## Big Questions Debate

### Round 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Bollinger</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Bobba</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Bobba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Don't speak with computer in front of you.
- Look forward - not at your opponent.
- I like the Board Game idea, but it should not be the majority of your content.
- Use as an example - Need real big life issues.
- Don't go over your contentions - Need to go over the arguments that you are winning.
- Contentions 2 and 3 are stronger than 1.
- But you actually argue those more. Where you would give a stronger case, argument.
- Hard organization.

---

**RFD:**

I am concerned that both sides kind of brought up new arguments late in the round.

Everything else was in oral critique.

The **Aff** was more organized and attacked with more logic -

**Neg** was all over the place.

**AFF Wins**
### Big Questions Debate

**Judge:**沙漠里山Cardinal

**Round 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Daynah Andrews</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Stephanie B</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Safiya Goff</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

1. **Religious rules**
2. **Interpretive laws**
   - negates morality
   - Lawyer can interpret
3. **Universal morality**
   - changes against circumstance
   - Police killing on duty vs off duty
4. Morality changes through history

---

**Defended The Question well, answered with confidence on reason**

Drug issues and laws not moral issues

-- Negs clearly disproved universal laws of morality
   - not objective
   - Government issues reflects societal views
   - so negates objective morality
   - Sacrifice and killing negate universal morality

---

**Good delivery**

---

**Many previous arguments**
Affirmative

- Medical use of drugs
- Political topics vs political
- Laws don't justify morality
- Morals: how we live our lives, laws don't define that.

Second counterargument about drugs being political means not moral judgment was effective.

Tough job to work for this subject and build a strong argument and fight against two debaters.

Negative

Drugs are evil.
Sacrifices, many cultures done this in past and how they figured sacrifices are wrong.

Human sacrifices dealt with objective morality.
Aztecs did sacrifices and not followed morality.

The Negs were more vigorous and consistent on their arguments, more examples presented to refute affirmative.
FLIP: 6 Kaushal Parimi v. 8 Peterson - Alarcon

Big Questions Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 5110</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kaushal Parimi</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Perception explained.
Theory of law mentioned universally accepted.
Happiness - positive.
Harm - negative.
Religion based off a God - How do we determine ideas exist.

Redefine conceptualism.

Def stated well, asked questions about war, murder - murder during war is accepted & well explained.

Contestation stated well, hands-on control explained.
Religion, morality a framework.

Morals evolving, not support others standards + ideology.
Morals always change.

Summary well stated.

Question re: obj morality def. could have won.

Says obj morality does not exist, not confident in answering that it does exist.

Asking for clarification.

Outcome more important consequence prioritize.
BQD

FLIP: 8 Granados - nsabimana v. 9 Nathan E Zonn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Room 5104</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 03:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Zonn</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Zonn</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative  Negative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  N

Comments & Reason for Decision:

All speakers Round 1
practice more with difficult terms
try to look up occasionally.

Better on cross - rey (all speakers)
Better on flaws of other case - hitting point
by point (all speakers)

Speaker 2 - negative - the word right needs to
come out - way overused.

Speaker 1 - negative - don't use 'um'
Notes

Speaker 1 - look

Negative * 2d 1

Um Speaker 1

Religion

Euthanasia

Brain research

Slavery

Relativism

Biology

Harm - nice turn!

Right, don't use

Speaker 2

Alcohol, drug use

Causing harm to others
to further one's chance for life

Losers of war
Brooke was able to make a convincing argument that objective morality, as defined by the opponents as majority opinion, is not beneficial for society. She also made an argument that off morality has changed over time and does not universally exist.