

Room: 209
Start: 2:00 PM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Geertsema,

Dennis

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Lakeville

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
St Thomas Academy/Visitation DO	(20-30)	Eagan AS	(20-30)
David O'Neill	<u>29</u>	Aarushi Sen	<u>28</u>

Winner: St. Thomas Academy - DO debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Dennis Geertsema

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- * Good Job on AFF Speech, tone & Clarity were excellent
- * You brought good evidence that took this round for you. Also tying it well to the flow of the round.
- * Not pick * Wasted your time in the AR, allow yourself to close with conviction instead of rambling on well after time was up. Probably would have scored a 30 on speaker pts if not for this.
- * In addition to your evidence, you pointed out the same from what I didn't hear ~~from the~~ from the NEG.

NEG

- * Great Job as well on your NR. - The rebuttals however seemed weak as I wanted to hear you tie your arguments to a card or other evidence vs just saying they are bad.
- * Bring out some emphasis to your case. Was waiting for excitement. Not to bash, but could use some action in your words. Avoid over-use of words like 'like'
- * Again in your NR, just did proof of this is BAD and dropped the evidence conversation. You have it BUT needed to tie it together.

Summary - my RFD weighed heavily on this round on the facts and whom brought evidence to their case and your opponents

Thank you + Good Luck!!

Room: 217
Start: 2:00 PM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

White, Rachel

St. Croix Prep

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

West Des Moines Valley LB

Lucas Bryant

POINTS

(20-30)

28

NEG

Lakeville AV

Alexia VonRuden

POINTS

(20-30)

26

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff	Neg
<p>in the context of these types of debates, it does not seem that you would need the practical knowledge of information. However, if someone were to run a deeper critique of that alienation, I could see how it would be helpful</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • excellent set up in cross-x • could have leaned more heavily on the problem of work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strongest argument about if everyone ^{everyone} is dead is these things do not matter because that could have helped you out here • you accept alienation, as defined, as a true concept. Your best bet here would have been to critique the idea itself as opposed to accepting or even arguing a framework that you did not understand

RFD: The aff wins for presenting an argument that was closely entwined to framework which went relatively untouched by Neg.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Edina BK

Biren Kayyal

POINTS

(20-30)

27

NEG

St. Croix Prep DG

Drew Grondahl

POINTS

(20-30)

29

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - good construction. Run out of time before could finish 2nd contention. need to know your value and criterion better to answer CX questions in a non circular way.

Neg - Definitions moved to value + criterion so smoothly I missed that part of Framework at first. good contentions. Sort of included argument against Aff in speech off the cuff - on the Framework level, which can muddy the construction of your own case - recommend keeping more separated. good First rebuttal.

Aff - CX questions - left 1:43 available for questions. could use time better. Good opening with disasters. followed by arguing death rate is lower due to less nuclear power - however that's not how ratios work. 0.2 deaths vs 10 deaths per 100 kilowatt hours is comparable. Good on indigenous people - needed to double down on this and your value. also needed some info on how much CO₂ is generated with nuclear and how it compares to coal.

Neg - questioned quantity of disaster evidence - effective. Nice to ensure debate on 4th Generation reactors. Didn't do enough to negate indigenous people + relation to topic vs. Aff's many points and evidence on this

Aff - needed to address the 4th Gen issue and how it affects your case. other things - the disasters, the terrorism - and saying, it could happen isn't enough. anything could happen - why should these be more weighted in this round?

Round ~~to~~ Negative - did better on value + criterion level and arguments against Aff contentions not addressed enough.

Room: 210
Start: 2:00 PM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Anderson, Sam

Eagan

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

West Des Moines Valley BK

Braedon Kirkpatrick

POINTS

(20-30)

28.5

NEG

Edina NA

Nathan Annareddy

POINTS

(20-30)

27.5

1/20

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- In the IAF I kept waiting for you to extend the spike that detonating nuclear weapons counts as producing nuclear power but you never extended it, your offense didn't make much sense without it.
- Okay, you went for it in the 2AR, probably okay since it's just a definition that wasn't contested.

- I'm glad Sanson's finally running Thomson on the neg but you seem a little confused. Thomson (or rather U233) can be used to build a nuke @ it's just more difficult. Also I'm not sure in the NC what's conceded and what's your own analysis, it seems like you're making a lot of unsupported empirical claims.
- Diversify your impacts, you could be more explicit in showing why burning coal and energy ~~impacts~~ shortages are bad impacts, both could ~~be~~ like into a Hobbes/stake sovereignty framework.

RFD: Aff wins that ~~ban on nuclear~~ banning the detonation of nuclear is topical, a nuclear exchange would cause extinction, and existential impacts come first, both from the NC standards

Room: 215
Start: 2:00 PM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Pierce-Ramsdell, Hartley

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

Edina

AFF

Roseville Area DU

David Ukatu

POINTS

(20-30)

26.5

NEG

Rosemount GC

Grant Criddlebaugh

POINTS

(20-30)

27

Winner: Roseville Area David Ukatu debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? Yes!

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF you have a soft voice so speak up a bit

- AC - Have justifications under your C.
- You need to label the cards under C more clearly
- Your C1 is confusing w/ the cards bc there are no sub-points
- Speak with more confidence and articulate more.

- CX - Look at me the whole time
- Know your case a bit better

- CX - Look at me while asking q's
- You are asking about a permutation which is good

- VAR - Signpost more
- You need to attack his competitiveness more
- Use all of your time
- F.W ≠ win. It is how you weigh

- VAR - You should spend this whole speech clarifying this round. First, F.W break down. Second, voters. Third, clarification. Fourth, weighing. Finally, world comparison.

NEG take running pps don't limit to 2:00

- CX - Look at me the whole time
- Ask more questions don't just let them be silence

INRI - If you are going to run a C.P. run a C.P. don't disguise it.

- Work on competitiveness
- Util requires consequences not data. Your argument needs to be more at Contentron 1.
- Don't say that it is irrelevant because it isn't
- Look at me when speaking
- You need to spend more time on his case
- Restructure your case b/c it is confusing and poorly constructed
- Use all of your time

- CX - Good arguments
- Look at me during CX

INRI - You don't need data to back up your arguments. You need warrants and logical arguments

- You need to clarify what your C.P. is. You never clarify it at all

You need to break this round down. 2:00 for clarifications/voters/weighing

RFO

This round was not clean. I am voting on the standard of Utilitarianism. The AFF's case does a sufficient job at undermining the C.P. that the Neg presents. This round was messy and I am

on the Standard of Page 9 of 12

Room: 213
Start: 2:00 PM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Davis, Danial

St. Croix Prep

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Edina MI

Mythili Iyer

POINTS

(20-30)

29

NEG

Eagan KP


Kayla Patyk

POINTS

(20-30)

28

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

A Your standard should achieve a particular value, otherwise, why should we bother to minimize harms if its not just or moral? Also, what constitutes a "harm"? Is this a deontological, virtue, or consequentialist calculus?

- Face the judge in CX

Make sure your questions are questions and not statements → also, make sure to differentiate b/t nuclear power & nuclear weapon testing

N The resolution doesn't necessarily specify the expansion # of nuclear what about nuclear disasters & the environmental impacts?
I don't really buy the radiation number / amount argument in the INC / AC3 → the fact that radiation has harms doesn't necessitate that the Aff give an exact amt. of ~~radiation~~ radiation
Since your argument hinges heavily on the next gen reactors, make sure you can give some specifics into their operation.

RFD:

The debate was framed in such a way that minimizing harms became the key voting issue. However, neither debater appropriately weighed the balance of harms vs benefits. A more clear criterion / value was needed in the round to establish whether nuclear waste or pollution or autonomy was most important. In the end, the Aff's arguments held clearer warrants.

Room: 214
Start: 2:00 PM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Hibbard, Sandi

Lakeville

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL
Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF

Edina SO

Stella Olken-Hunt

POINTS
(20-30)

29

NEG

St. Croix Prep JN

Jake Neau

POINTS
(20-30)

28

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

Signature: Sandi Hibbard

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Good ~~CX~~ answers & questions
- Assertive
- Cards
- Road map * thank you.
- Covered all contentions & rebuttals

- Good w/ questions
- touched on all contentions.
- Road map * thank you.

- Great debate -

RFD: Strong case. - ~~cards~~ Cards supported case well & Neg
couldn't dispute.

Room: 226
Start: 2:00 PM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Schleck, Max

Edina

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
St. Croix Prep LT		Roseville Area EB	
Logan Tan	<u>28.5</u>	Elizabeth Booms	<u>27.5</u>

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

Signature: _____


Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: I vote Aff because the Neg was extremely weak. Long term impacts. And also the Cyberterrorism was weaker because the Aff had clear evidence. The Neg's evidence was not clear. The Neg's evidence was not clear.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL
Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Edina AG	(20-30)	Lakeville MH	(20-30)
Amrutha Garimella	<u>28</u>	Morgyn Hibbard	<u>27</u>

Winner: Edina AG debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD

Neg wins framework but neither side was under such framework. As such, I default to Aff framework, where Aff wins on a completely conceded contention 3.

Aff

- work on speed
- good, clean ~~extensions~~ extensions
- good concession, but be careful with doing ^{this}
- you should have done a better job of clarifying "nuclear colonialism"

Neg

- Work on time management. You can't afford to give her entire contentions for free.
- good argumentation on the value/criterion debate
- you unfortunately misunderstood two or three critical arguments work on comprehension

Room: 207
Start: 2:00 PM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Doneen, Dean

Roseville Area

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Edina JS	(20-30)	St. Croix Prep AN	(20-30)
Jake Straub	<u>29</u>	Alex Nelson	<u>29</u>

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1:50 Aff
- Good coverage of the NC in the IAR
• not so great coverage of the AC
- Start your rebuttles on your side of the plan

Neg
- You did not explain that well how you met both frameworks in the NC
- ^{Risher(?)} ~~Bruster~~ or whatever (the card about not talking about extraction) didn't make any sense to me
- Thank you for weighing on your Sub B
- Stockton is defense, not a voting issue

RFD - Neg has good defense, but Aff gains offense from GIR and MRS.

Room: 206
Start: 2:00 PM
Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Appelbaum, Dotan
SLP
~~Modi, Jigar~~
Edina

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1 - 1, 2016

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Apple Valley NH		(20-30)	Lakeville RT	(20-30)
Nicholas Holland		<u>27.5</u>	Ryan Tullis	<u>28</u>

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff
 • signpost better
 - couldn't follow

both
 • Please don't get into a value debate, morality vs. justice: doesn't matter.

Neg
 • good line of ~~flow~~ questioning in CX
 • very interesting FW
 • should read FW as framing for weighing
 • Don't make new args in the ~~NR~~ NR
 • ~~use all of your time~~

RFD

FW debate = ??? . I guess util with emphasis on environment.
 Neg wins contention on NC. Aff not responding to fossil fuel tradeoffs, and new tech solves.

ROSEMOUNT IRISH INVITATIONAL

Oct 1-1, 2016

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Eagan PS	(20-30)	Edina NH	(20-30)
Pavan Sakhamuru	<u>28</u>	Noel Hayward	<u>29</u>

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

Signature: Matthew Davis

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff. Wow! You are ~~really~~ really familiar with your case and your delivery is very smooth. You seem to have a solid grasp of most of your evidence, but there were a few moments in CX when you got a bit shaky (but not much!)

AR You did a great job explaining the holes in the neg's story about the Gen 4 reactors, but I think you also want to go deeper into how his other responses that say even current programs are needed as a bridge. Overall, I think your responses to his case need to have a more consistent explanation/story and take into account all of his analysis/story as well.

Neg.
CX - Solid questions - I can tell you know what you are trying to get out of your opponent in CX. Good work.
NR - very solid story between your case and your AC attacks. Could you also link-in to Env. J through climate change impacts? Solid speech! I love how your whole strategy fits a consistent story.
NR - I love how your story stays consistent throughout the debate. I do feel that you glossed over some arguments that really needed EV to support them (Minerals d/a ^{here} H), Gen 4. Be careful, since getting called on this matter could be bad.

RFD: This was an awesome debate and both sides performed admirably!
FmWK - I think the neg's response that most govern. Govt actions shows that even when it comes to Env. J, countries must act through Util first. This was really close, as I think the Neg lets the Aff get too close on the "no sacrifices" idea (Neg's NR has no warrant), but the Aff's clearest argument/story on this area doesn't come until the 2AR - a bit too late to delimit from Util.
NC - Neg gets that reactors are in place with INR analysis off the Moore ev, which is all I need to get that NP is needed as a bridge. (I wish the aff would have engaged more with the NC's renewables stuff, since this was quite damaging.)
AC - I do give Aff some mining impacts, but Neg is giving me that the need for the bridge is more important, since we still need to prevent global ^{here} warming from GHGs.

A very close debate, but I give the Neg the "W" with a more consistent and supported story. Good job + Good luck this season!