

Room: 209
Start: 12:45 PM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

Opatz, Zach

Edina

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

St Thomas Academy/Visitation DO

POINTS
(20-30)

27

David O'Neill

NEG

Roseville Area EB

POINTS
(20-30)

27

Elizabeth Booms

Winner: St Thomas debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: Zachary Opatz

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF for they had greater evidence of the need to prohibit Nuclear Energy

AFF	NEG
work on eye contact Good professionalism	don't react back in forth while speaking work on eye contact don't apologize Good professionalism

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Edina NA		Eagan PS	
Nathan Annareddy	<u>27</u>	Pavan Sakhamuru	<u>28</u>

Winner: Ney Eagan PS debating on the Ney Side (Aff for Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team
Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Good C/I answers & answers questions
- Countered all contentions from Neg.
- Road mapped - thank you.
- cards
- linked
- voting

- Good C/I questions & answers
- Covered all contentions (almost forgot "D").
- Cards
- Road mapped - thank you.
- Voting
- make sure you cover all of the AR (Neg. C & D).
- linked

★ Good debate - hard decision. ★

RFD: Strong case - good card selection. Had a better argument for NP.

Room: 207
 Start: 12:45 PM
 Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

Pierce-Ramsdell,
 Hanley

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

Edina

AFF
 St. Croix Prep AN
 Alex Nelson

POINTS
 (20-30)
 28

NEG
 Eagan AS
 Aarushi Sen

POINTS
 (20-30)
 27

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

Signature: Hortly

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- AFF**
- * you need to have a stronger link to extinction
 - * make sure you back the round down!
- IAC:**
- Obsv come before the F.W.
 - Articulate important parts
 - Slow down for tags and names
 - Have some amt of solency to all of the nuclear issues from production
 - Have a link specifically to extinction if you want to claim that impact
- CX:**
- Good, calm answer, but look at the
 - Try not to ramble too much in answering
- CX:**
- Good questions just be careful on the tom that you use
 - I could see your strategy in your CX
 - try not to give away what your looking for
- IAR:**
- Good arg on F.W. and use of Holt
 - Try not to cross apply to much
 - Be more specific in responses to his refutation
 - Decent IAR but you need to extend more and be more direct with args
 - not just say "outweigh"
- 2AR:**
- You need to just go voters, clarifying, weighing, and then world comparison
 - Don't go to the building

- Nes:** * Don't say 2:00, just run prep down! *
- CX:**
- Clarification q's are fine but have some sort of goal to advance your position
- INR:**
- Read your case with more confidence
 - I like your contentions, it has a lot of impacts!
 - Don't say "I think" just say it as so
 - Put more arguments on flow
 - You need to attack his obsv... you have 1:0 left, use it!
 - Attack his arguments more in depth!
- CX:**
- It's okay to say "yes" or "no"!
 - Try and understand your case a little more
- 2NR:**
- You need to respond specifically to his Holt evidence
 - You are right in Gov't legit going w/ Util. but you need to be more clear
 - Respond to his obsv 2 on your evide does not matter
 - Make extensions and link back to V/er
 - Explain the double bind!
 - Spend the last 2:00 of 2NR just explaining voters, weighing, and world comparison.
 - You had 2:00 left... use it!

RFD: I am using the V/er of Morality through gov't legitimacy because of the Holt evidence and the dropped justifications. I vote in affirmation based off the observation 2 on aff and extinction impact that doesn't have the best link but is suff

Room: 205
Start: 12:45 PM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

~~Hintz, Matt~~
Edina

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1-1, 2016

AFF

Eagan KP

Kayla Patyk

POINTS

(20-30)

27

NEG


Lakeville AV

Alexia VonRuden

POINTS

(20-30)

28.5

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- 1.) Work on reading through your AC and understanding its argument.
- 2.) Don't ask so many of questions not necessarily your answers.
- 3.) Use the rhetoric of your opponent? Capitalism can't take care of her Cal responses.
- Your case says so much more than what come extremely
- 4.) Your answers to the standards are substantive, not reasons to reject her standards.
- 5. more in evidence to your team about points.

- 1.) Good CX questions.
- 2.) Doesn't your answer to EcoWatch come before Fukushima?
- 3.) Solid ZNR - Good argument overall.
- 4.) I think the economy evidence needs direct applicability to authority populations.

RFD

I think the Neg does a reasonable job of answering the objections to her standard and outweights the benefits of addressing climate change while extending a take out to the benefits for indigenous populations. The Aff's weighing is non-existent.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Apple Valley NH	<u>26</u>	Edina SO	<u>25</u>
Nicholas Holland		Stella Olken-Hunt	

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff	Neg
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> generally, the rebuttal arguments can be presented in a more methodical manner explaining + developing ideas more precisely wins the card framework level debate with a solid, though a little shakily presented argument about the well-being of society needing to determine both the minimizing of harm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> mention that nuclear power is the solution to globalization in NR 2 is this a mistake or a new point? never addressed the aff's point about nuclear crowding out renewable energy sources being the reason why renewables "are not ready yet" the point about the card about 17% of deaths being attributable to pollution is strong - lean on that more

Reason for Decision:

The aff wins at the framework + because the neg never addressed the aff's argument about nuclear being the reason renewables "are not ready" the aff wins.

Both: Neither argues the point about health (kids getting cancer) particularly strongly + leaned on it too heavily.

Room: 226
Start: 12:45 PM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

Torbert, John

West Des Moines Valley

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
St. Croix Prep LT	28	Rosemount GC	26
Logan Tan		Grant Cridlebaugh	

Winner: St Croix PRBP debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NU
Signature: [Signature]


Comments & Reason for Decision:

The AFF. CASE WAS STRONGER + BETTER PRESENTED.
THE NEG CASE WAS DISORGANIZED AND AT
ONE POINT, THE RESOLUTION WAS FULLY
MISTATED. THE NEG. CASE HUNG ON
THIS ISSUE OF SMR'S WHICH, WHILE
INTERESTING, WAS NOT PROVEN IN THE DEBATE
TO BE A REALISTIC ALTERNATIVE. NEG
WOULD HAVE BEEN BETTER FOR SWIMMING
PRESENTATION DOWN IN NC.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
Edina NH	<u>29</u>	Lakeville MH	<u>28</u>
Noel Hayward		Morgyn Hibbard	

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

A/ ~~the~~ The aquatic life card in the IAR felt like a new argument → you tied it to the criteria, but the connection felt tenuous to me. The CO₂ card on the IAR/ C₂ felt similar → in the future, put these items in your case. You can turn the NC by stating that nuclear can be transitioned to allow for alternatives → that takes out a lot of the Neg's inputs "Minimizing harms" needs some context - do you mean human or environment? I don't really buy it comes 1st w/o this context.

N/ In the INC/AC3, you should phrase the argument that nuclear power harms ~~the~~ natives less than climate change and actually allows them greater pocket b/c it reduces climate change. I don't really buy the extinction argument climate change might be terrible, but in L-D, it's hard to prove extinction itself, and then to prove nuclear as the only solution. However, I do tend to agree w/ your other FW arguments. You need to address the Nuclear CO₂ emissions → Mining, transport, etc. There's no timeframe on the resolution, so the Aff can get your benefits, you need to clearly link that nuclear is the only option for climate change.

RFD

While the Neg ultimately won the Framework debate, she failed to link her own contentious-level arguments into the environmental protection framework, allowing the Aff to demonstrate he fulfilled the Neg's benefits w/o nuclear power.

Room: 213
Start: 12:45 PM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

Geertsema,

Dennis

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Lakeville

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
West Des Moines Valley BK	28	Edina JS	27
Braedon Kirkpatrick		Jake Straub	

Winner: West Des Moines - BK debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Dennis Geertsema

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- * GOOD JOB ON AFF SPEECH, LOTS OF INFORMATION BUT STILL FAR SHORT ON TIME TO WRAP UP AS TIMER GOING OFF - perhaps shorten up definition or omit nuclear power + what it is. To something not needed to strengthen your case, AND MAKE TIME
- * Your presence in the room is strong, you take command of your arguments, just watch so to not cross the line of bullying

NITPICK. Be respectful when not speaking, you click your pen alot and deep breath are loud. FYI

NEG

- NE SPEECH WAS GOOD, GOOD TONE.
- * YOU DID A JOB DURING YOUR NR TO TRY AND WRAP UP THE ROUND.
- * YOU HAD GOOD EVIDENCE ON HOW COAL PLANTS ARE BAD, NEED TO PUSH THAT HARD EVEN THOUGH OPPONENT DENIES IT. YOU HAVE THE EVID AND HOPED TO HEAR MORE ON THAT.
- * GIVE STRONG EMPHASIS ON YOUR IMPACTS.

SUMMARY: ~~THE~~ MY REFS WAS ON STRONG CONVICTION FROM THE AFF. IT CAME TO A BELIEF FROM THE AFF THAT THEIR CASE OVERWHELMED THE NEG.

THANK YOU AND GOOD LUCK!

Room: 215
Start: 12:45 PM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

Bernard,

Debbie
ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Apple Valley

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
Roseville Area DU		Edina BK	
David Ukatu	<u>28</u>	Biren Kayyal	<u>29</u>

Winner: Roseville Area DU debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win?

Signature: D. Bernard

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both sides had some good points, especially in opening arguments, ~~but rebuttal~~. AFF was more convincing in rebuttals, and finished with more clearly argued voting issues.

AFF - you are soft-spoken - nice voice but sometimes hard to hear/understand.
- work on use of time - seemed like you had more to say in your AC but ran out of time. If it was important, are there other points to shorten? If not important - OK.

NEG - clear arguments for your case in the NC. Didn't appear to ~~conv~~ rebut all the AFF points - perhaps better use of time will help?
- your rebuttals were not as strong as your opponents.
- you had more time in your second negative rebuttal - perhaps use it to - make stronger point of ~~re~~ reminding what you feel are the key voting issues.

Room: 217
Start: 12:45 PM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

Schleck, Max


Edina

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
West Des Moines Valley LB	25	Lakeville RT	29
Lucas Bryant		Ryan Tullis	

Winner: West Des Moines Valley LB debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? X

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

@Comments

LB

definitely capital you are
gives respect 2 times at 1:30
I was fine but you were telecasted
with 5m jokes at these local
forums

RT

again you did admit that it was
pre-emptive in instructions you with 2 points
against the opponent, also on this really
never finished case you were 2 points, either
you did full in on practice and do prove it
or you link, doing neither side
the result of this debate.

RFD: I vote AFF on a multitude of merits, the 4/2 as it was 2-~~5~~
you dropped and well extenuated. The opponent was able to state, but the judge
on the NC made it impossible to vote neg.

Reason for speaking ^{AFF} you should not be sneering in debates, although I
am a pro-spike judge I still found it's wrong to do that. I only deduct
a couple of points because it only happened a few times, but overall
it hurts part of your debate style. you may have some speaker points in the future
coming your way.

Room: 214
Start: 12:45 PM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

4

Hagen, Becky

Roseville Area

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
St. Croix Prep JN	28	Edina AG	29
Jake Neau		Amrutha Garimella	

Winner: Jake Neau School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? X
Signature: R Bullis

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Better debating was done by the Aff because the Neg's argument just didn't seem to be on the level. Instead of fully committing to the Neg side, her argument was that nuclear power is a placeholder - technically without information about the end of that placeholder on some sort of timeline, her argument supports the Aff world because it admits it is long-term & isn't a long-term solution.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL
Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
St. Croix Prep DG		Edina MI	
Drew Grondahl	<u>26</u>	Mythili Iyer	<u>27</u>

Winner: St. Croix DG debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? Y

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD
Aff extends case after defeating
Hun 2006, Neg can't outweigh

Aff

- work on spreading
- your alarm sound is deeply unprofessional
- don't bring up topicality in the 2AR

Neg

- good CX
- good cross-application of evidence, but you should ~~do~~ ^{apply} more than one card to his case - as it is, you applied Hun 2006 (?) to just about the entirety