

Room: L104
Flight B: Start 8:45am
LD

5

Wilson, Matt

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight
or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hockaday KF

Glenbrook North PD

Kathleen French

28.5

Pat Donovan

29

The better debating was done by the NEG from GBNPD
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 hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

St. John's MJ

Anderson MV

Matt Joyce

28.5

Madeline Vuong

29

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I believe that Madeline links offense to the AC showing the converse true. If I give full weight to Green/Darman I must also give full weight to CB 3 "kill/let die difference." This means that, along with the DP turn, that MV carries enough into the CR to show that people would not consent to the rez. Moreover, I also look to CB 2 calling it necessary & moral. Thus even if consent, not sure why we call it moral.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Blake SM

Mayde Creek SZ

Susie Marshall

27

Sara Zaman

27

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

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

Signed: _____

Douglas Jeffers

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

THE AFF SEEMS TO ACCEPT THE CONSISTENCY
BURDEN. I DON'T SEE THE AFF EVEN ADDRESSING
THE INCONSISTENCIES THAT THE NC
POINTS OUT.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Mayde Creek DA

Danny Alexander

24

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Torrey Pines NK

Naveen Krishnamurthi

16

The better debating was done by the Neg from Torrey Pines NK
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:

What go so fast if you have 145 left? I
can blow that speed, but it's pointless

Your case is abusive and if he chooses to say
so he will win that argument. "More lives" is
not a fair standard. It's 5 lives Morality
definition is no good, source it or something.

Your standard is not min. of 5 lives, it's max
of 5 lives, period.

His whole case says neg is better decision; why even
put that in? Also, you never answered his attacks
Only said it doesn't matter and then give unwarranted
claims.

You never do a good job with arbitrary argument which
remains as weighing much because you didn't tell me
why not.

You wasted most of CX by asking questions
you shouldn't (Do I win questions)

Doing all these 8 point things aren't as cool
as you think. Need as many as you say (a
say 8 and give 5) and some are so similar
they should be combined. Don't yell at me.

Know who he is. Just saying "He's an authority
on the subject" doesn't make it true

Don't try to waste his time, answer clarifications
questions directly. You started too fast and
monotonous but slowed to understandable
pace after

It's extended, I can't re-extend 2 times in
same speech.

Genocide always justified teleologically
genocide argument giving Neg ballot under "better choice" burden, "arbitrary" burden,
and ↓ HR violations.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale MM

Marcus Moretti

29

Crowley DL

Daniel Lumpee

30

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: Jo Russell

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Excellent rd.!

Neg. clearly met all burdens established for him!
Key issues were the Callahan examples & the dbl. bind
placed on aff. with his Util. "body count."
For me, human worth ultimately prevails
following a critical code of conduct.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight
or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

3:28

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Apple Valley CT

Austin SFA JM

Chris Theis

29.5

James Monaco

28.5

The better debating was done by the aff from Apple Valley CT
AFF OR NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Sabrina Graham

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The NC allows for a solid theory argument b/c you give the AC any ground. You also need to prove that subjectivity is bad or else the alternative of objectivity is matter. You also need to impact the track evidence @ the bottom of the NC. It is to prove the prosecution false in any way it just says that people will conform b/c they feel guilt. You need to put @ least some defense on the AC b/c now you have lost negative time advantage.
AR: There needs to be a 20 second theory blip @ the top of the NC. b/c many of your arguments are contingent on debatability. That would just give it an independent reason to vote on debatability.
NR needs to respond to the definition of permissability b/c then you are not debating moral standards, so the NC is matter. It's almost as if you don't want to refute arguments. If I wasn't flouting you would be winning the round.
3AR: Good simplification of arguments.

RAD: The Aff wins the definition of ~~permissability~~ permissability wh/ the Neg never responds to which means the subjective question of morality is matter b/c the AC says no one would be culpable so I would affirm.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

San Ramon Valley AS

Amanda Swenson

W 26 TB

New Trier Township CC

Charlie Cao

W 28 TB

The better debating was done by the NEG from New Trier
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: While it is labeled as a utility take out, the Arendt card off the second premise sufficiently addresses the premise's warrant so the AC syllogism is taken out and it default negative.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Austin SFA JT

Salado TC

James Tobey

29.5

Tyler Cook

29.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from Salado TC
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 : 17

- The clearest I have ever seen you speak.
- I don't really like your case because I think it is too defensive. However I do see the strategic value to your case and in retrospect it is a good case despite my objections to it.

: 20 Neg

Neg

- Neg strat is top notch
- I specifically like the pre standard arguments put on top of the AC, explained more in oral critique.
- You're signposting needs to be better though. Specifically the last two sets of argument the first having 3 args about applying morality and the second 4 about statist.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Elkins JS

Greenhill TT

Joey Schwartz

29

Tanya Thanawalla

28

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirm on the extension of moral permissibility defining it as a set ethical rules & some form of action. The NC benefits from the AC depend on the AC grabbing some benefits of action which he & do or even want to do.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight
or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Monticello DC

1:19

Daniel Cook

28

NEGATIVE

2

POINTS

Cascia Hall DA

Daniel Auffenberg

26

The better debating was done by the Aff from Monticello
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
- Odd case but it does affirm. I think you need stronger warrants for why conditionality is ok.
- IAR is well organized & extended well.
↳ solid substantive & technicals.
- I worry for most rounds that our adversistic horror against this idea would give people a moral inclination to say you are wrong.

I'd recommend bringing 9 times
Neg Deontology is a noun; it is a theory. It can't be a std bc it can't weigh args with a noun bc a noun can't DO anything.
- You need to be more directly responsive to individual args in Aff case. You talk generally ... need specificity.
- Your 2nd C is non-unique. Racism exists.

RFD
Neg concedes Burden analysis
∴ Aff can win w/ one situation
VC is min suffering bc deont & linked
∴ Aff reduces suffering of PVS
∴ action is M.P.
∴ I affirm.

[2AR could be less wordy... you would repeat yourself a lot during extensions. hit them home any

Room: N203
Flight A: Start 8:00am
LD

5

Arton, Michael

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight
or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Monticello MT

Matthew Thomas

28

Greenhill EC

Ed Culham

28

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

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

Signed: _____

MTB

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

ORAL

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight
or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Jesuit WS

William Simoneaux

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Dulles SC

Sasha Chada

~~24.5~~ 24.5


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

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

Signed: Mike Spirtos

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

vote on NC 6 v. 5 six is greater.
They is muddled will explain in oral.



HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

51

POINTS

Westlake DR

Devin Race

29

Southlake Carroll RB

Ryan Bennett

29

The better debating was done by the West 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:

The neg wins the args at the bottom of the AC tent problematize the phrase 'morally perm'. That means the reso. is affirmed. The AC wins that if a theory exists then the action is perm. However, this is done in tandem w/ C3 which does not get extended for the JAR and it does not respond to the argument that things like nihilism could be valid theories.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Strake Jesuit College RH

Los Altos JW

Roddy Hernandez

27

Jing Wang

29

The better debating was done by the Neg from Los Altos JW
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 problem w/ the round is that the IAR just isn't good enough. Roddy, your extension of offense is questionable at best. I don't understand the issue selection either. The 2AR seems to lack focus. Also, don't ~~extend~~ make a new extension of the presumption argument; you know I won't buy it and it's annoying.

RFD: I negate. The resolution is a meta-ethical question which makes the NC come prior to the AC. The negative wins that individuals ~~should~~ would/should cooperate w/ each other and that they would never choose a moral system which undermined themselves. The IAR "turn" is greatly exaggerated in the 2AR and still bites the NR answers.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight
or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

New Trier Township XX

Carnegie Vanguard RV

Andrew Chesley

27

Rachel Vogel

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from CARN VAND RV
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Newtown High School (AA

Greenhill DS

Akshay Agashe

29.5

Danielle Smogard

29

The better debating was done by the Aff from Newtown HS AA
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 like the NC but I'm not sure about the strategic value of running that many theory preempts. Also, I think more explanation as to how the offense functions on the same post-first impact level as AC impacts would have been useful.

ORAL

Aff gets out of NC on 2 levels: extension of pfeempt at top means no unique benefit to VIL, extension of Eizek 2 means no reason to label these actions as only impermiss. Eizek 2 provides Aff offense so don't need to evaluate skepticism debate.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight
or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Mountain View DK

Apple Valley KG

Daniel Khalessi

28

Kevin Granlund

27.5

The better debating was done by the Aff from Mt. View DK
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

Can vote on Cardio Turns or Aff winning neg Standard
with weighing analysis. 2NR fails to be comparative
& abuse isn't demonstrated on D Kill.
Good 2AR.

Room: N214
Flight A: Start 8:00am
LD

5

Groner, Adam

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight
or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Plano TL

Hebron JW

Tomas Lorinc

27

Jonathan Wallen

26

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

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

Signed: AS

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

oral

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Westwood AA

Seven Lakes Sd

Abhay Agarwal

29

Steve delperdang 1:00

25

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: INTRODUCTION, PLEASE. AT THE START OF THE CASE INSTEAD OF JUST SAYING WHAT THE NEGATIVE BURDEN IS, SPEND THE FIRST PART EXPLAINING WHAT YOU HAVE TO PROVE AND THEN WHAT NEG'S BURDEN IS. FURTHER, YOU NEED TO CLARIFY WHY ACTIONS CONSIDERED TO BE A-MORAL ARE CONSIDERED MORALLY PERMISSIBLE. IF WE CANNOT EVALUATE SOMETHING IN MORAL SENSES, WHY CAN WE CALL IT MORALLY PERMISSIBLE? YOU SPEND A GOOD PORTION OF YOUR CASE READING AT A REASONABLE PACE WITH EMPHASIS, BUT GRADUALLY SPEED UP AND BLEND YOUR SENTENCES TOGETHER. ALSO, IF YOU'RE GOING TO READ FROM A LAPTOP, YOU REALLY NEED TO HOLD IT SO YOU'RE NOT BENDING OVER THE TABLE. THE ARGUMENT IN YOUR FIRST CONTENTION, THE FIRST ARGUMENT ABOUT RATIONALITY REALLY NEEDS TO BE WARRANTED. (1) WHY IS THE AGENT IN THE RESOLUTION RATIONAL? (2) WHY WILL THIS AGENT MAKING THE DECISION BE A RATIONAL AGENT? YOUR POSITION ALREADY PRESUPPOSES THE AFFIRMATION OF THE RESOLUTION AND IT ISN'T CLEAR WHY WE CANNOT EVALUATE IRRATIONAL ACTS MORALLY.

NEG: YOU START OFF FINE IN CX, BUT TOO QUICKLY LOSE THE FOCUS AND IMPACT. I WOULD HAVE LIKED TO HAVE SEEN MORE FOLLOW-UP ON THE ISSUE OF RATIONALITY, ESPECIALLY IF HE'S ALSO CLAIMING THE GROUND OF A-MORAL ACTIONS BEING CONSIDERED MORALLY PERMISSIBLE AS WELL. YOU NEED TO WORK ON DELIVERY AND ARTICULATION BECAUSE YOUR POSITION IS UNIQUE BUT DOESN'T SEEM TO BE AT ALL IMPORTANT OR SOMETHING YOU BELIEVE BECAUSE YOU JUST GLOSS OVER IT AND SPEW IT OUT WITH NO IMPACT. FURTHER, YOUR RESOLUTIONAL LINK IS WEAK AT BEST BECAUSE (1) YOU'RE NOT EXPLICITLY USING ANY OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE RESOLUTION (2) YOU ONLY ADDRESS HOW A "LOVE ETHIC" CAN APPLY IN THE LAST TWO SENTENCES OF YOUR CONSTRUCTIVE. WHEN IT COMES TO ANSWERING THE AFFIRMATIVE POSITION ABOUT RATIONALITY AND THE PROBLEM OF SAYING THAT ANY ACTION TAKEN BY THE INDIVIDUAL IS MORAL BECAUSE IT'S RATIONAL, YOU SHOULD REALLY CLARIFY WHAT IT MEANS FOR THE IDEA OF RATIONAL ACTORS. IN ADDITION, YOU NEED TO DO MORE TO EITHER RELATE YOUR CASE TO YOUR OPPONENT'S CASE OR LEAVE TIME TO SUMMARIZE THE CONFLICTING REAL

RFD: THIS WAS AN INTERESTING DEBATE INsofar as you BOTH TAKING DIFFERENT INTERPRETATIONS OF HOW THE CONFLICT SHOULD BE ADJUDICATED. THE PROBLEM IS THAT YOU'RE STILL RELYING TOO MUCH ON LINE-BY-LINE ANALYSIS IN ATTEMPTING TO ANSWER ONE ANOTHER'S INDIVIDUAL ARGUMENTS. AFF DID A GREAT JOB OF SHIFTING THE TONE SOMEWHAT AWAY FROM THAT STRATEGY WITH COMPARATIVE CONFLICT ANALYSIS BETWEEN THE TWO POSITIONS. THE INR, HOWEVER, STILL SKIPS AROUND QUITE A BIT AND ADDRESSES INDIVIDUAL ARGUMENTS SEPARATE IMPLICATIONS INSTEAD OF HOW THE CONFLICTING PIECES CAN FIT TOGETHER TO FORM A COMPLETE PICTURE. AT SOME POINT, YOU REALLY NEED TO REALIZE THAT I'M NOT FLOWING, INDIVIDUAL ARGUMENTS AND DON'T CARE ABOUT RANDOMLY BLIPPED EXTENSIONS WHICH DON'T ILLUSTRATE HOW THEY ALL FIT TOGETHER, RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OR RELATIONSHIP TO THE RESOLUTION. AT THE END OF THE DEBATE, IT SEEMS THAT I'M LEFT WITH AFF'S CLAIM THAT MORALLY PERMISSIBLE ACTIONS ARE THOSE WHICH THE ACTOR DECIDES ON AND CHOOSES TO TAKE. WHILE I THINK THIS BEGS THE QUESTION, THE NEG DOESN'T REALLY ADDRESS IT MUCH BEYOND SAYING THAT IRRATIONAL PEOPLE COULD ACT, TOO HOWEVER, THIS DOESN'T REALLY ANSWER THAT IF PEOPLE MAKE THE DECISION, IT'S MORAL TO THEM BASED ON THEIR OWN MORAL SYSTEM. THE DISTINCT NEGATIVE CLASH COMES FROM WHETHER OR NOT WE SHOULD REDUCE THE FEAR OF DEATH TO PROMOTE LOVE. I'M NOT CLEAR ON HOW THIS IS COMPETITIVE WITH THE AFF'S INTERPRETATION AND SEEMS SECONDARY TO THE ISSUE OF DETERMINING THE MORAL PERMISSIBILITY OF THE ACTION. IT'S PRETTY UNCLEAR TO ME HOW FEAR OF DEATH MAKES THE ACTION IMMORAL.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Anderson BB

Meadows JL

Bronte Bejarano

26

Jordan LaMothe

27

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

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

Signed: _____

Douglas Jeffers

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I THINK THAT THE NEG WINS A RIGHTS
VIOLATION, & THE NOZICK CARD ON THE AC
WHICH MEANS THAT NO SOCIAL/COLLECTIVE
GOOD REASON CAN OUTWEIGH THAT.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hattiesburg BK

St. Vincent De Paul EP

Bretton Klinedinst 2:05 15

Ethan Pawson 2:47 20

The better debating was done by the NEG from ST. VINCENT DE PAUL
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:

GOOD INTRODUCTION AND THESIS EMERGING, THEN IN. WITH YOUR VALUE AND CRITERION, YOU DO A GOOD JOB OF DEFINING BOTH, HOWEVER, YOUR STANDARD REQUIRES AN ADDITIONAL MECHANISM TO DETERMINE WHEN IT HAS BEEN MET. HOW DO WE KNOW WHAT THE GREATEST GOOD IS AND HOW DO WE KNOW IF AND WHEN IT HAS BEEN FULFILLED? FURTHER, WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL GOOD AND MORALITY? JUST BECAUSE BENEFICIAL OUTCOMES ARE PRODUCED DOES NOT MEAN THAT THE ACTION ITSELF TO ACHIEVE THAT END IS A MORAL ACTION. YOU NEED TO BETTER EXPLAIN HOW WE GET TO THE POINT THAT QUANTITY MAKES SOMETHING MORAL. THIS WOULD MEAN ADOPTING CLEAR JUSTIFICATION FOR A PARTICULAR KIND OF MORAL THEORY. YOU'D NEED TO SPEND A LOT MORE TIME IN THE CRITERION, CHOOSE A CLEARER ONE AND ARTICULATE WHY PRODUCTION OF AN ACTION IS LESS IMPORTANT THAN THE OUTCOME IT PRODUCES. DON'T ARGUE IN CX: ANSWER TO THE BEST OF YOUR ABILITY

IN CX, IF YOUR OPPONENT ISN'T COOPERATING WITH HYPOTHETICAL EXAMPLES YOU GIVE, MOVE ON SO YOU DON'T WASTE TIME. IN YOUR CONSTRUCTIVE YOU NEED TO WORK ON ARTICULATION AND DELIVER SO YOU'RE NOT JUST READING FROM THE PAGE. STOP SWAYING DURING YOUR CONSTRUCTIVE. IT'S INCREDIBLY IMPORTANT FOR YOU TO READ MORE SLOWLY AND ALLOW YOUR AUDIENCE TO ABSORB WHAT YOU'RE SAYING. DO YOU MEAN THAT WE CAN'T EVALUATE ANY MORAL QUESTION BECAUSE WE NO LONGER HAVE OUR TRADITIONAL VALUE SYSTEM? WHY SHOULD WE RETURN TO THAT INTERPRETATION INSTEAD OF USING WHAT WE INTERPRET TO BE MODERN VALUES AND MORALS TO BE? IF YOU'RE GOING TO KRITIK THE RESOLUTION AND THE AFFIRMATIVE'S STRATEGY INSTEAD OF DEBATING THE RESOLUTION, YOU REALLY NEED TO MAKE THAT YOUR WHOLE STRATEGY OR YOU REALLY NEED TO LET IT GO. WITH THE ANSWERS TO UTILITY, YOU NEED TO CONTEXTUALIZE IT IN TERMS OF THE CONFLICT OF THE GIVEN RESOLUTION

RFD: SIDE COMMENTS DURING YOUR OWN SPEECH ("WOAH" OR "THAT WAS DEEP") ARE A LITTLE BIT WEIRD AND DETRACT FROM WHAT YOU'RE SAYING. NEG PROPOSES THE IDEA THAT WE CAN'T HAVE VALUES BECAUSE WE WERE NOT FUNCTIONING, FROM WHAT OUR ORIGINAL VALUES SHOULD BE. AFF COMPLETELY MISHANDLES THIS KRITIK OF VALUES VIA NEITZSCHE. I'M GOING TO REJECT THE KRITIK HOWEVER, BECAUSE THE NEG USES IT FOR "REAL WORLD" ATTACKS ON HIS OPPONENT, SAYING THAT HE NEEDS TO BE HUMBLER AND THAT HE HAS SUCH SKEWED VALUES BECAUSE OF THE DEPARTURE FROM THE TRADITIONAL VALUES. NOTHING HAPPENS WHEN I SIGN THE BALLOT, EXCEPT A WINNER AND LOSER OF THE DEBATE, SO I'M NOT VOTING ON THE KRITIK. I THEN LOOK AT THE QUANTITY VERSUS QUALITY DEBATE BECAUSE THAT'S ALL THAT'S LEFT. THIS DEBATE WAS PRETTY MESSY ON THAT FRONT BECAUSE NEITHER ONE OF YOU WAS TELLING ME HOW ANY OF THIS RELATES TO DETERMINING THE MORAL PERMISSIBILITY OF THE ACTION. NEITHER OF YOU IS EVALUATING THE MORAL PREMISE OF THE RESOLUTION AND JUST LOOK AT THE "FUNCTIONAL," PRAGMATIC APPLICATION. I RELUCTANTLY NEGATED YOU.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE :40

POINTS

NEGATIVE :20

POINTS

Albuquerque Academy KC

Walt Whitman EM

Kate Cygan

24

Emily Massey

24

The better debating was done by the Neg from Walt Whitman EM
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:

Unfortunately, the high pitch of your voice makes it hard to distinguish what you say when you get fast or excited. Also, slow down in the beginning so I have an idea of the structure.

I like the case in that there is no better choice, just lack of moral ascribed. Didn't get everything but got all main points & warrants/impacts, just missed some details

You didn't answer sum. of positive obligations this may hurt you

→ it just did

Bring alive to autonomy if can't act

Like your ct, I think you got a lot done toward killing the moral dilemma stuff

Use language of round more in signposting. I didn't necessarily get her reaction etc but I got the arguments. Good argument = she loved the reaction stuff to prove & culpable

Great speed/style. Appreciate starting slower & accelerating.

Way to bring up & impact drops. Dealt well with turns, good speed

OK, so sum of pos obligations sets up that the res is not a moral dilemma which takes out aff. Also, neg makes distinction b/w moral and good thing to do. More autonomy when & forced to always live for others.

Neg

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker SR

Crowley HL

Sachin Rangarajan

26.5

Hailey Lopez

27.5

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

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

Signed: gh

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: ① Neg +/0 solvency because we cant ~~xxx~~ predict
the future benefits of something

② NC comes before plan b/c it is the
only weighing mechanism I have. NC wins
harm principle arguments

BOTH OF YOU SHOULD WORK ON
MORE DEPTH OF ARGS AND
BEING LESS BLIPPY

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Carrollton School of Ag

St. Vincent De Paul BB

Alina gomez

21

Brian Bordley

23

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

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

Signed: David McGinnis

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The affirmative is misunderstanding and/or misrepresenting John Rawls, and the critique is hard to follow (and very poorly extended). Neither debater really seems to understand what the other is trying to do, ~~and~~ I would recommend working on clarity of strategy and content.

Room: L199
Flight A: Start 8:00am
LD

5

McGinnis, David

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Los Altos DM

Daniel Moerner

30

Homeschool KV

Kelsey Valadez

26

The better debating was done by the Aff from Daniel Moerner
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- theory conceded in the N

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Plano East SS

Vestavia Hills High KS

Shilpa Sethuraman

27

Kevin Sipe

27.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from Vestavia
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 hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Law Magnet LM

Cascia Hall RK

Lorena Nanez

26

Rahul Kohli

26

The better debating was done by the NEG from Cascia Hall
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. 26 let's

2. 13 used

~~comment~~
Aff

good turn

You need to give me a reason why I vote Affirmative on this w/ your argument

you must explain why dialogue is a voter.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Marcus CC

Northland Christian JR

Carson Chalmers

28

Josh Roberts

30

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

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

Signed: Greg A. McGee

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Yes, Josh NR was complete.

I vote

- 1) Aff violates Deontological Standard by killing innocents.
- 2) Aff did shift ground too much & Neg met original AC burden of displaying utilitarianism back.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

West Des Moines Valle YZ

Yale Zhu

26

Cathedral DD

David Delgado

26

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

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

Signed: Greg McGee

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- good CX

- slowdown

- Turn phase off
- slow down

I vote off off of the definition of
Permissible and the alleged underpinnings.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Colleyville Heritage MT

Mubeen Tejani

26

Stony Point TH

Tyler Haulotte

25

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

• 2NR = very repetitive
need to do more than repeat
the NR





AR - needs to signpost
to extend rector
or link to NR


NR needs to respond to
for AR you have 3
answers



- jump around too
much organized



for need more cards



HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight
or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

West Des Moines Valle AK

Strake Jesuit College PB

Alex Kramer

26.5

Philip Bartholomew

27

The better debating was done by the NEG from STRAKE
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 NC ABOUT THE AFF = UNNECESSARY KILLING SINCE IT'S CONCEDED

NEG IS AHEAD ON THE THEORY DEBATE - "PREDICTABLY 7 GROUND AND 3 AFF DOES THE
SAME THING AND THE NEG HAS, NO ARTICULATION
IN 2ND OF WHY PUTTING A DUNNO ON HIM
V. NOT DOING SO MATTERS

THE AFF APPOSITION DOESN'T GRAPPLE WITH THE ARG THAT THIS CONCEPTION OF
(M) WOULD BE CONTRADICTORY + MAKE ACTIONS SIMULTANEOUSLY PERMISSIBLE + IMPOSSIBLE

Room: FA107
Flight B: Start 8:45am
LD

5

Hogan, Tim

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight
or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Albuquerque Academy IE

Ian Erickson-Kery

26

Bronx Science SS

Saboor Sheerazi

28

The better debating was done by the

NEG
AFF or NEG

from

Bronx Science
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Colleyville Heritage BB

Bekah Boyer

28

Hockaday SR

Sarah Ridout

28

The better debating was done by the

Neg.
AFF. OR NEG.

from

Hockaday SR
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

Jo Russell

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

aff. did not respond adequately to Neg's responses to the Jones "brain dead" card. in addition, too many issues in Neg's case were not addressed at all. aff. - how can you claim to o/w on "predictability" w/o warrant?

I thought research burden was a waste of time by both debaters.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Blake PO

West RB

Phelan O'Neill

28

Ryan Beck

27

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

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

Signed: _____

MB

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

ORAL

NC DROPS TOO MANY KEY POINTS FROM AFF CASE.
ADDITIONALLY, NR IS INCREDIBLY DEFENSIVE,
ADVANCING LITTLE OFFENSE.

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

5

Aguilar, Josh

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks
October 17-19

MM MM MM

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight
or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Pace Academy MM

Jenks DR

Michael Melia

28

Daniel Rose

28

The better debating was done by the AG from Pace 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:

The AG C3 goes dropped whenever inds will be used as + means
we aight to default to magnitude This compounds the turns on
the NC about saying more people

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Northland Christian MD

Molly Dunn

27

Winston Churchill LB

Lynn Bimler

29

The better debating was done by the Neg from Winston Churchill LB
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:

I negate.

1. I ~~can~~ look at the NC. The only Aff response is a cross-application of Tooley. The Aff claims the Neg never explains a relevant distinction btw Killing and letting die, but this is clearly the thesis of the NC. Aff never explains the warrant in Tooley as to why there is no distinction so I vote off the NC.

2. I don't think the Aff can generate offense off the AC b/c she mishandles and then drops (2412) the analysis about solvency and her standard being inappropriate. ~~the evidence which proves~~

A few general notes: The Aff seems to be overly fragmented and has trouble layering arguments into a cohesive story. She also needs to work on extensions and impacting. The Neg does a good job handling an AC that I don't think her NC stacks up well against. The NC should have been able to cover more, but the NRZ was close to perfect.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Winston Churchill CD

Claire Daviss

285

Strake Jesuit College PT

Paul Tyger

29

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

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

Signed: Sabri Graham

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Good NC strat but the double FX argument is weak which makes me think you won't be going for it. You need to respond to the permissibility standard @ the top of the AC. b/c she can try and get out of some of the morality debate by just going for permissibility.
AR: The time constraint really hurts you that's why you need more offense coming out of the AC.
NR: You need to tell me where to look 1st on the flow especially w/c there are a view places that I could look to that are independent of other arguments.
ZAR: Much better than the 1AR but you need to focus on the act/omission argument. If you want to win the debate b/c it takes out your only reason that you would prevent unnecessary harm. If you lose that you lose the debater even if he doesn't have a competing standard.
RFR: The NC goes away b/c the grammar argument is dropped so intent & matter.
The overview is contingent on the act/omission debate. But it helps the Neg to prove that you don't know the certainty of the outcome.
Act/omission flows Neg b/c of the Positive/Negative analysis is clearly defining a distinction for the Neg.

Room: L216
Flight B: Start 8:45am
LD

5

Dessi, Katie

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight
or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Awty International PH

Phillips Hogan

27 1/2

West GT

Graham Tierney

27 1/2

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

GPAL -

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Kingwood NG

Neil Grigg

25

Shawnee HS

Heather Swadley

28

The better debating was done by the

Aff
AFF or NEG

from

Kingwood NG
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RPD

① no brightline 4 neg standard, but even if I grant one somehow exists I've got a very dropped answer was to dignity - it bias = inevitable than dignity & not either way.

② from there I vote off the I example arg. not conditional as per ten #3 under the standard.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight
or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Kingwood GA

Geoff Alexander

24

Southlake Carroll CC

Cathy Creighton

28.5

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Geoff
Arriving 10 minutes late, waiting
10 minutes to pre-flw is a tad
too much. Come prepared!

- The NEG wins all contested args.
- ① Aff has to be cat
 - ② emotion linked to external stimuli
& in rez & emotion part of def
of morality.
 - ③ Time screw arg. makes no sense.
 - ④ Double bind

Room: L104
Flight A: Start 8:00am
LD

5

Wilson, Matt

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight
or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science BE

Bobby Esnard

29

Brophy College Prep MJ

Matt Johnson

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from Bronx BE
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

Room: L218
Flight B: Start 8:45am
LD

5

Massey, Jonathan

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight
or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bronx Science AS

Adam Silver

28.5

Brophy College Prep JL

Jeff Lockhart

29

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: L218
Flight A: Start 8:00am
LD

5

Massey, Jonathan

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight
or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Pace Academy AZ

Marcus EK

Alex Zhang

29

Evan Kirkham

29

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

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

Signed: Jonathan Massey

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff wins #3 AC Nye card - morality purely
descriptive, therefore doesn't bite into any of the
NC

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks
October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Winston Churchill AL

Amanda Legrand

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Northland Christian TC

Thomas Carmichael

27

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

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

Signed: A U.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD

The Agreement that there will be checks; ~~that~~ that kicks out of the atrocities that the Neg brings up.

- The Aff maintains ~~the~~ that ~~the~~ ^{the} Neg can't link to HW because of the forced obligation
- So the benefits of the Aff provides enough off to vote w/ the discourse argument

Room: L215
Flight A: Start 8:00am
LD

5

Yim, Anthony

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight
or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Scarsdale DD

Daniel Daks

28

Westlake AW

Andrew Waks

28

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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD-

The Aff wins on the Burdens placed on the top of the
AC.

Room: L101
Flight B: Start 8:45am
LD

5

Graham, Ryan

L = LIBRARY

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Dulles KG

Law Magnet JR

Kiwi Gupta

29

JAQUELINE RIOS

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from Dulles
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: Although I think the AC is interesting, I don't think the INR justifies why I negate. First, the AC does not extend any arguments legitimizing murder and we have had past debate topics ~~debate~~ (debaters are not running around killing people. Also, the reason to negate is unclear (education, dialogue) and I need a stronger link story between education and its importance to debate. I ^(auto) affirm because grammatically the individual must be innocent (if others die b/c of that person they are no longer innocent).

Room: L101
Flight A: Start 8:00am
LD

5

Graham, Ryan

L = LIBRARY

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight
or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hockaday SV

Marquette University SH

Shivani Vohra

30

Samuel Hope

30

The better debating was done by the AFF from Hockaday
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: The AC clearly extends Nathan and the burden analysis; the burden analysis precludes the AC's criticism and Nathan defines the affirmative burden. Even if I look at the AC, I feel like a coin flip does concede both actions would be permissible (so I could still affirm). I vote off Sandel and the analysis ~~proving~~ proving that there is no moral restriction against affirming. Also, the ~~cross~~ cross application of Nathan, along with the other responses, is sufficient to take out the overview.

Room: L219
Flight B: Start 8:45am
LD

5

Conrad, Neil

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight
or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Seven Lakes Jk

Stony Point MY

Jacob koshak

25

Mirusha Yogarajah

27

The better debating was done by the NEG from Stony Point MY
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:

There are enormous, painstakingly obvious answers to the kritik and the off case argument. Unfortunately, the affirmatives does not come up with even one. I vote on the kritik — no need for presumption.

HEART OF TEXAS

St. Marks

October 17-19

Disclosure and Oral Critique encouraged. Please hand your ballot to a runner after each flight or text/call results to: 817-320-5888 (Steffany Batik)

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Walt Whitman JK

Alief Kerr JT

28

Jane Kessner

28.5

Joshua Tang

~~28~~

The better debating was done by the AFF from Whitman JK
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 negative concedes the AC framework, so the affirmative must prove that hypothetical consent is a sufficient condition for morally permissible action and that hypothetical contractors would accept the resolution. She proves the first prong with the extension of Part 1 subpoint A and the second prong with Part 2. Though the NC is a bit under-covered, the hypothetical consent analysis ~~can~~ overrides the analysis in Quinn - so long as hypothetical contractors consent, there is no violation of self-ownership. Incidentally, the overpopulation argument is taken out by the "no circumstances" in the argument. There is no link to the scenario, Brow et al. analysis.