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Arnav Bawa (*10)

Round 2  
PSH 150  
Fri 12/06/19 05:00PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Rank (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd  Nathan E Zonn</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd  Nathan E Zonn</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Rank (1-4)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd  Hays</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd  Lafar</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</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**

Great initial arguments for the case. Some analogies fell short and was not convincing during CR-X.

**NEGATIVE**

Both with strong arguments. Was able to give good answers and was strong in CR-X. Disbelieved some of the examples of moral objectives (i.e., Hitler).

This was a very close contest. The negative team beat the AFF by a small amount.
Objective Morality Exists.
### Big Question

**MORRISON, KRISYY**

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>PSH 231</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 05:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Jillian Leah Kahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>10 Hamilton High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>Josh Tint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>6 Catalina Foothills High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Great Job Guys! In the courtyard debate:

- Principles concerning the distinction between right & wrong. The denotes "value" existence is not a value.
- I gave verbal feedback. Very impressed by you both.

Decision:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd Kiah Reason</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd 17 Paradise Valley</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affirmative**

The winner of this debate was

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?

**Judge's Signature**

School / Affiliation / Occupation

This was a tough debate and a tough topic.

Thank you for presenting on it. Both sides agreed that human free will, the argument came down to where does moral issue flow?

Are you born with it or do you learn it from the society around you? Do concrete morals exist? Based on the argument that morals are learned, that was presented, I believe that was not the case.
## Big Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>PSH 552</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 05:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1st 2nd</td>
<td>Riley Riley Oldani</td>
<td>Hari Saurav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Points</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(circle)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>16 Brophy College Prep</td>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The winner of this debate was</strong></td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

---

Overall, both sides brought up excellent points. The argument about suicide reducing harm ultimately won the case for me and the idea that wars are not directly motivated to harm others but rather in correlation to some ulterior motive. Finally, I couldn't see how religion is the cause of morality, and Aff. brought this point up numerous times as well.
**Aff**

- Morality: harm - all harmed
  - caused by fear, pain

1. Ought to be followed
   - 2. Universal moral norms

Avoid all harm to maintain life.

While there is harm, people try to maintain least amount of harm.

**Neg**

- Morality: set of good and bad behavior
  - Obj: only facts
  - Only if

- Human taught
  - 2. Minilist: people create their own rules

- Morality & religion are exclusive
  - Moral code comes from religion
  - Life is valuable so we should decide what is valuable in life.

- Suicide: No objective moral cannot be outliers
  - If norms change, then morality changes

- Objective
  - What about atheists?

- War
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Big Question</th>
<th>Ethan Fiber (*22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>PSH 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker (circle)</td>
<td>Rank Points (1-4) (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>3 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan David Hernandez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Mesquite High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affirmative**

- The winner of this debate was Affirmative
- (Circle Winner) NO

**Negative**

- 1st 2nd Jordan Rosen
- 19 Ironwood High School
- 4.30

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: Neg case + observations are criminally undercovered by the affirmative. This allows the negative to quickly respond and clearly flow through their entire case. Aff has only the bunny argument at the end of the round, and that argument is nullified by the instant response. Because of this I have to vote Neg on framework and contentions from case.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Big Question</th>
<th>Amanda Kalkstein (*12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>PSH 433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(circle)</td>
<td>(1-4) (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Pierce</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayden Puckett</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia M Hall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Mesquite High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Objective Morality w/o Religion w/o Supreme Being
- Objective Morality Changes
- Case: Subjectivity
- Morals from Self
- Universal codes PPL Follow
- Unnecessary Harm
- Crossfire
- Subjective vs Objective Reality
- Hitler/Stalin had Objective or Subjective Morals
- Nervous vs Objective Morals
- Didnt Impermanence changing over time
- Subjctive vs Objective
- Universal vs Subjective
- Attacking Arguments
- All Morality
- Attacks all Arguments
- Cultures are different
- Higher Beings attack
- Suicide 
- Bad/Good 
- Right/Wrong
- Jayden - soft spoken
- Mentally Ill shouldn't be applied
- Quiet
- Supper awkward
- Strong
- We don't share same moral/values
- Strong
- Morality develops over time
- Objective Morality cannot exist
- Hearing voices
- Mental Health
- Subjective Morality
- Didnt
- Impermanence changing over time
- Subjctive
- Universal vs Subjective
- Extend
- Attacking Arguments
- All Morality
- Attacks all Arguments
- Cultures are different
- Higher Beings attack

Q&A
MORAL SUBJECTIVITY ➔ OBJECTIVITY
STARTING W/ ONE PERSON
MULTIPLE PPL EXPAND

(NO QUESTIONS)
ON TWO PPL SIDE

⇒ HARM PPL FOR REASONS
• MOTIVATION BASED ON RELIGION
  • RELIGION

CONTENTION
B/C
morality changing
1ST SPEAKER: stronger
morality based on
Humans

SUBJECTIVE MORALS ➔ UNIVERSAL CODE

need subjective morals
for objective morals

X

DONT NEED A GOD

GOD VS NON BELIEVERS

APPSIDE
OBJECT REALITY EXISTS
B/C SUBJECTIVE REALITY EXISTS?

Gods? REALLY UNDERSTAND
I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT POINT

She is making
ATTALL

RELIGION

IN

SUBPOINT A
SUBJECTIVITY
• CONTRADICTS
• OBJECTIVE
NEG
AFF B2I NEGATE

SP2

just b/c one believes it
doesn't mean it's true?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Speaker (circle)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Isabel Behrendt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Sophia Ortega</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 Perry High School

16 Brophy College Prep

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? _______

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg team didn’t exec Aff contentions.
Unable to present a convincing case.

1. Very pointed rebuttal
2. Good cross-question and pinning on specific points.
3. Good follow-up question.

1. Very good eye contact.
2. Clean in presentation.
3. Need to work on background research & use contention more.
4. Organize time more effectively.
5. Good questioning, but need to do follow-up.
6. Need to have clear thought so sentences are complete.
Objective Morality exists

**Affirmative**
1. Definition → Dictionary
   - Emotion = human desire
   - Physical → Categorical
   - No morality → No Law

**Negative**
1. Definition →
   - Con
   - Moral machine
   - Subjective moral decision

2. Talking future probabilities

Intentional / moral / society build on morality
if not on what?
2:13 Prep time

Very pointed rebuttal
4:4
No clarity on thought
Followup question
Let's prove her counter point
Gave choice
Goes against common morality
Lab's of morality

1:57

Inference of morality
No contention are disapproved

2:05
Didn't use all her time

Prep time

Prep time