



Resolved: Wealthy nations have an obligation to provide development assistance to other nations.

Each debater has the burden to prove his or her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle of value (what ought to be). No debater can realistically be expected to prove complete validity or invalidity of the resolution. The nature of proof should be in the logic and the credibility of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion (researched from topic-specific literature and applicable works of philosophy). Judges should only evaluate those arguments presented in a clear and understandable manner, with claims that meaningfully clash with the opponent's arguments. Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments. Unallowable in rebuttal are new arguments (allowable however, is new evidence supporting points previously made, or refutation of opposing arguments).

AFF

Neenah MA

Maddie Alt

POINTS
(20 - 30)

28

NEG

Sheboygan North RW

Rachael Williams

POINTS
(20 - 30)

28

Winner: ~~Neenah MA~~ Neenah MA debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
Signature:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Every argument in this round is a wash, ~~so~~ so it's very difficult to judge.

- Framework - both debaters agree

- Poverty cycle - both debaters prove half their solvency

Point Scale:

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Excellent
24-26 Good
22-23 Average
20-21 Below Average

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive 6 min.
Neg Cross-Ex of Aff 3 min.
Negative Constructive 7 min.
Aff Cross-Ex of Neg 3 min.
Affirmative Rebuttal 4 min.
Negative Rebuttal 6 min.
Affirmative Rebuttal 3 min.
Each debater has 4 min. prep used before their own speaking times, at their discretion.	

~~I~~ I chose the loan issue to judge off because it went fairly unaddressed by the Neg. Although it ~~wasn't~~ ^{wasn't} sufficiently impacted, it's still extended.

- Good job to both!

Room: 814
Start: 8:40 PM
Lincoln Douglas

4

Erikson, Philip

SF Roosevelt



Resolved: Wealthy nations have an obligation to provide development assistance to other nations.
Each debater has the burden to prove his or her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle of value (what ought to be). No debater can realistically be expected to prove complete validity or invalidity of the resolution. The nature of proof should be in the logic and the credibility of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion (researched from topic-specific literature and applicable works of philosophy). Judges should only evaluate those arguments presented in a clear and understandable manner, with claims that meaningfully clash with the opponent's arguments. Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments. Unallowable in rebuttal are new arguments (allowable however, is new evidence supporting points previously made, or refutation of opposing arguments).

AFF		NEG	
Brookfield East RL	POINTS 11.50 (20 - 30)	Appleton East JS	POINTS 21.50 (20 - 30)
Rafael Li	<u>28</u>	Joel Savoie	<u>28</u>

Winner: Rafael Li (Brookfield East RL) debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
 School/Team
 Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff wins abuse on the T ii

Point Scale:

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Excellent
24-26 Good
22-23 Average
20-21 Below Average

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 min.
Neg Cross-Ex of Aff	3 min.
Negative Constructive	7 min.
Aff Cross-Ex of Neg	3 min.
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min.
Negative Rebuttal	6 min.
Affirmative Rebuttal	3 min.

Each debater has 4 min. prep used before their own speaking times, at their discretion.



Resolved: Wealthy nations have an obligation to provide development assistance to other nations.
Each debater has the burden to prove his or her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle of value (what ought to be). No debater can realistically be expected to prove complete validity or invalidity of the resolution. The nature of proof should be in the logic and the credibility of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion (researched from topic-specific literature and applicable works of philosophy). Judges should only evaluate those arguments presented in a clear and understandable manner, with claims that meaningfully clash with the opponent's arguments. Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments. Unallowable in rebuttal are new arguments (allowable however, is new evidence supporting points previously made, or refutation of opposing arguments).

AFF		NEG	
Sioux Falls Lincoln ZS	POINTS	Brookfield East AS	POINTS
	(20 - 30)		(20 - 30)
Zindeh Scere	<u>27</u>	Arjun Shreekumar	<u>28</u>

Winner: Brookfield East debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Matt Amylon

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff failed to contend a card that negated the solvency of aff. Both debaters were outstanding overall - debate was decided on this one card.

Point Scale:

29-30 Outstanding
27-28 Excellent
24-26 Good
22-23 Average
20-21 Below Average

Speech Times:

Affirmative Constructive	6 min.
Neg Cross-Ex of Aff	3 min.
Negative Constructive	7 min.
Aff Cross-Ex of Neg	3 min.
Affirmative Rebuttal	4 min.
Negative Rebuttal	6 min.
Affirmative Rebuttal	3 min.

Each debater has 4 min. prep used before their own speaking times, at their discretion.