

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Rosemount GC	(20-30)	Edina NA	(20-30)
Grant Cridlebaugh	<u>23</u>	Nathan Annareddy	<u>27</u>

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

Signature: Rachel

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff	Neg
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There There are big variations on pace is when you read. Fast is fine + slow is fine but many stops + starts is jarring.• Some struggles keeping track of time• It would have been stronger if you brought up your idea about banning in the future, if at all<ul style="list-style-type: none">• It is is a weak argument as it does not stand compared to your contentions about harm to future generations• You mischaracterized what the neg said in cross X that Thorium is a type of nuclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• say options are nuclear + Thorium which confuses the point of Thorium being a type of nuclear (you could say "uranium + plutonium power")• There were points that the aff made regarding• Your case would have been stronger if you repeated that Thorium is nuclear by your def.• Did a good job capitalizing on this inconsistency
<p>Reason for decision: The neg provided two very different rebuttals, neither of which were strong and the second completely mischaracterized a statement made in cross X.</p>	

Room: 205
Start: 11:00 AM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

3

Watkins, John

Roseville Area

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Lakeville AV

Alexia VonRuden

POINTS

(20-30)

28

NEG

St. Croix Prep AN


Alex Nelson

POINTS

(20-30)

29

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD

Racism argument does not sufficiently link to Aff's evidence, Aff wins on damage to environment and risk of war.

Aff

very good speaking
clarity

very good +
comprehensive IAR

work on outweighing
more clearly

Neg

- good CX, but don't just talk
over her
- the orientalism arg is good,
but it needs to be more clear re:
why prolifer. won't lead to war.

Alternatively, outweigh on ~~possibility~~ ^{likelihood}
Racist discrimination is certain,
nuclear war is very unlikely.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Eagan AS

Aarushi Sen

POINTS

(20-30)

27

NEG

Edina NH

Noel Hayward

POINTS

(20-30)

28

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

Signature: Joel Hagen

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - setup case well, with value, crit, contention & sub points. On CX had some difficulty answering questions even when not cut off. (examples of infants, yes to fossil fuels in California)

Neg - not giving Aff full answer once she says something that can be viciously tried if not heard fully (like alternatives). Good construction, good use of utilitarian to take on Aff's points.

Aff - left a lot of time on table to question Neg. really needed to tackle the utilitarian issue here since he is saying "needs of the many" and you are basing on needs of disadvantaged groups - you don't fully take on this potential of greatest clash between your frameworks. just saying justice is better isn't full argument - this leads to the odd case where he is saying nuclear plants are in desolate (ie. minority) communities so affect fewer people and you are saying the nuclear plants are in minority (ie. desolate) communities and affecting those people, which makes value debate even more crucial here.

Neg - odd focus on time of card rather than substance of card. absorbing environmental justice into your value works for you in this round.

Aff - still needed a lot of defense here on value level & why the needs of the few should still count against needs of many.

Round to Neg largely on value level

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Edina SO

Stella Olken-Hunt

POINTS

(20-30)

28

NEG

St Thomas Academy/Visitation DO

David O'Neill

POINTS

(20-30)

29

Winner: STA/V David O'Neill debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

A The status quo isn't really an expansion of nuclear power
- make sure to force the judge in CX
- what was the point to your world comparison? (IAR)
- The IAR on the N side of the flow lacked convincing warrants to refute the non-uniqueness arguments against your case. You need some proof of the scale of nuclear harms vs. other pollution, colonialism, and terrorism.

The extinction point was obvious, so you didn't need to let him frame how the round breaks down; you could reform the debate in the IAR

RFD

The Neg. was able to better refute the Aff's arguments from the Value and during the flow.

N Extinction seems like a very policy argument; I don't buy it ~~as~~ with the warrants you have, but you did prove the usefulness/necessity of nuclear power in the INC anyway. Ultimately, you have to prove it's better w/o principle, so don't worry a/b demonstrating the extinction of humanity w/o it - too speculative.

Don't waste so much time on the "Two Worlds" argument - it's unwarranted, so state it and move on

The util calculus argument in the INR is a little late \Rightarrow it felt like a new argument as you didn't have util in the INC

Signposting in the INC/N was a little sloppy
You relied way too much on extinction, but you still ~~very~~ successfully addressed the Aff's points during the flow.

Room: 217
Start: 11:00 AM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

3

Pierce-
Ramsdell,
Harley

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

Edina

AFF

Lakeville RT

Ryan Tullis

POINTS

(20-30)

~~28~~ 27

NEG

West Des Moines Valley BK

Braedon Kirkpatrick

POINTS

(20-30)

29

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

* You need to respond to case Turns *

AFF

IAC:

- Slow down for card names
- You need to be very clear in what your C2 is doing to deaths
- Your C3 is defense not offense and it doesn't link to your V/Cr

CX:

- Good calm composure and solid answers
- It's okay to say "yes" and "No"

CX:

- Good clarifications but you need to have a goal in mind for CX and get certain concessions
- Good job pressing him to concede that your extinction happens first

IAC:

- You need to respond to the 6 case turns he puts
- You need to uncover your extinction impacts
- Why do his happen later?
- You need to signpost better otherwise I have no where to put arguments.

IAC:

- You not using prep time in this case makes you look defeated
- Label your voters and outweigh

NEG

CX:

- Stand up during CX
- You need to have a strategy in CX to get imp concessions.
- Be careful w/ how you ask q's, you can come off a bit rude when asking them.

IAC:

- Be more clear when running speed (articulation)
- Signpost where you want turns
- Make turns specific to his case not just AG in gen
- You need to be explicit w/ how he bites into the Turns.
- You didn't touch his F.W. if you are going to just outweigh then drop your F.W and link in.

CX:

- Good answers and of knowing exactly what your arguments are

IAC:

- You need to extend your arguments
- Have the Turns labeled more clearly so your extensions are easier.
- Break the round down in a more clear way. Label voters with (1, 2, 3...) also use 1:15 left to just say aff world vs. neg world

RFD: This round is messy. I will be voting in negation because of the plausibility arg that is conceded by the AFF. Also, I bypass the 6+ turns that the neg places on the AC even though he doesn't link properly.

Room: 216
Start: 11:00 AM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

3

Schleck, Max

Edina

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Lakeville MH

Morgyn Hibbard

POINTS

(20-30)

28

NEG

Eagan KP

Kayla Patyk

POINTS

(20-30)

28.5

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFP: I vote neg, basically for my reason was not suffering
 against KESPR, something wrong was as to be seen with just in mind we
 now have to know into what impression we create the people we are trying show him
 all the other part may not be perfect as long as it is what means one can be less
 for deal we should use it. This is why since he was supposed to look expectu
 on Rosemount NY resources

Room: 208
Start: 11:00 AM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

3

Hagen, Becky

Roseville Area

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Edina MI

Mythili Iyer

POINTS

(20-30)

29

NEG

St. Croix Prep LT

Logan Tan

POINTS

(20-30)

28

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

Signature: R Billyj

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Better debating was done by the Aff. While the Neg did present a good case, the Aff addressed state actors, terrorism, colonialism & future safety for generations ahead - All valid arguments which the Neg left on the table by saying that yes these exist & can be stopped instead of providing solid arguments against them. For example, he could have used his argument about fission fatalities than any other energy source - But he dumped that too soon. Very close Debate, however. Well Done!

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Eagan PS

Pavan Sakhamuru

POINTS

(20-30)

30

NEG

West Des Moines Valley LB


Lucas Bryant

POINTS

(20-30)

29

Winner: LUCAS (WEST DES MOINES VALLEY LB) debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win?

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

BOTH DEBATERS ARE VERY STRONG IN FOLLOWING AREAS:

1. CLEARLY ARTICULATING THEIR CASES
2. VERY THOROUGH & CONCISE
3. CITATIONS, CARDS & STATISTICAL ARGUMENT ARE VERY WELL UNDERSTOOD.
4. REBUTTALS BY BOTH ARE VERY GOOD, INCLUDING X.C.'S.

AREA THAT IS VERY STRONG THAT I THINK CLEARLY IDENTIFY WINNER ALBERT SPEAKER POINT IS LOW BY ONLY 1-POINT IS THE CLOSING ARGUMENTS BY CLEARLY STATING THE STANDARD, HOWEVER OF NEG IS STANDS OUT BETTER

JUST A NOTE BETTER NEG WON THIS ROUND

IT WAS A FASCINATING DEBATE

BOTH ARE GOOD DEBATERS

WISHING THEM BEST OF LUCK FOR NEXT REMAINING ROUND.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
Edina JS	29	Roseville Area DU	27.5
Jake Straub		David Ukatu	

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

Signature: Matthew Davis

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff: You've obviously spent some time with this case - the AC was very smooth - good delivery!
CX - If you say your burden is only to prove that NP is bad, does that completely fulfill risk assessment in a ban-type policy? I'd be careful with that ;)

IAR - I like how you explain your linkages to his ©, but I'd also encourage you to see if any of your scientific evidence could be expanded for future use. Solid IAR! Also, be careful about undercounting his contentions if there comes to it.

Neg: I like the layout of your case, but I wonder if you want to have a little more time to read evidence vs. the AC. I like the approach of the SMRS as another way to approach the neg, but does this risk an aff permutation that goes my plan then your plan?

IAR - I think you did a solid job extending and responding, but I'd like a little more impact comparison. What is the impact on future generations of a ban? Extinction? I think I need to hear this more.

RFD: I have to say that I'm not a huge fan of the immediate framework concession, but I do think that you both did a solid job of linking into the Precautionary Principle throughout the Rebuttals. I do vote Aff in this round based on the Impact Calculus, so I think that the Neg just needs to spend a little more time explaining what the actual impacts of a ban would be, since the aff is spending a lot of time talking about why their impacts outweigh through the ©.

Great debate!

Room: 214
Start: 11:00 AM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

3

Linden, Jack

Eagan

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Edina AG	(20-30)	St. Croix Prep DG	(20-30)
Amrutha Garimella	<u>28</u>	Drew Grondahl	<u>27</u>

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~AFF~~ Neg:

- good ~~ask~~ question
- try to ~~use~~ use CX question for
- focus on the ~~big~~ big impacts of the AC because the solvency was really what hit home the aff's arguments
- Your explanation of your framework could have been a bit better (hard to tell the difference at times)
- Be sure to respond to ~~alleged~~ evidence read against NC

~~NEG~~ AFF:

- Utilize the first subpoint of the first contention more (suc. proli.) is really a good impact
- practice extensions w/ the links to the framework (framework debate was a bit sloppy)

I vote AFF off of the cont 3 which shows the impact on future generations. The neg unfortunately had no solvency for the high amounts of n.w. waste w/ or w/o tten y.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Edina BK

Biren Kayyal

POINTS

(20-30)

26

NEG

St. Croix Prep JN

Jake Neau

POINTS

(20-30)

27.5

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Know your case better. You stumble a lot when reading it and barely get to the 5 second contention. The framework structure isn't clear, you read several arguments in succession without distinguishing them. And in CX you claimed you didn't read a Medina card but you did in your framework.
- Focus more on the offense in your AC. You don't even mention indigenous people in your rebuttals. You have no warrant for your terrorism arguments and the Chernobyl argument in the 2AR is weak.

- When you respond to his V/Criticism, respond without referencing the contentions. You should be arguing about whether we care about political stability more than morality before you address the question of whether he needs his own culture.
- If you run out of arguments in the 1N, you can sit down earlier. It's a good idea to prepare broad turns that apply to most ACs so that this doesn't happen and you can always fill 7 minutes of speech time in the 1N.
- You defend and extend your NC very well. You have good answers to his responses but I wonder if you should have evidence to back up your arguments, and if that evidence should be in the NC.

RFD: NEG wins that nuclear power is uniquely advantageous for the home (lower storage requirements, aff had no evidence for his ambitiously recharging battery argument), and that loss of naval power leads to fear, tension, and war which outweigh the AC. NEG also wins that there are alternatives to storage problems (stick it in the desert where it won't affect anyone).