


ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
Edina JS		Lakeville AV	
Jake Straub	<u>27</u>	Alexia VonRuden	<u>28</u>

Winner: LAKEVILLE School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I THOUGHT THE NEG. SIDE HAD A BETTER CASE SPECIFICALLY ON ISSUES OF

- 1) GLOBAL WARMING
- 2) ECONOMIC BENEFIT

AFF ARGUMENTS ON WEAPONS PRODUCTION + TERRORISM DID NOT SEEM TO BE WELL SUPPORTED. ALSO AFF USE OF WORD "DUMP" VERY MISLEADING. LIKED NEG. CRITERION OF UTILITARISM BETTER. AFF POINT THAT CRITERION MUST OF THE ROUND THEN CONCLUDED IT 3:1.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
St Thomas Academy/Visitation DO		Lakeville RT	
David O'Neill	<u>28</u>	Ryan Tullis	<u>29</u>

Winner: Lakeville RT debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Rachel White

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- At the values level, the debate became quite circular with debaters arguing ~~that~~ the difference between making up states & states being made of up people & in ~~justice~~ vs. just state action vs. morality
- Aff did not respond to Neg's R2 rebuttal regarding cancer.
- Aff did not provide enough evidence to back up the idea that nuclear takes more time
- Neg's developing country R2 argument left the aff open to bring up wartime capabilities
- Aff's argument that we should assume all studies are funded by nuclear is weak

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Lakeville MH

Morgyn Hibbard

POINTS

(20-30)

28

NEG

Edina NA

Nathan Annareddy

POINTS

(20-30)

27

Winner: Lakeville MH debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1:30

Aff

- The first ~~cards~~ ^{cards} under your standard say basically the same thing
- Your impacts link back to util, nothing special gotten out of environmental protection, even your justifications are just util
- Be sure to extend your extraction impacts
- You're winning a lot of the specifics, get into stuff about mining like you did w/ cooling water

1:20

Neg

- Less contention one, more contention two
- Read that solar bad card on your case if you want to read it
- You are misunderstanding, or at least oversimplifying, pragmatism
- ~~Need to read the cards that make us better than~~
- Do better weighing between Thorium and Coal

RFD - Neg didn't respond to (the under developed) arg that aff doesn't have to defend coal, still causes water contamination.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Edina BK

Biren Kayyal

POINTS
(20-30)

25

NEG

Eagan AS

Aarushi Sen

POINTS
(20-30)

26.5

Winner: Eagan AS School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - I would encourage you to get more familiar with your team's case, as you were reading pretty slow and you ran out of time right as you started contention II. (I can't really give this contention much weight since you only read the first line of the first card before time ran out. (Perhaps timing the speech before the tournament would be a good idea i). Otherwise, keep at it and it'll get smoother.

IAR - You did a good job comparing/contrasting the case arguments, but you also want to get back to the Value/Criteria debate as well. Also, it is always a good idea to reference your authors in this speech too.

ZAR - Be sure to also link to her V/C, since you did drop/concede in the IAR. I think you had the cards in your AC to address this, but you never extend them.

Neg You had a very smooth delivery that was easy to flow. Suggestions: 1st - I would actually say why their © isn't as good as yours, not just "Because Golden Rule." 2nd, If you say you "have a card that..." you need to actually read the card or it doesn't impact the round. (You had 1:20 left in the NC so you could have read those 2 cards, right? :))

INR - You did a good job extending your arguments, but - again - you lean heavily on a piece of evidence that you didn't even read, which makes the Avalera ^(sp?) ev, a non-issue in the debate. (You had 1:50/aff) I would spend time with voting issues too. You also want to impact your arguments through the VC at the end of the debate as well. :)

RFD: Overall, I thought this debate could have been a lot cleaner, and both sides were missing some vital arguments/analysis in the rebuttals. However, the cases seem strong, so there is the material for great debates. I would just encourage both debaters to work on their rebuttals and their V/C compare and contrast.

I do vote negative because her evidence and analysis (combined) show that the world w/o NP would be much worse than a world with NP, which makes the ban violate her criterion.

Good Debate
+
Good Luck! :)

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Eagan PS

Pavan Sakhamuru

POINTS
(20-30)

28

NEG

Rosemount GC

Grant Cridlebaugh

POINTS
(20-30)

27

Winner: Eagan/Pavan Sakhamuru debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

A Make sure you can account for how the reductio ~~carve~~ carbon emissions; it's not req'd that you be a nuclear physicist, but a basic explanation would strengthen your C2 sub C considerably.
Don't let the opponent talk over you no Cx.
You basically won on principle, but you had a good argument w/ the lack of tangible application of SMR's, how they're a future hope, not a present reality. However, don't fall into the trap of saying the Neg can't apply their argument in all situations. No side has to prove absolute universalism.

N Counter-plans have no place in Lincoln-Douglas. If you want to examine the resolutions more analytically, not a kritik. We can't weigh both sides of this debate equally -> your plan isn't weighable philosophically, only via specific, real-world outcomes, which are a secondary concern in L-D.
Face the judge during Cx
Cannot prove they will be used -> read up on BetaMax ~~or~~ HDDVD: superior technology doesn't always prevail
I'm assuming you're a policy Cx debater: if you want to succeed in LD, you'll need to take some different approaches to the resolutions.

RFD As a fairly traditional L-D judge, I do not vote on counter-plans, but even if I did, the Aff was able to clearly demonstrate the invariability of the Neg's plan, as it lacked any clear warrants that could demonstrate it's success.

Room: 217
 Start: 8:45 AM
 Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

1

Pierce-
 Ramsdell,
 Harley

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

Edina

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Eagan KP	(20-30)	St. Croix Prep JN	(20-30)
Kayla Patyk	<u>28</u>	Jake Neau	<u>27</u>

Winner: Eagan Kayla Patyk debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Harley P.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF
 * Work on your time management in IAR *
 (1:45 FW, 1:45 FW, 1:15 contentions, 1:15 contentions)
 yours theirs yours theirs
 Speak more clearly and with more confidence

- You spend way too much time on the value
- The Churchill cards should be under Cr
- I like the idea of the case but you need to be very clear in solicency
- You need more contention level evidence

- CX:**
- Good job in taking up his CX by re-explaining your arguments
 - Decent answers but try and answer in a more consist manner

- CX:**
- Good q's in CX and link between (J) and polit stab
 - Decent job pointing out lack of links in his case
 - Really smart w/ the all countries don't have!

- IAR:**
- Extend! You have to do this to win! Extend your FW too!
 - Signpost so I know where you are
 - Jump around the flow so you have enough time!
 (1:45 your FW 1:45 their FW)
 - Be careful w/ time management, 1:15 your case 1:15 their case

- JAR:**
- A couple of new arguments ... watch it!
 - This speech should be voters → clarification → weigh
 - You should barely refer to the flow. Just tell me how you win

- Neg**
 * Just say "running down prep" ... don't limit yourself to 8:00 min!
 CX:
 - Summarization / Clarification questions are fine but try and have a goal for CX.
 ↳ Flowing more diligently can alleviate some of these questions
 - Look at me and ask q's with confidence!

- NEG:**
- Slow down and be more articulate
 - Obsv ≠ Value Criterion. Just have 1 obsv
 - You need stronger links to Nuke war
 - Argue F.W. and contentions separately
 ↳ tell me why her V/Cr is bad not that she doesn't achieve it
 - Signpost and be clear
 - *** Do not say relocate them ... that's really bad *
 - You need to do more work on direct attacks to her case in general

- CX:**
- Its okay to concede that the values are similar!

- JAR:**
- FW arguments ≠ contention arguments
 - Spend more time explaining your contentions
 - Signpost more clearly
 - Be more clear in what you are arguing
 - Spend 8:00 breaking round down @ end and weigh

RFD: Neither side does enough work on the V/Cr, but the AFF proved that Justice is a prerequisite. Therefore, I will be using the AFF V/Cr of respecting indigenous


land rights. The Contention 1 of the AFF outwights any potential "Nuke War" harm that the Neg provides because he 1) doesn't prove nuke war and 2) emphasizes cold

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
Roseville Area EB	29	St. Croix Prep DG	26
Elizabeth Booms		Drew Grondahl	

Winner: Elizabeth (Roseville Area) debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? N/A

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFFIRMATIVE :

- Very clear, concise & effective utilization of time including a very good argument on rebuttal, citing weaknesses of opponent & where opponent is lacking to not to take full advantage
- Thoroughness in preparation.
- Highlighted flaws very clearly in opponent, in rebuttal (very strong pt.).

NEGATIVE :

- Started good to present the case, but lacking in following areas that could be very well improve in future:
 - 1) Not utilizing time more effectively
 - 2) Need to focus on citing opponent's contentions & why it has flaws with good explanation.

OVERALL: DEBATE TOPIC IS TODAY'S ONGOING ISSUE, AFFIRMATIVE IS HANDS-DOWN WITINER FOR THIS ROUND.

Room: 208
Start: 8:45 AM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

1

Ahsan, Talha

Eagan

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Edina MI

Mythili Iyer

POINTS

(20-30)

27.5

NEG

West Des Moines Valley BK

Braedon Kirkpatrick

POINTS

(20-30)

28

Winner:

West Des Moines Valley

debating on the

Neg

Low point win?

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature:

[Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff framework isn't fully formed, your justification
don't all have impacts

Neg, you should really have your own timer
also clarity could use some improvement, sign post
was okay but could be slightly better

Aff I need explicit extensions

Neg, I don't have the same flow as you for
the purpose of referencing numbered arguments, sign post
in the 2N was a little sloppy, also use all your
time, was that a 3 minute 2N?

Note for both: I really like it when you explicitly say
extend, make flow a lot easier

RFB; HOPPE (sp?) is dropped, go off neg framework,
note of Goldberg.

Room: 206
Start: 8:45 AM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

1

Hibbard, Sandi

Lakeville

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

St. Croix Prep LT

Logan Tan

POINTS

(20-30)

28

NEG

Edina NH

Noel Hayward

POINTS

(20-30)

29

Winner: Edina NH debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team
Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Good answers to CX.
- Road mapped - thank you.
- Covered all contentions,
- Voting

- Good CX questions
- Linked AC case to yours
- Touched on all AC contentions
- Strong case.
- Voting
- Road mapped - thank you.

★ Great first round of the day - good job. ★

RFD: Strong case - linked back to V: & Criterion on both sides.

1:30

2:03

Room: 207
Start: 8:45 AM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

1

Anderson, Sam

Eagan

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

West Des Moines Valley LB

POINTS

(20-30)

29

Lucas Bryant

NEG

Edina AG

POINTS

(20-30)

27.5

Amrutha Garimella

Winner: Valley debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
 School/Team

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- "my fw isn't consequentialist because it looks to squo" - warrant unclear
- There weren't a lot of arguments to answer in the 1AR, with increased efficiency you should have had enough time to answer the NC contention at least to hedge

- ~~When you hit a case with a really long framework, you should focus on getting him to clarify exactly what it means and how you link it because he's probably going to use it to exclude your offense.~~
- Right now your response to his fw and that it aren't specific enough to answer his warrants.
- Learn your case better in 1X. He notes about your criterion and you answer by talking about your contentions.
- You're more responsive in the 2N with your "reformed capitalism" arguments but as was pointed out that was a new argument

RFD: Neg traps that expert predictions fail w/ Tetlock study so we can't trust the NC predictions, neg has no offense under either criterion and aff wins both his contentions + fw

Room: 214
Start: 8:45 AM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

1

Linden, Jack
Eagan

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Roseville Area DU

David Ukatu

POINTS

(20-30)

29.5

NEG

St. Croix Prep AN

Alex Nelson

POINTS

(20-30)

22.5

Winner: St. Croix Prep School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Jack Linden

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff:

- focus on the big impacts of the AC and weigh w/ those (what could happen in an accident)
- Practice linking your offensive args back into the framework
- Take out econ args w/ weighing analysis in the AC
- Be sure to have some framework comparison

Neg:

- ex: solid questions (try to dig more into his studies so that your cards in the 1NR are even more effective @ proving them wrong)
- 3NR: show specifically how you link into both frameworks, & just say it
- lots of evidence (be sure to clarify if it's a turn or what type of arg it is at the beginning)
- make weighing analysis w/ the framework more clear

I vote neg off of the potential benefits to societal welfare and the refutation of the potential harms of nuclear power presented in the AC.