

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

~~1:10 used~~
1:05 remain

30s remain
43s

PRO

Spkr	Newport CS	POINTS (0-30)
3	Evelyn Chen	28
1	Maya Srikanth	28

CON

Spkr	Gig Harbor MN	POINTS (0-30)
4	Jessa Moomaw	28
2	Emily Nold	28

Winner: GTHS (MN) debating on the con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signatures] School: Peninsula HS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Newport → Very limited definition of Plan-C.
 → Tell the judge what % of US GDP Plan Columbia support accounts for
 → I felt internal displacement was non unique and your second contention relies completely on me already agreeing that it is not a proper use of resources

HHS → Awesome response to all opponent arguments and stretching Plan-C definitions.
 → loved the landmine removal subpoint

Great Debate

both → Find a way to clearly demonstrate increase or decrease in coca, became ^awash
 → Civil and very pleasant and mature debate

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

#05

257

PRO

Spkr	Gig Harbor KH	POINTS (0-30)
4	Steven Kotanksy	29
2	Spencer Hannan	29

CON

Spkr	Puyallup KW	POINTS (0-30)
3	Sarah Kurpius	28
1	Trixie Witham	29

Winner: GHHS (KH) debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature] School: PHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Puyallup → much of your case is explanatory and not made up of actual contentions. Build on your arguments/evidence and minimize explanations of PC, FARC, etc.
- Cut back on reading such long cards in rebuttal. You read the evidence, but failed to present impact and
- Great response to "Balloon Effect," but failed to adequately respond to Pro's Human Rights contention, esp. internally displaced ppl (a non-unique argument) and false-positive scandal
- GHHS → Strong comprehension and use of your evidence
- Case is strong, but use of Locke seems a stretch and easily countered by arguing any benefits to US therefore defend US Natural Rights
- Drop the 'meth addict' analogy
- Back and forth on drug production became very tiresome

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Puyallup BT	POINTS (0-30)
3	Ruby Burton	29
1	Ave Trebilcock	28

CON

Spkr	Newport CQ	POINTS (0-30)
2	Selma Chihab	27
4	Sarah Quinn	29

Winner: PUYALLUP B.T.
School/Team

debating on the **PRO!**
Side (Pro or Con)

Low point win? SORT OF?

Signature:

School: KINGSTON

Comments & Reason for Decision:

A.T. 'PLANNED COLUMBIA' HASN'T REDUCED COCAINE PRODUCTION
 'P.C.' IS BAD FOR COLUMBIANS & THEIR ENVIRONMENT
 WHAT IS THE ACTUAL INTENTION OF "PLANNED COLUMBIA"
R.B. MORE COKE! (...YEAH!!)
 COCAINE PRODUCTION DOESN'T DECREASE, IT JUST MOVES (... SWEET ANALYSIS!)
 'P.C.' IS NOT ONLY INEFFECTIVE, IT ACTUALLY MAKES THINGS WORSE!!!
 IS "RE-ELABORATE" EVEN A WORD?!

S.C. "OUGHT" IMPLIES OBLIGATION...NICE!
 '* 'P.C.' REDUCES VIOLENCE
 'P.C.' IS GOOD FOR BOTH COLUMBIA AND AMERICA
 BE AWARE OF YOUR LEFT HAND; OVERUSE OF THE SAME GESTURE WILL LEAD TO A LOSS OF IMPACT
 'P.C.' HELPS PREVENT THE SPREAD OF THE ZIKA VIRUS?! WHOA! (...MORE ON THIS!)
 TRY TO AVOID FACING YOUR OPPONENT DURING C-X
S.Q. COLUMBIA'S PROBLEMS ARE REAL BUT ARE NOT THE RESULT OF 'P.C.'
 HEALTH RISKS TO HUMANS (OF SPREADING) SOUNDS WORSE THAN COCAINE PRODUCTION...
 CORRELATION IS NOT CAUSE & EFFECT... COOL!
 TAKE IT EASY ON THOSE KNUCKLES (...KRACK!!)



BALLOON EFFECT!
 MOST OF CON'S ECONOMIC CLAIMS COULD NOT BE WEIGHED AS THEY WERE NOT DIRECTLY LINKED TO THE INTENTION OF "PLANNED COLUMBIA". PRO WAS ABLE TO SUCCESSFULLY CONVINC ME THAT I SHOULD BE MORE AFRAID OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL/HUMAN HEALTH RESULTS OF AERIAL SPRAYING THAN I SHOULD OF COCAINE AVAILABILITY.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Team	POINTS (0-30)
	Annie Wright HB	
1	Jin Huang	27
3	Caitlyn Bell	26

CON

Spkr	Team	POINTS (0-30)
	Gig Harbor FD	
4	Anna Frisk	30
2	Olivia DuPuy	30

Winner: ANNIE WRIGHT H.B.
School/Team

debating on the



Low point win?



Signature: ♥ 99 味外喜

School: KINGSTON

Comments & Reason for Decision:

J.H. LOVE YOUR OUTFIT... STYLIN'!
 GREAT FLOWERY (...FOR A NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKER) TRY TO WORK ON PLURALIZATION, VERB-NOUN AGREEMENT & USE OF ARTICLES, ETC...
 'PLANNED COLUMBIA' IS BAD FOR COLUMBIA AND AMERICA... EXCELLENT ANALYSIS!
 'SOVEREIGNTY' ... GOOD POINT!!
 YOUR FINANCIAL CLAIMS DON'T HAVE MUCH IMPACT SINCE 'P.C.' ISN'T SUPPOSED TO 'SAVE U.S. TAXPAYERS MONEY'.

C.B. IF 'P.C.' HAS BEEN SUCCESSFUL, THEN THERE IS NO REASON TO CONTINUE IT... WHOA!!
 HARSH CHEMICALS... YEAH!
 CRIME WASN'T GONE AWAY, IT JUST CHANGED FORM...



O.D. THANK YOU FOR DEFINING "PLANNED COLUMBIA"! (... BUT TELL ME MORE ABOUT THE INTENTIONS OF "P.C.")
 ZIKA SURVEY UNCE IS COOL... BUT IS IT THE INTENTION OF "P.C."?!
 IS GOOD, EFFECTIVE PASSION (... BUT TRY NOT TO SPECULATE TOO MUCH...)
 GOOD CONTROL OF (-X) TIME!

A.F. PERCEIVED "HARMS" DUE TO 'P.C.' ARE ACTUALLY DUE TO OTHER FACTORS WITHIN COLUMBIA AND ARE NOT A DIRECT RESULT OF P.C. (... GOOD ANALYSIS!)
 P.C. IS WORKING, BUT HAS MORE WORK TO DO! NICE!!
 P.C. EXISTS TO HELP FARMERS (... TO AVOID RELYING ON CRIME)
 "P.C. IS EVOLVING" (HMM...)

BOTH SIDES SEEMED TO AGREE THAT THE (MAIN) INTENTION OF "PLANNED COLUMBIA" IS COUNTER-TERRORISM. PRO'S (UNREFUTED) CLAIM THAT 'P.C.' UNDERMINES COLUMBIA'S NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY SEEMS TO BE A REAL CONSEQUENCE OF P.C. AND IS IDEOLOGICAL CONTRADICTIONARY TO THE AIMS OF P.C.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

~~PRO~~ CON

Spkr	Puyallup BL	POINTS (0-30)
2 nd	Grace Burchett	29
1 st	Raymond Lappin	28

~~CON~~ PRO

Spkr	Kingston HV	POINTS (0-30)
2 nd	Seth Hillsberry	28
1 st	Hayden Victory	28

Winner: Puyallup BL School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: Newport HS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Puyallup
~~Know~~ Know yr case better

Both
 Ask more questions

Kingston
~~1st~~ 1st speaker: be a little more clear + loud in delivery

2nd speaker
 Good Questions + ethics
 Good Answers
 Good Source Comparison

Definition of should nonuniques Aff ~~more~~ impacts + more weighing on Neg. Aff args about causation/correlation do not outweigh neg extension of magnitude args

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

~~PRO~~ Con

Spkr	Puyallup MR	POINTS (0-30)
1 st	Madi Martin	28
2 nd	CJ Robinson	29

~~CON~~ Pro

Spkr	Peninsula SW	POINTS (0-30)
2 nd	Jacob Settle	30
1 st	Alex Williams	28

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

Signature: [Signature] School: Newport HS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~debater~~

Neg o/w : no weighing mechanism for econ impact

APP

- Go for US Heg & more
- Good percep. dominance

- Actor Arg is ~~Ø~~
- demil + rural strengthen solves civilian casualty
- ~~2nd speaker for [scribble]~~
↳ good signpost

yay

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

Neg Gig Harbor GS

PRO		
Spkr	Providence Classical Christian LB	POINTS (0-30)
2	Abbey Langub Sarah Sisney	29
4	Jeannine Brokaw Samantha Griffith	30

CON		
Spkr	Interlake HS - Bellevue JCD	POINTS (0-30)
1st	Amy Jiang	28
3rd	Monica Connell	29
	Archika Dogra	

Winner: Gig Harbor School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Diana P. Chinea School: Newport HS.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both teams were strong. Evidence presented by Gig Harbor appeared stronger & more thorough.

I wanted a bit more proof from Interlake that Human Rights violation w/out Plan Columbia would decrease.

Nice logic employed by Gig Harbor

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Peninsula TR	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Emma Taylor	30
2	Lauren Russell	28

CON

Spkr	Gig Harbor CP	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Gabe Carlson	28
1	Daniel Piacitelli	30

Winner: Gig Harbor debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Diana Chinea School: Newport High

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Two very strong teams. This choice was not an easy one. I liked Peninsula's arguments presented by Emma about Corporations benefiting most, but wanted a bit more proof.

Gig Harbor presented evidence that appeared stronger. I liked their use of statistics + proof.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eastlake MB	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Casey Mauck	28 30
1	Prateek Bhaumik	28 28

CON

Spkr	Puyallup BM	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Rimpal Bajwa	28 29
1	McKenzie Mestas	28 28

Winner: Puyallup BM School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win?

Signature: Joseph Hyink School: PCS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Puyallup - Con - 1st

- well-written case.
- Good job throughout the round defending your claims. I would like clearer links between Plan Colombia and the economy. Give me warrants with evidence.
- Have a better answer to the claims that PC has accomplished certain of its objectives and is now time to move on.

Con wins:

1. Economy - overall benefits to the entire economy (due to PC) seem greater
2. Improvement of quality of lives, again, seem to have a bigger scope.
3. Peace agreement seems to fit under Plan Colombia.

Eastlake - Pro - 2nd

- Be careful not to be contradictory. I had to figure out on my own that you both celebrate successes as well as end PC because of the harms. Show me that initial objectives being achieved won't be reversed. Show me that harms will go away when PC ends.
- I was not convinced that the 'Andean Act' was completely separate from PC.
- I was not convinced that FARC can maintain their drug trade under peace agreement.
- I was not convinced that 'Peace Colombia' is 'completely separate' Why? It seems that it certainly falls within the realm of PC's objectives.
- I was not convinced that the harms you talk about have enough impact to end the plan. Their scope is much more limited, and so the impact seems smaller.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

Aub MTU TR

PRO

Spkr	Curtis OS	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Amanda Oulinger Toney	26
1	Ethan Shry Reed-Johnson	26

CON

Spkr	Puyallup FB	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Valentino Flores	27
3	Paris Broadnax	28

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

Signature: [Signature] School: Peninsula

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both groups brought up valid arguments regarding the resolution. Overall, the con group's discussion of numbers outweighing lives saved because of Plan Columbia won the round while their numbers weren't proven to be a direct cause of Plan Columbia.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Newport SR	POINTS (0-30)
3	Casey Schoonover	26
1	Ravneet Ranu	26

CON

Spkr	Kingston GJ	POINTS (0-30)
2	Bella Galbiati	27
A	Denney James	28

Winner: Kingston School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: Peninsula

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The con team did well to keep the discussion within their established framework regarding cost/benefit of safety. The decrease of violent acts was never countered effectively, only with mentions of environmental impacts.

While the pro team had some valid points regarding the movement of the drug outflow, con did well enough to keep this focused on Columbia.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Eastlake DJ	POINTS (0-30)
1	Amber Duan	25
2	Jillian Jackson	28

CON

Spkr	Gig Harbor YD	POINTS (0-30)
2	Irvin Yi	26
1	Thomas Dean	25

Winner: EASTLAKE School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: RAISBECK AVIATION

USE OF SOURCES AND STATING OF ARGUMENT.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- DRUG TRAFFIC INCREASING
- HEALTH/PSYCHIC PROBLEMS
- 52.1% AGAINST PEACE TREATY
- CAUSING INTERNAL DISPLACEMENT
- EXTRA-JUDICIAL KILLINGS CIVILIAN TARGETING
- INEFFECTIVE AGAINST DRUGS
- GLYPHOSATE IS A CARCINOGEN

← IDPS EXAGGERATED BY PC
 VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS
 " OF DEMOCRACY

VERY CONCISE, STAYED ON POINTS
 GOOD USE OF DATA

- 1 GROWING EMPLOYMENT
- INCREASED LAW ENFORCEMENT
- ECONOMIC GROWTH

PEACE DEAL = VALIDATION
 AND MADE THIS POSSIBLE (?)

GLYPHOSATE GOT A CLEAN BILL OF HEALTH?

MUST LOOK AT BROADER PERSPECTIVE

- drop in homicides
- added that the gov. reconsidered after referendum failure

* cannot say one source is better than another?

LOOK TOWARDS FUTURE

- SPRING STOPPED 2015

← INCREASES STABILITY
 ECONOMIC BENEFITS

"WE HAVE DIRECTLY CORRELATED" -
 WHEN PRESS'D, BLURRED DEFINITIONS

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Bellevue MT	POINTS (0-30)
1	Aisha Magsi	26
2	Emily Tang	26

CON

Spkr	Peninsula WL	POINTS (0-30)
1	Nicholas Wiklund	26
2	Tony Lasley	27

Winner: PENINSULA School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: RAISBECK AVIATION

Comments & Reason for Decision: THE DISCUSSION WAS PRETTY EVEN, BUT PENINSULA WAS STRONGER DURING CROSSFIRE.

- NOT MAINTAINED DEMOCRACY
- HASN'T CUT DRUG TRADE
- HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS
- PLAN COLOMBIA IS CAUSING DEATHS.
- COCAINE DELIVER IS BECAUSE OF A LACK OF DEMAND
- COLOMBIAN MILITARY INTERVENTION
- WANT MORE HUMANITARIAN AID, RATHER THAN MILITARY
- DATA WAS PRETTY GOOD

ASKED FOR ECONOMIC IMPROVEMENT, 30% DROP IN POVERTY
 INCREASED INVESTMENT

- MORAL OBLIGATION
- ECONOMIC INTERESTS
- IMPROVED STABILITY
- ASKED A LEADING QUESTION THAT WAS SELF-DESTRUCTIVE
- DEFEATING FARL = FEWER KILLINGS
- TONY WAS GOOD AT ASKING SPECIFIC QUESTIONS
- LESS COCAINE = MORE SECURITY
- FARL IS THE CAUSE OF HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS
- REDUCTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL DEGRADATION
- COCAINE REDUCTION
 - LONG-TERM TRENDS
- SELF-INTEREST ECONOMICAL?

VERY NICE COMMENT ON THE EMBASSY SOURCE

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Gig Harbor AA	POINTS (0-30)
1	Finlay Adamson	28
2	Kier Adamson	29

CON

Spkr	Raisbeck Aviation US	POINTS (0-30)
2	John Ursino	27
1	Thomas Swanson	28

Winner: Gig Harbor School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Thury Foster School: Eastlake

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Con Pro
24/30

1. Continue plan
2. Increase cocaine production
3. help with reintegration
4. Strengthen relationship

Fare peace →

Environmental → 2015 Ended

Need \$ reintegrate

Crop substitution

Strengthen influence

Money going from military to peace

Pro Prep
1+

1. Widespread debt
2. Trained killers
3. Lack of peace
4. Environmental destruction

Positives outweigh negatives

Paramilitary violence
 Cocaine production increased
 Peace deal continue herbicide

Money

Evidence presented but not backed up. (Herbicide will continue)

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO		
Spkr	Team	POINTS (0-30)
2	Providence Classical Christian BH	27
1	Landon Butaud Olivia Hatcher	27

CON		
Spkr	Team	POINTS (0-30)
2	Raisbeck Aviation TB	28
1	Toshi Take Miles Bush	29

Winner: Raisbeck Aviation debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: Eastlake

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CON	PRO
<p>Prep-time 30sec</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Essential to FARC control Decrease violence How to do peace deal 	<p>Prep 45sec + 1:15</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Not much left to accomplish <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Counter narcotics not working - violence reduction Govt stronger Human rights violation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Body count incentive
<p>Did not answer pro argument that cocaine levels are increasing?</p>	<p>Countered Con arguments well</p>
<p>Flawed argument → Success or Failure Can't execute peace plan without \$</p>	<p>Good summary</p>
<p>Signed peace agreement may fail w/o US.</p>	<p>Human rights not countered</p>
<p>Farc</p>	

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Redmond MC	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Rishma Murugan	28
2	Khushi Chaudhari	29

CON

Spkr	Puyallup SJ	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Taylor Skaggs	26
1	Kiara Jones	25

Winner: Redmond MC debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: PCCS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Con - 1st

Pro - 2nd

- Avoid responding to arguments in Crossfire - save that for the speeches
- I think it would help to spend more time on the benefits to the US, especially since the original purpose was to combat drugs in the US.
- Make a stronger link between the decrease in cocaine ~~use~~ use in the US and Plan Colombia
- Make your questions briefer.
- Good, solid research
- Good, concise Final Focus

- Definitely practice your speeches + reading your case
- Excellent observation that Con's impacts often had nothing to do with drugs
- Make sure you understand what your opponents have to say before rebutting.
- Some solid reason - make sure you have evidence to back up all your claims.

Con wins

1. establishes framework of benefits vs harms.
2. shows more benefits than harms
3. very good answers (with evidence) to claims of Pro.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

2nd speaker

5
.15

^{Con}
PRO

Spkr	Puyallup KW	POINTS (0-30)
3	Sarah Kurpius	29
	Trixie Witham	30

^{pro}
CON

Spkr	Auburn Mountainview TR	POINTS (0-30)
4	Nickolas Toney	28.5
2	Katherine Reed-Johnson	28

Winner: Puyallup KW debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: GHHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both sides should signpost more in retering to other args. Especially with all of the subpoints. Clairity was better, still could use work.

I could not buy OO case in us links to PC.

REFD: Weighing under the FW of the con, Con wins the Debate: Based on Econ Benefits and saving lives overall.

Chadwell, Andrew

Room: 802
Flight 1 Start: 5:30 PM
Open Public Forum

2

~~Binnig, Zach~~

Gig Harbor

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

26
50

Spkr	Interlake HS JCD	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Amy Jiang	27
2	Monica Connell	
3	Archika Dogra	28

CON

2nd speak

Spkr	Providence Classical Christian BH	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Landon Butaud	28.5
2	Olivia Hatcher	29

.55
.43
.25

Winner: Providence Classical BH debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: GHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Clarity of CF Questions will help with flow.

- Never admit that a life without Rights is worth Living.

Both sides should work on keeping things clear for each side.

Messy round - gave it to CON because the final focused proved PC should still exist while PRO ranted about human rights and never impacted their case out.

PRO would have won if they had called out the contradictions from Con.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Raisbeck Aviation TB	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Toshi Take	27
1	Miles Bush	28

CON

Spkr	Puyallup BT	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Ruby Burton	26
2	Ave Trebilcock	27

Winner: Raisbeck Aviation TB debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature:  School: EASTLAKE H.S.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

MILES - Good reading of case. Work on making some eye-contact. Good job during crossfire. Good analysis during grand crossfire on Peace deal.

Ave - Practice reading case more smoothly & work on making some eye contact. Don't let Pro dominate crossfire, use the time to poke holes in Pro's case.

Toshi - Strong first speech. Good analysis of farmer evidence in neg. case. Good questioning on Peace deal during crossfire. You mumbled your road map. Speak up. Work on really crystalizing the voters you won. Second speech was a little rough.

Ruby - Good evidence on reduced crime & violence. Slow down so you can enunciate better. You also read a card without giving a citation. You need to use crossfire more effectively - ask questions.

I am voting Pro as they were stronger overall in supporting their case with solid evidence and good analysis. A number of Pro arguments were dropped by Con.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

CON
~~PRO~~

Spkr	Gig Harbor CP	POINTS (0-30)
4	Gabe Carlson	29
2	Daniel Piacitelli	28

CON ~~PRO~~

Spkr	Bellevue MT	POINTS (0-30)
3	Aisha Magsi	26
1	Emily Tang	27

Winner: Gig Harbor CP debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature:  School: EASTLAKE H.S.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Daniel - Be sure to check with judge before beginning. Wasn't quite ready. Strong questioning during crossfire.

Emily - Strong reading of case. Work on pronouncing names. You need to use crossfire more actively. You struggled a bit in your second speech explaining harms of peace agreement.

Gabe - Strong first speech. Good analysis on Aff. connection harms to Plan Columbia. Your definition argument was unclear. Good questioning during crossfire linking harms to P.C. Even stronger second speech.

Aisha - Good job arguing the peace deal. Strong evidence. Neg - Aid shock argument is unclear. Good job noticing new evidence by Neg. You struggled to explain connection between Farmers poverty and P.C. Also, you had :20 seconds left in final speech.

Overall, this was a good round. You are all strong debaters. I am voting CON as they were sufficiently able to poke holes in PRO case, especially with regards to the harms you claimed. Good work, everyone!

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON

Spkr	Gig Harbor MN	POINTS (0-30)
2	Jessa Moomaw	30
1	Emily Nold	29

CON PRO

Spkr	Redmond MC	POINTS (0-30)
2	Rishma Murugan	29
1	Khushi Chaudhari	30

Winner: Redmond MC debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: Helen Boyer School: NEWPORT

OUTSTANDING WORK BOTH SIDES.

Should end Plan Colombia

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CON 1st. Start end Plan Col.

Const.

- ① ↓ production
- ② ↓ crime rates
- ③ AID in place
 - US AID - effects on poor - FARC - Col govt
 - deadly explosives - US has invested \$
 - land mines claim lives

CON AFF
 must prove that Plan Colombia has been unsuccessful.

- ① unsuccessful in reducing growth smuggling, production, use hurts enviro.
 - Good citation Noam Chomsky
- ② fail to encounter insurgent violence.
 - Good cite to Wash Post.
 - Fragments left wing orgs
- ③ human RTS violations
 - a. sexual violence - US
 - b. incentivize murder 6/15
 - c. killing of civilians → false positives

Benefits from plan Colombia
growth decreased overall
 env'l issues ↑
 power vacuum
 re 3a > landmines outweigh

Production of area has increased. - 4/20
 * Even if production did go down, food production goes down.
 Dre 3a - US soldier immunity. the US soldiers blame FARC.

Colombian soldiers do these things
 on going project → more mines to uncover.

VOTERS - Limit scope too much. 2000-14 - extended time re evidence -
 • 2003-07 Human RTS Violes
 NOT unique
 - land mines are ≠ human RTS & they are deaths. So weight - yes - but meeting's argu - NO.

Price of cocaine has gone ↓
 Stability → NOT TRUE
 FARC gets 5 seats.
 social unrest - FARC in govt
 people who have v. RTS.
 Immunity to US soldiers.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

contends effective plan.

Contend plan ineffective.
APP Resolved US spend Plan Colombia

Spkr	Kingston HV	POINTS (0-30)
2	Seth Hillsberry	29
1	Hayden Victory	28

Spkr	Peninsula TR	POINTS (0-30)
2	Emma Taylor	30
1	Lauren Russell	29

Winner: Peninsula TR debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: Helen Boyer School: Newport 1899-2015

Comments & Reason for Decision:

layd goal. Reduce pro d'n - met ↑ Peace.
Define - good.
 CONT: WASTE TAX DOLLARS \$10B:
 • COCA ↑ production increased.
 • Hum RTS viol's.
 • JOBS - lost
 • It will end, at some time →
 Hayden's evidence is good. Work on smoothness. You know this! Try to stand still.
 Good Q on X fine re why does oil matter?
 → *persuade factor tip*
 → *Framework: "should"*
 → *does not need to be immed'ly ended. re production of coca - fact rights! hard to win.*
 • impact → lives lost.
 • Correlation only - w/ rebel activity.
 • jobs lost - in coca industry? why do we care about protecting those jobs?
 → *system FRANK*
 → *voter coca decreased - but they did.*
 • military bases/hum viol's - not unique
 • plan Col will end some day -
 → *is a failure. (admit)*
 → *Failure. Costing \$, Jobs lost. correlation, not causation.*

Framework: moral obligation.
ended it would have Col & U.S.
↓ coca decrease.
 The Economist - good source + benefit to environment - oil spills
 50% drop in homicide
 ↓ kidnapping 88% terrorism 7x20
 GDP x 4 → Col. *(WIN) b/c this in structure (+)*
 Peace deal b/t FARC & U.S.
 • destabiliz'n & deaths. *no evid.*
 US oil production supported + Business Insider +
 Good know: stability of govt/col.
 Emma 1999-2015 ↓ decrease in production, coca (+)
 (only last 2 yrs - true data).
 Human RTS viol's - not unique & not just Plan Col. / criminal trials. (+)
 → *Good catch (+)*
 Job training programs.
 U.N. comprehensive study. ↓ coca prod. + env'el impact on Rain Forest.
 → *can't end plan Col b/c of oil imports.*
 Job growth - *the non coca* (+)
 sexual assaults - outweighed by crime increase (+)
 Long slow ↓. Brook's Inst. (+)
 Coca *(WIN) on weight of reduction both crime & JOB TRAINING*

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

Con
~~Pro~~

Spkr	Puyallup BM	POINTS (0-30)
2	Rimpal Bajwa	29
1	McKenzie Mestas	27

Pro
~~Con~~

Spkr	Annie Wright HB	POINTS (0-30)
21	Jin Huang	27
2	Caitlyn Bell	26

Winner: Puyallup BM debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Cesly Lam School: Redmond.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Jin - too fast, good eyecontact, you speak clearly but have many mispronunciations. This is very distracting. Talking during opponents prep time is rude.

Caitlyn - you did not ask any questions during 1st speaker questioning. Nice final focus, however you did not recap any holes in Con's case. and you had time remaining please do not giggle during opponents prep

Your team does not make very good use of questioning and Grandcross. Also you leave a lot of speaking time unused during constructive and rebuttal.

Mackenzie - No eye contact. = Nice case. very organized.

You could slow down a bit. If opponents do not have an answer about how the Columbian govt has grown dependent don't keep asking the question.

Rimpal - good eyecontact, you are a very good speaker however very fast. You think quickly on your feet, had a very concise final focus.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Puyallup SJ	POINTS (0-30)
2	Taylor Skaggs	25
1	Kiara Jones	26

CON

Spkr	Eastlake MB	POINTS (0-30)
1	Casey Mauck	28
2	Prateek Bhaumik	29

Winner: Eastlake MB School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Lesty Lam School: Redmond

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Casey - too fast, No eye contact, very organized case, well prepared. with answers to probable line of questioning :) great job.
~~Questioning~~ Questioning was very good!
- good eye contact in your second speech.

Prateek - very prepared for rebuttal, very organized, & convincing. good questioning during Grand cross.
Summary was clear, concise and persuasive. Well done.

Kiara - Should familiarize yourself w/ the case so you don't just bend over and read. Questioning needs to be more concise, find evidence that supports. FARC is a detriment and cannot be trusted.
work on stating a clear conclusion at the end of your speech.

Taylor. Not prepared for rebuttal. good questions though.
familiarize yourself w/ current talks of peace & ceasefire.
Your final speech should be a final focus, clear, full sentences should be used. not "um". Please take your hands off your ~~hips~~ hips. I couldn't flow your las speech at all.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON

Spkr	Raisbeck Aviation US	POINTS (0-30)
3	John Ursino	28
1	Thomas Swanson	24

CON PRO

Spkr	Eastlake DJ	POINTS (0-30)
2	Amber Duan	26
4	Jillian Jackson	28

Winner: Avidtron US debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: [Signature] School: Riverside

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Try not to face one another in CX

:45 seconds
Short on your refutation *

+ Great Final focus!!

I voted on primarily, voted on the points
the con brought on how the US disarmed
FARC and has made it less of an issue
as well as the cons ability to take down
the ~~terrorism~~ terrorism arg.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Peninsula WL	POINTS (0-30)
2	Nicholas Wiklund	26
34	Tony Lasley	28

CON

Spkr	Puyallup MR	POINTS (0-30)
31	Madi Martin	29
34	CJ Robinson	30

Winner: Puyallup MR School/Team debating on the con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: Madison Furber School: Auburn Riverside

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- ~~True~~ Constructive was too fast and it was 30 sec short

: Good refutation, just watch time

- Do not make blanket statements w/o evidence

+ Really well constructed refutation!! :)

+ Really good summary!!

+ OVERALL very well constructed speeches

~~Really appreciate the~~

+ Really liked the Peace Columbia arg

Overall, con was able to refute all of the pro arguments. Overall win on HR & Econ

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Gig Harbor YD	POINTS (0-30)
2	Irvin Yi	28.6
1	Thomas Dean	28.5

CON

Spkr	Puyallup BL	POINTS (0-30)
2	Grace Burchett	28.3
1	Raymond Lappin	28.4

Winner: Puyallup debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? yes

Signature: [Signature] School: UW/Puyallup

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro
 Use your time!
 Correlation vs causation so then do it yourself
 w/ other prices
 offensive is weak, defense great
 Some ex of's every time.
 Balloon effect - show me relevant data, other
 come increases, etc.
 Use your time

Con
 Use your time!
 Assert yourself. speaker 1 in Cx
 "could you elaborate on balloon effect" & get something done in Cx!

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Kingston GJ	POINTS (0-30)
1	Bella Galbiati	28.1
2	Denney James	28.3

CON

Spkr	Gig Harbor AA	POINTS (0-30)
1	Finlay Adamson	28.7
2	Kier Adamson	28.9

Winner: Gig Harbor AA School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: [Signature] School: University of Washington/Reynolds

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Use your whole time!
 "completely end" → you dropped this
 Ask harder on correlation/causation
 Let them answer

answer their questions!
 winning on all but correlation vs causation
 line by line
 Avoided the "have to end" definition; this was some place you could have lost if they'd gone into it, figure out non blippy answers

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Gig Harbor FD	POINTS (0-30)
3	Anna Frisk	30
1	Olivia DuPuy	28

CON

Spkr	Newport CS	POINTS (0-30)
4	Evelyn Chen	30
2	Maya Srikanth	28

Winner: Gig Harbor School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: _____ School: Annie Wright

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Good presentation skills
 - Eye contact
 - Paced speaking
 - Inflection
- At times a little aggressive/emotional
- Good framework
- Lots of points of argument
- Could use more statistics and counterfactuals

- Very organized
- Statistically rich
- Spoke faster than could sometimes be followed.
- Organized rebuttals

Main: Quality of presentation and ability to follow argument was stronger. Very close debate & hard to call.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Newport CQ	POINTS (0-30)
1	Selma Chihab	26
3	Sarah Quinn	28

CON

Spkr	Gig Harbor GS	POINTS (0-30)
4	Samantha Griffith	29
2	Sarah Sisney	28

Winner: Gig Harbor GS debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Gina Su School: PCCS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This was a very close debate. Good reasoning and support on both sides. Pro team didn't directly refute the false positive claim made by the con team, that the criminal behavior ~~was~~ was exaggerated. Con team had a broader concept of PC's purpose, not just about cocaine, but also about infrastructure, and that planting a certain amount of seedlings doesn't necessarily have results in selling, buying, etc. CON team looked more at the overall benefit of PC and had a clearer picture of what was unique/not unique to PC and/or Columbia

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO

Spkr	Puyallup FB	POINTS (0-30)
2	Valentino Flores	27
4	Paris Broadnax	28

CON

Spkr	Gig Harbor KH	POINTS (0-30)
3	Steven Kotanksy	30
1	Spencer Hannan	29

Winner: Gig Harbor School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: _____ School: Annie Wright

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Good selection of evidence
- Having presentation
- Did not adapt well to counter arguments, just restating previous arguments.

- Organized
- Strong speaking skills
- Big picture comparisons paired with relevant facts.
- Adjusted well to counter other teams evidence.

Main: Organization, fluidity and adaptability of presentation / argument. Explained counter arguments clearly and well.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Puyallup SJ	POINTS (0-30)
3	Taylor Skaggs	27
1	Kiara Jones	27

Spkr	Peninsula SW	POINTS (0-30)
4	Jacob Settle	30
2	Alex Williams	30

Winner: Peninsula SW debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Diana Chinea School: Newport HS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~Peninsula~~ Puyallup had good arguments. Please keep this up and gather additional evidence. Have confidence in your abilities, and stand tall.

Peninsula - strong speeches, interesting + well presented evidence. Clear arguments.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Puyallup BL	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Grace Burchett	30
2	Raymond Lappin	29

Spkr	Gig Harbor KH	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Steven Kotanksy	30
1	Spencer Hannan	29

Winner: Gig Harbor School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Diana Chinea School: Newport HS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This was a close call but Gig Harbor's evidence was stronger in the end.

Strong speeches by Puyallup by both debaters.

Rebuttals were strong by Gig Harbor + both debaters were very comfortable with evidence

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Bellevue MT	POINTS (0-30)
1	Aisha Magsi	29
3	Emily Tang	29

Spkr	Interlake HS JCD	POINTS (0-30)
2	Amy Jiang	29
	Monica Connell	
4	Archika Dogra	29

Winner: Bellevue School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Thomas Bacon School: Puyallup

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aisha: Bold strategy with your case. Just make sure you and your partner are fully on the same page.

Emily: good rebuttal and CF

Amy: good Summary

Archika: humanitarian aid is not ONLY needed when there are human rights violations.

RFD: Can win based on the fact that their impacts are more recent and this problem can be solved. They also win the flow.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Eastlake MB	POINTS (0-30)
1	Casey Mauck	30
3	Prateek Bhaumik	29

Spkr	Gig Harbor FD	POINTS (0-30)
4	Anna Frisk	28
2	Olivia DuPuy	29

Winner: EastLake School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Thomas Bacon School: Puyallup

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Casey: good job in CF. when you trap your opponent, get your answer and move on, don't let them ramble and waste time.

Switch speaker order maybe?

Prateek: good arguments in rebuttal, asking them to prove it. But tell me in your speech when they don't! win that dropped argument!

Olivia: make sure to access your impacts.

Anna: make sure you check all points on flow I have like 3 missing spots on mine after your rebuttal.

RFD: Close call!

I think Eastlake debated very well and Casey flat out ran CF. Even though the three main arguments could've been claimed they weren't so I have to give the win to con on default by lack of evidence on pro and dropped arguments. Pro couldn't prove deaths were U.S. caused and dropped C3 which stated terror was combated and relations were vital and good.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Peninsula TR	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Emma Taylor	28
4	Lauren Russell	30

Spkr	Providence Classical Christian BH	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Landon Butaud	28
1	Olivia Hatcher	29

Winner: Peninsula TR School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: Charles Rusk School: Mt. Rainier

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This debate came down to the peace being made with Plan Colombia. I felt the Con had the stronger initial Plan, but were unable to provide evidence to back up some of their claims when pressed. The Aff won with the argument about U.S. involvement being the reason for a continued war that was backed up with evidence. The Neg did not seem to be ready for this and it carried to PRO.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Puyallup FB	POINTS (0-30)
1	Valentino Flores	27
2	Paris Broadnax	29

Spkr	Raisbeck Aviation TB	POINTS (0-30)
2	Toshi Take	29
1	Miles Bush	28

Winner: Raisbeck Aviation debating on the pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: W. Chmil School: AMHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Puyallup - Great speakers. You had a lot of great facts but failed/lacked to tie them to your argument. Work on specifically tying your points to why we need to keep the plan.

Paris - Excellent job during cross fire. Loved how passionate you were.

Raisbeck Aviation - Excellent job about explaining its original intent and how there is no use for it. You guys had great questions and good job pointing out the flaws in your opponents argument. Good job tying everything specifically to why you're Pro.

Both of the teams worked well together and supported their own partners.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Puyallup KW	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Sarah Kurpius	26
1	Trixie Witham	27

Spkr	Newport CS	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Evelyn Chen	28
1	Maya Srikanth	29

Winner: Newport School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: V. Chmil School: AMHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Puyallup - Great stage presence - You guys were very comfortable and worked well as a team. Raised great points but didn't have many questions during crossfire. Your summary failed to persuade me. Make it a bit stronger.

Newport - Spike fast but clear. Lots of great content. Solid statistics. Excellent questions during crossfire. Every point that was used against you, you destroyed it during crossfire. Very impressive.

Awesome job to both teams!

Chadwell, Andrea

~~Hyink, Joseph~~

~~Providence Classical Christian~~

Gig Harbor

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	POINTS (0 - 30)
Puyallup BT	
Ruby Burton	29
Ave Trebilcock	28.5

2nd

Spkr	POINTS (0 - 30)
Peninsula WL	
Nicholas Wiklund	28
Tony Lasley	27.5

Prep
.48
1.12

Prep
.28
.15
1.17

Winner: Puyallup BT School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: GHHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

try and organization cards better. I'm tired.

- You need to explain your 3rd Contention better in case - rather than 2nd crossfire.
- The arg that "its natural change" is iffy.

FO I voted con, PRO did not fulfill the burden of proving that all of PC should be ended.

Chadwell, Andrew

Room: 807
Flight 1 Start: 7:30 PM
Open Public Forum

3

~~Hyink, Joseph~~

~~Providence Classical Christian~~

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Gig Harbor

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

2nd speaker (Circle One)

PRO CON

.30

Spkr	Kingston GJ	POINTS (0-30)
1	Bella Galbiati	26
3	Denney James	27

Spkr	Eastlake DJ	POINTS (0-30)
2	Amber Duan	29
4	Jillian Jackson	28

.35
.25

Winner: Eastlake DJ debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: _____ School: GHHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Read whole case in constructive, + FW. Provide more impact on Columbian Collapse. Link to reconstruction efforts after Peace Deal.

Nice Job.

Good Point on US Govt. Sources Being Biased.

RFD: Voted PRO, showed clear understanding of Topic - Outweighed Con's Govt studies on Balance.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Puyallup MR	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Madi Martin	37
3	CJ Robinson	38

Spkr	Gig Harbor CP	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Gabe Carlson	38
2	Daniel Piacitelli	38

Winner: Gig Harbor School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: Peninsula

Comments & Reason for Decision:

In direct reference to the established framework, con didn't completely convince me that the benefits outweighed the cost. This goes directly to the main point of contention in this round regarding the balloon effect. If the established purpose of Plan Columbia as established in round was to focus on drugs and peace/military, the outflow of those issues to Mexico, Peru, and Bolivia can therefore rule Plan Columbia's purpose unsolved on a more global scale. Narrowing the scope of these goals to Columbia would limit this argument, but was not established in round.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Gig Harbor GS	POINTS (0-30)
4	Samantha Griffith	38
2	Sarah Sisney	37

Spkr	Redmond MC	POINTS (0-30)
1	Rishma Murugan	37
3	Khushi Chaudhari	37

Winner: Gig Harbor School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: K Hutcheson School: Peninsula

Comments & Reason for Decision:

While both teams stuck to the framework of cost benefits, Pro effectively stressed the long-term harms. Despite FARC gaining seats in the Colombian govt and rendering/reducing that guerrilla group's human rights violations, not enough was supported by con in connection to those victims that may be filled in their absence.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Raisbeck Aviation US	POINTS (0-30)
3	John Ursino	29
1	Thomas Swanson	26

Spkr	Kingston HV	POINTS (0-30)
4	Seth Hillsberry	28
2	Hayden Victory	26

Winner: Aviation School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: _____ School: Peninsula HS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Kingston -> Your lengthy definition of 'should' left me more muddled than illuminated and isn't necessary for me to understand your third contention.

-> Assume that your judge understands causation and correlation

-> Awesome attack on humanitarian aid, but they argued budgeting vs. mission quite well

Aviation -> I agreed w/ your assessment that "should" means "ought to"

-> Great assessment and case for continued US presence despite peace deals in working

Really a fun debate to listen to

A lot of your discussion came down to humanitarian aid and its relevancy, with goals/mission being in contradiction to actual US budget

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Newport CQ	POINTS (0-30)
1	Selma Chihab	27
3	Sarah Quinn	30

Spkr	Gig Harbor YD	POINTS (0-30)
4	Irvin Yi	28
2	Thomas Dean	28

Winner: Newport School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: _____ School: Peninsula HS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Newport → AS succinct, forceful and convincing a rebuttal as I have heard
Well done
 → Newport, your understanding of Plan-C was flat-out awesome
 → Enjoyed hearing evidence about the aerosols

GHHS → The case 'boiling down' to the Balloon Effect forces you to convince me that if cocaine in US doesn't go down in price, the whole thing is a wash and we should not fund Plan-C. That's a tough line.
 → Though con never argued against your first contention, winning on 2 and 3 made it a non issue and thus in line w/ US interests

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

A

Spkr	Puyallup BM	POINTS (0-30)
3	Rimpal Bajwa	28
1	McKenzie Mestas	27

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

B

Spkr	Gig Harbor MN	POINTS (0-30)
2	Jessa Moomaw	27.5
4	Emily Nold	30

Winner: Gig Harbor MN School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: _____ School: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

McKenzie - you first point is that it is injuri economy? K.M.J. is there data to show these results from P.C.

Jessa - good, well developed - the ball is still argument is intriguing

D - second round - Early on explanation of evidence, more structured, well paced, well clear than Rimpal

D by Pro's argument that econ. impact already occurred. Not as cogently as Cicco predicted as D for the better effort - it's not theoretical, and it's genuine + the point of impact US taxpayer.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

A

Spkr	Annie Wright HB	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Jin Huang	25
1	Caitlyn Bell	25

B

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Gig Harbor AA	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Finlay Adamson	30
2	Kier Adamson	29

Winner: Gig Harbor AA School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: J. Guttormsen School: Curtis

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Caitlyn use all your time
 Kin - you are arguing that decrease in cocaine use was resulting
 from ↓ in demand, not supply, ∴ P.C. must?
 maybe clarify a bit more up front

Jin → use all your time, take your opponents to task and
 address their contentions

Finley - I like that you are looking at
 the impact on American taxpayers.
 I wish, in the admission that other drugs are
 replacing cocaine which more explains the ↓ in
 cocaine use with developing

PRO shows that the \$\$\$ for Plan Colombia can be
 better allocated domestically, Columbia can handle
 the plan better, and Plan Colombia leaves US soft
 power in region.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO **CON** (Circle One) (Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Puyallup BM	POINTS (0-30)
4	Rimpal Bajwa	27.5
2	McKenzie Mestas	27

Spkr	Redmond MC	POINTS (0-30)
1	Rishma Murugan	29.5
3	Khushi Chaudhari	30

Winner: Redmond MC debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature] School: Peninsula HS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I gave this round to the con because they successfully debated the points about the overall benefits to both the Col. econ & the benefits the U.S. see's (which the pro failed to refute). The con also won the point concerning drug production. I will say that the pro won the point concerning ~~far~~ FARC b/c the con did not clearly say why we still need P.C. if FARC is weakened.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Puyallup BT	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Ruby Burton	27
1	Ave Trebilcock	26

Spkr	Gig Harbor MN	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Jessa Moomaw	30
4	Emily Nold	29.5

Winner: Gig Harbor MN debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature] School: Peninsula

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I gave this round to the pro because of their points about colombias economy & investment into PC as well as the cons inability to provide a direct link between the ~~benefits~~ of the good things happening in colombia & P.C. itself. and ~~overall~~ throughout the entire debate the pro posed several questions & brought up many points that the con simply could not answer.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

~~PRO~~ CON
 (Circle One)

HIGH SPEAKS FOR ALL!!
 (Circle One) PRO ~~CON~~

Spkr	Peninsula SW	POINTS (0-30)
3	Jacob Settle	30
1	Alex Williams	30

Spkr	Gig Harbor GS	POINTS (0-30)
4	Samantha Griffith	30
2	Sarah Sisney	29

Winner: Pen SW School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: Madison Thibodeau School: Aub. Riv.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- + great eye contact
- + great Obama quote
- try not to lean on chair
- + Good job hitting all points in your refutation
- Don't buy continuation arg

- 20 sec short constructive
- try not to lean on chair
- Cite "PDF" source
- + great refutation
- try not to say "I don't know"
- Don't buy rape victims arg
- + Good Americanism card!

GREAT CX!!!

Did not vote on the continuation arg. Felt like it was a little weak. That being said, I voted con based on the CBA framework. The benefits of P.C. far outweigh in this round.

GREAT ROUND!!!

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

spkr	Raisbeck Aviation TB	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Toshi Take	29
2	Miles Bush	20

spkr	Gig Harbor AA	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Finlay Adamson	29
1	Kier Adamson	29

Winner: Avi TB School/Team debating on the con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? yes

Signature: Madison Sullivan School: Aub. Riv.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Constructive was a lil short
↳ try and add more to case

- try not to waste too much
time telling me what the opposition
is "going to say"
↳ tell me more about why I
should buy your arg's!!

Both teams are very good
@ speaking!!

1 Ultimately voted for con because, although columbia
can handle the \$\$\$ aspect, they are having trouble
w/ fighting violence.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Gig Harbor FD	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Anna Frisk	28
1	Olivia DuPuy	28

Spkr	Newport CQ	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Selma Chihab	27
4	Sarah Quinn	27

Winner: GIGHARBOR FD debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: [Signature] School: EASTLAKE H.S.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Olivia - Strong reading of Con case. Good questioning during crossfire. Second speech was good, but started slow, which made you have to speed up towards the end. Keep eye on time.

Anna - Very good job on addressing all points on Pro case. Very clear. Strong questions on civil war - P.C. death links. Very good final focus - very clear explanation of voters. Framework argument a bit unclear.

Selma - strong reading of Pro case - clear voice, good eye contact. Questions during crossfire connecting harms to P.C. were unclear.

Sarah - Good job addressing Con arguments - but you were all over the flow. Organize your speech down the flow. Final focus was a bit muddy. Be sure to be really clear balancing benefits vs. harms. This wasn't very clearly done.

In the end I am voting CON as they were better able to argue benefits of Plan Columbia as outweighing harms.

Room: 728
Flight 2 Start: 9:00 AM
Open Public Forum

4

Bohannon, Todd
~~Penev, Miglena~~

Eastlake

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Puyallup FB	POINTS (0-30)
1	Valentino Flores	24
3	Paris Broadnax	28

Spkr	Bellevue MT	POINTS (0-30)
2	Aisha Magsi	27
4	Emily Tang	27

Winner: Bellevue MT debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: EASTLAKE H.S.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Valentino - Please speak up and work on making eye contact. Good questioning during crossfire re: Peace deal. Use some emphasis & inflection in speaking. You are a bit monotone.

Paris - Good analysis on aerial vs. manual spraying. Good questioning during crossfire. Good point on correlation b/w P.C. and ↓ in violence. You dominated grand crossfire. Solid final focus. Good job crystalizing arguments!

Aisha - Good reading of your case - but work on making some eye contact. Second speech was rough - analysis weak on humanitarian aid.

Emily - Con framework stands - good job pointing this out. Strong evidence from Brookings Institute. Questioning during crossfire was confusing. Your final focus was ok - but ~~the~~ weighing benefits vs. detriments of P.C. was weak. You want to explain why the neg. impacts outweigh Pro's claimed benefit.

Good debate, everyone. Both teams need to work on balancing benefits vs. harms. In end, Paris was better able to show harms of P.C., so I vote **PRO** - but this was a very close round!

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

1.5 minutes
~~14 seconds used~~
1 min remain

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Auburn Mountainview TR	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Nickolas Toney	26
2	Katherine Reed-Johnson	27

Spkr	Newport CS	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Evelyn Chen	29
1	Maya Srikanth	28

Winner: Newport CS School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: Gig Harbor

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both teams spoke very well. Very respectful.

Both teams should work to not get bogged down in semantics
Both teams need to spend more time tying impacts back to the resolution. The pro needs to remember to use all of their speaking time.

This round I chose to vote for Con because they carried more impactful arguments to the end of the round. Pro needed to do a better job of showing the negative impacts of PC rather than focusing so much on refutation. The pro argument about IDP, was especially weak in that they had 0 evidence PC was responsible.

Resolved: The United States Should end Plan Colombia

Room: 802
Flight 1 Start: 9:00 AM
Open Public Forum

4

Binnig, Zach

Gig Harbor

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

1:5 min
1:15 sec

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Puyallup KW	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Sarah Kurpius	29
1	Trixie Witham	30

Spkr	Peninsula WL	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Nicholas Wiklund	27
4	Tony Lasley	28

Winner: Puyallup KW School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: Gig Harbor

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both teams could do a better job of tying Impacts to plan Colombia itself rather than expecting the Judge to connect the dots for them. Both teams were excellent speakers and were very respectful. Crossfires were very topical.

I chose to vote for Con this round because they did a better job of proving their impacts were directly related to plan Colombia. The pro's resolution analysis put an unnecessary burden on the con. The pro is still responsible to show how PC has a negative impact not just that it provides no positive

Katerina Zhuravel

Room: 726
Flight 1 Start: 9:00 AM
Open Public Forum

4

Hillard, Lauren

Gig Harbor

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

spkr	Providence Classical Christian BH	POINTS (0-30)
4	Landon Butaud	29
2	Olivia Hatcher	28

spkr	Annie Wright HB	POINTS (0-30)
3	Jin Huang	27
1	Caitlyn Bell	27

Winner: Providence Classical Christian School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: [Signature] School: Auburn Riverside

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The United States should end plan Columbia: Resolution

Points that won me over to PRO:

- Impacts → cost & Colum dependability
- Really drilled those in so GOOD JOB!
- Never end col plan, already spent \$8 bill & 15 yrs but still unstable
- Drug problem didn't really decrease

These impacts won over con's C#2 & #3

Con should have expanded on C#1 Terrorism & used FARC more!

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC
 QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

Plan Col. ^{US s/end} ~~US s/end~~

PRO	CON (Circle One)	POINTS (0-30)	PRO	CON (Circle One)	POINTS (0-30)
3	Gig Harbor KH	30	4	Eastlake MB	30
1	Steven Kotanksy	30	2	Casey Mauck	30
	Spencer Hannan	30		Prateek Bhaumik	30

Winner: Eastlake debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: Helen A Boyer School: Newport

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Spencer
 Plan - ALT/DIFF strategies
 + Brookings Inst.: drug production ↓ but worldwide? in other source.
 ② Human Rts vbls ↓.
 ③ pushed to negot'v table.
 + Atlantic source good
 ③ us AIP needed for future need to protect future lives mines. 1/2 children victims
 + Spencer - hesitation -
 + Stevens good knowledge of case w/ overall coca production.
 + no impact re
 + PAPC giving up COCA 2 weapons. good research.
 UN HWO - Fumigation not cancerous.
 + Stevens Landmines - people needed to remove Focus on U.S. interests.
 + Spencer Summ overall production going down (dispute) deal will not go through otherwise.
 + Stevens Plan Col needed for future. "TIP" - say "fewer resources" on said "less resources"
 + Prateek - coca production is just moving. extra judicial killings → Landmine removed not p/o plan.
 + Casey - causation Casey - 5000 energy why no longer need why plan s/stay.
 + Casey definition: PLAN was to combat drugs & contribute to Peace - Amnesty Intl.
 + CONTRIBS to rid in other parts of world.
 + NOT NEEDED - landmines ≠ Peace DID CONTRIB to ↓ production & BUT - won't it go up again?
 + Casey - great case knowledge. Strong argu's.
 + Prateek - thoughtfull - good
 + Casey - Fumigation - cancer, rashes. displaced of people
 + Casey - false positive scandal: illegal under Leaky law
 + Casey - DRUGS PROD'N!
 + Casey - FIN'L AID depended on deaths.
 + Casey - FACT ~~cost~~ ~~and~~ ~~cost~~ can be better
 + Casey - "catching" **CLOSE DEBATE** if beneficial than harmful from past
 + Casey - Q - do you know demands of PAPC in peace treaty? Produce CARD with peace treaty
 + Casey - BOTH → Produce CARD with peace treaty
 + Casey - CONTRIBS to rid in other parts of world.
 + Casey - NOT NEEDED - landmines ≠ Peace
 + Casey - DID CONTRIB to ↓ production &
 + Casey - BUT - won't it go up again?
 + Casey - great case knowledge. Strong argu's.
 + Prateek - coca production is just moving. extra judicial killings → Landmine removed not p/o plan.
 + Casey - causation Casey - 5000 energy why no longer need why plan s/stay.
 + Casey - CONTRIBS to rid in other parts of world.
 + Casey - NOT NEEDED - landmines ≠ Peace
 + Casey - DID CONTRIB to ↓ production &
 + Casey - BUT - won't it go up again?
 + Casey - great case knowledge. Strong argu's.
 + Prateek - coca production is just moving. extra judicial killings → Landmine removed not p/o plan.
 + Casey - causation Casey - 5000 energy why no longer need why plan s/stay.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC
 QUALIFIER

U.S. S/End Plan Col. 2d

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

Plan Col S/B cont'd 1st

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Gig Harbor CP	POINTS (0-30)	Spkr	Eastlake DJ	POINTS (0-30)
2-4	Gabe Carlson	29	1-1	Amber Duan	30
2-2	Daniel Piacitelli	30	1-3	Jillian Jackson	30

Winner: Eastlake DJ debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? yes no

Signature: Helen Boyer School: Newport

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Inherent final drawbacks.

Cont 1

Drug WAR BAD.
 Traffickers will find alt routes.

Good knowledge of your case - not just reading.
 Plan not solving goal = waste \$.

Cont 2 US funds human rights - false reporting, abuses

impact - innocents murdered.
 Good sources: impunity in both Col soldiers & US.

Soft power good sign
 Huffington Post - NOT a good source Do not use

Links: abuses by us

Cross - good why balloon effect makes production ants

Gabe Govt role & serve people. Must prove - beneficial to U.S.

correlation not causation re production.
 No link to "may make users quit"
 Good Q - how does US benefit from Col & can grow?

Human rights abuses b
 Balloon effect extends.
 Advocating
 Plan - not counterplan

VERY CLOSE DEBATE / W/TO Eastlake on weight and need for continuance of aid as strategy +

Amber
 Objective: contingency
 weigh on safety of citizens.
 good stats on ↓ of income.
 Nice use of rhetorical Q.
 • peace agmts - us must be id
 cur 2.
 illicit drug use.
 good stats & good authorities
 x 3 of GDP.

Amber - Cross - good ability to support why us needs to be there.

good sign
 Plan Col must be ended - not just part of it

Jillian
 Re production - must have data - AND you give +
 - no link b/t Plan Col & sexual violence
 → becomes a pt for con
 - b/c it preexisted.

crime overall dropped in 6 yrs.
 50% vote - uses it for con - b/c shows need for U.S.
 Higher school enrollment.

Jillian cross - good insightful Qs.
Amber - Good summary.

GRAND CROSS - good evild on re conciliation.

Gabe - good sticking to no counterplan.
Grand cross - good Q re why not approved by citizens?

114
3
4/4
3
2/2
3
2/2

Room: 804
Flight 1 Start: 9:00 AM
Open Public Forum

4

Griffith, Jennifer

Gig Harbor

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One) ^{Pro} 2nd

Spkr	Puyallup MR	POINTS (0-30)
	Madi Martin 1 st	28
	CJ Robinson 2 nd	29

CON 1st (Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Raisbeck Aviation US	POINTS (0-30)
	John Ursino 2 nd	25
	Thomas Swanson 1 st	26

prep used: 30 + 1.30

prep used: 1.55

Winner: Puyallup MR School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: GHHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

madi: engaging speaker. nice use of tone, inflection and gestures. Controlled cross well, clarified answers to own team's benefit

Thomas well spoken, well organized & clear map. Beware of coaching/talking to partner too much / too loudly during final focus. Persistent, which is good. Additional facts when persisting would be more effec

CJ: handled cross well. pushed for specifics that benefited team's argument. strong speaking voice. mapped final focus very effectively by being concise & reiterating key facts / sources

John: good ^{pointed} questions in cross. Responses to opponents questions or rebuttles not as strong. Good speaker, clear, easy to understand

Both PRO & CON made compelling arguments about the benefits & or success of Plan Columbia retrospectively. However, PRO was more convincing that the altered focus of Peace Columbia is a better path forward and con was not as effective in arguing that Plan Columbia & Peace Columbia were the ~~same~~ essentially the same thing

Well presented, engaging debate by both sides! Nicely done!

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO **CON** (Circle One) 1st

Spkr	Puyallup BL	POINTS (0-30)
2nd	Grace Burchett	28
1st	Raymond Lappin	27

prep used: 40+1m

2nd (Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Peninsula TR	POINTS (0-30)
2nd	Emma Taylor	28
1st	Lauren Russell	26

prep used: 30+15

Winner: Puyallup BL School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: GHHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Lauren: personable, likeable speaker
argument/case well mapped.
would like to see more engaged
in final focus

Grace: nicely used new evidence to
rebut opponents arguments. well
organize, easy to follow argument.
assertive in cross

Raymond: Framed argument well
good deconstruction of opponents facts by
questioning of age/relevance. Engaging
speaker

Emma: strong speaker. Used facts well
to rebut opponents arguments. Handled
opponents cross questions well, pressed for
specific evidence to deconstruct opponent
argument

PRO & CON presented different, conflicting framework for the resolution which ultimately decided the debate. CON was more convincing that their frame of tied most closely to the resolution. As a result, they were more effective arguing the benefits of continuing plan Columbia given the reduction of coca/cocaine production in Columbia specifically.

Nicely job by both teams!

Chadwell, Andrew

Room: 200
Flight 1 Start: 9:00 AM
Open Public Forum

4

Moutafov, Iskra

Eastlake

Gig Harbor

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

rep
1.00

PRO CON (Circle One) 2nd spk

Spkr	Team	POINTS (0-30)
	Puyallup SJ	
	Taylor Skaggs	27
	Kiara Jones	27.5

1st spk (Circle One) PRO CON Prep 1.02

Spkr	Team	POINTS (0-30)
	Kingston HV	
	Seth Hillsberry	26
	Hayden Victory	26.5

Winner: Puyallup SJ debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: GHHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both sides need to work on clarity and flow of Constructives.

• Call them out for FW abuse.

• Also try not to jump around as much in Rebuttal.

Final Focus - Give me Voters

• "Should" double def - FW. Pick One.

• PC definition is abusive to the Con. Not working for me.

• FARC/Peace accords are critical to this topic.

• 3rd Contention is irrelevant.

RFD: Gave the Round to the Con Based on Economic impacts of PC- PRC FW/Def were abusive - threw them out

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One) *PRO 1:15*

Spkr	Gig Harbor GS	POINTS (0-30)
4	Samantha Griffith	28
2	Sarah Sisney	26

(Circle One) PRO CON *1:40*

Spkr	Puyallup MR	POINTS (0-30)
1	Madi Martin	27
3	CJ Robinson	29

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

Signature: [Signature] School: Mount Rainier HS

Comments & Reason for Decision: This was close! Con edged out simply based on a very slight advantage with stronger evidence.

* Drug production
 - Probably carcinogenic
 - Drug trafficking
 - Not working!

*Not buying my argument
 Still Aerial spraying
 Not substantiated
 No evidence
 cut in half/not complete*

* Economy
 - decrease poverty
 - increase \$
 - more farm land
 - More rape and violence

*"Peace Columbia"
 Economy plan Columbia is strong enough brought them to the table
 to move forward alone/15% from aid
 Plan Columbia is what makes this sustainable*

* Human Rights
 - Paid for crimes
 - Corrupt military

Not fully demilitarized

* Effective
 - less coca
 - Smaller drug operations
 - Dropped by over 50%

*more farms
 not effective methods
 probability - Not worth the risk/no evidence
 consumption/no other reason?*

Environment
 Human Rights
 Economy

Human rights
 * Human Rights
 False positions more attacks
 Peace
 Economy?
 Effect
 Violence

Senator Pushing back?

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Gig Harbor YD	POINTS (0-30)
4	Irvin Yi	28
2	Thomas Dean	28

Spkr	Kingston HV	POINTS (0-30)
3	Seth Hillsberry	27
1	Hayden Victory	26

Winner: Gig Harbor YD debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature:  School: EASTLAKE

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Thomas - Solid case reading. Big, clear voice - work on making some eye contact. Good work during crossfire - excellent questioning. Good second speech especially analysis on heroin/magnitude.

Irvin - Good job addressing con arguments - however you didn't really address framework argument. Good analysis during grand crossfire on drug production. Strong second speech - good work crystalizing in your second speech.

Hayden - Started strong, but you struggled towards end of reading your case. Work on your questions during crossfire - didn't have much. You did a better job during grand crossfire.

Seth - Good job addressing lives saved however, you dropped human rights violations. Good job during crossfire on Δ in cocaine correlation. On framework - I don't see how just b/c P.C. has been long standing policy that it won't end. Need to work on clarifying this argument.

I am voting for **PRO** as they were more clear in showing harms of Plan Columbia is a clear, compelling way. Good job, both teams!

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016


PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Peninsula WL	POINTS (0-30)
2	Nicholas Wiklund	28
4	Tony Lasley	28

Spkr	Annie Wright HB	POINTS (0-30)
1	Jin Huang	26
3	Caitlyn Bell	26

Winner: Peninsula WL debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature:  School: EASTLAKE H.S.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Nicholas solid first speech. Good analysis during cross-fire. Strong second speech - pointing out contentions dropped by Pro & strengthening your case.

Tony - Good job addressing all points in Pro case and poking holes in correlation between claimed harms & P.C. Solid crystallization of voters during final focus. Good work.

Jin - Good reading of your case, however, you had 40 seconds left. You could add more evidence or another argument. Good questions during ~~cross~~ crossfire. Summary speech dropped a number of arguments & you had 30 seconds left.

Caitlyn - Careful not to use up so much prep for one speech - a full 2 minutes used. Also, you had 1:30 left in your speech! Good questioning in crossfire on FARC. Your second speech was stronger - however a number of CON arguments were dropped.

CON easily won this round. Pro needs to work on providing more evidence - appeared somewhat unprepared. Good job!

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Bellevue MT	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Aisha Magsi	26
2	Emily Tang	27

Spkr	Newport CQ	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Selma Chihab	24
2	Sarah Quinn	26

Winner: Bellevue School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: V. Chmil School: AMHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Bellevue - Clear, organized, solid argument. Awesome job at picking up the opponents weak arguments. Excellent questions during crossfire. Solid summary! The summary tied everything really well. Also, awesome job at staying true to the time.

Newport - 1st speaker - speech was excellent but the speaker struggled during crossfire. I felt that you didn't know how to answer questions. Both of you kept going over time and struggled to answer & ask questions. Don't look at your opponents.

Summary - weak & went over time. Work on condensing your speech. Practice asking questions.

Questions were too wordy and confusing

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Puyallup BM	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Rimpal Bajwa	28
1	McKenzie Mestas	27

Spkr	Providence Classical Christian BH	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Landon Butaud	30
1	Olivia Hatcher	29

Winner: Providence Classical Christian School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: V. Chmit School: AMHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Puyallup -
 + Organized, great team work, well prepared
 + good use of current stats
 - cross fire, confused about how peace treaty was signed.
 - No clear measure of success of plan. There is no end goal to the plan then why are we funding it. If we took the plan away, everything would collapse - this shows the plan isn't working.
 - If plan "doesn't" harm U.S. -> how is it benefiting us then? why should we continue to fund it.

Providence - Loved your stance on fixing the issues in Columbia vs. continue to give them money.
 + Excellent job pointing out flaws in opponents arguments.
 + Foreign aid - fix issue & move onto helping another country. Yes! Solid argument!
 + Great job pointing out how plan is corrupt.

Both teams did a great job! It came down to continue supplying fish or teach people how to fish. We need to fix issue in Columbia -> agreed. Help them become stable & independent.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Gig Harbor MN	POINTS (0-30)
4	Jessa Moomaw	30
2	Emily Nold	29

Spkr	Eastlake MB	POINTS (0-30)
1	Casey Mauck	30
3	Prateek Bhaumik	28

Winner: Gig Harbor MN debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature] School: Auburn Riverside

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Resolution: The US should end plan Columbia

Great debate on both sides! Liked how you all were passionate 😊 Gig Harbor be a little bit nicer though!

Pro won b.c.:

- Effectively showed that coca prod went up overall (52% in 2016) whereas con's net decrease was 2009.

- Good point on how past benefits won't disappear if get rid of plan

- Balloon effect & how it shifts to other countries

- USA can't throw \$ & expect it to solve things

Points that cancelled out:

- US violations (isolated case of false +)

C#3 bc it was very very good! Tie it in to more Human Rights violations!

4
4
3
4
4
3
2
2
3
2
2

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Gig Harbor KH	POINTS (0-30)
4	Steven Kotanksy	30
2	Spencer Hannan	28

Spkr	Eastlake DJ	POINTS (0-30)
1	Amber Duan	29
3	Jillian Jackson	30

Winner: Gig Harbor KH School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: [Signature] School: Auburn Riverside

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The US should end plan Columbia

Very difficult choice bc this was an awesome debate to watch. Best I saw all day haha

Pro won bc...

- ultimately had to use their framework (soft power) since con conceded to it in Final Focus

- showed recent facts of drug product increasing

- USA is supporting Human Rights violations itself not just FARC & that affects it negatively (gives it less influence)

- Power vacuum fact

- Turned ~~PRO~~ CON's Econ contention w/ framework bc their GDP doesn't affect

Con: Great fact about civil war ending

- Good turn about drug decrease helping USA

- Should chill counter insurgency more & NOT give into their framework!

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One) *End* :40

Spkr	Gig Harbor AA	POINTS (0-30)
<i>2</i>	Finlay Adamson	<i>28</i>
<i>1</i>	Kier Adamson	<i>26</i>

1:25 *Keep* (Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Peninsula SW	POINTS (0-30)
<i>2</i>	Jacob Settle	<i>29</i>
<i>1</i>	Alex Williams	<i>27</i>

Winner: Peninsula SW debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
 School/Team _____

Signature: [Signature] School: Mt. Rainier HS

Comments & Reason for Decision: Pro spent too much time to convince me to drop Con's contentions while not effectively showing why. Con overall had a stronger position and knowledge of subject.

* *talked each other*
 * Not increased price of cocaine
 lower street price
 effects Drug economics / use is down

* Helps U.S.
 ↓ 46% low in 2014
 • Eco Benefits

= Argumentative in CI
 • where is the?

* Supply & Demand
 - wasting valuable funding
 - How much \$
 increased U.S. GDP

* Helped Humanitarian Aid
 - Trained native youth
 - Increased government → Bump
 - Environmental Benefits ↑
 - Physical needs being met
 columbian grounds not as important

* No longer necessary
 - U.S. pays for 75%
 - Harm: other relations
 No drugs in Israel?
 Bring sides together for
 Int'l and diplomacy.
 \$x more?

* Increased Security
 ↓ Violence down
 less guerrillas

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	Raisbeck Aviation US	POINTS (0-30)
3	John Ursino	28
1	Thomas Swanson	27.5

(Circle One) PRO CON

B

Spkr	Peninsula TR	POINTS (0-30)
4	Emma Taylor	28
2	Lauren Russell	27.5

Winner: Peninsula TR School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? no

Signature: [Signature] School: Curtis H.S.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

2 dramatic arguments
 clearly - who are
 the winners pre FARC,
 pre Columbia govt...?

Thom — good, clear delivery of coherent and developed case.

Lauren — interesting points — re alternatives for Columbia, P.C. targets wrong aspect.

Weighty benefit/impact in re: govt of Columbia or people of Columbia's

Emma — US is anti FARC => the P.C. is more to deny US interest?

US benefit from P.C... but Columbia do not

Thom — you, in the 2nd speech you state that past success against FARC predicts future success against insurgents. The you argue past violence does not predict future violence

a close round but PRO shows that PC does not solve for cocaine and exacerbate instability in Columbia

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

D

(Circle One)

PRO **CON**

Spkr	Gig Harbor FD	POINTS (0-30)
4	Anna Frisk	26.5
2	Olivia DuPuy	26

Spkr	Puyallup KW	POINTS (0-30)
3	Sarah Kurpius	26
1	Trixie Witham	28

Winner: Puyallup KW debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? no

Signature: [Signature] School: Curtis HS.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

a lot of specific detail in your case, Trixie.
 be seen, but Team, it provides, and explain
 evidence to support that Pylite, Cocoa products,
 etc. Otherwise it becomes word against word.
 which harms environment, people use
 products of cocoa, or eradicates the same
 Con does a better job of showing link between
 their evidence and the ingredients/benefits to
 retaining the Columbia

Room: 410
Flight 1 Start: 12:30 PM
Open Public Forum

5

Ali, Amina
~~Bennet, Kristi~~

Eastlake

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** CON

Spkr	Puyallup SJ	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Taylor Skaggs	25.5
1	Kiara Jones	25.

Spkr	Auburn Mountainview TR	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Nickolas Toney	27.5
2	Katherine Reed-Johnson	27

Winner: Auburn Mountainview TR debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature] School: Peninsula

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I gave this round to the pro because they were able to show ~~the~~ major holes in the con's case. ~~the~~
~~the~~ CON: KNOW YOUR CASE!

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Kingston GJ	POINTS (0-30)
1	Bella Galbiati	26
3	Denney James	26

Spkr	Puyallup FB	POINTS (0-30)
2	Valentino Flores	27
4	Paris Broadnax	28

Winner: Puyallup FB debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: Madison J. Johnson School: Auburn Riverside

Comments & Reason for Decision:

* Stay off phone in round *

- Don't lean on chair while speaking
- Watch the way you word your speeches, ie, "uhm" "a lot" "things"
- Do not make statements w/o evidence to back it
- Don't bring new info into your final focus

Both need to work on how they structure their final focus

- Be louder in constructive
- Try and add more to your case - I felt as though it was redundant

I voted for Pro due to the fact they proved in the status quo w/ recent info what is going to benefit us more, w/ less cost to the U.S.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Newport CS	POINTS (0-30)
4	Evelyn Chen	29
2	Maya Srikanth	29

Spkr	Puyallup BT	POINTS (0-30)
3	Ruby Burton	28
1	Ave Trebilcock	26

Winner: Newport CS School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: Madison J. [unclear] School: Auburn Riverside

Comments & Reason for Decision:

+ Great rebuttal & Summary
 - try
 - Try to avoid filler words
 "Uhh", "Uhm"

- Try not to read directly from laptop if it isn't a card or your constructive
 - Peace Columbia \rightarrow Plan Columbia
 - Dropped args
 + Good Final Focus, just try and hit on both of your voters equally

Ultimately I voted Pro due to dropped arguments, as well as the fact I didn't buy the effectiveness \rightarrow
 \rightarrow (Pro outweighed)

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr	Gig Harbor CP	POINTS (0-30)
2	Gabe Carlson	29
1	Daniel Piacitelli	28

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Redmond MC	POINTS (0-30)
1	Rishma Murugan	28
2	Khushi Chaudhari	29

Winner: Redmond School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

10 sec Signature: [Signature] School: SKHS 30 sec
 10 sec 40 sec

Comments & Reason for Decision:

① 1. aero fumigation to eliminate coca doesn't solve prob, just displaces Peru & Bolivia have increased cocaine
 2. Human rights abuses War on drugs kills innocent victims

Cross: interrupted opponent

② Military expansion is not always positive example?
 no clearly defined increase GDP because of Plan Colombia

Cross: Did not answer opponents question about integration of FARC

① Net harms must outweigh
 1. Increase in military support and security
 2. Prevented Colombia collapse 64% in 1999 - 2014
 3. Peace deals made possible from Plan Colombia FARC decrease HR violations
 7.5 to 4.5 billion 50% drop in cocaine use

Cross: nice point that US govt is not sanctioning HR violations

② Proof of drug reduction of 50%
 Proof of increase of cocaine prices through supply & demand negligible amount given Plan Colombia compared to other US interests

Cross: increased law enforcement pointed out non specific tactics

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Raisbeck Aviation TB	POINTS (0-30)
2	Toshi Take	28
1	Miles Bush	27

Spkr	Puyallup BL	POINTS (0-30)
2	Grace Burchett	29
1	Raymond Lappin	29

Winner: Puyallup BL debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: [Signature] School: SKHS

30 sec

40 sec
10 sec

Comments & Reason for Decision:

① 1. has not been successful in drug prevention
 2. military intervention is no longer necessary
 HR violations are protected and not prosecuted
 cross: no data on specific harm/killings

② ~~did~~ supported positives, did not prove Plan Colombia is no longer useful
 cross: no direct connection between displacement and plan Colombia

① "56% drop in homicide
 93% drop in kidnapping
 2. Provided job training for Colombia, doubled GDP
 3. 3 billion in drug money has been reduced
 4. Peace Colombia
 cross: correlation vs causation about ex. killings/crimes

② near 50% reduction of cocaine according to UN
 violence increased after peace deal with FARC, US presence still needed
 cross: nice point about # before Plan Colombia

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

U.S. spend Plan Colombia

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

Plan Col s/critique

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Auburn Mountainview TR	POINTS (0-30)
3	Nickolas Toney	30
1	Katherine Reed-Johnson	30

Spkr	Bellevue MT	POINTS (0-30)
2	Aisha Magsi	30
4	Emily Tang	30

Winner: Bellevue MT debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: Helen Boyer School: NEWPORT

VERY GOOD BOTH SIDES!!

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Katherine AC
 Define as all aid
 mid displaced persons
 • Cont 1
 pot term = no cocaine
 ↑ drug O's/deaths - drug Plan Col
 false pos. lives
 cancer
 • Cont 2
 • Cont 3
 7000+ rapes
 with 4200 ↑ in cocaine deaths
 AR 95% of total coca
 Poverty decrease minute
 Facts? "good voice emphasis; as in:
 "Crucial evidence" ... "failing"
 good answer: "My beliefs are not at
 issue; facts are at issue." to "Q what
 is survival?"
 Catharine sunny
 Focus on source good
 slowest quarterly growth
 chemical still being used
 Katherine tip do not say
 "ignorant" - use a softer word
 fact - glyphosate still being used
 Pot - can say cancer
 failure - false positives
 rapes

Aisha NC
 In order to win, neg will show Col needs US
Cont 1 guerrilla trust in spot eroded.
 • Cont 2 LESS poverty
 • FARC recruited many by times
 • COCA bushes planted w/ US assistance
NEWPLAN -
 more emphasis on Human Rights
 too early Peace treaty fragile
 Cross ← aerial spraying
Emily NR
 benefited 180k families
 chemical - glyphosate banned last year
 to make cocaine phosphite
 Q - how will Colombia survive w/o help of US?
 Cross Q - shot of confidence
Aisha sunny
 clash - Col not strong enough to establish Peace
 deal - done now.
 fragile
 don't say "amount of civilians" - say "number of civilians"
Emily why war:
 drop Δ can be determined
 Humanitarian aid
 US Aid weakened FARC help to Col.
 coca use - shows help is still needed
 to do w/ Plan Col.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Providence Classical Christian BH	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Landon Butaud	28
1	Olivia Hatcher	28

Spkr	Gig Harbor GS	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Samantha Griffith	27
1	Sarah Sisney	27

Winner: Providence Classical Christian BH debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: [Signature] School: 99

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The fundamental assertion of the pro side, that there needs to be brightlines on plan Colombia and that perpetual foreign aid is perpetual otherwise goes unchallenged. Indeed most of the flow was on the con side of the page. Con argues that results have been achieved yet never says when the US could stop aid.

The pro case hinges on the fact that eternally giving aid is intrinsically bad; a point I accept. Meanwhile, con shows improvement without saying when the improvement will be self-perpetrating by the Colombians

4
~~4~~
~~3~~
~~4~~
~~4~~
~~3~~
~~2~~
~~2~~
~~3~~
 2
 2

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

U.S. spend Plan Colombia Dec 9 - 10, 2016

~~U.S. spend~~
 Plan Col & continue

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Peninsula WL	POINTS (0-30)
2	Nicholas Wiklund	30
4	Tony Lasley	30

Spkr	Raisbeck Aviation US	POINTS (0-30)
3	John Ursino	30
1	Thomas Swanson	30

Winner: Raisbeck Aviation US School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? NO

Signature: Helen A Boyer School: Newport

Comments & Reason for Decision:

VERY CLOSE DEBATE!

Nick
 ① Hurts Col
 ② Hurts US
 ③ Not working
 ④ US throwing fuel on fire
 Columbian dying for a war they do not want. Good sentence
 ⑤ Hurts US: cocaine ↑ priced ↓ 4290
 ⑥ Nice - appreciate the extremely polite treatment to your honorable opponents. Like a lawyer.
Tony
 Nice casual manner.
 "peace treaty can be overseen"
 - grammar please!
 Many groups - so no guarantee.
 Directly a result of Plan Col that there is still war - conjecture?
cocaine jobs?

Thomas
 (cont) essential peaceful forum + wash post + successful counterinsurgency rural level
 US cont'd presence needed
 largest # of internally displaced persons UN
 poverty & low quality of life

Also Thomas - good respectful manner.

John
 Problem: Human RTs viols within the past. Arguing not what has been wrong - what is needed in future. +
 moral obligation spending small
 very understandable..
 Acknow that Col has a cocaine problem + doing something is better than doing nothing. +

Nick Human RTs not improved.

Thomas Plan Col - future.

Grand Cross
 Final - two reasons: Tony

Good Qs by Thomas. Persistent!
John - FINAL
 US assisted in defeating FARC.
 US providing military person net to train ...
 Look to future not past. WR +

AID 85% of money to Col.
 Police killing citizens

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Eastlake DJ	POINTS (0-30)
1	Amber Duan	27
2	Jillian Jackson	28

Spkr	Puyallup KW	POINTS (0-30)
2	Sarah Kurpius	26
1	Trixie Witham	26

Winner: Eastlake DJ debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: [Signature] School: 99

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro needs to speed up reading of case a little bit.

voter 1: Human rights I accept that glyphosphates are bad and do harm but the con does point widespread aerial spraying has stopprd. The plan continues to harm Colombians but at a reduced rate.

voter 2: Economy. Con points out that the economy is up and drug production is down. Pro points out that there are no causal links, only correlation. I buy this argument. Plan Colombia is presented as self evident when pro rightly points out that there could be a variety of external factors that could explain changes.

voter 3: Peace Colombia. I rejected peace colombia as a valid part of plan Colombia. By all accounts the peace process has been between the Colombian govt and FARC. It seems little overt influence from the U.S. can be found. ~~the~~ Peace Colombia is indeed separate.

Pro also points out that the colombian economy increase and ↓ in coke production can be attributed to other factors, namely oil.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One) *2:45 + 1:10*

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Redmond MC	POINTS (0-30)
1	Rishma Murugan	
3	Khushi Chaudhari	

2:45

Spkr	Puyallup BL	POINTS (0-30)
4	Grace Burchett	
2	Raymond Lappin	

Winner: Redmond MC debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
 School/Team

Signature: [Signature] School: Mt. Rainier HS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

** B-lateral Co-op*
 - expand reach and military force
 - Decrease in violence
 - Prevented Collapse of Columbia
 - U.S. Presence in Columbia "only causing harms"
 - If stable, plan no longer needed

** Made Peace Possible*
 - FARC in government
 - End the 50 year war
 - "Not working" "Nov. 13"
 - why is this good?

** Benefit the U.S.*
 { steady decrease over 16 years } Bump
 { Quality of life/want peace to succeed }

** Human Rights Violations*
 - increase in civilian killings
 - Excludes programs/Head hunting
 - Herbicide
 - not cocaine: c
 - not from herbicide Always
 - false positives heard gas down

** Drug Production Increase*
 - more land
 - Seems to have
 - Look over the entire time/not just last few years
 - Cocaine \$ on rise in U.S.
 - Columbia Produces 15% of what it was

** Peace Treaty*
 - Not true FARC wants more cocaine-not real crops
 - Recently production have gone up
 - Human Rights - U.S. involvement

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Peninsula SW	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Jacob Settle	30
2	Alex Williams	30

Spkr	Eastlake MB	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Casey Mauck	30
3	Prateek Bhaumik	30

Winner: Peninsula SW School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Thomas Baron School: Puyallup HS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Prateek: IF you speaking first don't reread your contentions unless you have NEW info to add in your rebuttal

Casey: You did a good job asking for the frame on suspect evidence

But both of you need to shut your opponents down when you find faulty evidence, don't give them an opportunity to redeem themselves

RFD:

2 arguments unrefuted ^{by con.} were voters for the pro and con's voter was a dropped arg.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

A

Spkr	Gig Harbor KH	POINTS (0 - 30)
3	Steven Kotanksy	30
1	Spencer Hannan	30

(Circle One) PRO CON

B

Spkr	Raisbeck Aviation TB	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Toshi Take	29
2	Miles Bush	29

Winner: Gig Harbor KH debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? no

Signature: [Signature] School: Curtis

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Disclosed in Record
ORA / RFD

**AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC
 QUALIFIER**

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Gig Harbor MN	POINTS (0 - 30)
2	Jessa Moomaw	
1	Emily Nold	

Spkr	Puyallup MR	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Madi Martin	
2	CJ Robinson	

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

Signature: _____ School: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Puyallup - Con - 1st

Gig Harbor - Pro - 2nd

Great round to both teams!

- I'm listening for size of impacts.
- Speeches are great - a little weaker in crossfire.
- Some claims are unsupported.
- I'm a little sceptical of the 8x spending.

1. Even if the US is spend much less, they must be accomplishing something.
2. overall scope vs. limited
3. timeline - Can measured more, & recency of reversal isn't enough to establish trend
4. decrease in cocaine use in US presumably results from decrease in availability.
5. plan can be reformed.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

2nd

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

1st

Spkr	Gig Harbor YD	POINTS (0-30)
	Irvin Yi 2	30
	Thomas Dean 1	29

Spkr	Puyallup BM	POINTS (0-30)
	Rimpal Bajwa 2	30
	McKenzie Mestas 1	28

Winner: Puyallup BM School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature] School: AMHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Irvin

- + Strong cross won cross round. convincing.
- Stronger proof on false positives

Thomas

- + know cards but brought back
- + good points & arguments
- nicer refute in cross & catching opponent.

McKenzie

- + Strong arguments in Summary. staying w/ context.
- + grand good back up of data to refute.
- Stronger arguments in Summary. would benefit round.

Rimpal

- + good note on peace being dropped

Balloon effect argued hard. would have won on serving citizens - stronger cards!

Ahhh.... so close, came down to Summa Final Focus, and who had the stronger cards! well done both teams!

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON 1st.

Spkr	Interlake HS JCD	POINTS (0-30)
	Amy Jiang 1	
	Monica Connell	
	Archika Dogra 2	

Spkr	Newport CQ	POINTS (0-30)
	Selma Chihab 1	
	Sarah Quinn 2	

Winner: Interlake HS School/Team debating on the PRO Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
 Signature: [Signature] School: AMHS

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Archika

Sarah

- + Strong Cross questions arguing effects of P.C. esp Zika V.
- + Strong question on P.C.
- Brought cadutin back in Final Focus
- + Zika catch won on this pt.

- + good stating opp dropped Arguments Balkan eff.
- Be confident in Rebuttal.
- + good ?'s in cross got caught w/ civil war.
- have stronger cards in relations to collaborator.

Amy

Selma

- HR. of CII very close Argument on corruption eff human Rights
- + Stronger cards in cross
- good catch on dropped conclusions in summary.
- argue how you won in summary

- confidence in cross good questions.
- organize speech in summary
- + Herb not dang. good Argument won on this point.

Both teams dropped confounding w/in Rebuttal

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

~~1:20~~
1:22 left

1:31 left
:31 left

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Gig Harbor AA	POINTS (0 - 30)
1	Finlay Adamson	27
3	Kier Adamson	27.5

Spkr	Peninsula TR	POINTS (0 - 30)
4	Emma Taylor	28.5
2	Lauren Russell	26.5

Winner: Peninsula TR School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: Lisa Weber School: Interlake

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Peninsula did a better job of explaining their case and were more engaged with refuting Neg w/ explanations. Neg did a good job of back own case but not as well refuting Pro

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

used 40 sec

PRO **CON** (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Puyallup FB	POINTS (0 - 30)
<i>2</i>	Valentino Flores	<i>28</i>
<i>4</i>	Paris Broadnax	<i>28</i>

Spkr	Gig Harbor FD	POINTS (0 - 30)
<i>3</i>	Anna Frisk	<i>29.5</i>
<i>1</i>	Olivia DuPuy	<i>29.5</i>

Winner: *Gig Harbor FD* debating on the *Con* Low point win? _____
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: *Lisa Weber* School: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Remember to be gracious in crossfire and not shout down opponents and do not belittle past harms - by comparing them to nothing in the present.

Con won because they had a deeper understanding of the topic that they were able to communicate during the Pro round.

Pro had great points about the environment but I needed more real world impacts

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

3*

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) **PRO** **CON**

Spkr	Gig Harbor CP	POINTS (0-30)
2	Gabe Carlson	29
1	Daniel Piacitelli	28

Spkr	Newport CS	POINTS (0-30)
2	Evelyn Chen	28
1	Maya Srikanth	28

Winner: Gig Harbor School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: _____ School: Raisbeck Armatow HS

Comments & Reason for Decision: THIS WAS VERY DIFFICULT TO DECIDE, BUT GIG HARBOR WAS SLIGHTLY MORE EFFECTIVE IN THE FIRST CROSS FIRE.

- DRUG WAR INEFFECTIVE
- MOVING DRUG TRADE (& VIOLENCE)
- NOT ACHIEVING PRIMARY GOAL
- US FINDING HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES
- HR ABUSES HURTING US SOFT POWER
- NEVER ENDING WAR SO THAT PL WILL CONTINUE TO LEVEL
- NEWER DATA RE BALLOON EFFECT

- NEEDED INSTEAD OF PEACE DEAL
- MAY LEAD TO FURTHER BLOODED
- TOO MUCH INFLUENCE FOR FALL
- IMPAIRED ECONOMY
- PEOPLE HAVE BEEN PROSECUTED FOR HR ABUSES
- FURTHERING QUALITY OF LIFE

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr	Kingston GJ	POINTS (0-30)
1	Bella Galbiati	26
2	Denney James	24

Spkr	Puyallup BT	POINTS (0-30)
2	Ruby Burton	27
1	Ave Trebilcock	25

Winner: Puyallup BT School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____

Signature: _____ School: Rainier Aviation HS

Comments & Reason for Decision: THE PRO SIDE EMPLOYED MORE VARIED ARGUMENTS AND MORE UP TO DATE RESEARCH

- COST/BENEFIT IN SAFETY
- BETTER TO WEAR THEM OFF SLOWLY
- US EMBASSY STATS
- " MOST IMPORTANT PIECE OF EVIDENCE "
- COLOMBIA APPROACHED U.S. - WILLING TO MODIFY
- LESS CRIME/MORE LIVES SAVED
- " I THINK " - REFERRING TO PERCENTAGES VS. HARD NUMBERS
- MISSING CARD (LAST CROSSFIRE)
- SAFETY MOST IMPORTANT

- INEFFECTIVE
- CONTAINING PRICES STABLE
- MORE COLA THAN EVER
- EXTRA JUDICIAL KILLINGS
- HEALTH EFFECTS OF ~~F~~ SPOKING
- DESTRUCTION OF LEGAL CROPS
- ECOLOGICAL EFFECTS
- HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES
- CAUSATION VS. CORRELATION
- BALLOON EFFECT
- END PLAN COLOMBIA, COLOMBIA WILL DIE ?
- IF IT'S WORKING, WE DON'T NEED IT.
- MORE UP TO DATE SOURCES

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

PRO CON (Circle One)

Spkr		POINTS (0 - 30)
	Annie Wright HB	
	Jin Huang	
	Caitlyn Bell	

(Circle One) PRO CON

Spkr		POINTS (0 - 30)
	Puyallup SJ	
	Taylor Skaggs	
	Kiara Jones	

Winner: Forfeit Puyallup debating on the _____ Side (Pro or Con) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: _____ School: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision: