## BQD

**Big Questions Debate**

**Charlie Mack (*'12)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finals</th>
<th>Room 2209</th>
<th>Sat 10/05/19 04:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(circle)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Brooke Scott</td>
<td>Nathan E Zonn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td>9 Brophy College Prep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **16**

Judge’s Signature: **S. Nagarajala**

School / Affiliation / Occupation: **Phoenix Basis**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

### Affirmative:
- Strong arguments include:
  1. Morality cannot be determined by individual perception of what is right or wrong. Morality is based on collective belief that benefits all two members of society.
  2. Difference between absolute and objective is found in how we raise the relationship of morality, perception, and society rules and regulations.

### Negative:
- Excellent example of how morality could be questioned under different situations.
- Good argument in the definition of moral relativism and how it affects the individual experience of subjects.
- Dr. Zonn could explain the difference between individual moral beliefs and collective morality (society as a whole).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nathan E Zonn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**  |  **Negative**
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  **No**

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1. **Aff**
   - Conviction, validation, live to value, right to reap. I believe does not attend.
   - How are sacrifices, nothing under serious light.

2. **Neg**
   - Morality is subjective; hard example to validate. Pragmatist leads decision.
   - Subjective

---

**CF**

- **AF** - **Neg**
  - Question → Answer clearly.
  - Clean < RN
  - Cited directly

---

**AF**
- Real existence definition → objectivism and absolutism → good point validated.

**Neg**
- **Cont** → influence by external factors, decided by one or situation, found a median
  - **OBJ** objective moralism & subjective moralism

**RF**
- Renew without emotion, external factor influence by Neg,
  - Responded back in self defense as a moral when obstacle...
AFF: Great presentation of accurate and clear. Validates her given care authority.

NGC: Time A/E. Right & left, reactive normally.

AFF: Great care presentation on the case. Strong Orientation and non-delicitation.

NGC:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Room 2209</th>
<th>Sat 10/05/19 04:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong>&lt;br&gt;(circle)</td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong>&lt;br&gt;Brooke Scott</td>
<td><strong>Points</strong>&lt;br&gt;(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>2 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Talked a little too fast
- Good and clear voice
- Good material and reference
- Passionate about your topic, very convincing
- Good questions; asked to the opponent; tough and smart questions.
- The definition was convincing
- Any stealing of life was good point on preservation of life.
- Toward the end, it felt rushing
- Overall, good speech and argument - well done.

- Good resource on counter the opponent's points.
- Good voice and clear.
- Coherent and calm
- Logic flow on points was easy to understand
- Interesting example using a self-driving car
- Examples given were strong.
- Respectful to everyone in the room; good eye contact.
- Strong evidences to support your points.
- External factors vs. internal self; the clarification was strong.
- Great speech!