


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	
Apple Valley BS	POINTS (20 - 30)	West Des Moines Valley CR	POINTS (20 - 30)
Brandon Schellhaass	<u>26</u>	Carly Rieger	<u>28</u>
Winner: <u>West Des Moines Valley CR</u>		debating on the <u>Neg</u> Side (Aff or Neg)	
School/Team: <u>Apple Valley BS</u>		Low point win? _____	
Signature: 			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Negative's case goes unresponded

↳ Moral obligations can only exist in reciprocal relationships

↳ wealthy vs. developing isn't reciprocal

↳ therefore, no obligation exists

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	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Apple Valley SA	(20 - 30)	Appleton East TS	(20 - 30)
Serena Abraham	<u>29</u>	Tyler Stearns	<u>27</u>

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg:

- I need a road map! Tell me you're going FW → 2 off so I can get out paper
- Contradictions between util responses and DAs were really confusing

Aff :

- smart to drop util b/c he links hard to util
- don't run out of time in the IAR! Pretty much dropped dep DA and you would have lost if the link to structural violence was strong in the DA.

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.	

Voted AFF off of C1 link to structural violence. Weighed over Dependency DA because no clear link to standard in the DA.

RFD given

Room: 852
Start: 9:30 AM
Lincoln Douglas

6

Scoffield, Becky



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	
Neenah EB	POINTS (20 - 30)	Brookfield East SN	POINTS (20 - 30)
Ellie Balensiefen	<u>27</u>	Shloka Nambiar	<u>29</u>

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

Signature:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Speaking: AFF: Solid in case, but work on pauses in rebuttal
Neg: Watch overgesturing w/hands. Good cadence in speaking

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

V/VC debate: Neg wins this portion of the debate w/arguments of how democracy leads to improved societal welfare.

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.	

Arguments: Too much gets dropped by AFF in rebuttal rounds. Neg wins on arguments regarding: debt cycle, rise of authoritarian regimes, & movements.

Room: 821
Start: 9:30 AM
Lincoln Douglas

6

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	
Appleton East IW	POINTS (20 - 30)	Brookfield East VS	POINTS (20 - 30)
Isabella Wirth	<u>28</u>	Viktor Sakman	<u>27</u>

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

No risk of Neg offense

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.