joshua Tang

29

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

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

Signed: J. Ryan Graham

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Oral

RFD: I agree that a moral system which prescribes conflicting duties is incoherent. As such, the AC no longer links to morality because it does not tell me what "right" conduct entails. Further, the AC forces the AC to address why either a. AC does not violate agency or b. agency is important to morality. The AC is dropped + linked to the AC thus, I negate

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speed

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Awty International PH**

**Mayde Creek SZ**

Phillips Hogan

28

Sara Zaman

27

The better debating was done by the Aff from Awty International  
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:

Double bind. Consistency is p std + Aff's guaranteed solency.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Apple Valley KG**

Kevin Granlund

28.5


**Northland Christian TC**

Thomas Carmichael

27

The better debating was done by the Aff from ~~Apple Valley KG~~ Apple Valley KG  
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 NK and Neg case args are not responding to the Aff case but to a fictional util construct the NEG creates to argue against. Aff clearly shows that I only evaluate the agent, not the action. Culpability is not a comparative std. but a binary one. Aff demonstrates through DeBecker that action is under duress because death is socially abhorred, Finkelstein says duress → p culpable

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Hockaday SV**

Shivani Vohra

28

**New Trier Township CC**

Charlie Cao

27

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Theory is muddled  
c/n Vote there

~~Q~~ Vote of F dropped  
AC burden + SANDER

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Stony Point MY**

Mirusha Yogarajah

28

**West Des Moines Valle AK**

Alex Kramer

28.5

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Work comes down to  
meta-ethics v. context.

NEG answers context  
~~APP~~ APP d/n give lip service to  
meta-ethics

NEG wins

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Blake PO**

Phelan O'Neill

27

**Jesuit WS**

William Simoneaux

29

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

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

Signed: Terry Hunt

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Affirmative is not responsive to Neg case -  
Basically - relies on intent argument and neg takes  
out this argument - moral worth of human being  
precludes the AC - Neg turns aff oppression  
argument - ~~I~~  
Good round.

**HEART OF TEXAS**  
**St. Marks**  
**October 17-19**

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speed

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Harker SR**

Sachin Rangarajan

28

**Strake Jesuit College RH**

Roddy Hernandez

30

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

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

Signed: Terry Hunt

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg wins -

Room: FA108  
Flight A: Start 8:45am  
LD

1

Massey, Jonathan

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speed

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**St. Vincent De Paul BB**

**Greenhill DS**

Brian Bordley

27

Danielle Smogard

29

The better debating was done by the

NEG  
AFF or NEG

from

Greenhill DS  
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

*J. Massey*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:



Room: FA108  
Flight B: Start 9:30am  
LD

1

Massey, Jonathan

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Brophy College Prep MJ**

Matt Johnson

27

**Strake Jesuit College PB**

Philip Bartholomew

29

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

J Massey

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- rule utilitarianism

- de

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Seven Lakes Jk**

Jacob koshak

27

**West GT**

Graham Tierney

29

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

**COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:**

- Don't read quickly + have time left in AC
- you need to be able to justify your standard better in CF.
- You had to argue V/C 1st in IAR
- No more in 2 please
- 2AR was pretty non responsive to NR

- Good CF.
- not on speech clarity
  - watch time manage ment, you cut is very close on cardy the AC.
  - Same w/ NR, understand w/ votes

Neg clearly wins the V/C debate on both sides of the flow + impacts offense on both so I Negate.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Carrollton School of Ag

Kingwood NG

Alina gomez

27

Neil Grigg

26

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Work on link b/w rationality + morality  
The implied consent argument was a little confusing  
- you should have extended your observations  
to take out neg arguments

You need to justify your lack of V/L  
- Slow down - you have a different neg  
position + you should explain it.  
- Try to respond directly to Aff case not  
just ram lots of blocks.

P.S. - I hope you feel better soon!

In this round nobody won so I default Neg.  
There were several ways the Aff could have won,  
but she failed to respond to too many of the Neg  
V.I. arguments and can't achieve her value.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Westlake AW

Bronx Science BE

Andrew Waks

28

Bobby Esnard

27

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Although the logic of how the IAR off caseish thing functions prior to the NC could have been made ~~re~~ directly in relation to the NC as I believe the order of operations is clear.

The NR does not substantively respond to the off case. The only argument is that it doesn't link - but I think the link is crystal clear in both speeches.

The off case is extended - the implication is that we can't resolve.

The AFF has clearly extended offence - the Double-Bind

- there are 2 new arguments (1 is a new crossapplication of the E-point)  
That Figure

- the only other argument is that this comes after the NC

- which I guess is true

but I can't negate - the implication for me is that

I have to ~~at~~ affirm or vote for no one.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Winston Churchill AL

Walt Whitman JK

Amanda Legrand

27

Jane Kessner

29.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from Walt Whitman 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:

- ① The AFF misunderstands the NC and therefore makes nonresponsive arguments and crossapplications against it.
- ~~The~~ The Neg is indicting the term permissible as a binary. She explains that you can't use scalar judgments to come to a binary conclusion because there is no point when something becomes less wrong enough to become suddenly permissible.
- This argument is conceded. This extension from the AC in no way answers it - it actually feeds it as does the rest of the AC. The AC's criterion is scalar and cannot ever affirm b/c it can't become permissible.
- ② The offcase is completely dropped - she points out another distinction (besides #6) ~~that~~ that is explicitly present in the resolution. The offcase is clearly extended. ~~not extended~~
- ③ The turns to Schneider are dropped in the ZAR & the perspectives argument has no warrant extended in the 1AR or ZAR

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Pace Academy AZ

Austin SFA JT

Alex Zhang

28

James Tobey

28

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

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

Signed: Jennifer Miller

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This is the sort of round that makes my head hurt! ~~I think that both of you are going to lose to this ground~~ Both of you propose burdens for the round and there isn't really a discussion of which burdens are applicable / best for the round. The debate about moral permissibility at the top is irresolvable. Aff says that neg has burden to prove a categorical prohibition against the resolutional action and says this is the preferable neg burden b/c the NC never defines a burden for him. I think this is incorrect, but I accept it b/c James says it's true in CR. The Negative meets this burden w/ the extension of the #2 out of the NC. The 2AR response is probably true, but is completely new.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit

a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**West Des Moines Valle YZ**

**Homeschool KV**

Yale Zhu

26

Kelsey Valadez

26

The better debating was done by the AFF from West Des Moines Valley YZ  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

*Jennifer Miller*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The NC has coverage issues. Kelsey, you are repetitive on the standard and burden: just group the two and make your response b/c you are wasting a lot of time otherwise. Also, you are misunderstanding the AFF argument about choosing which world you live in. The AFF isn't saying that everyone actually has a choice about which world they live in, but rather that if we could make a choice ~~about~~ who knowing whether we would be ~~positively or negatively~~ the one or part of the group we would choose to have the highest prob of living. It's a veil of ignorance type argument. Thus, your response doesn't really apply. Also, the grouping is incorrect b/c not all of the AC rests on this premise. Finally, I am unclear about what the argument on the underview is. Yale, you are very smart and have good instincts about arguments! That said, you need to work on ~~extra~~ extensions. ~~Read~~ My suggestion is that you write out extensions for both of your cases. You can read them in the round; even if you choose not to read them you will know what a good extension of each point looks like.

RFP: I affirm off the underview. Even if I didn't, AFF wins #3 in Contention.

Room: FA111  
Flight A: Start 8:45am  
LD

1

~~Johnson, Gary~~  
ADAM NELSON

# HEART OF TEXAS

## St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Scarsdale MM**

Marcus Moretti

29

**Carnegie Vanguard RV**

Rachel Vogel

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from Scarsdale mm  
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

Timmons



Room: FA111  
Flight B: Start 9:30am  
LD

1

~~Johnson, Gary~~

ADAM NELSON

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Salado TC**

Tyler Cook

28.5

**Bronx Science AS**

Adam Silver

28.5

The better debating was done by the Neq from Bronx Science AS  
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

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Glenbrook North PD**

Pat Donovan

28.5

**Vestavia Hills High KS**

Kevin Sipe

28.5

The better debating was done by the Aff from Glenbrook North PD  
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 NR extends a few pieces of offense.

*[Handwritten signature]*

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Anderson BB**

Bronte Bejarano

26

**Austin SFA JM**

James Monaco

27


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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

people probably exist. just my personal feelings though. maybe not; i guess i may not exist.  
James: don't double-ten yourself, bud.



people exist.  
maybe?

# HEART OF TEXAS

## St. Marks

## October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit

a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**POINTS**

## NEGATIVE

## POINTS

## Marcus CC

## Marquette University SH

## Carson Chalmers

28

## Samuel Hope

28.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from Marquette University SH  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed:

**COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:**

1. Interest  
2. Permit

WSE

in be  
both

PCs with 15.

rules

Al 2  
best

morals

meanings

4-10-68

100

Path

As the  $\alpha$ -value increases, the  $\beta$ -value decreases, and vice versa.

2. Contract

try

Paramet

50

Ground

Left  
all

pred.

1. 1.1

23 Regatta  
Delta

Leont +  
An. 61.5.4

Save in  
inver

ent pr  
7-11

## References

K du  
 come  
 before  
 HC  
 intervention  
 integrates

attracts  
 all  
 pushes

each pop.  
 bad from  
 and:  
 it to  
 back  
 comes  
 here

left 3  
 only  
 much  
 that  
 values

not  
 suffer  
 many  
 ③ die  
 in re  
 can kill  
 bystander  
 has cond.

still  
 take  
 bad  
 actions

①  
 ②  
 ③  
 ④  
 ⑤  
 ⑥  
 ⑦  
 ⑧  
 ⑨  
 ⑩  
 ⑪  
 ⑫  
 ⑬  
 ⑭  
 ⑮  
 ⑯  
 ⑰  
 ⑱  
 ⑲  
 ⑳  
 ㉑  
 ㉒  
 ㉓  
 ㉔  
 ㉕  
 ㉖  
 ㉗  
 ㉘  
 ㉙  
 ㉚  
 ㉛  
 ㉜  
 ㉝  
 ㉞  
 ㉟  
 ㊱  
 ㊲  
 ㊳  
 ㊴  
 ㊵  
 ㊶  
 ㊷  
 ㊸  
 ㊹  
 ㊺  
 ㊻  
 ㊼  
 ㊽  
 ㊾  
 ㊿

# HEART OF TEXAS

## St. Marks

## October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

**AFFIRMATIVE**

## POINTS

## NEGATIVE

## POINTS

## Albuquerque Academy IE

## Southlake Carroll CC

Ian Erickson-Kery

27.5

## Cathy Creighton

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from Albuquerque Academy II  
AFF or NFG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Eric M Palmer

**COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:**

Handwritten notes and diagrams on a legal topic, likely related to the M.D. (Mental Disorder) case. The notes are organized into sections and flowcharts.

**Top Left Section:**

- not obv. bad outcome
- Shows neg. impact
- self
- MD & matter
- never shows must kill
- Prove M.D.

**Top Right Section:**

- 1. never shows why need to kill - might make other
- 2. uncertainty
- vs. death happens either way - will be blamed

**Bottom Left Section:**

- not in res. time
- could choose not killing always permits
- if he labels permits, he excludes the other
- not killing saying so little
- no alt to action, bc death occurs either way

**Bottom Right Section:**

- judgment either way
- uncertain
- analogous people who link from M.D. to deham
- must kill
- he uses people as means

**Far Right Section:**

- not a rat. sol. force
- can't tell how judged
- Levin's truth: kills more
- People are gen. rat he takes that
- no reason why

**Far Left Section:**

- not a rat. sol. force
- can't tell how judged
- Levin's truth: kills more
- People are gen. rat he takes that
- no reason why

**Far Right Section:**

- not a rat. sol. force
- can't tell how judged
- Levin's truth: kills more
- People are gen. rat he takes that
- no reason why

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science SS

Saboor Sheerazi

28

Crowley HL

Hailey Lopez

27

The better debating was done by the aff. from Bronx Sci. SS  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESANT NAME

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

Signed: Jo Russell

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

aff. clearly won the Armstrong issue & accountability.  
His quantity/quality distinction was never addressed.  
aff. met his burdens.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Westlake DR

Dulles SC

Devin Race

29

Sasha Chada

28

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

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

Signed: Jo Russell

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Basically, the rd. turned on aff's 4th contention which Neg. failed to address in NC. In addition Neg. did not offer a counter def. This produced a rd w/ little direct clash. Neg's theory of philosophy was marked w/ vague explanations & he had a burden to clarify it, but did not.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Colleyville Heritage MT**

Mubeen Tejani

27.5

**Apple Valley CT**

Chris Theis

29.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from Apple Valley  
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

NC comes first Quinn 1+2 dropped  
IAR lacked clearly extended offense



# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Brophy College Prep JL

Jeff Lockhart

28

Los Altos DM

Daniel Moerner

28.5

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

<sup>in ex,</sup>  
Neg - Spent less time telling him how he's going to use your responses and just answer the questions.

~~Also, watch unnecessary rudeness in your CX - speaks ~~well~~ would have been higher~~

Neg - Also, watch unnecessary rudeness in your CX - speaks ~~well~~ would have been higher  
as actual substance of your speeches was impressive.

ORAL

Vote Neg on conceded NC F/w + offense. NC consists,

Aff argues ~~that~~ indicting NC weren't clear + weren't gone for in 2AR.

Also, Neg using args about 1AR offense appealing to new, unjustified standard.

Aff - you're making smart arguments + I appreciate the willingness to go for an alternative strategy but the 1AR + 2AR stories were disjointed

+ there was no clear Aff ballot story.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Mayde Creek DA**

Danny Alexander

26

**Hockaday KF**

Kathleen French

29.5

The better debating was done by the Neg. from Hockaday.  
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:

~~APP~~ → Clear substructure. I think that you Neg - More time could have been focused on the Arendt turn.  
can flesh out your case more. Plenty of time left.  
I was expecting specific advocacy.

Specifics needed in 1AR. You are talking too generally. Extensions need to be warranted

RFD. Although I could negate on many

levels, most compelling is off lesser evil turn & Arendt showing that choosing between less evils leads to massive H.R. violations. Thats Neg is winning quantifiable std. Neg tells a beautiful substantive & technical story @ end of NR.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Torrey Pines NK

Naveen Krishnamurthi

25

Jenks DR

Daniel Rose

2:05

25.5

The better debating was done by the Aff from Torrey Pines NK  
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 part of the syllogism that affirms is after the buzzer. That's a problem.  
- My problem here is this conception of morality is subjective & you are claiming this is objective which I think is problematic  
- Don't read hunched over. Pick the binder up

Bad IAR strat. You spent 1:45 on value/2 stuff. Just extend ① descriptive args ② Favre ③ Reason ④ NP ⑤ no 2 done. Why the these args when totally unimportant here?

RFD: I have very little idea about how to really evaluate this round bc it isn't about the topic @ all.

Argh. Double argh. Triple argh. My paradigm is written to avoid rounds like this. Argh. I just wish there were some actual content in the 2AR. This would have made my 1. Recasier. This round is a mess. Thankfully I have ~~attended a round~~ the VC - but arg extended, ∴ Aff win interp.

You needed to ask (?) in CX. You wasted extremely valuable time to attack this position. You give a poor first impression by being silent through 1:20 min of CX. My impression is that you were confused & will be unable to handle the case. I am impression you want to give  
- STAND for CX!

- Use all your time WNC → so many individual notions to attack.  
- Neg case needs to be a LOT more developed

→ Need to give clearer value. Watch the new NR args

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedily

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Greenhill EC**

**Hebron JW**

Ed Culham

28

Jonathan Wallen

26

The better debating was done by the AFF from Greenhill EC  
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 2AR

NEG

- Work on coverage

- organization of speech was not very clear

RFD

Oral

I wrote on Nielson + the NC turn.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Hockaday SR

Sarah Ridout

27

Northland Christian JR

Josh Roberts

29

The better debating was done by the NEG from Northland Christian JR  
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

- need to work on coverage...  
the AC precept a lot of stuff  
he talks about but you need to point  
this out

NEG

- make the argument NR more specific to  
rhetoric of AC ... otherwise good job

RFO

Oral, Aff makes a lot of Neg's  
arguments on the AC + NC.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Cascia Hall DA

Cathedral DD

Daniel Auffenberg 120 ~~25~~ 25

David Delgado 2:45 18

The better debating was done by the AFF from CASCIA HALL  
AFF OF NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Cyndy Woodhouse

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: YOU NEED TO PRACTICE READING YOUR CASE A LOT SO THAT YOU CAN PUT NECESSARY EMPHASIS ON THE MORE IMPORTANT WORDS AND PHRASES AND AREN'T SO MONOTONE. WITH YOUR VALUE OF LIFE AND CRITERION OF UTILITARIANISM, YOU NEED TO CLARIFY QUITE A BIT. FIRST, ARE YOU DEFENDING QUALITY, QUANTITY OR BOTH? SECOND, YOUR CRITERION NEEDS AN ADDITIONAL STANDARD TO DETERMINE WHEN IT'S BEEN MET. WHAT IS THE GREATEST GOOD FOR THE GREATEST NUMBER? HOW DO WE DETERMINE IT? WHY IS THIS THE WAY WE BEST PRESERVE LIFE? HOW DO WE KNOW IF IT'S BEEN MET? THROUGHOUT THE REST OF YOUR CASE, I LIKE THAT YOU SPECIFY THAT THERE IS NO MORAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN KILLING AND LETTING DIE. FROM THAT CONTENTION, HOWEVER, YOU DO NEED TO EXPLAIN HOW THIS RELATES TO THE RESOLUTIONAL BURDEN. IN CX, REMEMBER THAT YOU'RE NOT JUST TRYING TO CLARIFY THINGS FOR YOUR OWN BENEFIT BUT ALSO FOR ME. HAD YOU LOOKED UP AT ALL IN CX, YOU'D SEE HOW LITTLE I CARED FOR THIS STUFF.

NEG: IN CROSS-EXAMINATION, BE SURE THAT YOU ARE LOOKING AT ME NOT AT YOUR OPPONENT. IN THE INC, THERE IS NO REASON THAT YOU SHOULD BE READING OFF OF A LAPTOP, WHICH REQUIRES YOU TO BEND OVER THE TABLE. FURTHER, READING YOUR NCIS IS COMPLETELY UNNECESSARY AND DETRIMENTAL TO YOUR SPEAKER POINTS (AS CLEARLY ARTICULATED IN MY JUDGING PARADIGM). HAD YOU BEEN LOOKING AT ME IN CX OR AT ANY POINT IN YOUR CONSTRUCTIVE, YOU WOULD HAVE SEEN THAT I'M NOT TAKING A TRADITIONAL FLOW AND SHOULD THEREFORE DEDUCE THAT I'M NOT EVEN CLOSE TO INTERESTED IN SOME KIND OF FLOW GAME. IN ESSENCE, AT THE END OF YOUR CONSTRUCTIVE, I HAVE NO CLUE WHAT YOU'RE ACTUALLY ADVOCATING, NOR DO I GET A LOT OF YOUR RESPONSE TO THE AFFIRMATIVE POSITION, MAKING IT NEARLY IMPOSSIBLE TO GET ANY IDEA WHERE YOU THINK ANY RESOLUTIONAL CLASH MIGHT BE. FINALLY, HAD YOU BEEN LOOKING THROUGH MY PARADIGM, YOU WOULD SEE I'M NOT ANY KIND OF FAN OF RESOLUTION GAME.

RFD: I GET THAT DEBATE IS COMPETITIVE AND KIND OF A GAME, HOWEVER IT'S STILL A COMMUNICATION GAME OR COMPETITION, MEANING THAT IT WOULD BE SUPER IF YOU TRIED TO ① DEBATE THE RESOLUTION ② COMMUNICATE THOSE IDEAS IN SUCH A WAY THAT I COULD FOLLOW. I FELT AS THOUGH I WAS ENTIRELY UNNECESSARY TO THE DEBATE AND THAT NEITHER OF YOU MUCH CARED IF I WAS GETTING WHAT YOU WERE SAYING OR IF IT RELATED TO YOUR OPPONENT'S ARGUMENTS OR THE RESOLUTION. AT THE END OF THE ROUND, AFF IS ADVOCATING RESPECT FOR HUMAN LIFE SUCH THAT WE JUST TRY TO RETAIN AS MUCH OF IT AS POSSIBLE, MAKING IT MORALLY ACCEPTABLE TO SACRIFICE ONE PHYSICAL LIFE FOR THE PRESERVATION AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE. NEG'S POSITION IS SOLVENCY-BASED ON AN ABSTRACT, IMMEASURABLE CONCEPT OF AGENCY, ASKING AFF TO PROVE HE'S SUPPORTING ABILITY TO AND RESPECT FOR MAKING DECISIONS. THE PROBLEM, THOUGH, IS THAT NEG SPENDS NO TIME IN HIS "SLOWER" OF THE TWO SPEECHES CLARIFYING IF HE'S TALKING ABOUT AGENCY PRECLUDING THE ABILITY TO DEBATE THE RESOLUTION OR HE'S ASCRIBING ADDITIONAL CONTEXT TO THE RESOLUTION, SAYING THAT THE GOVERNMENT FORCES PEOPLE TO PHYSICALLY DO IT. WITHOUT NEGATIVE CRYSTALIZATION/CLARIFICATION, I'LL RELUCTANTLY AFFIRM BASED ON SPECIFIC AND MORE DIRECT GENERAL APPLICATION TO THE RESOLUTION.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Northland Christian MD

Shawnee HS - Wow. GREAT DELIVERY

Molly Dunn : 40

26

Heather Swadley 2:03 29

The better debating was done by the NEG from SHAWNEE  
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: AN INTRODUCTION WOULD BE GREAT SINCE THIS IS SUPPOSED TO BE A PERSUASIVE SPEECH'D BE GREAT. IN TERMS OF KILLING VERSUS LETTING A PERSON DIE, IT WOULD BE GREAT IF YOU WOULD EXPLAIN WHY THAT MATTERS AND HOW IT IMPACTS YOUR POSITION. IN YOUR CRITERION, YOU NEED TO TAKE MORE TIME TO CLARIFY ① WHAT RIGHTS PROTECTION MEANS, ② HOW WE MEASURE IT ③ WHAT IT HAS TO DO WITH DETERMINING WHAT IS CONSIDERED TO BE RIGHT & WRONG. THE BULK OF YOUR CASE POSITION REALLY JUST ILLUSTRATES A NEED TO MAKE AN ADVANTAGEOUS DECISION, BUT IT IS LESS CLEAR HOW THIS APPLIES, OTHER THAN A PURE BODY COUNTS. THIS WOULD REQUIRE ADDITIONAL STANDARD JUSTIFICATION TO SHOW HOW WHY RIGHTS PROTECTION RELATES TO QUANTIFIABLE RETENTION OF RIGHTS. IN CX, WORK A LOT ON CUTTING OFF YOUR OPPONENT MORE EFFICIENTLY AND POLITELY SO YOU DON'T JUST KEEP SAYING "OK" YOU ALSO NEED MORE DIRECTION IN CX TO AVOID GETTING STUCK ON JUST ONE IRRELEVANT POINT.

NEG: YOU HAVE SOME GOOD QUESTIONS IN CX WITH MUCH-NEEDED FOLLOW-UP. I WOULD HAVE LIKED TO HAVE HEARD SOME DISCUSSION OF ENDS BASED VERSUS MEANS BASED DECISION-MAKING. INSTEAD OF WAITING TO READ UTIL BLOCKS IN THE INR. IN TERMS OF YOUR CASE STRUCTURE, IT'S INCREDIBLY IMPORTANT FOR YOU TO SPEND LOT MORE TIME JUSTIFYING AN ABSTRACT STANDARD LIKE DIGNITY. WHAT DOES IT MEAN? HOW DO WE KNOW IF IT'S BEING PROTECTED? IT'S INSUFFICIENT TO SIMPLY PLACE RANDOM SOLVENCY BURDENS ON THE AFF WHICH ARE BASED ON IMMEASURABLE STANDARDS FOR ACHIEVEMENT. AS YOU DEAL WITH THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN KILLING AND LETTING DIE, I THINK YOU DO A GOOD JOB OF LOOKING AT THE MORALLY RELEVANT DIFFERENCES, HOWEVER, TAKE THAT A STEP FURTHER TO EXPLAIN WHAT IMPLICATIONS THIS WILL HAVE TO CASE. DOES SHE MAKE ANY "LET DIE" ARGUMENTS? DELIVERY: DON'T PUT YOUR HANDS BEHIND YOUR BACK. YOU DO USE THE LAPTOP WELL WITHOUT SACRIFICING COMMUNICATION.

RFD: YOU BOTH DO AN EXCELLENT JOB OF FOCUSING ON THE SAME ARGUMENTS AND NOT GOING UNNECESSARILY FAST TO TRY TO COVER EVERYTHING. YOUR DELIVERY WAS GOOD. NEXT, WORK ON MAKING MORE STRATEGIC CHOICES REGARDING YOUR ARGUMENTS. THOUGH IT'S PRETTY CLEAR IT'S NOT FLOWING, YOU DO, TO A LARGE DEGREE, SPEND 90% OF YOUR REBUTALS GOING THROUGH EACH ARGUMENT INDIVIDUALLY. AT SOME POINT, IT WOULD BE MORE ADVANTAGEOUS TO ABANDON LINE-BY-LINE DEBATE. THIS WAS, HOWEVER, A PRETTY GOOD DEBATE BECAUSE OF YOUR COMMON FOCUS ON ARGUMENTS. THE QUESTION AT THE END (A PRETTY COMMON ONE, BUT MUCH MORE UNIQUELY ARGUED) IS ABOUT QUANTITY VERSUS QUALITY. AFF ARGUES GENERAL PROTECTION OF MORE BY SACRIFICING ONE, HOWEVER, DOES NOT ADDRESS THE UNDERLYING NEGATIVE PREMISE: THAT IT'S NEVER MORALLY PERMISSIBLE TO VIOLATE RIGHTS WHEN IT'S CONVENIENT.

# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks  
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**West RB**

Ryan Beck

27

**Hattiesburg BK**

Bretton Klinedinst

24

The better debating was done by the

Aff

from


West RB

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

There was a lot of issues on the flow that wasn't nec. Both debaters need to work on ~~the~~ time management

RFD

- The turn of the CI, which drops the NC
- The Aff standard of hypothetical consent/which goes clean extended.
- The idea that the individuals need to be rational actors goes clean extent.



# HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please submit ballot first. Students will forfeit a round if they do not show up within 20 minutes of the start of the round. Phone # for problems, speedy

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Monticello DC**

**Cascia Hall RK**

Daniel Cook


29

Rahul Kohli

28

The better debating was done by the Aff from Monticello DC  
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

- The Aff ob. go. extended which gives him an easy out by running the concept of the tool in a tool box.
- The idea of suffering flows aff due to the fact that it links back to the negs standard and the standard of minimizing