Room: 206
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Ahlstrom, Mark

STA/Vis

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Eastview AO		Edina AM	
Ayman Omar	28.5	Anand Mittal	28

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

Signature: [signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Dont Need full source cites in LD until state.
- Good job defending not mil service
- Dont explain/argue in cx. Do that in rebuttal. just ask what his arg is
- Need to be more efficient. Dropped your 3rd contention, which in some ways is your strongest in this round.
- ~~he did make responses on your standards, just Not tagged that way~~
- his key arg on rspct is that cant eval
- its Not hard to say that ~~Ahlstrom~~ Voulenteerism is bad. Thats the thesis of his case
- Shouldnt go drop debater w my Paradigm
- your Attack on Voulenteer feeds his case
- way too much dropped from Ac. R really only touching on the 1st contention
- he did rspnd to your standards, Just not done w signposting, which when he has no training on structure of theory
- you have to be clear that

RFD: Kinda a mess. Neg misunderstands aff, so the turns dont actually apply. Plus, I think the Aff wins the theory (topicality) shell. So, with that, the Neg case is de-linked. Std is still Possible, but I have No clue what left can link to that, so I have to use Aff standard. here, Im left with turns that dont actually link, but Not called out, or the little gap year thing dropped. The gap year is cleanest, so I vote there

Room: 219
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Frank-Siegel, Dan-

Edina

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

AFF		NEG	
Minnetonka EM	POINTS (20 - 30)	**Apple Valley CR**	POINTS (20 - 30)
Ethan Mirman	28	Cori Roberts	~~DAM~~ 225

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

Signature:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- This smoking argument is sketchy at best...
- Deontology doesn't evaluate consequences...

Neg 1:26

- Case is good, but please don't fluctuate speeds as much, it is hard to follow.
- The underview in the NC could have been used much better, You wasted a lot of time, and should have stopped if You had nothing to say. It gave him more prep and when we only have 10 seconds that matters

Both

If you want to tell me to read evidence, give a metric for evaluation! no one weighs!

RFD

This round comes down to what card is right on the conscription cards and the turn. Both debaters just say I should read the evidence after. There is little comparison between what I'm looking for. So I just read the evidence. The neg was right because the aff study concluded economic reasons deter interests.

Room: 010
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Hoverson, Doug

STA/Vis

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
East Ridge BO	26.5	Apple Valley BS	27.5
Ben Olson		Brandon Schellhaass	

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

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

You both sometimes get lost in the weeds when explaining your examples. The Aff basically dropped the Neg econ DA, which linked in to the util framework and resulted in ~~an Aff~~ a Neg win.

Room: N23
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Soczynski, Aman-
Edina

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
Eastview MS		**Chanhassen NW**	
Maxwell Schaefer	29.5	Natalie Williamson	29.0

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

Signature: [signature]

1.25

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1.20 Maxwell: great answers I thought the first one on Equal respect was a bit confusing but the rest was great.
- good talking about equal rights
- I thought your 2AC/AR was well done I thought you navigated Kant's theory well as making sure you responded to all of
- good job bringing up individual - she didn't talk about this
- I thought that tiling into Kant's theory was really well done & also great job w/ voters.

Natalie:
- great questions, I thought the Q's about colonality is a great one
- I thought your answer to the equal respect Q. was really good.
- I thought you did good job extending cards & overview - one thing you didn't touch on was the evidence showing benefit for individual
- I thought your voters were fantastic. well organized & well thought out

WOW! You both are really talented debators, this was a fun round to judge. Excellent job both of you - I ended up voting because I thought that it did a better job navigating Kant & pushing home those individual benefits to inv. people in conscript

Room: 202
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Van Dyke, Nathan

Minnetonka

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
Edina SO		Eastview SM	
Stella Olken-Hunt	29	Sanjana Molleti	29

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

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

1AR: Framework NC, AC
You compare national service to paying taxes. "We are not losing our freedom, we are fulfilling our responsibilities." Hmm. You place Neg arguments under the framework of utilitarianism. You perhaps reached a draw on contentions 1 and 2. C3 is most impactful, assuming national service would solve for militarism, and it doing so has not been challenged yet.

2AR: Israel is a good counterexample to Aff's claim of totalitarianism and indoctrination.

Neg

Utilitarianism problems: majority/minority, measurement, rights.
You suggested alternative ways to achieving economic benefits. You also showed that personal and cultural enrichment are non-unique benefits and could be achieved through volunteering. Your comments on Congress being less likely to go to war with compulsory service were brief (due to time).

2NR: Framework → N → A
You reiterated some negatives of national service, namely indoctrination, stifling dissent, dangerous precedent. You again make the case for non-unique benefits in Aff's C1 and C2. In response to C3, you did not argue against a reduction in militarism, but instead stated that Congress has no moral reason for national service.

RFD: Close round. If Neg spent more time returning to the standard of respecting personal sovereignty, I would vote Neg. Aff did a better job of weighing impacts and wins on militarism reduction.

Room: 217
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Stewart, Diane

Maple Grove

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
Edina AG		Minnetonka CH	
Amrutha Garimella	26	Christian Hilgemann	26.5

Winner: Minnetonka CH (School/Team) debating on the Neg (Side (Aff or Neg)) Low point win? —

Signature: [signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- You sound very uncertain of your CX answers. You can be more firm.
- Be pushier during your CX also
- I don't think you completely understand Solvency - you say "I don't need solvency but I fix problems better"
- You said "prefer my authors credentials vs. his definition" but don't state the credentials at all or address the magnitude of like 5-6 dictionaries
- You can't bring back the AC that you completely ignored in the 1AR
- Stop fidgeting w/ ~~the~~ your flow
- You shift around a lot
- Would like to see more warrent on a lot of things. Your C1 as well as all responses to the AC were just floating claims
- What is inherent about the bill of rights or decl. of independance
- Good v/c debate, but since she said literally nothing about minimizing harms you could probably just point that out and extend and briefly clarify your standards
- You have basically no offense, which ended up being okay, but I would say is probably not good overall strategy

Definitions preclude the aff case almost entirely, plus aff drops standards & can't link at all to autonomy. Eventhough aff attacks autonomy there is no reason ever given to prefer minimizing harms. The only aff impact are from Jamal, which neg says you are just shifting who is jobless which aff never addresses

Room: 204
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Henry, Ryan

Eastview

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Edina JR		Chaska AW	
Jonah Rosenthal	27	Austin Wu	29

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

Signature: [illegible]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Honestly I think the link to nuclear war is really tenuous and you really have to eliminate AFF offense for ~~by~~ me to vote on it just because of probability, Neg actually comes close to doing this, but by not addressing AFF ~~CIT~~ in the first speech it allows AFF to address the culture attacks by saying Horowitz solves for militarism (even though I don't think it actually does). I would be willing to vote for nuclear war over the just the 3 ppl dying per day, but I can't overlook the cultural impacts that AFF is able to salvage by CIT being dropped.

Room: 216
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5 Stiras, Liz

Edina

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Eagan KP		Apple Valley SA	
Kayla Patyk	26	Serena Abraham	27.51

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

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AC - Case is written to support voluntary service and tells me many people do it. I'm not seeing how it's relevant. Very loose definition of 'compulsory'.

Framework I'm losing sight of what aff's framework actually is. Rights are only meaningful in a community. Okay. It doesn't leave me with much of an impact. This happens on the neg but the Clifford evidence is pretty clear to me. The phrase "too broad" isn't neg's argument and they say as much in rebuttals. This is a murky area to vote. I end up preferring the DA/CP debate anyway. Impact scenario is largely unmitigated and link is mishandled. UE is currently low. Going much lower will trigger inflation. While it's possible CP links (neg says they fund + give "space", but it could easily be argued more people would serve), aff links more. ~~Etc~~ The increase in funding is never shown to trigger any sort of economic decline; this analytical is unpersuasive.

Room: 213
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Boals, John

Apple Valley

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Lakeville MH		**Edina PS**	
Morgyn Hibbard	28	Prasoon Sinha	27.5

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

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

verbal

Room: N31
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Rossini, Sophia

Roseville Area

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
Edina OJ		Lakeville AM	
Om Jahagirdar	29	Andrew Mills	30

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

Signature: [signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff – The extinction impacts were excellent in the final speech but I wish that it had also been said earlier

Neg – good framework w/ value of autonomy
A I do think the aff dropped the argument that any reduction of biopower is a value

Overall, very close round

Room: 214
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5 You, Josh

Apple Valley

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
Rosemount MQ		Minnetonka JM	
Michelle Quan	28	Joseph Melander	28

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

Signature: [signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The thing about labeling framework arguments was weird...

Framework goes aff - tacit consent isn't real consent and origin of social contract may be flawed. That leaves competing prereq. claims. I think life is more fundamental than existence of US gov't and more plausibly intrisically important. Ros value to life turn is a terminal impact with no link analysis, and neg does little work on AC contentions, so aff wins under aff f/w.

As for T/definitions. aff is only definition of "in" so I say that the plan is sufficient to affirm. Military vs. civilian definition feels like a wash, also it doesn't matter which def I use,

Room: 212
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5 Ahsan, Talha

Eagan

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

1:37

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
Edina SC		Lakeville AV	
Sandra Chen	29	Alexia VonRuden	27.5

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

Signature: [signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff okay, Neg you can't concede framework and then complain that it's abusive. Also you can't just argue a position is abusive without fully explaining why. You should also respond to definition justifications. Also a lot of your arguments seem to try to coopt offense but outside of the autonomy argument I'm not seeing much a reason as to why negating is uniquely better. Additionally you need to respond to Strauss and Connelly. Aff C3 feels a bit weak, it felt tacked on to the end of the AC. It's also important to be aware of a possible contradiction with White Mans Burden bad + foreign aid good.

RFD: aff has terminal defense vs NC, and responds to autonomy turn. Wins offense on AC contentions + try or die justification

Room: 215
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Davis, Danial

St. Croix Prep

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Lakeville NG		Apple Valley KA	
Noah Gallagher	30	Kenan Anderson	30

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

Signature: [signature]

Pronouns: Apple Valley KA's Anderson pronouns: he/him, Lakeville NG's Gallagher pronouns: He/Him/His

A

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Corps = "Core"
- Against the NC, your alienation argument was unwarranted.
- For all the talk of new in the 2, your discussion of the Neg rebuttal of your Contention 2 itself felt new, you said yourself you dropped his evidence

N

- I don't love hypothetical questions in CX that take the concept to a ridiculous extremes
- I don't really buy the medication's hypo, especially as the Aff dismissed it.
- Overall, good warranted flow coverage in the INR, though.
- You put most of your stock in Framework, and you do a nice job of explaining your position, but I don't think you do enough to show Legitimacy is necessary, given the way the Aff laid out the Resolution and the Walker card.

RFD

Basically, the round was very close; there were some minor drops and new in the 2 arguments on both sides, but otherwise excellent coverage of the core issues in the round. So, I compared worlds, and I was not convinced that the evidence of the Neg's Cont. 1 proved the government entirely illegitimate, and thus unable to consorpt. But even if I did, the Aff's Framework allowed for a better solution to cyclical harms that the Neg unveiled to existing.

Room: 210
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Anderson, Sam

Eagan

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

AFF 2:10	POINTS (20-30)	NEG 1:53	POINTS (20-30)
Edina NA		Chanhassen ER	
Nathan Annareddy	28	Evan Rowe	28

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

Signature: [signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

You generally have the right idea, I would just take it a step further. Do probability weighing against the NC, challenge the strength of link, make your turn more explicit. You sort of do all of these things but they can be more explicit and emphasized.

With this NC, you should be ready to explain one of two things — either how you solve biopower, or how the aff makes it internally worse, i.e. given that biopower exists in both worlds in some form, why is it worse in the aff world? Given that Foucault is criticizing problems in the status quo, how will they be made worse by affirming? Being able to articulate that specific link will make it easier to weigh against aff offense compared to the more generic "compulsory NS is biopolitical, and biopolitics is bad"

RFD: The neg's main response to the aff is that the neg solves the root cause of aff impacts by prioritizing biopower, but didn't explain how they solve biopower. Aff has conceded offense from four wars and military tech is a turn to biopower.

Room: N30
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Hibbard, Sandi

Lakeville

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
Edina LF		**Eastview DP**	
Lucca Figari	28.5	Daniel Portnov	29

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

Signature: [signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Good UD answers & questions
Framework.
Good mapped - thank you.
• Link to Standard.
• Persuasive - [illegible]
• Covered contentions.
• well-spoken

• Good UD questions & answers
• Covered contentions
• Linked to standard in both cases.
• Good mapped - thank you.
• Framework.
• Persuasive - [illegible]
• [illegible]
• well-spoken

Both had really good cases - good rebuttals.
Good job - tough decision. Thank you for "taking it easy" on a first-time Varsity Judge.

RFD: Value American Citizens - choice. Persuaded.

Room: Main Office Conference
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Smith, Nick

Apple Valley

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
Eagan ML		Lakeville EH	
Marguerite LaPlant	28	Elliot Harvanko	28.2

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

Signature: [signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

- Don't have to take a stance in CX if you don't want to
- lol @ punishment = comm service
- Aff only violate b/c CX, should push back against manufacture of viol.
- Gets RVIs
- New shell, not counter interp

Neg

- Fake news - no interp in AC, never happened.
- CX ?s could be more precise, like examples of oppression
- Prison stuff no link
- Clog link mech
- Read stories get same quant out. Brain needs to catch up to mouth
- Interp should be more precise
- Newoff & CP is acts-wise 30 CP > theory
- Said can have RVI & can not

RFD

- Don't buy no-RVI, said get RVI when said to drop "No RVI" warrant
- 1 min arb no abuse shell b/c blue arb
- IN shell neg where, had to read bad/nonapplicable generic cvgs.

Room: 207
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Hasan, Aleezeh
Rosemount

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Edina ZI		**Lakeville AL**	
Zoe Iyer	28	Alec Loftus	28

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

Signature: Aleezeh

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

- content of speech is done well, but presentation could be better
- nice job linking into FW
- rebuttals were very organized, but some of the dropped points weren't responded to.

Neg

- NR could be a lot more organized
  - just do a line by line instead of an overview
- no reason to read the kellog card twice
- FW debate is well done, but rebuttal is messy.

RFD: While Neg won the FW, Aff linked into it better

Room: 201
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Mohamed, Aisha

Rosemount

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Apple Valley TH		**Edina RM**	
Tai Henrichs	27	Rahil Modi	28

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

Signature: [signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff 1
- Great cross-x!
- I think your main point about their not really existing an act omission distinction not existing is the only point that's clear in your response to neg framework.
- Bad idea just dropping entire NC on the hope that I won't buy his PW.
- Impact extensions to framework.
- Don't drop the burden!
- Don't address his new arg in the NR

Neg 1
- Great NC!
- Spend more time on the util framework
- Spend more time extending your case & crystallizing.
- Show why you meet your burden - don't make a big deal about the burden & not spend time showing how you meet.
- What is the neg story?

RFD: I vote neg, because neg wins framework & the aff concedes neg contention level. Also aff drops the turns on ~~the~~ ALL of his sowency!

Room: 218
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5 Tran, Kim

Rosemount

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Edina JA		Roseville Area EB	
Joseph Annareddy	27	Elizabeth Booms	26

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

Signature: [signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF:

- you can speed up a bit - personal preference
- use up all the time, can go over main points at the end of the AR
- great sign posting!
- go in on the impacts of implimentation!
  - you have all yo need in the case to show that the draft will work and that the my data is based on drafts during war time

NEG:

- Clear sign post please! NC was a bit unclear to me (the standard got lost in it)
- connect the nationalism to the US, straight out tell me. You danced around it

RFD: the standard debate was dropped by both sides. Voted off of nationalism and the link/nonlink to US

Room: 008
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Stenzel, Jeff

Lakeville

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Edina AS		Roseville Area EC	
Aiden Swan	29	Elyse Colihan	27

Winner: Edina AS (School/Team) debating on the AFF (Side (Aff or Neg)) Low point win? No

Signature: Jeff Stenzel

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF logic flowed well and he had excellent presentation. I understood his (aff) arguments better than hers. (Neg.) She did not use all her time on 2nd Neg. (only used 3:22) She dropped several contentions. I didn't note him dropping any.

Room: 205
Start: 2:45 PM
Varsity Lincoln-Douglas

5

Rossini, Delia

Roseville Area

ROSEMOUNT IRISH CENTENNIAL INVITATIONAL

Sep 30 - 30, 2017

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Edina NH		St. Croix Prep LT	
Noel Hayward	29	Logan Tan	29

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

Signature: [illegible]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1ac - probably should probably slow down w/ the 2nd & 3rd contentions w/ more clarity so opponent understands, but it's fine

1nc - tell me why these budget issues are a huge deal. overviews > underviews

1ar - I appreciate the framing and standards at the top of your speech

1nr - if we don't know the cost how do we know the impact. no response to ross card which gutted contention

2ar - framing the round w/ your reasons you fit the role of ballot is what secured everything. needed to know why neg fits better

Not a lot of comments besides this was close & y'all did great