## Big Questions Debate

**Room 2209**

**Sat 10/05/19 12:30PM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>Greg Stephens (*8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan E Zonn</td>
<td>Daynah Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

**Greg Stephens**

Judge's Signature

Tempo Prep (22)

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

- *Affirmative*: (Diction is crisp)
- *Negative*: (Diction a little fuzzy)
- Start with definitions
- Harm is objective
- Intentional
- Moral Duty
- Not to harm
- Religion not needed
- Cite Aristotle & Plato
- Goes beyond social customs

**Negative** made a very good initial argument, but struggled somewhat in the follow up questions and rebuttals.

**Affirmative** was better organized and ready with answers to *Neg*'s questions.
At.
At contends that Neg's 3 contentions contradict each other.

Testing to avoid harm and preserve universality.

Q: When there are many types of morality, can there be objectivity?
Neg says no.

If values can be prioritized so can morality.

Humans have an innate instinct to preserve life and avoid harm.
A cultural belief does not negate objective morality.

Neg.
Objects to bringing up animals.

"I have not contradicted myself" because 3 types show there is no objectivity.

Asserts that a "rule of thumb" is not objective.

Contention that attitudes toward suicide are diverse in culture.

Instinct is not a moral value, some value life, some don't.

There is no universal moral value. A value is something prioritized - not an objective moral.

Instinct is not a moral. One moral might be violated to promote a larger good.
### Big Questions Debate

**Topic:** Objective Morality Exists

<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>Nathan Zonn</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Daynah Andrews</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

**Is this a low point win?**

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Affirmative:**
  - God = not feeling
  - Moral = some being, right, wrong, thing
  - No morality at all for neg to win
  - No to home, racism, sexism
  - Home = parent's view, feeling
  - Human exists: morality exist
  - Objectivity - cannot be measured
  - Mathematics
  - Universal moral claims
  - Q: relativism, self-contracting?

- **Rebuttal:**
  - More 1 example of moral objectivity
  - Neg: contradicts itself: has 3 existing
  - Simultaneously
  - ... morality is subjective
  - 1. Consec.
  - 2. Relativism
  - 3. Util.

**Negative:**

- Belief that morality is universal, not up to interpret consequences
- Framework, nowhere is there objective morality
- Love
- Moral relativism - diff. for diff. people
- Cultural

- If true - then no moral diversity
- There is diversity
- Situational dependent

- No clear rule based morality
- Context, depends on morality
- Rules, if moral, good from breaking rule

- Q: metaphysical meaning, stick
  - No way to measure

- Q: motility into debate
  - Innate sense: instinct

**3 Contentions**

- No to home
- Racism, sexism
- Parent's view

---

**Excerpts:**

- Love
- Relative: correlated to objectivity

---

**Conclusion:**

- Animals - not relevant.
- Sacred values: values vs. morals
- Contradict
- **Debate:**
  - Need for each to have some object
  - Valid to command space time
  - Rule of thumb - in objectivity

- **Judge's Signature:**
  - Sunnyvale, Scientist

---

**School / Affiliation / Occupation:**

- Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational
**Questions**

**AFF:** wide variety of morality - but not objective morality  
**NET:** natural evolution - human evolution, change over time, desire to avoid harm  
**AFF:** avoid harm - tribal, values & approach, preserve life, no harm  
**NET:** suicide - state of irrational, break objective morality, means irrational & not apply

**AFF Summary**  
Framework: objective morality exists somewhere in soc. have a mind & lead to break  
NET: values prioritized but not morality - but can be prioritized to counter suicide well  
NET: all people need to argue to obj. morality - just someone...  
**NET Summary**  
New argument: Yolo, have fun.  
Instinct: know how to do it, not learned.  
Instinct vs moral.  
*no example of what is one objective moral*  
Many types... except objectively.  
AFF needs a list of why objective.

**AFF Rationale**  
- objective morality - minute path to avoid harm (suicide)  
- all except one: relativism disguised as objective  
- Evidence of avoiding harm

**NET Rationale**  
- relativism:  
  - cognitive rel:  
  - instinct - new argument, not tied in well  
  - utilitarian flows through  
  - Framework - does not exist anywhere, limited to finite set of goals

**Key Deciders**  
- extremely comfortable in speaking and complete knowledge of the case  
- cross examination & questions were outstanding to keep the basics of the framework clear  
- proved that harm is measurable and therefore objective  
- challenged in finding information and organizing thoughts  
- conceded too many times in questions  
- brought up new argument late in the round (instinct) and it supported the AFF  
- main argument of all relativism was refuted
**THEILE, CHRISTINE**  
**Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational**

**BQD**  
**FLIP: 9 Nathan E Zonn v. 2 Daynah Andrews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Big Questions Debate</th>
<th>Christine Theile (*1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Finals</td>
<td>Room 2209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Nathan Zonn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Daynah Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(Circle Winner)

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

Judge's Signature: [Signature]

School / Affiliation / Occupation: Academia / Educator

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF argument was sound and addressed all contentions of the NEQ argument. While NEQ argued that all morals are subject to who holds the beliefs, AFF argued that a moral objective must have to be believed to exist and AFF example of a moral objective morality that sustaining life and instruct to do no harm was sound. AFF definitions and framework held strong. Both were well prepared and arguments were good but AFF prevailed.
<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>Brooke Scott</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kaushal Parimi</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<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**

**McClintock HS**

Judge's Signature: [Signature]

School / Affiliation / Occupation:

---

I think that a wise strategy for determining objectivity appeals to ideal theory in moral philosophy. E.g. Kant, Korsgaard

I think that Rawls Veil of Ignorance might be a looking into for the Aff. These philosophers: (Kant, Korsgaard, and Rawls) may help provide you w/ ammunition as to why and how a objective morality exists.

You made a Prem arg that you drop - that's ok. It wasn't extended much.

I think that you **do** the work of establishing the existence of categorical moral duties w/ your examples.

Don't go for objectivity ≠ absolutism @ the beginning. I don't understand why this would be the case or how it helps you. Objectivity IS absolutism since we are talking about existence.

I voted for the Aff on the Neg's failure to respond to the wellfoundedness of morality argument of the Aff.

Try to avoid contradictory statements in your answers to questions such as the existence of rationality (though you do provide a slightly interpretive) that stands above emotion. This fulfills the Aff's burden of establishing that there is some hint of objectivity.

Some Key Terms/Philosophers To Categorize Research (FOR BOTH DEBATERS):

- Immanuel Kant (objectivity) ➔ Categorical imperative
- Christine Korsgaard ➔ Impartial rational spectator
- John Rawls ➔ The Grundtvig of the Metaphysics of Morals (book)
- Rational autonomy/agency ➔ Teleology (purpose of ethical morality)
- Veil of ignorance ➔ Just an idea for leveraging definitional debate
- Self-Contradiction (book) ➔ Just another idea for leveraging definitional debate
### Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

**BQD**

FLIP: 2 Brooke Scott v. 6 Kaushal Parimi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Big Questions Debate</th>
<th>Glen Uehara (*12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2210</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Brooke Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kaushal Parimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? __________

**Judge’s Signature**

Mohegan High School

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**Brooke**

Slow down a bit. Be more clear & articulate.
Tell us where you are going. Will help you map out what points your opponent makes & be able to refute them.

**Kaushal**

You spoke a lot to your points but didn’t speak to hers as much as you could have. She started challenging some of what you were saying, but you didn’t come back as strongly with your stance/position.

**Brooke**

You agreed your points well but your points at the beginning were ‘phrased’ & could have driven your ending argument home more ex. “Like I mentioned in the beginning human life & require human sacrifice...” just being it far out & we can see where you tie it all together.

**Kaushal**

I really liked how you used facts more than feelings for your rebuttal. Be careful about what you say, as someone could get offended (talking about sex preference). Your audience is key & you have to build up those claims well, more than just saying it. It would be more impactful by providing relevant opinions (philosophers) & stats to support.

**Brooke**

You did a good job hitting the points & I like that you used facts. You mapped out where you were going & it made me see your points easier. Putting some additional ‘emotion’ behind what you say to make me believe that you will stand behind what you are saying.

“I hope you judges don’t want to live in that type of a world.” really makes it more personal to your audience but be careful how what you say, because not everyone is going to believe what you do. Base some of your words on facts to make me ‘have’ to believe what you are saying. Use philosophers & statistics (just sprinkle it in here & there).
# Big Questions Debate

**BQD**

**FLIP: 2 Brooke Scott v. 6 Kaushal Parimi**

**Big Questions Debate**  |  **Room 2210**  |  **Sat 10/05/19 12:30PM**
---|---|---
**Semi-Finals**  |  **Nicholas Sitzman (*19)**  |  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td><strong>Brooke Scott</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td><strong>Kaushal P.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Judge's Signature**

**Basis: Scottsdale**

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**Brooke:**

Needs to slow down on her presentation of arguments.

It was difficult to follow/understand.

Strong presentation - Confident.

Aggressive - positive.

**Kaushal:**

Clear presentation of argument.

Needs to speak with more emphasis.

Both need to support their arguments with more/ clearer or better (clearer, effective, stronger).

Both need better supports for their arguments rather than repeating the same ones.

Clarify and emphasize their definitions to support their positions.