

Room: 116
Start: 12:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

Shmikler,
Richard

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

St. Louis Park

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Edina AS

Aiden Swan

POINTS

(20-30)

28.5

NEG

West Des Moines Valley CT


Conal Thomas-McGinnis

POINTS

(20-30)

29

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Oral

- questions or help w/ drills/coaching needs

rshmikler@gmail.com

www.flowprep.org

Room: 109
Start: 12:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

Pierce-
Ramsdell, Hay-
ley

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

Edina

AFF

St Thomas Academy/Visitation SK

Sophia Kuriscak

POINTS
(20-30)

29.5

NEG

Lakeville NG

Noah Gallagher

POINTS
(20-30)

30

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

Signature: _____

Hayley PR

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Sophia - The case is awesome... abusive... but awesome. haha

- I appreciate the fact that you knew how they won
- Good flow coverage. I do think you still need to go in-depth on the arguments, though. At the end of the ~~round~~ speech - you have a lot on the flow, but it's still blippy.
- Just because he doesn't run MExclusivity as the comp doesn't mean you automatically perm.
- I needed MORE (well...any) responses to his Net Benefits. This could be pretty bad.
- While he may not say yours is bad... he is the ONLY person comparing the two plans.
- Good job breaking it down at the end - I wish you would've done this sooner...

Noah - The CP is a wee bit permable...

- I actually really like the CP though. I would suggest maybe having more comparative analysis about the cost. You say it costs \$200 million, but what does the average reactor cost?
- When in doubt - start weighing. Always my go-to for when you got nothing else. ☺
- Although the ideas of the plan/counterplan are similar - I would've liked to see some deconstruction of her supposed advantages. - You compete on net-bens so you have to make sure that you can win pretty much all of them - why ~~is~~ not take ~~her~~ her advantages too? ←
- Good ZNR. You did a nice job breaking down theory and explaining it all. Even if you think it isn't ~~well~~ ^{hang in there} well...
- I think the amount of time spent ~~on~~ on the Net Bens could've been even BIGGER. BLOW THIS COMPETITION UP

RFD: I don't like Theory ;).

I end up negating bc the aff never responds to the whole net benefit analysis thing that sort of happened. Honestly every advantage was messy af....

But the only "advantage" that was clear so that's what I vote on.

Room: 001
Start: 12:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

McGinnis, David

West Des Moines Valley

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL
Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Apple Valley TE

Trinity Ek

POINTS
(20-30)

27

NEG

Edina JR

Jonah Rosenthal

POINTS

(20-30)

26

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

How many of you are there?

I love this debate. Both debaters are smart, aggressive, and well-prepared.

I elect not to vote on themes b/c 2NS d/n extend the initial shell, Neg is winning the arguments, but the thesis is initially terrible, so I hold it to a high std of exten.

So I vote neg on case.

Room: 006
Start: 12:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

Smith, Nick
St Thomas Academy/Visitation

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL
Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF
Lakeville AL
Alec Loftus

POINTS
(20-30)
27.5

NEG
Edina PS
Prasoon Sinha

POINTS
(20-30)
20.75

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Aff is pretty dense with sciencey listing...
- More key issue relation during IAR. get bogged down with some less important arguments

Aff	Neg
	- Don't need extinction stuff, AC agrees clim change bo
	- More time on hum vs nature imp
	- Don't read new deal ev, extend IN deal ev;
	- Water imp not same as AC water imp

RFD

Neg Concludes FW

Aff ahead on shift - Neg needed either concrete brick analysis or answer to long term less important. ^{2 renewables}

No uniqueness for renewables bad & reason they are bad they no impact to environment. Only other my offense is deal but A) only impact articulated to humans B) doesn't address ^{as our} factors _{prod} C) not a _{prod}
min local water, so at least a wash and

Room: 204
Start: 12:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

Reikowski,


Megan

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Lakeville

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
Edina AM	28	Apple Valley CR	27
Anand Mittal 1:20		Cori Roberts	

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff
The things you're extending out of the top of the AC have huge impacts to your standard that I don't think you're making clear

Neg
I feel like you really got thrown off by the aff framework + got sloppy because of it.

RFD
Neg drops offense from top of AC; Aff extends and impacts it. 1 affier.

Room: 004
Start: 12:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

McDonald, Ceil

Eagan

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF
Apple Valley SA

POINTS
(20-30)

29

Serena Abraham

NEG

Lakeville KD

POINTS
(20-30)

28

Kelby Drogemuller

Winner:

AV SA

School/Team

debating on the

AFF

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

Signature:

Ceil McDonald

I agree w/ Aff on framework debate

Comments & Reason for Decision:

A critical error made by neg was to say she was supporting the S.O. with that you are saying you are also supporting the continued use of fossil fuels. To think you mean to say change to completely use Nuclear Energy, eliminating the need for fossil fuels. and then argue that Aff can guarantee that. Neg also seemed to misunderstand the Dusselday card that Aff referred to in all 3 speeches that clearly says there is environmental damage in the mining & transportation of uranium that would not occur with renewables.

Aff was wrong to say that renewables being intermittent & undependable was not mentioned until rebuttable. I have it on my flow as her first Aff case argument when she said it would take 25 yrs for renewables to catch up to nuclear energy. An opportunity for clear clash was missed by both sides on that pt. Neg said will take 25 yrs for renewables to catch up. Aff case says advances in storage capacity & fast growth in renewables 5-10 yrs possible. Neg missed that piece of Aff evidence, Aff should have clarified more before last speech. you tried a little in 1AR, but it wasn't clear. Neg did not make clear in CX or in rebuttal that was looking to use NE 100% so Aff arguments about carbon fuels still being used carry the day. Neg did not see that Aff case was saying renewables could not be effective. NR not effective.

Room: 113
Start: 12:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

Higgin-Houser,

Dori

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Apple Valley

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Lakeville GG

Grace Geertsema

POINTS

(20-30)

28

NEG

West Des Moines Valley MS

Manasi Singh

POINTS

(20-30)

27

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

Signature: Dori Higgin-Houser

Comments & Reason for Decision: Best debate so far today - good job!
Manasi

Grace good definitions given
Contextual / Nuclear power
Clear, complete evidence
did not hear you address question - if there is no life, what need for morality? or how to manage waste - took a long time to get to answers, which is not a positive
very confident in your argument, but this seemed to limit your ability to be questioned - you rigidly stuck to your statements instead of answering

good definitions given
rate of speed easy to understand
convincing case
relevant questions on cross
Framework of self-own indep was convincing.
This was a very close debate, with opponent slightly more precise in defense. You need to do a little, not much to win.

good job on final cross
Suggestions
intensity rather high, can get hard to listen to. Intensity + volume do not = convincing debate, necessarily
Suggest decreasing intensity a bit

Suggestions
your last argument was not very substantive, could've been stronger to win debate

Room: 007
Start: 12:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

Hasan, Aleezeh

Rosemount

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Edina SC

Sandra Chen

POINTS

(20-30)

28

NEG

St Thomas Academy/Visitation LW

Lauren Wohlberg

POINTS

(20-30)

29

Winner: Sandra Chen debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? Yes

Signature: Aleezeh

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Aff
- you didn't respond to all of her arguments on time before jumping in to voters
 - try to weigh arguments with FW
 - "5 months" wasn't specified earlier when opponent asked

- Neg
- your jumping around on the flow try to go in order
 - it's difficult to follow where you are
 - some arguments could be placed differently
 - don't get flustered
 - you missed opportunity to make some extensions

- There is a lot of snark coming from both of you, let's keep it professional

RFD: Aff covered more on the flow and weighed better arguments

Room: 111
Start: 12:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

Brundage, Rick
Apple Valley

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL
Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Edina MK

Mark Kivimaki

POINTS

(20-30)
28

NEG


St Thomas Academy/Visitation NW

Nick Weir

POINTS

(20-30)
28

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AC IN MONTGUE = 4; NC, SAME
DIRECTIONALITY OF FILL
IN NEEDED TO BE
BETTER.

NEGS GOT MORE WORK
COMPARING WARRANTS ON FILL-IN
EITHER RENEWABLES ARE INEV.
& MOVE FASTER w/ NUCLEAR OR
COAL WILL COME UP MORE
OFTEN

Room: 005
Start: 12:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

Hoverson, Doug

St Thomas Academy/Visitation

MA

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

West Des Moines Valley AZ

POINTS
(20-30)

28.5

Annie Zhang

NEG

Lakeville EH

POINTS
(20-30)

28.5

Elliot Harvanko

Winner:

Lakeville EH

School/Team

debating on the

Neg

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Do urban residents not "live in the environment"

PERM the C-Plans.

*Native Americans ARE citizens,
since 1924*

*So I was already to affirm, but the late round analysis switches it back.
The first CP is answered by saying it won't reduce oppression, but if that
won't, what will? The Neg points out there is no actual solvency
mech. for nuclear in that that isn't solved by a CP.
The Neg ^(CP) ev. that indigenous persons are hit worse by climate Δ
is not refuted, and adds to Neg.*

Room: 110
Start: 12:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

Gallagher, Don

Lakeville

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
West Des Moines Valley AJ		Apple Valley JB	
Animesh Joshi	<u>27.5</u>	John Boals	<u>28</u>

Winner: Apple Valley JB School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - well prepared. Spoke fast but intelligibly. Seems to know his case well.

Neg - also well prepared. Present arguments that were new to me.

I feel that Aff has a fatal flaw in his def. of country. Neg's tying country to State to I law trumped. So framework to Neg.

Much time spent debating value/role of contracts. Neg conceded on coercion, however Aff failed to prove linkage. i.e. Bad contract → oppression, yes.

oppression → nuclear, yes maybe. Never isolated nuclear. ^{As cause} Burden of proof on Aff.

This Debate was fought mostly on Neg's ground.

Decision Neg

Room: 002
Start: 12:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

Ahlstrom, Mark

St Thomas Academy/Visitation

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Edina RM		(20-30)	West Des Moines Valley WG	(20-30)
Rahil Modi		<u>28</u>	Will Golay	<u>29</u>

Winner: WDM WG School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff of Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~People not getting 30 mi~~
20 mill: seiverts No big deal

- good spread, but I would have saved more time to get to Aff. He has clearly extendable impacts to weigh with

Attack timeframe
ON fusion.

- Not enough offense. Most args are defense or mitigation
- Harris Not seem to take out fusion.

- I dont get how anti Renewable mindset ↓
Nuke Research
- CP outside of neg case
- order could be more efficient to rule more of Neg out

I dont get the Phelps. If any action perpetrates Racism, where is the room to criticize oppression?

Easy ballot comes off the pic. Aff is spread out of the round. Generic turns on the pic miss the actual scope of just fusion.

Room: 003
Start: 12:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

Ahsan, Talha

Eagan

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Apple Valley HD

Henry Dikeman

POINTS

(20 - 30)

30

NEG

West Des Moines Valley AC

Anna Correa

POINTS

(20 - 30)

30

Winner:

WDMoas Valley

School/Team

debating on the

Neg

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? _____

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Oral RFD

Room: 117
Start: 12:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

Davis, Matthew

St. Croix Prep

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Edina OJ	(20-30)	Rosemount JS	(20-30)
Om Jahagirdar	<u>29</u>	Jason Senthil	<u>29.5</u>

Winner: Rosemount JS debating on the Neg Side (Aff/Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff: This is a well-constructed case, but I wonder if your veil of ignorance discussion could be further connected/impacted in your conclusions - I just don't see the connection at face value, but I'm sure this will become more obvious in rebuttals. I do really love the Rawlsian theory here, so I hope you don't just concede framework

AR - Theory - I think that if you cut your theory shell down to a few bit hitters you'd still be able to get more coverage elsewhere, since running a 10pt shell really minimizes the time skew arg, right? Also, I'd have a backup attack (non Ux ev on NP & to exclude fusion, right?) Also, make sure to extend the original standards on theory (educ., fairness/ground, since you just seem to go away from this in the 2AR.

Neg: This is a solid set-up for your strategy, but I'd be careful of your linkages to your own ex/impacts since you still = some level of bias (but I'm sure you know how all this works, right?)

INR - You did a solid job covering all the positions, which helps get out of condo bad stuff, but you probably d/n even have to run the condo position since you've got a link-12 to the other positions, right?

RFD: Ultimately, I don't find the Aff's theory extensions as compelling as the INR's 50/50 ground argument, ~~from~~ which seems to preserve aff ground. Why not perm? This allows me to go to framework, which is being better explained by the extension of the Gooden evidence - policymakers on vs No I. After this, the GW impacts of fusion make the CP preferred, so I, negate. I think ~~if~~ the Aff can blow up their oppression 1st stuff, then I can give some ground, but Neg still proves this is non Ux.

Room: 107
Start: 12:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

Anderson, Sam

Eagan

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

West Des Moines Valley JM

James Meng

POINTS

(20-30)

29

NEG

Apple Valley KA

Kenan Anderson

POINTS

(20-30)

29

0:23

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: Neg does not respond to NIRS turn on DA - there's no implicit interaction with the link evidence and the warrant is conceded. So at least aff has risk of offense on DA which both sides end up agreeing is the biggest impact. I almost regretted on the indigenous paternalism arguments, but the neg does not do enough work to have explain how the turn interact with the aff's framework arguments, the link is never made explicit and the argument isn't developed well in the 2N. From there I affirm off ~~the~~ NIRS or Mandel, to constructing the energy economy, which does seem specific to electricity production.