Room: 202-4
Round 8 Flight 1 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Baney, Jon
Kickapoo

Fitzgerald (Aidan Fitzgerald)	Qiu (Tori Qiu)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: FITZGERALD (Entry Name or Code) on the side AFF (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Kevin McDougal, Cindy Mentzer. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.

2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.

3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

VERY CLOSE ROUND; SCIENCE AS A PARADIGM DOES ALLOW FOR CAUSALITY, BUT OBSERVATION IS AN ISSUE

DETERMINISM – EVEN ~~MACRO~~ ~~MACRO~~ QUANTUM PHYSICS CAN HAVE AN EFFECT

HIDDEN VARIABLE, SCIENCE ASSUMES CAUSALITY

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: _____

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 202-4
Round 8 Flight 2 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Baney, Jon
Kickapoo

Sethi (Kavya Sethi)	Newell (Anna Newell)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Newell (Entry Name or Code) on the side NEG (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Kevin McDougal, Cindy Mentzer. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Ø AN UNFAIR BURDEN ON AFF, DON'T HAVE TO TWIST RESOLUTION. NEG WINS W/ INCONSISTENCIES WITHIN SCIENCES / CONFLICTING EVIDENCE LEAVES ROOM

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: _____

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 202-1
Round 8 Flight 1 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Crane, Lasica

Kingston

Dainty (Thomas Dainty)	Lewis (Xavior Lewis)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Xavior Lewis (Entry Name or Code) on the side Neg (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Angie Richard, Will Walker. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism: When responding to questions please do not abuse the time! Try to be concise and not ramble. Don't answer question w/ question! Relax! You seemed to get a bit flustered or agitated and it effected your delivery. I did not accept your argument equating robots to neap soft determinism.

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism: Good questions, I like that you keep them to the point and direct. Good responses to aff arguments. Nice refutation of aff. Excellent job.

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

the affirmative did not effectively support his arguments.
The negative was able to refute and defend his arguments

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: Lasica [redacted]

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 202-1
Round 8 Flight 2 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Crane, Lasica
Kingston

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Schweikert (Evan Schweikert)	Morrison (Adrian Morrison)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Adrian Morrison (Entry Name or Code) on the side Neg (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Angie Richard, Will Walker. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism: Excellent job answering cx. In your ice cream example you would have been better to mention opportunity cost factors that act on our preferences. This is a weak example - needed a little better support. Affirmative always has the burden of proof! Don't get this twisted up and confuse the issues. I don't think you really got the most out of your Mearon research info.

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism: Nicely constructed case. Good explanations of studies. You should not have been using cx to make arguments. Answers should be to the point - be careful not to debate during cx.
Excellent response and crystalization speech in consolidation.
Try not to overuse words like "basically".

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Affirmative did not persuasively support his arguments and did not adequately respond to neg's arguments.
The negative did a better job arguing and defending his position.

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min
(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)	

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: Lasica [redacted]

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 213 AA
Round 8 Flight 1 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Findlay, Mikayla

Millard North

Hervey (Jacob Hervey)	Roy (Rebecca Roy)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Rebecca Roy (Entry Name or Code) on the side Neg (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Angi Burns, Rodney Kornegay. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Strat needs to link back to science, heavy reliance on philosophy

Great Rebuttal, isn't flown through

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

excellent rational

good defense on frame work

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Aff's theoretical args never link back to science, just philoshy

Speech Times and Order:

~~Affirmative Constructive~~	5 min
~~Negative Constructive~~	5 min
~~Question Segment~~	3 min
~~Affirmative Rebuttal~~	4 min
~~Negative Rebuttal~~	4 min
~~Question Segment~~	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: _____

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 213 AA
Round 8 Flight 2 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Findlay, Mikayla

Millard North

Brover (Liza Brover)	Webb (Braden Webb)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Braden Webb (Entry Name or Code) on the side Neg (Side: Aff or Neg)

Other judges on panel: Angi Burns, Rodney Kornegay. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

embraces quantum indeterminacy as a static law

turn his ship example

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Compatiblism

turn 'unfalsifiable'

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Aff doesn't fulfill their own burden of defending determinism per the neg's
- compatibilism
- Correlation DNE causation

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: _____

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 202-3
Round 8 Flight 1 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Flores
~~Parks, Justin~~
Hutchinson

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Bassett-Audain (Beau Bassett-Audain)	Cormier (Colin Cormier)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Cormier (Colin Cormier) on the side Neg (Aff or Neg)
Entry Name or Code

Other judges on panel: Nancy Groves, Tom Mosberger. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Good constructive speech
Great job asking for (cards)evidences
Couldnot show your card

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Good evidences, Great data
You say go down a lot. (toomuch)
Talk really fast
You give us lots of informations
You showed you cards all evidences

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Bette Debater,
Good job refuting opponent points
Great contentions arguement
Awesome Rebuttal
You really support your side

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: Linda Flores

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 202-3
Round 8 Flight 2 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

FLORES
~~Parks, Justin~~
Hutchinson

Hancock (Samuel Hancock)	Calcagno (Fletcher Calcagno)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Hancock, (Samuel Hancock) on the side Aff
Entry Name or Code — Side (Aff or Neg)

Other judges on panel: Nancy Groves, Tom Mosberger. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

~~[illegible]~~
Really like the speed of you speech
Great eye contact
Geat Rebuttal
Awesome explanation of digital
Good evidences

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Fluent, organize constructive speech
Talks little too fast in beginnig then got better
Got a little confuse in questions sections

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Great job refuting Opponent
Explain your case very well, very calm
You really understand the topic
Awesome debater

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: Linda Flores

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 202-5
Round 8 Flight 1 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Gasman, Chad

ILEAD North Hollywood

Russell (Dalton Russell)	Mills (Andrew Mills)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Russell (Entry Name or Code) on the side Aff. (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Cole Mendell, Donald Steiner. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

The framework & knowledge question three was a good strat. Be wary of your question 2, because free will is the capability for choice, not to act on it.

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

your ~~strongest~~ strongest argument was your doubt observation, and I liked your 1st contention - I wish you'd touched on it earlier.

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Voted Aff on knowledge question 3 + framework. More complex verbal RFD.

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: [redacted]

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 202-3
Round 8 Flight 1 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

HANCOCK
~~Groves, Nancy~~
Pueblo West

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Bassett-Audain (Beau Bassett-Audain)	Cormier (Colin Cormier)
27	29
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Cormier on the side Neg
Entry Name or Code — Side (Aff or Neg)

Other judges on panel: Tom Mosberger, Justin Parks. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:
- Succinct and effective refutation on Rebuttal
- good use of time
- adequate organization
- Sign posting could be better

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:
- Simply fantastic speech organization/sign posting
- Quantum Mechanics may not be the most accessible approach to this topic

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):
Although neither side provided sufficient evidence to support their case, Neg more effectively refuted case brought by Aff - therefore took goes to Neg

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: _____

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 202-3
Round 8 Flight 2 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

H Ancock
~~Groves, Nancy~~
Pueblo West

Hancock (Samuel Hancock)	Calcagno (Fletcher Calcagno)
28	27
AFF	NEG

Winner: Hancock (Entry Name or Code) on the side Aff (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Tom Mosberger, Justin Parks. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

- did not see a clear link between digital physics & Evolution contention in rebuttal - introduced as standalone contention??
- nice job in cross ex
- adeq - ate speech organization but definite room for improvement

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

- why run a moral/ethical arg if you are just going to concede due to framework??
  - justify it in your framework
- more caution needed in crossex

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

The round wasn't at all clear, but Aff adequately refuted Neg's arguments too many dropped contentions on both sides

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: _____

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 204 AA
Round 8 Flight 1 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Kinnaman, Laureen

Highland

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Mainzer (Quade Mainzer)	George (Alan George)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Mainzer (Entry Name or Code) on the side AFF (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Tania LoPinto, Jesse Nelson. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

DEFINED TERMS set parameters for debate.
Clearly clashed with NEG.

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Definition of terms
FIAT argument.

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: _____

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 204 AA
Round 8 Flight 2 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Kinnaman, Laureen
Highland

Gibbens (Josh Gibbens)	Schmitz (Caleb Schmitz)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Schmitz (Entry Name or Code) on the side NEG. (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Tania LoPinto, Jesse Nelson. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

You have the burden of proof. All neg had to show is that there was some room in science for the concept of free will -- not 100% consenses.

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

~~I think you may have lots under~~

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

You showed evidence that some scientist do leave room to study the concept of free will further, thus successfully negating.

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: _____

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 213 AA
Round 8 Flight 1 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Kornegay, Rodney

Mountain Brook

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Hervey (Jacob Hervey)	Roy (Rebecca Roy)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Roy (Entry Name or Code) on the side Neg (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Angi Burns, Mikayla Findlay. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Strong arguments. Addressing Det. + indeterminism is a good move, but your opponent made it a weakness. I agree that if ~~and free will is proven~~ that is determinism proven then FW can't exist. The argument that right wrist & primitive is good one.

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

You won the argument by convincing me that the choice not to act is still free will.

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

I choose Neg. b/c at the reason stated above and I feel that the Neg addressed and showed deficiencies in the Aff's scientific proof. Swayed to me that veto power is choice of Free Will.

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round ~~followed~~ the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: [signature]

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 213 AA
Round 8 Flight 2 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Kornegay, Rodney

Mountain Brook

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Brover (Liza Brover)	Webb (Braden Webb)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Webb (Entry Name or Code) on the side neg (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Angi Burns, Mikayla Findlay. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Assuming that Determinism + free will can coexist is a "fatal flaw". Chemical reactions predict action. Science boils everything down to laws.

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

The argument the Det. + Pro can coexist is interesting and you convinced me. We are not necessarily bound by science and free will to act is not limited by science.

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Neg convinced me that free will + choice can overcome any chemical reaction. Science says the reaction happens but the ~~rea~~ action to it can differ according to the ind. agent.

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: [signature]

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 202-4
Round 8 Flight 1 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

McDougal, Kevin

Perry

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Fitzgerald (Aidan Fitzgerald)	Qiu (Tori Qiu)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Qiu (Entry Name or Code) on the side Neg (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Jon Baney, Cindy Mentzer. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

- Contention 2 is your strongest
- good physics knowledge to defend your premises

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

- Good variety in cases
- strong big bang refutation

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Neg wins because she developed a strong set of warrants for determinism's flaws. Throughout Aff seemed to focus on the wrong arguments and thus allowing Neg to outweigh on Contention-level analysis. Balanced round!

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: Kevin McDougal

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 202-4
Round 8 Flight 2 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

McDougal, Kevin

Perry

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Sethi (Kavya Sethi)	Newell (Anna Newell)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Newell (Entry Name or Code) on the side Neg (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Jon Baney, Cindy Mentzer. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

- gun analogy didn't convince me
- Strong delivery
- Your burden for the Neg sticks them in a contradictory spot by demanding empirics or puts you in this spot by allowing FW to be studied in science

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

- Must slow down on tags.
- fair interpretation of the Resolution.
- Strong rebuttal

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Neg wins because she controlled and forwarded the main framework of the round. She then went on to prove it w/ evidence, theory, and topic. Aff had muddled refutations.

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: Kevin McDougal

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 204 AA
Round 8 Flight 1 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

MEARS
~~LoPinto, Tania~~
Regis

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Mainzer (Quade Mainzer)	George (Alan George)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: George (Entry Name or Code) on the side Neg (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Laureen Kinnaman, Jesse Nelson. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Pronouns: Judge Kinnaman pronouns Ms.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

The "how do you Know" questions are getting you in trouble. You have the 100% burden.

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Why are you yelling at us? It's a small room.

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

~~Aff~~ continually telling me "we don't Know" is really problematic, but neg doesn't pick up on this
Neg, however does pick up on a related matter → Science of the picture.
Missed opportunities on both sides that could have made this better.

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: _____

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 204 AA
Round 8 Flight 2 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

MEARS
~~LoPinto, Tania~~
Regis

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Gibbens (Josh Gibbens)	Schmitz (Caleb Schmitz)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Gibbens (Entry Name or Code) on the side Aff (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Laureen Kinnaman, Jesse Nelson. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Pronouns: Judge Kinnaman pronouns Ms.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

I would like to have seen a more varied sourcing. I like the last line of the case.

Don't put away before the round is over.

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

The green light experiment does not help your case as presented.

Avoid telling me derogatory things about Aff. ("he has confirmation bias.")

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Arg... Harris '12 is great, but it can't be the only sourcing that affirms. Even if it don't require a 100% threshold, you've got to give me more than one person. Science is repeatable, after all. Neg, however, increasingly either mis-states or misconstrues arguments in the final speeches and drifts from the key argument of 100%.

It could point to one argument to vote neg, but the round ended up going off on the whole.

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: [signature]

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 202-5
Round 8 Flight 1 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Mendell, Cole

Rocky Mountain

Russell (Dalton Russell)	Mills (Andrew Mills)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Andrew Mills (Entry Name or Code) on the side NEG (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Chad Gasman, Donald Steiner. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Your use of knowledge questions as a basis for your case and framework is inspired, and brought a whole new dimension to this debate. The distinct use of scientific evidence was also well utilized to flesh out these questions.

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

You do a remarkable job of utilizing your evidence to the fullest extent, particularly with the Heisenberg principle. Your speaking style exudes confidence and composure and makes it easy for me to engage with what you're saying.

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Ultimately, NEG won this round for me in large part due to the logically consistent argument that was made and maintained that free will as an idea can exist as a cause within AFF's cause/effect point. AFF did make some truly inspired arguments in relation to proofs and probability, but NEG was able to overcome them with room left in the Heisenberg principle.

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: Cole Mendell

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 202-4
Round 8 Flight 1 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Mentzer, Cindy

North Allegheny Sr

Fitzgerald (Aidan Fitzgerald)	Qiu (Tori Qiu)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Qiu (Entry Name or Code) on the side Neg (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Jon Baney, Kevin McDougal. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

The genetic / twins argument was your strongest.

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

You showed several areas of science where there is room for free will.

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

The analogy of the watch was very helpful. — Thank you,

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: Cindy Mentzer

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

Aff prep
2:27
2:17
4:46
13
4:59

Neg Prep
1:05
1:59
3:04
1:39

JOHN TEMPLETON

Room: 202-4
Round 8 Flight 2 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Mentzer, Cindy

North Allegheny Sr

Sethi (Kavya Sethi)	Newell (Anna Newell)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Newell (Entry Name or Code) on the side Neg (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Jon Baney, Kevin McDougal. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Very interesting about liberals + Conservative — brain scans also during gambling tasks

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Science is Constantly changing body of knowledge

Soccer ball kicked same — but different results

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

showed several fields of science

evidence of free will.

— very consistent

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min
(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)	

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: Cindy Mentzer

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

Aff Prep: 2:40, 1:33, 3:72, 4:13, 0:47

Neg Prep: 1:30, 2:06, 3:36, 1:24, 4:16

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 213 AA
Round 8 Flight 1 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

Mills
Burns, Angi
McKinney North

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Hervey (Jacob Hervey)	Roy (Rebecca Roy)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Hervey (Entry Name or Code) on the side ~~Aff~~ (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Mikayla Findlay, Rodney Kornegay. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Clear concise presentation of your case. Great use of cards - verbalizing & restating when needed to stake your claim.

Thank you for giving your opponent time to finish her statement in question round.

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Well presented arguement

In the question segment, you gave up "time" - keep pressing!

Great questions & process in refuting your opponent's case.

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

~~Aff~~ wins the round. Well present arguement with the ability to refute Neg's case & rebuild his own several times.

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: [signature]

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 213 AA
Round 8 Flight 2 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

MILES
~~Burns, Angi~~
McKinney North

Brover (Liza Brover) — **AFF**

Webb (Braden Webb) — **NEG**

Winner: Webb (Entry Name or Code) on the side Neg (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Mikayla Findlay, Rodney Kornegay. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.

2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.

3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Great questions to opponent to refute his case

I like how your clarified your definitions to strengthen your argument.

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Great rebuttal to opponent questions & use of this time to rebuild your case.

Clear concise argument - laued out well.

Clarifying of argument.

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Neg was able to refute his position to a higher level with use of questions & rebuttal. Solid case.

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: [signature]

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 202-3
Round 8 Flight 1 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Mosberger, Tom

GlenOak

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Bassett-Audain (Beau Bassett-Audain)	Cormier (Colin Cormier)
AFF	NEG

Winner: Cormier (Entry Name or Code) on the side NEG (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Nancy Groves, Justin Parks. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Be a little bit more assertive with delivery

- "making decisions later in life" → isn't that like free will? (Never really attacked by Neg)
- good persuasive analysis of info brought up in rebuttals -
- good last Speech (Attack on microtubular)

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

good control of questioning Period.
- Agree with your side about definition - I don't vote on definition debates anyway.
- very professional Speaker - / Excellent Energy -
- good defense of your case -

Then Neg does good job explaining how it does.

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

* (AFF doesn't need to have well known studies, like master)

*RFD = Good Round -

The microtubular scientific evidence was the key vote for me. AFF did a good job attacking, but not strong enough to outpower NEG.

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: Tom Mosberger [redacted]

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 202-3
Round 8 Flight 2 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Mosberger, Tom
GlenOak

Hancock (Samuel Hancock)	Calcagno (Fletcher Calcagno)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Hancock (Entry Name or Code) on the side AFF (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Nancy Groves, Justin Parks. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Be a little more Assertive with Delivery
– Questioning Period kind of going no where –
– Round a bit murky... Seemed to lack real attacks on the Cases, more of a I Say this & He Says That,

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

You did agree to that in CX that use Current Science, not future Science.

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

AFF Stronger with analysis – his Cont. #2 & Digital evidence.

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: Tom Mosberger [redacted]

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 204 AA
Round 8 Flight 2 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Nelson, Jesse
O'Gorman
[redacted]

Gibbens (Josh Gibbens) — AFF

Schmitz (Caleb Schmitz) — NEG

Winner: [redacted] Gibbens (Entry Name or Code) on the side Aff (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Laureen Kinnaman, Tania LoPinto. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Pronouns: Judge Kinnaman pronouns Ms.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

The Neg position that b/c there is disagreement amongst scientists about FW means that science leaves room for it is unconvincing. Just b/c people disagree does not mean that all opinions are well founded. Further, Neg consistently misinterprets the meaning of determinism. determinism ≠ fatalism. [redacted] Ultimately I am voting on Aff evidence pointing to subconscious operation leading to a predetermined outcome. I affirm.

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: Jesse Nelson

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 204 AA
Round 8 Flight 1 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Nelson, Jesse
O'Gorman

Mainzer (Quade Mainzer) — **AFF**

George (Alan George) — **NEG**

Winner: George (Entry Name or Code) on the side Neg (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Laureen Kinnaman, Tania LoPinto. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Pronouns: Judge Kinnaman pronouns Ms.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

The Aff argument that all future conclusions in science are irrelevant is unconvincing given that Aff case defines science as activity that includes constant self-correction. Aff implicitly concedes that science is thus definitionally skeptical. Further, Aff drops Neg's QM contention that empirically demonstrates inherent uncertainties in cause & effect. This is enough to negate. But Neg also effectively demonstrates that the multiverse implys the necessity of conscious choice to determine outcomes, but also that because conscious choice is unpredictable, there is no ground to Affirm. I negate.

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: Jesse Nelson

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 202-1
Round 8 Flight 1 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Richard, Angie

Klein Oak

Dainty (Thomas Dainty)	Lewis (Xavior Lewis)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Thomas Dainty (Entry Name or Code) on the side AFF (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Lasica Crane, Will Walker. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

- Careful not to let aggressive questioning get "under your skin"
- Watch fluency in rebuttals

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

If you ask a question, let your opponent answer it.

- Articulate - specifically beginning consonants.
- Slow down a bit
- No prep time used - ?

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

*Framework - Both of you take a 1 example ~~to~~ to win stance.
AFF → only 1 part of science. NEG → only 1 instance FW might exist.
- AFF upholds consistently

*Epilepsy - AFF says Brain works same
Neg 1st says "we don't know if BC effects FW or if FW effects BC." Later says - we Do know some. - Contradicts AFF wins

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: Angie Richard

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 202-1
Round 8 Flight 2 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Richard, Angie
Klein Oak

Schweikert (Evan Schweikert)	Morrison (Adrian Morrison)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Adrian Morrison (Entry Name or Code) on the side Negative (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Lasica Crane, Will Walker. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

- Thank you both for being polite!
- Ice Cream Example → weak

until! CX → Be careful!

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

- Nice job explaining studies in CX w/out notes - clearly you actually understand the studies
- Don't make an argument in CX!

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

(1) Burden of Proof → AFF always has burden of proof. AFF must show Science no room for FW. Neg doesn't have to prove FW exists - just that there is some room for FW w/ science. Neg wins this.

(2) Does Choosing your preference, mean No free will? Neg wins → Can still consider other flavors but still choose my preference

(3) Flaws in Experiments - AFF claims & matter b/c no studies in his case - False (1) AFF has twin experiment and (2) Neg shows Science develops/progresses from experiments - testing hypothesis.

(4) Veto - AFF drops Neg's 3rd contention

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: Angie Richard

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 202-5
Round 8 Flight 1 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Steiner, Donald

Woodrow Wilson

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Russell (Dalton Russell)	Mills (Andrew Mills)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: The Mills on the side Neg
Entry Name or Code — Side (Aff or Neg)

Other judges on panel: Chad Gasman, Cole Mendell. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

The structure (knowledge questions) provides a very clear path for analysis and keeps independent points separate well. I'm not sure I buy the "present tense" argument in crossfire when you define science as a process implying movement toward a future. Your win potential rests heavily on how we conceive "free will."

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

Your case is well grounded in logical progression of thought. To win you must maintain our agreement that doubt = room & the "present tense" vs. future argument. Excellent handling of cross-fire. Interestingly, your case rests more on the concept of "no room" than on definitions of "science" or "free will."

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

The debate comes down to a clash of how to evaluate the topic. Aff wants us to see it through the prism of the nature of free will. Neg wants us to view it through the prism of what it means to "leave no room." In the end, the lack of 100% certainty of studies Aff cites, Neg's logical construction, and the overextension of application of knowledge question 2 by Aff give my ballot to the Neg.

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: Donald L Steiner

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 202-1
Round 8 Flight 2 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

WEBB ~~Walker, Will~~
University

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Schweikert (Evan Schweikert)	Morrison (Adrian Morrison)
AFF	**NEG**

Winner: Evan Schweikert (Entry Name or Code) on the side Aff (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Lasica Crane, Angie Richard. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.
2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.
3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

* Neg missed Aff framework setup 1st half.
* Burden debate ✓
* "Science" limitation on this debate ✓
* Determinism not disproved
* Rebut Emergent properties
* where does free will come from? ✓

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

* Burden of concrete Intuitions
* emergent properties
* Veto
* Abolitionist - "against best interest" ✓
* Burden - must exist
* Emergent Properties

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

(1) Framework to Science only agreed in cross x to Aff

(2) Where does free will come from? Cross x to Aff

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: Jenny Wolf

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION

Room: 202-1
Round 8 Flight 1 Start: 1:00 PM
National Speech and Debate Tournament
Jun 19 - 23, 2017

BIG QUESTIONS

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

WEBB
~~Walker, Will~~
University

Dainty (Thomas Dainty) — **AFF**

Lewis (Xavior Lewis) — **NEG**

Winner: Lewis, Xavior (Entry Name or Code) on the side Neg (Side (Aff or Neg))

Other judges on panel: Lasica Crane, Angie Richard. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: Science leaves no room for free will

1. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.

2. Debaters may only make arguments directly related to the topic. When you sign your ballot, you are confirming that the winning debater ran a position about the topic. Debaters that run non-topical positions will be automatically forfeited.

3. Please fill out reasons why both sides may have won the debate in the space below. This technique is designed to force you to make the best possible case for both sides and help to eliminate bias in your decision. Your final decision for the winning debater should be filled in the boxes at the top of the ballot.

Reasons why the Aff may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

* Effort to narrow burden ✓
* Memoscene (circles)
* Soft Determinism - compatibilism ✗
* probabilistic
* only a brain

Reasons why the Neg may have won the round, positive feedback and constructive criticism:

* have no room definition ✓
* Hight Aff's contradictions
* Free will definition ✓
* Epileptic study challenge
* Infinite loop explanation ✓
* No Link highlight ✓

Reasons for decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

* Computational Linguistics Neg ✓
* Social Sciences - Different cultures
* Dropped Limit of free will argument

Speech Times and Order:

Affirmative Constructive	5 min
Negative Constructive	5 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min
Negative Rebuttal	4 min
Question Segment	3 min
Affirmative Consolidation	3 min
Negative Consolidation	3 min
Affirmative Rationale	2 min
Negative Rationale	2 min

(Each debater gets 5 min of prep time to use at their discretion)

I verify that this round followed the event rules and that the winning debater ran a topical position:

Signature: [signature]

NATIONAL SPEECH & DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE

JOHN TEMPLETON FOUNDATION