

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Spkr	Interlake HS - Bellevue TV	POINTS (0-30)
1A	Justin Tsang	28
2A	Edward Young	27.8

NEG

Spkr	Gig Harbor SJ	POINTS (0-30)
2N	Justin Shaw	27.3
1N	Hallie Jones	27

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

Signature: Zach Maghirang

Comments & Reason for Decision:

INC:

- This is an Aff answer to topicality! need to change the interp tag & include a violation/water.
- careful w/ CP → ③ pandemics in Africa is probably not competitive w/ the entrance into the ASIB.

IAR

- Good time allocation
- Watch out for tiny drops that can take out your Aff or args
- ↳ work on line-by-line
- need votes/standards on theory

Neg 2:07
 4:45
 Aff 5:25
 4:50

ZAC

- have better organization, you can do this by allocating times for each sheet before your speech
- might be some tension w/ DA impact D and your China rise advantage
- You should perm the counterplan

ZNR

- careful w/ new args in this speech
- Lacking assessment of IAR args - need to make more comparisons
- Tell a story! Explain the scenario of the DA when you go for it so its clear what I'm voting for or why the plan is bad.
- need to ① the FKT arg

ZAR

- Work on IAR/ZAR cohesion
- Prioritize one ①
- ANSWER THE FKT Arg! even if it's not impact

RFD

- Case mechanism goes functionally conceded and I do not think the solvency evidence supplies enough to take out the Aff. The Aff oiw the DA w/ warming and also the DA has no unique link to the Aff which mitigates the risk of it happening. I vote Aff.

Q's
 Email: Zmaghirang52@gmail.com

ZNC

- FKT arg should be on the T flow
- you're doing a good analysis on your cv but you need to have more engagement & application to their stuff
- take more offensive arguments → you're relying on defense on a case which is always harder to win the ground on.

NR

- I think ZNC should take off case and INR case for time purposes.
- Need to do more line-by-line work answering their specifics & telling the story

Room: 405
Start: 3:30 PM
Open Policy

1

Stevens, James

Puyallup

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Spkr	Ingraham TZ	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Zsa Zsa Toms	28.4
	Catherine Zhu	28.2

NEG

Spkr	Interlake HS - Bellevue RY	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Andrew Rowe	28.6
	Sterling Yun	28.3

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

Signature: James Stevens

Comments & Reason for Decision:

K o/w aff

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Spkr	Interlake HS - Bellevue LG	POINTS (0-30)
1A	David Li	28.5
2A	Katherine Gu	28.6

NEG

Spkr	Puyallup MR	POINTS (0-30)
2N	Luke Maghirang	28.4
1N	Nico Roshau	28.3

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

Signature: melizondo

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1A - be quicker in answering questions and you are spreading these answers as is
1N - too many repetitive ice age cards

"Fear of China?" - A: IAC is an act of hegemonic intervention in order to reorganize US as leader in world to contain China

2A - def need to be more clear on order or give me a moment & signpost you are shifting the order

- Also you spend a lot of CX in 1AC & 2AC asking questions - need to be rhetorical moments

- need cards that answer ice age or be more critical of their ^{ice age} story
- Make perm shield link arg*

2N - would have started on case on ice age turn and fully fleshing out that story cuz it was dropped & would get time for the relation's flow
- needed to do impact calc on ocean acid vs. ice age then the DA
2A - don't ask about args not in 2NC - Luke - you don't have to answer this
Not bad to ask for AT: perm Nico - Lol

1NR - too much overview & overview on DA - need to be more succinct w/ the Delay CP - need better AT: perm - probs right that NB makes it comp

- didn't answer Delay CPs bad

1AR - kick warming, AT: ice age, and go for Noko adv - need a story for this adv
- then dropping KAT should not be in your speech

2NR - be more cohesive - alot of it was repetitive overviews - also case debate!

2AR - didn't need warming

Kick out of

5:56 3:32

Room: 409
Start: 3:30 PM
Open Policy

1

Strand, Avery
Holguin, Jaime

Gig Harbor

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Spkr	Ingraham VZ	POINTS (0-30)
1	Tonias Vigil	28.5
2	Iris Zhou	28.4

NEG

Spkr	Interlake HS - Bellevue SM	POINTS (0-30)
1	John Sweeney	27.9
2	Daneel Markov	28.3

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

too fast IAC
 clear distinction b/w cards
 good line by line!
 warrants in extensions
 Cap vs misunderstanding "how can you argue
 ours"
 They dropped the DA in 2nd! OH MY
 Got off Wm!
 good call on T definitions

closed cs questions
 ↳ Have you rejected "all capitalists?" Stop saying "how!"
 solid question defense
 great 2nd question on military, keep digging
 good line by line ... in the 2nd R. Show
 me more early
 Choose W or T
 drop T

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Spkr	Gig Harbor SJ	POINTS (0-30)
3	Justin Shaw	27
1	Hallie Jones	27

NEG

Spkr	Interlake HS LG	POINTS (0-30)
4	David Li	29
2	Katherine Gu	38

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

Signature: McKenna M...

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff:
 slow on tags. Read add on in an advantage.
 Don't label the K for them.

Let them answer your questions in CX
 I think you should be on the wiki but get that's not your decision, not a voter.

Neg:
 would lose a more clear alt.
 They are handing you K links, grab them.

Everyone need more clear sign posting & clearer spreading.

~~Beats~~ ^{aff} 1/2 the aff's authors aren't minorities, don't claim that. ~~at~~
 start with your positions, move to theirs

RFID: Voted on T, US-China in Africa means trilateral. Didn't Neg didn't answer T impacts.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF


Spkr	Interlake HS RY	POINTS (0-30)
2	Andrew Rowe	28.5
1	Sterling Yun	28

NEG

Spkr	Ingraham VZ	POINTS (0-30)
2	Tonias Vigil	27.5
1	Iris Zhou	27.5

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

Signature: _____



Comments & Reason for Decision:

Close debate. Both sides need to make arguments clearer - too much use of fragments / only 'titles' rather than argument sentences & too much 'they said x' followed by a response that doesn't clearly respond. Still good debate

Aff's coop is more comprehensive w/ aff - more than hotline & reduces ASAT risk. I also found the ISS end in 2024 a bigger threat than US appears weak / govt bureaucracy on space harms req. Close because I do think there is a risk of the DA - but the form seems more concrete & aff wins ASATs on case.

Room: 405
Start: 5:30 PM
Open Policy

2

Elizondo, Michael

Ingraham

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Spkr	Interlake HS SM	POINTS (0-30)
	John Sweeney	27
	Daneel Markov	28.2

NEG

Spkr	Ingraham TZ	POINTS (0-30)
IN	Zsa Zsa Toms	28.6
2N	Catherine Zhu	28.5

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

Signature: Michael Elizondo

Comments & Reason for Decision:

2A - you don't seem to be making your own speeches or pulling own cards or able to answer your own CX questions

Neg - Wins on T - 9pg - procedural fairness comes first and CI fails to beat the INP DA about infinite unconditional one-off engagements which explodes limits & kills edu in debate

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016


AFF

Spkr	Puyallup MR	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Luke Maghirang	28.1
	Nico Roshau	28.0

NEG

Spkr	Interlake HS TY	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Justin Tsang	28.5
	Edward Young	28.2

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

FW o/w aff

- Aff could probably meet - retool the plan text?
- 2AC spends too much time on case - should be like 2 minutes max
- INR needs better alt solency and clearer links
- 2NC/2NR needs to remember the interp/violation

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016


AFF

Spkr	Interlake HS LG	POINTS (0-30)
1	David Li	28
2	Katherine Gu	27.5

NEG

Spkr	Ingraham TZ	POINTS (0-30)
1	Zsa Zsa Toms	29
2	Catherine Zhu	28.5

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff: Why did you just make analysis on CAP turn in 2AC then read unrelated CAP Good args in 1AR? Switch that order ~~around~~ will work a lot better. You try to do a lot of work with just analysis that make some bold claims.

Neg: Thank you for explaining how internally they are bonded from solvency. However feel you should have called them out in 2NC/1NR that their CAP args are just personal analysis doesn't mitigate CAP turn.

RFD: I vote Neg on risk of ^{Cap & Food} ~~turn~~ turn and no solvency. T/F just footer.

Room: 200
Start: 7:30 PM
Open Policy

3

Elizondo, Michael

Ingraham

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Spkr	Gig Harbor SJ	POINTS (0 - 30)
2A	Justin Shaw	28.0
1A	Hallie Jones	28.1

NEG

Spkr	Interlake HS RY	POINTS (0 - 30)
1N	Andrew Rowe	28.5
2N	Sterling Yun	28.4

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

Signature: melizondo

Comments & Reason for Decision:

TVA slvs aff via counter-heg efforts
 AFF spent too much time on fiat being bad
 Aff should invest more time fixing T blocks - you are on the right path w/ good built in args

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Spkr	Ingraham VZ	POINTS (0-30)
1	Tonias Vigil	28
3	Iris Zhou	28

NEG

Spkr	Interlake HS TY	POINTS (0-30)
4	Justin Tsang	29
2	Edward Young	28

Winner: Ingraham VZ School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? yes

Signature: McKenna

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD:

I vote aff because I think the plan is a net reduction of capitalism. Even if I give you your FW, I don't see how small instances of rejecting capitalism is going to end up solving for poverty. Structural violence.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Spkr	Interlake HS SM	POINTS (0-30)
2	John Sweeney	25.5
1	Daneel Markov	26

NEG

Spkr	Puyallup MR	POINTS (0-30)
2	Luke Maghirang	28
1	Nico Roshau	28.5

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Neg wins CP
- perm still up to Trump = link to DA
- abuse not proven - substance over theory & resolved definition (plus the fact you can use the CP versus any plan doesn't make it abusive)
- Aff need work responding to neg arguments
- T, Case answers/terms, DA, CP especially
- Neg - the renewables = nat gas = less renewables
- the Trump net benefit isn't clearly explained
- if you go for mkwar/consequentialism - then show the consequences on the CP/DA

Room: 406
Start: 9:00 AM
Open Policy

4

Maghirang, Zach

Ingraham

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Spkr	Interlake HS TY	POINTS (0-30)
1N	Justin Tsang	28.6
2A	Edward Young	28.5

NEG

Spkr	Interlake HS SM	POINTS (0-30)
1N	John Sweeney	27.4
2N	Daneel Markov	27.6

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

Signature: Zach Maghirang

Comments & Reason for Decision:

specific q's? email: zmaghirang52@gmail.com

RFD: I vote Aff, try-or-die because Air causes don't mean the plan is a bad idea. I think
T is too late on standards and Aff probably meets. CP doesn't ☹️ aff or neg doesn't
get to pick a case o/w the DA.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Spkr	Ingraham TZ	POINTS (0-30)
1	Zsa Zsa Toms	28.8
2	Catherine Zhu	28.8

NEG

Spkr	Gig Harbor SJ	POINTS (0-30)
3	Justin Shaw	28
4	Hallie Jones	28

Winner: Ingraham TZ debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

The 2AC had the majority of the components that you needed, the next step would be adding depth to explanations / extensions of arguments. Right now its very "tag line" heavy.

I would add more evidence that helps frame your method i.e. structural changes 1st
 ↳ Also how engaging in PM and the state is necessary for women and to help dismantle patriarchy.

IAR

Extension Custom evidence one of the highlights for the debate. I could also start to explain what winning his argument means for the debate.

In the IAR it is good to re direct the debate to the AFF. compartmentalize the debate and always make the AFF relevant to almost all major issues in the debate.

NEG

- Most people believe NEG teams get to read (E)s. I would take out Iw in INC and add more substance to the R.
- Even in 1 off (E) debates, it is still important to have in death case debates in the INC, especially when trying to undercut the truth claims of the IAC. If they get access to the AFF, you can't win the debate, or is at least not very probable.

Block

I would change content overview that would focus more on the mobility of women to have access to speaking or their voice to be seen as not legitimate or emotional because focusing on this part of the debate undercuts all 2AC arguments about their engagement in politics is possible) productive.

Change Block split. Do the PERMs debate in IAR because you don't really get to the content of the (E) and this gives the IAR a lot of opportunities.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Spkr	Interlake HS RY	POINTS (0-30)
	Andrew Rowe	28
	Sterling Yun	28.3

NEG

Spkr	Interlake HS LG	POINTS (0-30)
	David Li	27.7
	Katherine Gu	28.2

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- 1AE CX - why so much time spent on "who goes to space?" I don't think it's something they "have" to defend - go it's an affect of the plan, they don't directly send people to space.
- 1NC - need more explicit alt on K, probably a few arg.
- 2AC - need efficiency drills - 3 mins to answer a couple of stock case args is too much.
- 2NC - answer voice alt, have moment to explain alt a bit better. make your link arguments: (a) have impacts - unclear why "only some people go to space" is bad, for ex, esp in the context of your epistemology claims, (b) be intuitively explained as DAs to perms - why doesn't inclusion of plan B a lot of your links. Answer LIT, too many blocks.
- 1NR - need better explanation of why epistemology implicates policy making. More time on case - or more time making FW args. a/b why case doesn't matter - is needed.
- 1AR - get thru case quicker, need more time on pres - if you're going to go for "extinction" o/w need to answer specific FW standards.
- 2NR - get to long exclusion any w/ more time, explain your link - args as they relate to FW.

2AR - don't need to w/o FW, should go for less

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Spkr	Puyallup MR	POINTS (0-30)
1A	Luke Maghirang	27.2
2A	Nico Roshau	27.3

NEG

Spkr	Ingraham VZ	POINTS (0-30)
2N	Tonias Vigil	27
1N	Iris Zhou	27.1

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Any questions email me @ rebeccapetrone96@gmail.com

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff dis course is a pre req - case outweighs

Aff

Need an answer to why your space discourse is different and key because we have had convos before

Explain cards don't just extend or say they are important

Don't say Dumb or stupid especially in round about discourse

Neg

2NR go for one position both were undercovered with very little comparison on either flow - either flow was winnable but make a choice and go in depth

Use cx to get your k link - trap them into saying we need to get tech to explore space

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC
 QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

3:31 | 145

7:07

AFF		
Spkr		POINTS (0-30)
	Ingraham TZ	
	Zsa Zsa Toms	
	Catherine Zhu	28.5

NEG		
Spkr		POINTS (0-30)
	Puyallup MR	
	Luke Maghirang	28.3
	Nico Roshau	28.4

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

Signature: _____

REF = CP (5) A, some (small) risk of NB

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- 1C of IAC - lots of ships passing in the night - it seems like Luke ~~is~~ is speaking/asking Gic that assume ~~an incorrect understanding~~ an incorrect understanding of the AFF, but Catherine isn't quite getting to the heart of that main line of thinking. ~~Whether~~ Whether team should be afraid of taking a step back, clarifying, and listening.
- 1NC - double - turn on the climate adv. need (5) on CP. unclear how sci dip defense applies to AFF.
- 2AC - nice use of intuitive analytics. Find a better offensive DA to run CP. Try to make your arguments ~~be~~ be framed more offensively - eg, "Trump won't pass a 45% tariff because..." instead of "they don't have a reason trump would pass a 45% tariff."
- 2NC - you need a call - saying trump will get the tariff passed - not just Jacobson's "a tariff would be bad" card. still unsure how sci dip applies, or how there's an IIC to the DA, etc.
- 1A/R - what is the impact to a trade war? need a more substantive answer to theory - it's their biggest line of offense on the CP.
- 1A/R - impact (5) def to CP more thoroughly, spend more time on theory, read news on CO2 turn.
- 2A/R - why so much time on impact framing - the CP (5) def is your route to this. Spend more time on DA link. You fractionally to impact call (shallowly) in 3-4 different places - pick one to go in-depth instead.
- 2A/R - either go for theory or don't. need to substantiate how some small (5) def still not really a Q of case v. DA.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Spkr	Gig Harbor SJ	POINTS (0-30)
	Justin Shaw NO show	
	Hallie Jones	28

NEG

Spkr	Interlake HS SM	POINTS (0-30)
1N	John Sweeney	27
2N	Daneel Markov	27.1

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

Signature: 

Any questions email me @ rebeccapetrone96@gmail.com

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Neg conceded vote Aff
if plan better than
sqvo - plan seems better -
neg solves wars - no
impact to pro lif ;
cap inevitable*

Aff
go in depth even
if they don't -
how does the case
(neg) solve for the
impacts of cap

Neg
* Go for one thing in
the 2NR! Depth over
breadth then you have time
to engage with other
teams stuff also

Room: 200
Start: 12:30 PM
Open Policy

5

Copenhaver, Rog-
Puyallup

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016


AFF

Spkr	Interlake HS LG	POINTS (0-30)
3	David Li	28.5
1	Katherine Gu	29

NEG

Spkr	Ingraham VZ	POINTS (0-30)
2	Tonias Vigil	28.7
4	Iris Zhou	28.4

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Spkr	Interlake HS TY	POINTS (0-30)
1	Justin Tsang	29.3
2	Edward Young	29.2

NEG

Spkr	Interlake HS RY	POINTS (0-30)
1	Andrew Rowe	29
2	Sterling Yun	29.1

Winner: interlake HS TY debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: BMMulett

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Stalling - getting out proximid during CX at the IAC. Also consider writing down your questions and key quotes beforehand
 Aff should time the IAC before the debate starts
 CX at the IAC was very good on both sides!
 ZAC is almost too fast, let start slower and do analytics much more slow than the card text

It feels confusing that Andrew is leaning in to whisper to Sterling during CX at the ZAC. You are giving strategy away and also not asking questions.
 Justin needs to interrupt CX a lot less ~~long~~ after ZAC.
 Re: block - the INR is way to big in this debate, there simply isn't enough time to meet a standard argumentative explanation burden. extend both the DA & CP plus case. in this debate it feels like I'm unclear about the CP case and I'm unclear about the link to the DA too. Not sure what the NB are for the CP either

RFD Aff old small risk of disagreement ~~by~~ by Japan. Aff can't the impact so warning and its unclear how CP ^{is} this impact claim. certainly was confusing on both sides, but I think the aff isn't perceived as apparent

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Spkr	Ingraham TZ	POINTS (0 - 30)
	Zsa Zsa Toms	N/A
1	Catherine Zhu	30

NEG

Spkr	Interlake HS SM	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	John Sweeney	28
3	Daneel Markov	28

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg
Wren: Dont cut that many cards + dont read cards that arent relevant.
no clear articulation of alternative

Be nice to your partner
You cant not get to your K.

Aff: Great organization
Good Idea to drop an advntg
Good management of prep time

RFD: I get it was an accident, but I have to evaluate you not getting to the K. At risk of the aff saving people from Structural violence; I vote on the plan.

**AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC
 QUALIFIER**

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Spkr	Puyallup MR	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Luke Maghirang	27.5
1	Nico Roshau	29.5

NEG

Spkr	Interlake HS LG	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	David Li	28
2	Katherine Gu	29

Winner: Inte-lake LG debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Ethan Unger

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - have strict defenses at tech level, you're super relevant on it, everyone will like it

Neg - make sure you're extending all the 2NR DAs to their notes they dropped

Luke -
 Don't drop
 R/B!

Katherine - when you read T-wins abt. I need at least a couple of words on it.

Nico - I know the T arg was a bit off but you have to hit it

David - not sure I have a clear understanding of the alt in the 2NR - articulated clearly

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Spkr	Ingraham VZ	POINTS (0-30)
1	Tonias Vigil	28.6
2	Iris Zhou	28.8

NEG

Spkr	Gig Harbor SJ	POINTS (0-30)
N/A	Justin Shaw	N/A
1	Hallie Jones	28.7

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

Signature: 

britmarwill@gmail.com

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- I think the CX of the IAC would be helped by writing down some questions before the start, and a little more precision.
 - ~~Both~~ Both debaters in CX of IAC should look at the judge
 - You all don't have to be so explicit about roadmaps before the IAC, "the k" can just be "one aff" or "one neg"
 - The framework arguments seems to be getting a little muddled as the affirmative progresses
 - The ZAC should avoid using personal experience to disprove debate is hard for women, I think it comes off a little redemptive on the structural claims the way is unclear
 - If the aff has a question for the ZAC you should share w/ Iris before cross-x and generally avoid interrupting ~~responses~~ especially in debate about whether or not woman's voice is silenced in debate
 - ~~The~~ the theory arguments the way makes seems in tension w/ many of the args being made about inherent unfairness by the neg
- RFD** Form 5 the links to the critique - I think its unclear what exactly about the aff if masculine joy affirmed