Both sides returned to the weaknesses addressed by their opponent and responded with dexterity. The affirmative was able to counter the negative's argument that the negative's central claim was a truism or "grounds argument" by framing his claim as a subjective, falsifiable statement. Because this was not then disproven with evidence by the negative, the affirmative's claim was able to stand.

Affirmative:
- Careful with setting up moral relativism as a straw man if the negative cites an error theory instead of appealing to moral relativism.
- Great reframing!

Negative:
- Provide evidence that obj. morality causes harm, then attack weaknesses.
- Great internal consistency!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd Abhiram k bobba</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>1st 2nd Granados - nsabimana</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd 6 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st 2nd pleasure nsabimana</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8 Bioscience High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

Objective morality exist

**Declarations**

1. Harm principals
   - Laws bind
   - Morality passed from gen. to generation

2. Happiness
   - Harm negative connotation like genes passed on
   - Humans share the same principals of morality

Examples of morality:

- Focus on mediating harm

Philosophers defined morality so not objective

- Religion places great role in morality

Cultural Rev. makes morality subjective

- Relates to pre-frontal cortex biological issue
- Morality differs from person to person, so dependent to pre-frontal role so make it subjective

Evolution has effect on morality

Example of animals killing animals cause harm for their own survival.

- Negating harm because it is universal argument
Affirmative

The end goal of all our actions is to get to and/or maximize happiness.

Good response by excluding animals in this argument.

Morality is objective goal but we can have subjective ways to reach it.

Evolution proves morality based on passing these genes to future generations.

Suggestions:
The debater on affirmative can present better by not being aggressive, could have been calmer in presentation and answering questions.

Good hand and body posture.

Rational:

All humans have the same goals to minimize harm and maximize happiness.

Negative

Question: The definition of harm and happiness.

Ways:

Affir.: Did not use well.

Rational:

did not refute the strong points of affirmative well organized.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Room 5104</th>
<th>Fri 10/04/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd Murillo - Nur</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1st/2nd Hall - Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd Jawed Nur</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1st/2nd Jonathan David Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8 Bioscience High School]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[14 Mesquite High School]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? 40

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Negative speaker cross examination pointed opponent only addressed human nature does what the majority does, they did not defend the point well.
- Negative was confident & answered questions with examples.
- Affirmative did well brought in new ideas at the end.
# Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

## Big Questions Debate

### Round 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd Peterson - Alarcon</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1st 2nd Daynah Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd Raquel Amador Alarcon</td>
<td>8 Bioscience High School</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>2 Arizona College Prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Daynah made opening remarks are good from both teams. However, Daynah excelled at rebuttals and consolidation. Daynah was able to address the rebuttals against her and effectively make the Convey rationale why object we morality does not exist.**
# Big Questions Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Andi Giberson (*'2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goff - Valtierra</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaushal Parimi</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Bioscience High School</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 BASIS Phoenix</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**.

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Eye contact - all speakers
- Solid arguments - both sides
- Stick to your argument - have contingency plans for alt. arguments
1st affirm - ok - couldn't tie argument together
1st neg - good job refuting the trolley problem (or)
relativism

Murder - people treated the same.

→ Generality vs specificity

2nd affirm -
2nd neg -

Consolidation? (B)

sort of skipped around.

(N)