

Room: 605
Flight 1 Start: 3:30 PM
Open LD

1

LaMourea, Tessie
~~Wiley, Tom~~

ECHS
Kingston

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Newport LH

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Liam Ho

27

NEG

Interlake HS - Bellevue AM

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Alia Memon

30

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision: neg won framework, aff had no offense through framework

2:30 2:20

Aff

- be very selective about what you say in your 1AR
- you spent way too much time repeating yourself
- when you extend a card, actually say "extend Card A" instead of your analysis

neg

- great extensions
- less repeating the card and more analysis of how it links into framework
- but overall very clear

Room: 605
Flight 2 Start: 3:30 PM
Open LD

1

LaMourea, Tessie
~~Wiley, Tom~~

ECHS
Kingston

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

| AFF | POINTS | NEG | POINTS |
|-----------------|-----------|----------------------------|-----------|
| | (0 - 30) | | (0 - 30) |
| Puyallup HP | | Interlake HS - Bellevue AL | |
| Hallie Pichette | <u>26</u> | Alex Liu | <u>28</u> |

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

2:00 2:00

aff

- I would make it really clear why c1 and c3 are separate. otherwise I would just condense them into one centertron
- watch your time

neg

- nice turn but you should spend more time linking it to framework

neg has nice turn an aff c2 and offense coming off of the NC

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Gig Harbor KG

Kayla Garcia

POINTS

(0-30)

~~28~~ 28.5

NEG

Raisbeck Aviation JS

Julia Shettler

POINTS

(0-30)

~~28~~ 29

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

voted neg - no reason why some judges aren't
biased is a risk at solvency
- ~~disputes~~ the
D less so than correct under neg
- those in cases

Aff -
answer incorrect
at Hellman -
You're prob
right but didn't
explain why

Neg risked solvency
7 off

Neg Explain the frame
On cart class better - I
don't know whether the
brake means no UOTL or
not at the end.

Room: 602
Flight 2 Start: 3:30 PM
Open LD

1

Unger, Ethan

Puyallup

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Interlake HS - Bellevue EZ

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Elizabeth Zeng

28

NEG

Raisbeck Aviation ER

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Emily Readey

29

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

Signature: Ethan Unger

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff
Permit the K!
jud a them org thing
note that you
answer both

Neg
too's all in on this K
- there is rule out low might
be a term of some kind.
- There's probably a more
wonder set of links to my
state information.

Room: 600
Flight 1 Start: 3:30 PM
Open LD

1

Chio, Justin

Federal Way

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Interlake HS - Bellevue ZL

Zitao Li

POINTS

(0 - 30)

24

NEG

Puyallup LB

Logan Buckner

POINTS

(0 - 30)

24

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neither of you made rebuttals. You just cross applied your ^{constructive} ~~constative~~ arguments to your opponents case

AC Rudotski left unaddressed. Police w/ bad intentions should be prosecuted regardless of them doing the act in the course of their job.

Room: 600
Flight 2 Start: 3:30 PM
Open LD

1

Chio, Justin

Federal Way

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Gig Harbor SA

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Summer Ash

29

NEG

Puyallup DP

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Drake Poirer

24

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg you had arguments on how to weigh risks, why drop them?
Concession to discourse was problematic
AL C2 not dropped but not sufficiently responded to. QI prevents trials
from occurring. That means discourse can't occur within the court.
pretty much game over at that point.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Interlake HS - Bellevue EZ

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Effie Zheng

NEG

Federal Way KW

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

Kaluhm Walter

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

IAC - Great announcement + animation. Lots points blurred together @ beginning. have questions ready for IAC cx

INC - Good use of evidence, have some pre-written blocks, use your case against their case.

Try and think of more strategic ways to ask questions, instead of "do you acknowledge..." try "Minorities are being hurt in the sqo, what do you do to help them?"

Good use of cx in the round

Find more ev on good officers outweigh the bad. use all your time

RFD: Neg dropped aff's case.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Newport SX

Sarah Xu

POINTS

(0-30)

29

NEG

Federal Way AM

Annamarie Meyers

POINTS

(0-30)

28

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

Signature: McKenna Min

Comments & Reason for Decision:

IAC - tell me when you're talking about something new, organize into ^{more} clear points in intro.

CX: ask questions about content, dont ask restate? s.

WC: similar impacts for points. Community safety seems like an odd value.
I think a more compelling strategy would be that police officers save more lives with a util value. Training solves is hard to win.

Annamarie good CX answers, Sarah don't give up on your line of questioning.

RFD: Aff solves structural violence, neg's training doesn't outweigh the saving of minorities lives.

Room: 601
Flight 1 Start: 3:30 PM
Open LD

1

Thornsberry, Ste-

Redmond

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Puyallup HM

Hunter McGuire- Floyd

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

NEG

~~Newport~~ Gig AM

~~Yoomin Chen~~
Autumn Miller

POINTS

(0 - 30)

26

Winner: Autumn Gig AM debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? Yes

Signature: Charles Rusk

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both debaters did well, but it was framing the debate in a way that it appeared the AFF was arguing the Neg side. It came down to the point about whether additional screening was more training or not and the NEG was able to argue that it was

Room: 601
Flight 2 Start: 3:30 PM
Open LD

1

Thornsberry, Ste-

Redmond

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Federal Way SL

Sebastian Lucatero

POINTS
(0 - 30)

26

NEG

Kingston TS

Thad Smith

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Winner: Kingston TS School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: Charles Pusk

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The AFF points were solid but ~~did~~ not provide a direct link between the protection given to officers and the increase in violence. Had they shown it would have reduced violence if changed, the debate may have ended differently

Room: 700
Flight 1 Start: 3:30 PM
Open LD

1

Steve Rowe
Yu, Liang

Interlake HS - Bellevue

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Puyallup AA

POINTS
(0-30)

Angeline Ashbaugh

27

NEG


Gig Harbor AH

POINTS
(0-30)

Anne Hansen

28

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision: Shouldn't AC lay out some terms of QI? Where is the welfare discussed?
Angeline- give titles to your Contentions, You say "Contention 2. Sub A,"
Anne- Not sure what the overview after you read your case does for you. Don't spend 30 seconds summarizing what you just read. The word counterplan is the wrong word for what the IAC is doing with 6th Amendment. Your coverage of the AC was very light.
Angeline- You can't attack pragmatism by saying QI is not working, You have to argue that pragmatism is a bad way to weigh the round. It sounds like you think it is good.
Anne- you insist ^{Aff} C3 is dropped - It isn't. She explicitly extends both. I am shaking my head, Answer. These. You never do...
Angeline- You keep arguing the effect of the value/crit, & the usefulness of it.

RFD: Value/crit goes neg because aff doesn't give me a good reason why soft welfare trumps morality. With that, I pick the world with the best out come. There are some good balance cards on neg that aff doesn't contest well. Aff doesn't impact her 4th/6th amendment into morality or pragmatism.

Both: Ask more. You spend most of your effort in your own case.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Puyallup KH

POINTS
(0-30)

26

Kaylie Haven

NEG

Ingraham AP

POINTS
(0-30)

28

Alexander Prakash

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

There is a philosophy called objectivism. This is not it. Pick a different name. And look up Ayn Rand. You claim it is, but it doesn't sound like what you say.

Alexander, effective cross-x. Perhaps a bit too leading though.

The best argument you can come up with against Ayn Rand is that she didn't like native americans? Seriously? Answer her philosophy. You commit the genetic fallacy.

Don't answer a question with "I'll read my contention 1 to that". That isn't an answer.

Kaylie- You drop a lot of your opponent's arguments. You aren't using your val/crit.

Alexander- Well done NR. Webster = better? Seriously?

RFD: Govt obligation is upheld more strongly, I am persuaded that it is inclusive of ~~Societal welfare~~ Justice.

The neg sets up two things aff barely responds to:

- 1) The resolutional interp. that aff must describe what limiting means, she doesn't
- 2) All of the neg contentions about systemic overload and collapse. These are mostly dropped.

Room: 205
Flight 1 Start: 3:30 PM
Open LD

1

Lisa Weber
Fitzgerald, Mike

Interlake HS - Bellevue

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

2:00 used

1:30 used 2:30 rem

AFF

Puyallup LG

Lukas Graham

POINTS

(0-30)

27.5

NEG

Eastside Catholic DC

Drew Charters

POINTS

(0-30)

28.5

Winner: Eastside Cath DC debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Lisa R Weber

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg - Excellent CX on Aff - Got Aff to concede they needed some sort of plan to back up their consequentialism standard - Aff came back with the 1AR stating that they would solve for Court Clog - which neg said would happen in Aff world - by having 3rd Party oversight away from Courts -> Neg came back in the NR and showed how Aff's framework worked for Neg better since consequentialism is about consequences of actions and showed again that aff conceded in 1st CX that the Aff should show some sort of plan. - Aff - weak 2AR -

Neg was more clear in refutations and much better organized at going down the flow - Aff needs to work on organization of flow - Basically - Neg won the framework debate using Aff's framework + Neg's contentions

Room: 205
Flight 2 Start: 3:30 PM
Open LD

1

Lisa Weber
Fitzgerald, Mike

Interlake HS - Bellevue

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

202 used
1:56 left

1:10 used

AFF

Puyallup AS

Ashley Simmons

POINTS

(0 - 30)

26.5

NEG

Raisbeck Aviation HT

Hong Ta

POINTS

(0 - 30)

26

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

Signature: Lisa Weber

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both people need to work on organization of their flow of opponents. Neg ended up being more organized at refuting Aff-but did not explain refutations-very little analysis

Aff was jumping all over the flow in 2AR but had more analysis-less coverage-

Im going with Aff - in her ~~first~~ CX of negs she got the concession that Neg didn't believe "A country with a lot of people and no resources should go and take resources from a smaller country" Neg was using util in her framework and couldn't refute ~~Neg's~~ Aff's argument on framework from the 1AR.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Federal Way AM

POINTS
(0-30)

27

Annamarie Meyers

NEG

Puyallup HP

POINTS
(0-30)

26

Hallie Pichette

Winner: Fed. Way AM School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Hallie- your value/crit seem poorly chosen for your contentions, why not pick utilitarianism or something? A deontological value seems poorly fitted to court clog + community pacts. The better justice argument is probably aff with aggrieved victims.

Annamarie- You should tell me how you are limiting QJ. You can't just limit it magically only to good people. How do we do that? Val/crit. debate handled well. I don't think you understand neg contentions. The fact that officers don't go to court now doesn't disprove that they will when we limit QJ.

Hallie- you effectively finish your speech at the 4 minute mark. you don't need to keep talking. You just repeat yourself over and over...

RFD: No one impacts their case into either criterion. How does aff support due process? I am not told. I don't think it matters which.

Neg loses the plot on their contentions. Hallie starts talking about judges not abusing QJ. How is this an extension of either contention? Without those, there is no reason not to vote on the violence arguments of the aff.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Ingraham AP

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.5

Alexander Prakash

NEG


Interlake HS EZeng

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Elizabeth Zeng

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I think Clog went totally unanswered, but I didn't see a clear ~~answer~~ extension of it either

There's zero weighing on the Rosen impact

I don't think CI is really an impact, but it's not really well fleshed out.

Lots of off impacts on a very messy flow that weren't really contested

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Kingston TS

POINTS
(0-30)

27.5

Thad Smith

NEG

Puyallup KH

POINTS
(0-30)

27

Kaylie Haven

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

On Framework - I think aff impact turn is compelling, + he wins there are lots of racist police means reform is good. The neg is mostly just "officers need QT" but I think aff pretty clearly doesn't remove, so he doesn't bite those impact

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Raisbeck Aviation HT

Hong Ta

POINTS

(0-30)

28

NEG

Interlake HS ZL

Zitao Li

POINTS

(0-30)

27

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

+

- great responses in CX
- good coverage in the IAR

-

- Conf. I wnt to get your words out while speaking first
- no need to debate the PW so much when you both agree

+

- Great clarity & pacing
- Some good CX questions

-

- try to give a little more explanation of things like to cost process truly its feasible

Both: be sure to respond to what your opponent is arguing not what you think they said

RFD: a very close round, in the end w/ you in util & the Aff has a bit more diverse offers showing solvency so w/ equal strength of evid I must vote Aff on the greater amount of proposed good.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Gig Harbor AM

Autumn Miller

POINTS

(0-30)

29

NEG

Newport LH

Liam Ho

POINTS

(0-30)

30

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| <p>+</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good attempt at coverage if you had a bit more this could have gone - bit more for you - great clarity & pacing | <p>-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - if you had pushed about a bit more + bit - try not to spend so much time on fr if not present you could it well but etc 2:00 of the WAR | <p>+</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good use of limit deft to help push exclusivity for the CP - Good coverage | <p>-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → try to put a bit more of this in the CP though to help drive it home → let try to explain your terms a bit more they ended up - bit blurry |
|---|---|--|--|

RFD: this was a fascinating & close round in the end while the Aff shows some strong advantages the Neg is able to ~~successfully~~ successfully defend their limit deft & keep the CP alive subverting a lot of the Aff's offense & coming out ahead. Really great round all around!

Room: 601
Flight 1 Start: 5:30 PM
Open LD

2

Weber, Lisa

Interlake

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Raisbeck Aviation ER

Emily Readey

POINTS

(0-30)

28

NEG

Puyallup HM

Hunter McGuire- Floyd

POINTS

(0-30)

27

2:55 used
1:05 used

2:38

Winner: Raisbeck Ave ER debating on the Pro Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Lisa Weber

Comments & Reason for Decision:

There was not much clash in this round by Neg. I believe Neg wanted a strong Framework debate but this was a problem when he was unable to define "Deontology" in his CX by Aff. What he did state as the definition of Deontology was "The means don't justify the ends" Aff was able to work with this definition and show how her Standard of Util used consequentialism and therefore her offense/contentions would work with Negs framework.

Neither person followed the flow in their Rebuttal speeches.

Room: 601
Flight 2 Start: 5:30 PM
Open LD

2

Weber, Lisa

Interlake

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Eastside Catholic DC

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.5

Drew Charters

Eastside catholic

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

NEG

Puyallup AA

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Angeline Ashbaugh

Signature: Lisa Weber

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff won the frame work debate and was much better at going down the flow for refutations of Neg and reaffirming his contentions

Neg did not bring up any new analysis of own case in the NR - Also tried to refute Aff w/o any evidence or depth of analysis. Neg lost frame work ~~in~~ in NR when she said that everyone values gate ty and that's part of the Pragmatism Standard.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Raisbeck Aviation JS

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Julia Shettler

NEG

Puyallup AS

POINTS
(0 - 30)

26

Ashley Simmons

Winner: RAISBECK AVIATION J.S.

School/Team

debating on the

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?



Signature: ♡ 为鹿未外喜

Comments & Reason for Decision:

MORALITY?! IS IT THE INTENTION OF THE POLICE TO CREATE/MAINTAIN "MORALITY"?

Q.I. PREVENTS LEGAL REFORM...GOT IT!

"MAJORITARIAN PRESSURES"(OOOH... I LIKE HOW THAT SOUNDS!)

Q.I. PREVENTS TRANSPARENCY...COOL!

"HESITATION" AS "DETERENCE" (... WHICH IS A GOOD THING...SWEET!!)

"POLICE DEPARTMENTS ARE INSURED" (... SO WHAT'S THE HARM IN GOING TO TRIAL? ... IT'S NOT LIKE THE INDIVIDUAL POLICE OFFICER IS GOING TO BE HELD PERSONALLY ACCOUNTABLE!) YEAH!!

☆ WHAT IS "MORALITY"? (YEAH!)

'COMMUNITY SAFETY'...SOUNDS GOOD TO ME!

POLICE "HESITATION" DOESN'T NECESSARILY GARENTEE AN INCREASE IN VIOLENCE...

TOO MUCH "MIGHT/MAY/COULD" NOT ENOUGH (QUALIFIED) "WILL/MUST"!

'MORALITY' IS TOTALLY SUBJECTIVE (RIGHT ON!)

EXCELLENT DESCRIPTION OF HOW Q.I. DOES (AND DOESN'T) WORK!

"THEIR JOB IS TO ACT ON THE SPOT" (...WHY DOES THIS SURE ME?)

CONSIDER FOCUSING MORE ON HOW Q.I. HELPS PEOPLE OTHER THAN THE POLICE...



I'M NOT WILD ABOUT 'MORALITY'... BUT AFF'S CLAIMS ABOUT THE INTENTIONS & RESULTS OF Q.I. (AS IT IS CURRENTLY BEING IMPLEMENTED) SEEM TO GO ALOT FURTHER IN TERMS OF CREATING/MAINTAINING "COMMUNITY SAFETY"

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Interlake HS AL

POINTS
(0-30)

28

Alex Liu


NEG

Newport SX

POINTS
(0-30)

29

Sarah Xu



Winner: INTERLAKE HS A.L.

School/Team

debating on the

Side (Aff/Neg)

Low point win?



Signature: ♥ 为未来外喜

Comments & Reason for Decision:

☹️ "OUGHT" IS NOT A 'MORAL OBLIGATION'!

★ "JUSTICE" IS A GOOD VALUE AS IT IS GERMAINE TO THE INTENTIONS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT / POLICE

☹️ JOHN LOCKE'S PHILOSOPHIES WERE INTENDED TO JUSTIFY SLAVERY!!

Ⓜ️ SLOW DOWN A LITTLE; WHEN YOU SPEAK TOO FAST, COMMUNICATION SUFFERS.

☹️ TRY TO AVOID TOO MUCH UNQUALIFIED SPECULATION (... ABOUT THE FUTURE)

☹️ WE ARE HOLDING POLICE OFFICERS (WITH MORE POWER / PRIVILEGE) TO A LOWER STANDARD THAN THE REST OF THE COMMUNITY... WHOA!!

♥ DREW CLEAR DISTINCTION BETWEEN "MILITARIZED" POLICE & COMMUNITY POLICE ... SWEET!

☹️ "CHILLING EFFECT" IS HIGHLY SPECULATIVE...

☹️ HOW DOES (UNLIMITED) Q.I. ENSURE "JUSTICE"?

☹️ IS IT THE INTENTION OF "LIMITING Q.I." TO "REDUCE RACIAL BIAS"?! (SOCIAL REFORM IS NOT THE JOB OF THE POLICE; COMMUNITY SAFETY IS!!)

☹️ "P.O.P." IS HIGHLY SPECULATIVE!!

☹️ I'M NOT THAT SCARED OF "COURT CLOG"; SLOWING JUSTICE DOWN IS NOT THE SAME AS DETERRING / PREVENTING IT

☹️ IT IS NOT THE (PRIMARY) DUTY OF THE POLICE TO 'REDUCE RACIAL BIAS / INEQUALITY'



NEG'S CLAIMS SEEMED TO CENTER AROUND "LAW ENFORCEMENT" WHILE AFF'S (MORE COMPELLING) CLAIMS CENTERED AROUND PUBLIC / COMMUNITY SAFETY WHICH IS MORE IN LINE WITH THE (OVERALL) MISSION OF THE POLICE.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Puyallup DP

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

Drake Poirer

NEG

Federal Way SL

POINTS
(0 - 30)

~~27~~ 26

Sebastian Lucatero

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

2:00 2:06

aff
- don't extend cards you dropped in the PAR in your 2AR

neg
- spend less time repeating what your opponent says
- practice your rebuttals

aff won by showing he could minimize the most harm clearly showed qual imm harms, increasing militarization and police overstepping boundaries

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Puyallup LB

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Logan Buckner

27

NEG

Gig Harbor SA

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Summer Ash

28

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1:45
1:30

aff
-you dont need to read the methodology of your studies in round - just read the ^{link} warrant and impact

neg
-nice use of the Paeman 10 ev

neg wins NC and framework
aff has no offense coming off of the Ae
neg places Paeman 10 ev, which actually turns the Ae's case, even if the neg never calls it a turn

Room: 207
Flight 1 Start: 5:30 PM
Open LD

2

Unger, Ethan

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Gig Harbor AH

POINTS
(0 - 30)

24

Anne Hansen

NEG

Interlake HS EZheng

POINTS
(0 - 30)

20

Effie Zheng

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

Signature: Ethan Unger

Comments & Reason for Decision:

they didn't address the for over
credibility or possible violence and credit
aff had the ability to solve its spee
inst. I voted aff

Room: 207
Flight 2 Start: 5:30 PM
Open LD

2

Unger, Ethan

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Interlake HS AM

POINTS
(0-30)

27

Alia Memon

NEG

Puyallup LG

POINTS
(0-30)

26

Lukas Graham

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

Signature: Ethan Unger

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - She was
to extend now
stuff in the 1AR
to use later. I don't
have time-looking then
on your flow

- Speaking for others
arg is 100% incoherent

Neg - She created a FW wall
that aff can't lose under.
Push back word
against that!

Aff on morality NZ both criteria

- Slightly better chance to solve

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Eastside Catholic DC

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.1

Drew Charters

NEG

Interlake HS ZL

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.1

Zitao Li

Winner: Eastside Catholic DC debating on the Aff. Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

great cx, let her answer though during
Impact analysis wins debates
↳ drop the courts stuff,
its doing nothing

Use all your time! 15s Cx leftover
Drop the courts thing.
intentions → strongly arg. now solve it.
dont let him bulldoze you
in Cx - if he asks a question, you get to answer!
DONT use 4 Min from Guin speech!

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Puyallup HM

Hunter McGuire- Floyd

POINTS
(0-30)

28

NEG

Gig Harbor KG

Kayla Garcia

POINTS
(0-30)

30

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| <p>+ - your c.s. h-s Some really interesting points - Some good ex. questions</p> | <p>- - diverted the topics clearly, it ends w/ a G.A. philosophy key to impact light - watch your time in the AR - signpost a bit more clearly in the AR</p> | <p>+ - great use of ex to gain ground on topic util - great speed & clarity come - good exten-sion</p> | <p>- - careful not to sig your opp has drafted contentions that he hasalt</p> |
|--|--|---|---|

2FD: Neg shows that the consequences + world belief in must be seen before the political world of the Aff. carries over alot more offense & ends up outweighing

Room: 207
Flight 1 Start: 7:30 PM
Open LD

3

Allen, Cameron

Gig Harbor

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Federal Way SL

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

Sebastian Lucatero

NEG

Interlake HS EZheng

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.5

Effie Zheng

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

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CP goes conceded, resolves the impacts to the aff, and has net benefit of Rosen DA,

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Interlake HS AM

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Alia Memon

NEG

Puyallup LB

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Logan Buckner

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

Signature: Cam Allen

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff is pretty far ahead on frame work,
INC coverage was spotty, two main args
on the aff get answered, conceded turns
to the neg Means is affirm

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Gig Harbor AH

POINTS

(0-30)

29

Anne Hansen

NEG

Federal Way AM

POINTS

(0-30)

27

Annamarie Meyers

Winner: Gig Harbor AH debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>+</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Great use of Cx to get concessions - great rebuttal though - good clear extensions | <p>-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Watch your pronunciation in the AC, it was borderline a couple times | <p>+</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good questioning during your Cx - great clarity of speech | <p>-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use all your time!!! - try not to concede the value/crit so early - try to hit all your opponent's contentions |
|---|---|---|---|

RFD: Aff shows training in the sense isn't happening blunting any real neg offense while flowing hers through clear Aff ballot.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Interlake HS EZeng

POINTS
(0 - 30)

24

Elizabeth Zeng

NEG

Puyallup KH

POINTS
(0 - 30)

25

Kaylie Haven

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Don't drop the NC. The IAR is the single hardest speech. If you give a bad one it's pretty much GG. Work on time allocation

All your loophole example is bad. That's not an example of QI itself being bad. It's an example of its implementation being bad.

Aff change your criterion

Frivolous lawsuits vs ignorance + race

Ignorance argument isn't fleshed out. Yes, it's unfair. But so what?

You guys don't weigh the arguments for me so I'm left to my own opinions.

To me frivolous lawsuits results in more harm than some misapplications of QI

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Kingston TS

Thad Smith

POINTS
(0 - 30)

26

NEG

Puyallup AA

Angeline Ashbaugh

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg use flashy words that grab attention of judge. For example, you could have run an overview at the top of the AC that the AC supercharges your C2.

AC you should have abused your Ob 2 when she concedes time frame. Just fiat the senate reforming QI in 2 months, hell, you could fiat 2 hours. That prevents her impacts from happening.

Without you giving me the timeframe I have to assume its long enough for her impacts to occur.

Neg convinces me that the manner in which Aff limits QI results in clogged courts which leads to a whole bunch of sad stuff.

Room: 402
Flight 2 Start: 7:30 PM
Open LD

3

Weber, Lisa

Interlake

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Raisbeck Aviation JS

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29

Julia Shettler

NEG

Puyallup HP

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

Hallie Pichette

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

militarism's bad

- neg needs to pin the aff down more
- aff should focus more on warrants, not just cards

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Ingraham AP

Alexander Prakash

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28.5

NEG

Puyallup LG

Lukas Graham

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Immunity bad, o/w security

- Both sides should make their values/criteria more strategically useful - use them to exclude the other side's offense
- ZAR/NR should start w/ reasons you win (voting issues?)

Room: 600
Flight 2 Start: 7:30 PM
Open LD

3

Unger, Ethan

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Gig Harbor AM

Autumn Miller

POINTS

(0-30)

28.5

NEG

Interlake HS AL

Alex Liu

POINTS

(0-30)

27

Winner: _____

Gig Harbor AM

School/Team

debating on the _____

Pos

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? _____

Signature: _____

Ethan Unger

Comments & Reason for Decision:

EXTEND DEFINITIONS

Aff - you definitely
need a more
nuanced analysis
of legal precedents
to REL - yours
- use Wright?

Neg you have something
going with court cases
- the articulation is
key!

WINTER IS
A REALLY GOOD
CARD

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Newport LH

Liam Ho

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Puyallup AS

Ashley Simmons

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

Winner:

Puyallup AS
School/Team

debating on the

Neg
Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

X

Signature:

Ethan Unger

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff -

Your ~~way~~
metaphors and CX
were incoherent
and had literally
nothing to do with
anything

Neg - when he says
can't tell it breaks
law, respond that
there's no uniqueness
to it - this isn't better,
it's worse in the world. It's
not a response

ZAR
line by line!!!
u

voted neg
- The F W debate got pretty messy -
I thought the aff's answers to the neg
is weren't great but the elapsed I meant the aff
really had no way to garner atleast. ZAR
winning they would have probably solved this

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

| Spkr | Interlake HS ZKA | POINTS (0-30) |
|------|------------------|---------------|
| 2 | Muhan Zhang | 28 |
| | Jinho Kwak | |
| 1 | Safa Aynoor | 28 |

NEG

| Spkr | Puyallup HW | POINTS (0-30) |
|------|------------------|---------------|
| 1 | Gavin Harrington | 26 |
| 2 | Jaykub Willis | 24 |

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

IAC: clearly mark moving between contentions/cards. Time IAC to make sure you can fit it all

INC: pass pages as soon as you finish, it makes your organization much easier during your speech. clarity is good, try and up your speed :) Russia INC shell really long, try shortening it to fit in more off case positions (T?). on case cards on modeling supplemented IAC? Jaykub - watch tone in CX, a bit aggressive for ?

ZAC: good line by line, concise responses to neg's args. :)

ZNC: some of your args on Russia DA seemed to insinuate the aff ~~as people~~ doesn't care about terrorism, debate the args not the people

INR: try not to take prep during the neg block. The main neg arg is that terror outweighs warming. Why? Also, try and split the neg block. Ex. ZNC takes on case, INR takes DA.

IAR: solid line by line, good job addressing why terror doesn't outweigh. make sure case extension for warming is clear. Addressed points of clash, but didn't explicitly extend advantage.

ZNR: ~~good job extending~~ good job extending

ZAR: good job extending case + weighing impacts

RFD: 1 buy that plan doesn't increase terror, plus it solves for warming

Room: 205
Flight 1 Start: 7:30 PM
Open LD

3

Maghirang, Zach

Ingraham

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Gig Harbor SA

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Summer Ash

28.5

NEG

Raisbeck Aviation ER

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Emily Readey

28.7

Winner: Raisbeck Aviation ER debating on the Neg Side (Aff/Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Zach Maghirang

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: Neg wins FW because the Aff's evidence indicates forms of resistance are pre-req to STB reform and there's no clear Aff response. While I think the Aff mitigates some K's, I buy the Neg arg that a risk of K's are a reason to try the alt, especially considering the functionally conceded discourse indicates on the Aff's.

Great debate!
K's? Zmaghirang52@gmail.com.

Room: 205
Flight 2 Start: 7:30 PM
Open LD

3

Maghirang, Zach

Ingraham

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

| AFF | POINTS | NEG | POINTS |
|----------------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| Raisbeck Aviation HT | (0 - 30) | Newport SX | (0 - 30) |
| Hong Ta | <u>27.8</u> | Sarah Xu | <u>28.2</u> |

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

Signature: Zach Maghirang

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG
1:53

2FD: I vote Neg. I think the Aff's @ is greatly mitigated by the Schwartz evidence bc QI doesn't deter aggressive action. I am convinced by the court clog DA that QI reduction causes ~~and~~ increase of frivolous law suits which would recreate injustices against minorities and cause economic decline.

Q's: zmaghirang52@gmail.com

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Federal Way AM

POINTS
(0-30)

Annamarie Meyers

28

Solid speaking

ums

Winner:

Aff Fedway Am

School/Team

debating on the

Aff

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

No

NEG

Puyallup HM

POINTS
(0-30)

Hunter McGuire- Floyd

25

ums

Signature:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Excellent signposting

IAC

(1:20)

KNOW Definitions of

V: Ret. Justice - words bandied about.

C: Due Process

Cont 1: Reasonable (I - violence - structure)
 Cont: lag time
 sub a) sub b) Solid CX

Try to use IAC = 6m full 6m speech time

Excessive force: Definition = force used that isn't commensurate with the opposing force.

E.g. Using a gun against an un-armed individual

AC: Doesn't provide evidence

Cont 2: officers close ranks
 Kudos. Tell clashed / ums

The Resolution & your RFD: You know Case very well. 2m Cheers.

Solid CX

V: morality

C: Deontology

Cont 1: Protect all

planted evidence
 - OJ Simpson trial!
 sub a) sub b) sub c) sub d) sub e) Etc.

Need tagline

Structure:

Cont 1: tagline

Be. Organized

are for ums

INE
 - (Florida case)
 - who care?
 (Baltimore) what?
 Ums x 20

Counted 2 in (12) rebuttal in 30s.
 3 in 1m. 4m - 8:00m
 4 in 2 - 5, 6, 7, 8

Pre-write rebuttals during opponents speech & prep.

V: morality - most out of CR: Deontology -> QI to keep all safe.
 Officers ATL -> Consequentialism leads to planting false evidence

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

| AFF | POINTS | NEG | POINTS |
|----------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|
| Puyallup AS | (0 - 30) | Gig Harbor AH | (0 - 30) |
| Ashley Simmons | <u>27</u> | Anne Hansen | <u>28</u> |

Winner: Gig Harbor AH debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: Charles Rusk

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This came down to the last speeches. NEG conceded a point about tyranny that AFF saw and effectively refuted. AFF, however, did not effectively tie it back to her points or give info on how the combating of this tyranny would lead to a more moral society. NEG was able to show that severe harm would be done to society if people were not to go into the policing jobs which was what carried the debate.

Room: 402
Flight 1 Start: 9:00 AM
Open LD

4

Rusk,

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Newport SX

Sarah Xu

POINTS
(0 - 30)

30

NEG

Raisbeck Aviation JS

Julia Shettler

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Winner: Raisbeck Aviation School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? yes

Signature: Charlie Rusk

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This debate came down to the value of both teams: Justice. While the AFF did a good job showing the disproportionate amount of violence put on communities of minorities but did not show how getting rid of qualified immunity would significantly reduce it. The NEG was able to argue that having many verdicts on these issues would cause harm to officers + the minorities disproportionate to what is happening now and that is what carried the debate.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Interlake HS AL

Alex Liu

POINTS

(0-30)

26

NEG

Eastside Catholic DC

Drew Charters

POINTS

(0-30)

26

Winner: Eastside Catholic DC debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Good Valent effort! Try to go down me. K line by line like intentions - Framework links impact, Alt.
- Go harder particularly for impact referend about how no state will be worse

- I wouldn't saw Jim Crow laws are "worse" than slavery so watch for that.
- I think you could have done your refutations slightly slower... no rush.

NO SOLVENCY for the AFF.

Neg's framework extends framework about engaging w/ ^{Challenging} oppressive structures.

Neg shows me that there is not an avenue to end oppression w/ the AFF.

Neg establishes several key turns on AFF.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Interlake HS EZheng

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29

NEG

Puyallup DP

POINTS

(0 - 30)

24

Effie Zheng

Drake Poirer

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

Signature: Kaelyn Holguin

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Good job in CX. U
Don't do good/bad officers. you got them mixed up and its misleading. They aren't "good" or "bad"
• try to respond to the race issues more calmly.

neg
• About the NY Stat - NY is only 25% black so the number being 50% is "kinda a big deal" you just overall seemed flip about the race issues. your BLM claim was "your Rosen 10 does not prove anything there is no warrants" you did not go line by line in 2 NR, jumped away

My road to RFD AFF was pretty clear. AFF shows that warrants in Rosen 10 which Neg makes as his big impact is not warranted and that competent officers will want to go to court to increase transparency. AFF shows how justice/ reducing recidivism is better upheld. The way Neg brought up race issues as an important Black lives matter as violent was off point and bothersome to me.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Raisbeck Aviation ER

POINTS
(0-30)

30

Emily Readey

NEG

Interlake HS AM

POINTS
(0-30)

30

Alia Memon

Winner: RAISBECK AV School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO (TIE)

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

URGENT WISE ROUND - THANK YOU! ULTIMATELY, THE AFF. ARGUMENT THAT SYSTEMATIC REFORM VIA SOCIAL MOVEMENT WOULD STILL OCCUR (AND IS - SEE BLACK LIVES MATTER) WHILE USING LIMITS ON QUAL. IMMUN. TO PUT LEGAL PRECEDENTS IN PLACE TO ENSURE INDIV. ACCOUNT. AND PUT PRESSURE TOWARDS SOCIETAL REFORM WAS THE MOST EFFECTIVE. NEG. ARGUMENT THAT COURT CASES DEPRIV RESOURCES WAS OUTWEIGHTED BY AFF ARG. THAT GETTING LEGAL PRECEDENTS HAS IMMEDIATE AND WOULD BE USED FOR LONG-TERM REFORM. NEG. ARG. ABOUT BACKLASH EFFECTIVELY COUNTERED BY AFF THAT PROGRESS OUTWEIGHTS - SEE SWAGERTY.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Puyallup LB

Logan Buckner

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

NEG

Interlake HS EZeng

Elizabeth Zeng

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF VC OF NEW. WFL WAS PERSUASIVE IN THAT THE PRAGMATISM AND IMMEDIACY AND MEASURABILITY OF REDUCING HARM DROVE TO AFF VALUE OF SOL WELFARE AND NEG VALUE OF QUAL. OF LIFE.

NEG. ARGUMENT ON COURT CLK DIDN'T HAVE IMPACTS THAT OUTWEIGHED DEATHS DUE TO RIOTING AS WELL AS DISTRUST OF GOVT INSTITUTIONS DUE TO LACK OF ACCOUNTABILITY THAT WOULD BE PROVIDED BY LIMITING QUAL. IMMUN. ALSO, AFF ARG. THAT COURT CLK SHOULD'N'T BE OUR PRIORITY VIA LHM 2015 THAT LOSS OF RIGHTS WAS MORE IMPACTFUL BASICALLY KILLED ALL.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

1:56 left

3:05 left

AFF

Gig Harbor KG

Kayla Garcia

POINTS
(0-30)

28.5

NEG

Ingraham AP

Alexander Prakash

POINTS
(0-30)

28

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

Signature: Lisa Weber

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - Need org on AC - No tag lines - No contentions
Just cards - How am I supposed to flow this?

Neg - Very rude in CX - May have made good points
~~I~~ I don't know because decorum and graciousness
is part of CX so my cognitive dissonance with
your rudeness - I didn't hear what you said.

Neg - Good Taglining 4 contentions - Fast 2 - the
subpoints didn't make sense - in that your points
had no analysis - didn't quite understand what
point you were trying to Good Delivery - ^{Great Amount of Sources}

Aff - Excellent IAR - Great Analysis and refutation of Neg
I agreed completely with your analysis of negs contentions
being 1 liners with evidence not particularly germane to
the topic - Great Delivery

Over

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

1:47

2:35 remaining

AFF

NEG

Puyallup HP

POINTS
(0-30)

Newport LH

POINTS
(0-30)

Hallie Pichette

26.5

Liam Ho

28.5

Winner:

Puyallup
Hallie Pichette

debating on the

Aff

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

X

Signature:

Lisa Weber

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - Good case - Weak IAR - Better 2AR
AFF

Neg - NC was weak on refuting ~~the~~ by basically agreeing with her - even on the counterplan
Where's the clash? Could have gone much more in depth of why your yours hared
V/C worked better in the Neg World -
NR was just Average

Single Neg basically agreed w/ aff there was not a lot of clash -

Aff brought up in her AC how QI immunity made citizen's unequal from Police - b/c /Police can use ignorance of the law to get out of prosecution but the average citizen is held to the standard "that ignorance is not an excuse"

So I went with Aff on this one

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Interlake HS ZL

POINTS
(0-30)

27

Zitao Li

NEG

Gig Harbor AM

POINTS
(0-30)

29

Autumn Miller

Winner: AUTUMN MILLER

JIG HOBRAH!

School/Team

debating on the

WIG!

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?



Signature:

Handwritten signature

Comments & Reason for Decision:

"CONSTITUTIONALITY"?! BUT THE U.S. GOVERNMENT VIOLATES THE CONSTITUTION ALL THE TIME SO WHY SHOULD Q.I. BE ANY DIFFERENT?

I WOULD CONSIDER LOSING THE LAPTOP; SOMETIMES IT HURTS MORE THAN IT HELPS...

Q.I. ALLOWS POLICE TO VIOLATE PEOPLES 'CONSTITUTIONAL' (CIVIL/HUMAN) RIGHTS... GOT IT!

YOU CLAIM THAT POLICE HAVE TO BE RESPONSIBLE/ACCOUNTABLE TO THE CONSTITUTION IS FLIMSY; I DOUBT THE POLICE READ THE CONSTITUTION.

YOUR OPPONENT ISN'T IGNORING POLICE RACISM, SHE'S SIMPLY CLAIMING THAT IT'S THE SYSTEM THAT HAS A RACIAL BIAS!

"IT'S A THING."

WHAT DOES THAT EVEN MEAN?!




YOU'RE ADDORABLE! (... BUT DON'T RISK COMING OFF AS "SNOTTY" DURING C-X)
"MORALITY"... HMM (NORMALLY I WOULD BE LIKE: "YUCK!"); BUT IT SURE AS HECK SOUNDS BETTER THAN 'CONSTITUTIONALITY'
LET'S PUT THE COSMOTOLOGISTS IN CHARGE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT!

YOUR OPPONENT IS TALKING ABOUT AN 'IMAGINARY' CONSTITUTION... GOT IT!
THERE WERE 'RACIAL MINORITIES' AROUND WHEN THE CONSTITUTION WAS WRITTEN (... BUT I KNOW WHAT YOU MEAN!)

IT'S THE ACTUAL 'LAW ENFORCEMENT' SYSTEM THAT'S THE PROBLEM; NOT THE INDIVIDUAL OFFICERS... PERFECT ANALYSIS!!

"MORAL AGENCY" SOUNDS BETTER THAN "VOLITIONISM"; "DISADVANTAGED" SOUNDS BETTER THAN "MINORITY"



NEG DID A CONVINCING JOB DESCRIBING HOW Q.I. PROTECTS INDIVIDUAL OFFICERS FROM TAKING THE BLAME FOR THE ABUSES OF A CORRUPT SYSTEM WHICH WAS LIKELY THE INTENTION OF Q.I.

Room: 602
Flight 2 Start: 9:00 AM
Open LD

4

Unger, Ethan

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Puyallup AA

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Angeline Ashbaugh

NEG

Raisbeck Aviation HT

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.5

Hong Ta

Winner: Puyallup AA debating on the PO Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? X

Signature: Ethan Unger

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - They are
better Util analogies
you can make in
speeches. Especially with
this topic, just call out fascist etc

Neg - 1) don't say
imperialism good. That's
hard to win even
2) Bottom at the NK
you had time left go back
up to util anal, just
slay her on that - it
was your best point to
the ballot

voted aff - no real ceters,
to the Util = imperialism, no
HARBY

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Puyallup KH

Kaylie Haven

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Gig Harbor SA

Summer Ash

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29.5

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

Signature: Ethan Unger

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - when
you read "objectivism"
there's a really negative
stigma to it because of
Rand. (arbitrary!!)

- she didn't go for any
type arg and almost dropped
your C2. You could have
totally gone for that, throw
her for ew.

My read a k
in front of me!
You know I will be
fine.

- I'm not sure
why you say all that
but don't solve
root cause.
- give me some discourse
key args etc
Voted my 2a courts into anti-fem/
racist + no chance to solve

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Puyallup KH

Kaylie Haven

POINTS
(0-30)

27

NEG

Newport LH

Liam Ho

POINTS
(0-30)

28

Winner: Newport LH School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~Machine~~ The best argument against con case is combination of refuting cap of insurance, arguing definition of limit, and explaining cost of frivolous law suits. Instead, Aff gave me arguments in final speech that could not be weighed in round due to lack of ability to rebut.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Puyallup DP

POINTS
(0-30)

26

Drake Poirer

NEG


Interlake HS AL

POINTS
(0-30)

27

Alex Liu

Winner: ~~Interlake HS AL~~ Puyallup DP debating on the ~~NEG~~ Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win?

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Drake: practice your speech more, make sure you know your case well.

Alex: I don't understand your gov. officials are police officers argument, Furthermore, you argue that frivolous law suits

Ultimately I am voting on ^{Courtroom} ~~efficiency~~ efficiency has increased court cases. Seems to lead better to the idea of justice in a consequentialist word. If we judge solely on consequences of actions, then \downarrow QI = \uparrow justice.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

2:00 left

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

1:30 left

AFF

Gig Harbor SA

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28.5

Summer Ash

NEG

Newport SX

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Sarah Xu

Gig Harbor Summer Ash

Winner:

~~Lisa Welter~~

debating on the

Aff

Low point win?

X

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature:

Lisa Welter

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Good AC - Need to learn Taglines and Accurate flow like, C1, A, B, C2, AB, etc - so it's easier to flow during refutation. Liked creativity of Aff you were a broken record in CX of Neg about wanting to get Neg to say you could perm - After 2 negative answers - move on.

Neg - Good re

Aff - It was hard for me to extend your cards in your IAR since they were not tagged in your AC.

Neg - NC was great at countering aff but you needed more analysis cross applying and linking your counter plan to your framework - you had the technical knowhow just didn't apply it as effectively as you could have

Over

Room: 202
Flight 1 Start: 12:30 PM
Open LD

5

Maghirang, Zach

Ingraham

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

| AFF | POINTS | NEG | POINTS |
|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| Kingston TS | (0-30) | Gig Harbor KG | (0-30) |
| Thad Smith | <u>27.5</u> | Kayla Garcia | <u>28.2</u> |

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

Signature: Zach Maghirang

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG 1:10 AFF 2:08

RFD: I vote neg - wins the fw arguing the transformative discourse is wt justice. Aff doesn't have a clear story to vote - even if plan creates justice its misconception of "as is" means this is just an illusion and doesn't actually lead to justice -

Q's? Email zmaghirang52@gmail.com

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Raisbeck Aviation JS

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Julia Shettler

NEG

Eastside Catholic DC

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Drew Charters

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

Signature: M Elizondo

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff needed a perm and spend more time on solvency takeout answers to push back against the K

^{in NR} Neg¹ was a bit repetitive and could have spent more time on examples like slavery evolving to PIC & racist voting laws to show a big story to why rev is better

Aff case is good but does have ~~to~~ to win reform/incremental change good - need cards or just examples - "Neg is right state ~~isn't~~ isn't perfect, not a reason to dissolve into anarchy" which is probs bad cuz no way to stop racists from killing people or ending oppression

Room: 402
Flight 2 Start: 12:30 PM
Open LD

5

Elizondo, Michael

Ingraham

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Gig Harbor AH

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Anne Hansen

NEG

Raisbeck Aviation ER

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Emily Readey

Winner:

Gig Harbor AH
School/Team

debating on the

Aff
~~Neg~~
Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

X

Signature:

M Elizondo

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg needed to spend more time on Chen ev to push back and go for one DA - would have had the ballot - that said, aff needs to do better @ answering FW & the DAs as a whole

Room: 602
Flight 1 Start: 12:30 PM
Open LD

5

LaMourea, Tessie
Fitzgerald, Matth-

~~Interlake~~
Eastside
Catholic

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Puyallup AA

Angeline Ashbaugh

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Federal Way SL

Sebastian Lucatero

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~AE~~

~~AE~~

2:00
1:43

aff

if you're going to spread, practice in advance so you don't stumble as much

group the framework debate to save time in the ITR

neg

try to be more assertive
watch your time

don't bring up dropped args in your NR
road map better

neg dropped good chunk of the AC and had no offense

aff able to show that cops ~~to~~ cause more harm ~~through~~ with the use of qi → aff wins

Room: 602
Flight 2 Start: 12:30 PM
Open LD

5

LaMourea, Tessa
~~Fitzgerald, Matth~~

~~Interlake~~
Eastside
catholic

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Puyallup AS

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

Ashley Simmons

NEG

Federal Way AM

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

Annamarie Meyers

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

Signature: _____



Comments & Reason for Decision:

2:00
2:02

aff wins the AC contention level debate
provides evidence of creates more
corruption
neg ~~speech~~ doesn't sufficiently address how
more training helps minimize risks

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Interlake HS ZL

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Zitao Li

NEG

Puyallup HP

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

Hallie Pichette

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

Signature: Charles Rusk

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This debate came down to topicality and Value. The AFF did a very good job presenting her case, and was able to argue back log isn't a significant harm. However, the majority of the AFF plan seemed to reside on a school Security official, and the NEG was able to state that they are different from officers and was not topical. They were also able to state that the immunity already did not apply to Constitutional violations, which was not challenged by the AFF.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Ingraham AP

POINTS
(0 - 30)

30

Alexander Prakash

NEG

Interlake HS EZheng

POINTS
(0 - 30)

30

Effie Zheng

Winner: Ingraham AP debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Charles Rusk

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Two of the best speakers of the day. While I did not find the value of Morality abusive, the AFF did a great job on stating why his value of Property was more substantial in the debate. The AFF also effectively attacked his opponents counter-plan, arguing they achieved the same thing, and arguing good officers still had reason to be afraid in either scenario. I wish I would have seen one more point from the Neg to tie together with their plan, as it stood it was light on points.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Puyallup HM

Hunter McGuire- Floyd

POINTS
(0-30)

26

NEG

Interlake HS EZeng

Elizabeth Zeng

POINTS
(0-30)

27

Winner:

Interlake HS EZeng

Debating on the

NEG

Low point win?

NO

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature:

Helen Boyer

Newport

I said at beginning of round to state sources fully the first time.

[Limit QI]

very focused on philosophy!

[US Needs QI]

Interesting, but concern that you both need to get into QI.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Q I OK
Insofar as it does not violate morals

How do we determine what is moral? Good Q - how does this relate to AC?

Value morality

deontology
Choice cannot be judged regardless of consequences.
Consequentialism = alternative.

NC
Moral obligation
Value: quality of life
Criterion: Utilitarianism (form of consequentialism -> most happiness)

Good summary of Kant
"Stanford Theory" state source.
Advocates for self-agency
OK to steal, murder, theft, drugs

Thank you for source!
Lawsuits not fair way to resolve.
Limiting QI will lead to depoliticizing.

Court 2: Loss of confidence in law enforcement.

Court 3: origin of law.
"Crown 95" - not a cite.
Not sure how this relates to your position after AC.
Now - in psych state of police release units field leads to poor decisions - your case becomes clear. (sorry if I missed it before!)
Argu v util-but again relate to your case. False evidence in sexual assault case -
Yes-but is there any evidence that happens how often? Court clog - takes officers off the streets - isn't that a problem?

"U of Va School of Law 192" is not a cite. "Law Review?"
"Bern 15" is not a cite.
Court 3: origin of law.
"Crown 95" - not a cite.

Aff cross
maximize happiness, minimize pain.
Court clog - cases drag on for years.

2d Neg Rebuttal
Good argu that if morality were in genes, there would be no crime. Util is used to create laws and there are laws preventing false evidence. Good meeting argued.
Good re if officers feel unsafe they will not do a good job.

Can breakdown - New argument.
2d Aff voters; weight of Frankfurt
How does falsifying evidence relate to QI?

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Interlake HS AM

POINTS
(0-30)

25

Alia Memon

NEG

Gig Harbor AM

POINTS
(0-30)

26

Autumn Miller

Winner: Gig Harbor School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature:

Helen A Boyer NEWPORT

AFF: US ought to limit QI

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG - us needs QI

Value: morality
Criterion: utilitarianism

Training not great for officers in US. Obj training sanctions use of force.

Property RTS are controversial - yes, but see Roe v Wade? Abortion? ^{AF said} ^{could be disagree}

How does that relate to property? ^{missed} ^{copy for AFF?} ^{not used} ⁺ "Clearly established clause" WIN

TIP: Please be respectful in your tone even if you disagree with opponent's arguments. "Flakey" ≠ ok, e.g.

Not good that Const is vague - just that we need to interpret it. (TIP) Poorly reasoned holdings are not gotten rid of they are overruled. Use formal language.

Same. other countries' systems provide examples. WIN - we, 3w

Obsv: 4th Am cases.
Obsv: VALUE: MORALITY
CRITERION: PROPERTY RTS PRESERVATION.
"One's own body" is not property
"Property RTS are prerequisite to all rights." Perhaps, philosophically, but not in the law.
[CONT 1] Better policing ~~sources~~

[CONT 2] QI Good sources.
Balancing test nullifies QI
NO CIVIL RTS
There are so many areas of law beyond 4th am. (comment) ^{your case could be broader} ^{very limiting}

We would have to ~~know~~ investigate police misconduct by sending them to court.

Q - Why are prop RTS so impo?
B/c all other RTS flow from it.

[CONT 3] QI focus on specific instances not on the law?.

+ Police S/B held accountable.
- other countries are different. ^{met}

NOTES
prop RTS p.o. jobs to uphold law; hold them responsible
better training of officers

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Raisbeck Aviation HT

POINTS
(0-30)

Hong Ta

28

NEG

Puyallup LB

POINTS
(0-30)

Logan Buckner

30

Winner: Aff RAHT

School/Team

debating on the Aff

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

Signature: Matthew Phillip Fisher

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff Solid Aff ✓ (1:55) Am

NC 4 m - (1:54) Aff is correct on omitted clash.

Structure (For Judges benefit) (You want organization) (Sign post)
 Value: Morality
 Value Analysis 1:
 2:
 3:
 Criterion:
 Cont 1: Absolute immunity
 Sub a) QI avoids debate
 b) QI avoids debate
 c) Distorts civil law
 Hassel
 Common Law = U.S. legal system
 Civil law = diff. type.
 Specificity = Civil Lawsuits

INC - Law Enforcement = dangerous, certain immunity, not absolute guarantee.
 V: Communitive Safety
 C: Societal Protection.
 (not = wash) by mutual agreement
 Cont 1: Frivolous lawsuits = clogged courts.
 Court Clog = Bannon 17
 QI = ↑ Public safety. Justice delayed can equal justice denied.
PRO ROSEN 2010 → ✓
 V: Morality → Subjective value I look to an objective value.
 Cont 1: Police checked for immunity.
 Cont 2: "police are inherently bad"
 Cont 3: Rights of police need to be considered

AR - Framework
 Millarian morality
 What proof for AI shift?
 Look at a bigger scale.
 focus on national scope.
 Insured.
 V:
 2AR Framework debate
 Civil rights. Liberty & safety.
 AI shift
 CE → not doing job correctly.

2NR
 → V: Communitive Safety: widest scale
 AS you can look with. Morality is too open to interp.
 1992 ↑ 75% civil trial increase.
 ✓ Become ↑ as a community.

406

Eastside DC vs Gig SA

Lincoln-Douglas Debate Ballot

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Tournament Date: | | | Tournament Location: | | |
| Round/ Flight: | Room: | Division: | Judge Name: <i>Petrone</i> | Judge School: | |
| Affirmative: <i>Eastside DC</i> | | | Name or ← Code → | Negative: <i>Gig SA</i> | |
| Aff. Points: | ← Award speaker points to each debater (based on the range below) → | | | | Neg. Points: |
| | 20-21 Below Average | 22-23 Average | 24-26 Good | 27-28 Excellent | 29-30 Outstanding |
| Decision: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Negative | | | Winning Team/Code: | | Low-point win? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |

- The resolution evaluated is a proposition of value, which concerns itself with what ought to be instead of what is. Values are ideals held by individuals, societies, governments, etc., which serve as the highest goals to be considered or achieved within the context of the resolution in question.
- Each debater has the burden to prove his or her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle. It is unrealistic to expect a debater to prove complete validity or invalidity of the resolution. The better debater is the one who, on the whole, proves his/her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle.
- Students are encouraged to research topic-specific literature and applicable works of philosophy. The nature of proof should be in the logic and the ethos of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion.
- Communication should emphasize clarity. Accordingly, a judge should only evaluate those arguments that were presented in a manner that was clear and understandable to him/her as a judge. Throughout the debate, the competitors should display civility as well as a professional demeanor and style of delivery.
- After a case is presented, neither debater should be rewarded for presenting a speech completely unrelated to the arguments of his or her opponent; there must be clash concerning the major arguments in the debate. Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments.
- The judge shall disregard new arguments introduced in rebuttal. This does not include the introduction of new evidence in support of points already advanced or the refutation of arguments introduced by opponents.
- Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.

Comments: provide detailed comments (both positive feedback and constructive criticism) designed to help both the debater and the coach; for example, suggestions on improving case construction, refutation, logic, delivery, etc.

*Neg-use CX to for m args not just what is this saying
An alt would be useful on this*

Reasons for Decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Plan makes squo net better no alt to squo

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

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

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

406

Eastside DC vs. Gig SA

Lincoln-Douglas Debate Ballot

| | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| Tournament Date: | | Tournament Location: | | |
| Round/Flight: | Room: 406 | Division: | Judge Name: Rusk | |
| Affirmative: Eastside DC | | Name or Code: | Negative: Gig SA | |
| Aff. Points: 25 | ← Award speaker points to each debater (based on the range below) → | | | Neg. Points: 24 |
| Decision: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Negative | | Winning Team/Code: Eastside DC | Low-point win? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | |

- The resolution evaluated is a proposition of value, which concerns itself with what ought to be instead of what is. Values are ideals held by individuals, societies, governments, etc., which serve as the highest goals to be considered or achieved within the context of the resolution in question.
- Each debater has the burden to prove his or her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle. It is unrealistic to expect a debater to prove complete validity or invalidity of the resolution. The better debater is the one who, on the whole, proves his/her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle.
- Students are encouraged to research topic-specific literature and applicable works of philosophy. The nature of proof should be in the logic and the ethos of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion.
- Communication should emphasize clarity. Accordingly, a judge should only evaluate those arguments that were presented in a manner that was clear and understandable to him/her as a judge. Throughout the debate, the competitors should display civility as well as a professional demeanor and style of delivery.
- After a case is presented, neither debater should be rewarded for presenting a speech completely unrelated to the arguments of his or her opponent; there must be clash concerning the major arguments in the debate. Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments.
- The judge shall disregard new arguments introduced in rebuttal. This does not include the introduction of new evidence in support of points already advanced or the refutation of arguments introduced by opponents.
- Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.

Comments: provide detailed comments (both positive feedback and constructive criticism) designed to help both the debater and the coach; for example, suggestions on improving case construction, refutation, logic, delivery, etc.

AFF
The best way to get your point across is not talk fast, high-pitched and mono-toned
This didn't hurt you more because both parties did it

Reasons for Decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

most of all was discussed after the debate

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

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

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

406

Eastside DC vs Gig SA



Lincoln-Douglas Debate Ballot

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------|----------------------|------------------|---|
| Tournament Date: | | | Tournament Location: | | |
| Round/Flight: | Room: | Division: | Judge Name: Elizondo | Judge School: | |
| Affirmative: Eastside DC | | | Name or Code → | Negative: Gig SA | |
| Aff. Points: | ← Award speaker points to each debater (based on the range below) → | | | | Neg. Points: |
| | 20-21 Below Average | 22-23 Average | 24-26 Good | 27-28 Excellent | 29-30 Outstanding |
| Decision: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Negative | | | Winning Team/Code: | | Low-point win? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |

- The resolution evaluated is a proposition of value, which concerns itself with what ought to be instead of what is. Values are ideals held by individuals, societies, governments, etc., which serve as the highest goals to be considered or achieved within the context of the resolution in question.
- Each debater has the burden to prove his or her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle. It is unrealistic to expect a debater to prove complete validity or invalidity of the resolution. The better debater is the one who, on the whole, proves his/her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle.
- Students are encouraged to research topic-specific literature and applicable works of philosophy. The nature of proof should be in the logic and the ethos of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion.
- Communication should emphasize clarity. Accordingly, a judge should only evaluate those arguments that were presented in a manner that was clear and understandable to him/her as a judge. Throughout the debate, the competitors should display civility as well as a professional demeanor and style of delivery.
- After a case is presented, neither debater should be rewarded for presenting a speech completely unrelated to the arguments of his or her opponent; there must be clash concerning the major arguments in the debate. Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments.
- The judge shall disregard new arguments introduced in rebuttal. This does not include the introduction of new evidence in support of points already advanced or the refutation of arguments introduced by opponents.
- Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.

Comments: provide detailed comments (both positive feedback and constructive criticism) designed to help both the debater and the coach; for example, suggestions on improving case construction, refutation, logic, delivery, etc.

slow down on tags overall for other judge

Qs in IAC CX wasn't ~~asking~~ ^{strategic} asking to explain cards gives aff time to flesh out case

Reasons for Decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Neg absent clear aff or specific link means no n-ung DA to aff - aff makes squo btr

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

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

Lincoln-Douglas Debate Ballot

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| Tournament Date: | | Tournament Location: | | | |
| Round/ Flight: | Room: | Division: | Judge Name: <i>Liam Donnelly</i> | | |
| Affirmative: <i>GH</i> | | Name or ← Code → | Negative: <i>ESC</i> | | |
| Aff. Points: | ← Award speaker points to each debater (based on the range below) → | | | Neg. Points: | |
| | 20-21 Below Average | 22-23 Average | 24-26 Good | 27-28 Excellent | 29-30 Outstanding |
| Decision: <input type="checkbox"/> Affirmative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Negative | | Winning Team/Code: <i>East side Catholic</i> | | Low-point win? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | |

- The resolution evaluated is a proposition of value, which concerns itself with what ought to be instead of what is. Values are ideals held by individuals, societies, governments, etc., which serve as the highest goals to be considered or achieved within the context of the resolution in question.
- Each debater has the burden to prove his or her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle. It is unrealistic to expect a debater to prove complete validity or invalidity of the resolution. The better debater is the one who, on the whole, proves his/her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle.
- Students are encouraged to research topic-specific literature and applicable works of philosophy. The nature of proof should be in the logic and the ethos of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion.
- Communication should emphasize clarity. Accordingly, a judge should only evaluate those arguments that were presented in a manner that was clear and understandable to him/her as a judge. Throughout the debate, the competitors should display civility as well as a professional demeanor and style of delivery.
- After a case is presented, neither debater should be rewarded for presenting a speech completely unrelated to the arguments of his or her opponent; there must be clash concerning the major arguments in the debate. Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments.
- The judge shall disregard new arguments introduced in rebuttal. This does not include the introduction of new evidence in support of points already advanced or the refutation of arguments introduced by opponents.
- Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.

Comments: provide detailed comments (both positive feedback and constructive criticism) designed to help both the debater and the coach; for example, suggestions on improving case construction, refutation, logic, delivery, etc.

Reasons for Decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

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

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

Lincoln-Douglas Debate Ballot

| | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| Tournament Date: FINCELS | | Tournament Location: OPER | | | |
| Round/ Flight: | Room: | Division: | Judge Name: COPENHAGEN | | |
| Affirmative: WEG HARZOR | | Name of ← Code → | Negative: SEASTSIDE CATHOLIC | | |
| Aff. Points: | ← Award speaker points to each debater (based on the range below) → | | | Neg. Points: | |
| | 20-21 Below Average | 22-23 Average | 24-26 Good | 27-28 Excellent | 29-30 Outstanding |
| Decision: <input type="checkbox"/> Affirmative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Negative | | Winning Team/Code: | | Low-point win? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | |

1. The resolution evaluated is a proposition of value, which concerns itself with what ought to be instead of what is. Values are ideals held by individuals, societies, governments, etc., which serve as the highest goals to be considered or achieved within the context of the resolution in question.
2. Each debater has the burden to prove his or her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle. It is unrealistic to expect a debater to prove complete validity or invalidity of the resolution. The better debater is the one who, on the whole, proves his/her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle.
3. Students are encouraged to research topic-specific literature and applicable works of philosophy. The nature of proof should be in the logic and the ethos of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion.
4. Communication should emphasize clarity. Accordingly, a judge should only evaluate those arguments that were presented in a manner that was clear and understandable to him/her as a judge. Throughout the debate, the competitors should display civility as well as a professional demeanor and style of delivery.
5. After a case is presented, neither debater should be rewarded for presenting a speech completely unrelated to the arguments of his or her opponent; there must be clash concerning the major arguments in the debate. Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments.
6. The judge shall disregard new arguments introduced in rebuttal. This does not include the introduction of new evidence in support of points already advanced or the refutation of arguments introduced by opponents.
7. Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.

Comments: provide detailed comments (both positive feedback and constructive criticism) designed to help both the debater and the coach; for example, suggestions on improving case construction, refutation, logic, delivery, etc.

Reasons for Decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

**Order/Time Limits
of Speeches**

Affirmative Constructive 6 min.
Neg. Cross-Ex of Aff. 3 min.

Negative Constructive 7 min.
Aff. Cross-Ex of Neg. 3 min.

Affirmative Rebuttal 4 min.
Negative Rebuttal 6 min.

Affirmative Rebuttal 3 min.

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

Lincoln-Douglas Debate Ballot

| | | | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| Tournament Date: | | Tournament Location: ARHS | | | |
| Round/ Flight: <i>FINAL</i> | Room: <i>406</i> | Division: <i>0</i> | Judge Name: <i>MAGHIRANG</i> | | |
| Affirmative: <i>Gig Harbor</i> | | Name or ← Code → | Negative: <i>Eastside Catholic</i> | | |
| Aff. Points: | ← Award speaker points to each debater (based on the range below) → | | | Neg. Points: | |
| | 20-21 Below Average | 22-23 Average | 24-26 Good | 27-28 Excellent | 29-30 Outstanding |
| Decision: <input type="checkbox"/> Affirmative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Negative | | Winning Team/Code: <i>Eastside</i> | | Low-point win? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | |

- The resolution evaluated is a proposition of value, which concerns itself with what ought to be instead of what is. Values are ideals held by individuals, societies, governments, etc., which serve as the highest goals to be considered or achieved within the context of the resolution in question.
- Each debater has the burden to prove his or her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle. It is unrealistic to expect a debater to prove complete validity or invalidity of the resolution. The better debater is the one who, on the whole, proves his/her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle.
- Students are encouraged to research topic-specific literature and applicable works of philosophy. The nature of proof should be in the logic and the ethos of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion.
- Communication should emphasize clarity. Accordingly, a judge should only evaluate those arguments that were presented in a manner that was clear and understandable to him/her as a judge. Throughout the debate, the competitors should display civility as well as a professional demeanor and style of delivery.
- After a case is presented, neither debater should be rewarded for presenting a speech completely unrelated to the arguments of his or her opponent; there must be clash concerning the major arguments in the debate. Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments.
- The judge shall disregard new arguments introduced in rebuttal. This does not include the introduction of new evidence in support of points already advanced or the refutation of arguments introduced by opponents.
- Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.

Comments: provide detailed comments (both positive feedback and constructive criticism) designed to help both the debater and the coach; for example, suggestions on improving case construction, refutation, logic, delivery, etc.

Reasons for Decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Questions? Email:
Zmaghirang52@gmail.com

RFD: I vote Neg → I think Neg is winning the FW argument about reform needing to be not enough + complete challenge of institutions is necessary. - I don't understand why aff is structural violence at end of the deb and think the Alt is the only way to reduce SV through anarchist + egalitarian communities

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

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

Lincoln-Douglas Debate Ballot

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|------------------------------------|---|-------------------|--|
| Tournament Date: 12/10/16 | | Tournament Location: Auburn Riverston HS | | | | |
| Round/Flight: Finals | Room: 404 | Division: W | Judge Name: Ethna Upton | | | |
| Affirmative: <i>Carroll Hobbs vs</i> | | Name or Code: ← | Negative: <i>Pepper King LP vs</i> | | | |
| Aff. Points: | ← Award speaker points to each debater (based on the range below) → | | | Neg. Points: | | |
| | 20-21 Below Average | 22-23 Average | 24-26 Good | 27-28 Excellent | 29-30 Outstanding | |
| Decision: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Negative | | Winning Team/Code: | | Low-point win? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | | |

- The resolution evaluated is a proposition of value, which concerns itself with what ought to be instead of what is. Values are ideals held by individuals, societies, governments, etc., which serve as the highest goals to be considered or achieved within the context of the resolution in question.
- Each debater has the burden to prove his or her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle. It is unrealistic to expect a debater to prove complete validity or invalidity of the resolution. The better debater is the one who, on the whole, proves his/her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle.
- Students are encouraged to research topic-specific literature and applicable works of philosophy. The nature of proof should be in the logic and the ethos of a student's independent analysis and/or authoritative opinion.
- Communication should emphasize clarity. Accordingly, a judge should only evaluate those arguments that were presented in a manner that was clear and understandable to him/her as a judge. Throughout the debate, the competitors should display civility as well as a professional demeanor and style of delivery.
- After a case is presented, neither debater should be rewarded for presenting a speech completely unrelated to the arguments of his or her opponent; there must be clash concerning the major arguments in the debate. Cross-examination should clarify, challenge, and/or advance arguments.
- The judge shall disregard new arguments introduced in rebuttal. This does not include the introduction of new evidence in support of points already advanced or the refutation of arguments introduced by opponents.
- Because debaters cannot choose which side of the resolution to advocate, judges must be objective evaluators of both sides of the resolution. Evaluate the round based only on the arguments that the debaters made and not on personal opinions or on arguments you would have made.

Comments: provide detailed comments (both positive feedback and constructive criticism) designed to help both the debater and the coach; for example, suggestions on improving case construction, refutation, logic, delivery, etc.

*Aff - more than should
at least in LAR*

*- Talk about "safety
for whom"*

*Neg - C.2 should
be relevant W/ vs*

*- More internal analysis
of safety key over Justice
- link to whom*

Reasons for Decision (provide a detailed justification, referring to central issues debaters presented in the round):

Order/Time Limits of Speeches

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

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

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

| AFF | POINTS | NEG | POINTS |
|------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Newport SX | (0 - 30) | Interlake HS AM | (0 - 30) |
| Sarah Xu | <u>26.9</u> | Alia Memon | <u>27.2</u> |

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

Signature: J Richards Eastside Catholic

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Aff tells me to focus on the harms that befall the oppressed as victims of structural violence. She advocates restricting QI because it prevents accountability for wrongful police action and because QI prevents courts from ruling and developing constitutional law.

The Neg provides a counterpoint view that tells me that I need to hold the right people accountable to create real change, and the police misconduct is due to training deficiencies and poor norms. She advocates a CP for vicarious liability and notes that the AC strengthens judicial oversight but does not acknowledge the institutional racism or the responsibility of the courts for the overreach of QI. This is claimed to diminish AC solvency.

The round is really decided in the IAR, which severely undercuts the Neg position, especially on the Aff side of the flow, not addressing, for example, the circular reasoning in AC epistemology of structural violence, or the 2 turns (scapegoating and legal indeterminacy) on the AC. The NC pulls these arguments across and does a good job rebutting her own case. I vote neg on the AC turns and the NC thesis that true justice requires that the departments and its norms ~~are~~ (the true culprits) be addressed, which the AC does not do.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Kingston TS

Thad Smith

POINTS
(0-30)

27

watch ums

NEG

Puyallup LB

Logan Buckner

POINTS
(0-30)

30

Winner:

Puyallup LB

School/Team

debating on the

Neg

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

No

Signature:

Matthew Fitzgerald

Comments & Reason for Decision:

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| IAC | 4m | SOLE USE OF NON-RESOLUTIONAL NOT ANSWERED |
| <p>V: J - Aristotle ✓ Add some</p> <p>C: Conservatism ✓ tonal</p> <p>Def: Does not mean ^{front} remove to your</p> <p>To limit - bands, constraints, confines speech</p> <p>Plan - Senate, change law.</p> <p>Cont 1: Reason - Laytona Davis. ✓</p> <p>Cont 2: Illusion of J ✓</p> <p>Cont 3: Harm ✓</p> <p>Harm = creates policy choices</p> <p>Stop playing with coat button.</p> | <p>INC 4m</p> <p>V: Community Safety ✓</p> <p>C: Societal protection ✓</p> <p>INR</p> <p>Community is safer ✓</p> <p>~ / GI -</p> <p>protect our police.</p> <p>Right to fair trial.</p> <p>Comm. Protection</p> <p>(LOG COURTS)</p> | |
| <p>AR</p> <p>Stuff ✓</p> <p>(Standard) Law Review,</p> <p>Checks & Balances,</p> <p>Justice EAST</p> <p>community safety..</p> | <p>2 AR</p> <p>IAR, AC - Net</p> <p>Clg court system.</p> <p>Fraudous laws w/ dismissed...</p> <p>Dropped all Cont.</p> <p>Justin!</p> <p>imitation frame</p> | <p>V: Justice ✓</p> <p>70% ↑ (evidence, solid)</p> <p>Limit GI = ↑ Court (log) & Justice</p> <p>Bias from swing PO. Removes</p> <p>OUTSIDE OF PRES</p> <p>(solid rebuttal)</p> <p>Vote: Neg = Safety</p> |

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Puyallup HP

Hallie Pichette

POINTS
(0-30)

28

NEG

Raisbeck Aviation HT

Hong Ta

POINTS
(0-30)

30

Winner:

Raisbeck Aviation HT
Neg Hong TA

debating on the

Neg
Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

Ab

Signature:

Matthew Fitzgerald

Comments & Reason for Decision:

IAE (2m)

4m / 1m / 2m

GREAT definition

V = Justice

C: Maximizing Adequation

Use all speech time

(6m)

Interesting CX

CX ✓

6m
7m
3m
4m
6m
3m

NC-AC
V: Morality
C: Minimizing harms
Consequentialist
Cont 1: Steer officers away from
necessary conduct.

STUFF ✓

- a) GLOB!
- b) things
- c) in morals
- d) poor representation

BLMP

NOT THE SQ. Status Quo

V: Justice cannot exist in its own.
C: Maximizing Adequation - Police officers
Socially, yes, are NOT equal.
More stuff, realistically, no. They risk their
lives daily.
FRIVOLOUS.

2NR JUSTICE IS HINDERED!

AC-NC flow
Argument: non-unique.
Nobody cares ✓✓✓

AR - Justice is
existing on its
own.
Loopholes!

2AR

Cont 2 =
Solves problem
Closes the
loop.
Flow in
forward.
No more
morals.

STUFF.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

| AFF | POINTS | NEG | POINTS |
|----------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|
| Gig Harbor AH | (0 - 30) | Ingraham AP | (0 - 30) |
| Anne Hansen | <u>29</u> | Alexander Prakash | <u>28</u> |

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

Signature: Melizondo

Comments & Reason for Decision:

IAC - think you need a good one sentence AT: what is structural vlnC?

Neg - work on phrasing what can & cannot be structural vlnC & govt obligations

Aff - impact out struct) vlnC in IAR w/ Scheper-Hughes

...: 410
ght 1 Start: 4:00 PM
Open LD

6 Rusk,

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER Dec 9 - 10, 2016

| AFF | POINTS (0 - 30) | NEG | POINTS (0 - 30) |
|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| Gig Harbor KG | | Raisbeck Aviation ER | |
| Kayla Garcia | <u>28</u> | Emily Readey | <u>27</u> |

Winner: Gig Harbor KG debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Gig Harbor SA

POINTS

(0-30)

29

Summer Ash

NEG

Raisbeck Aviation JS

POINTS

(0-30)

28

Julia Shettler

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

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Aff needs to show me more clearly how discourse is necessarily getting us to justice -
- Neg standard is clearer, but w/c analysis doesn't stand up to w/c attacks terribly well.
- Court Clog seems very non-unique. It already exists for a variety of reasons
- Judges vs Justices / ST. Both imperfect & neg defense seems out of touch - All can be biased -
- While I like the w/c Min. Ham, she doesn't attain it. Not hugely impressed w/ the Aff, but its better defended and Discourse - access to justice - is more clearly attained.
- Overall a nice debate - Both were clear speakers.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Gig Harbor AM

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28.5

Autumn Miller

NEG

Eastside Catholic DC

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29

Drew Charters

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

Signature: James Stevenson

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Anarchy > limiting QI
- Too much of the 2AR is new
 - 1AR drops court dog
 - 1AR is too defensive - needs more offense
 - Neg is a little too disorganized in the NR - needs better structure

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Interlake HS EZeng

POINTS
(0-30)

29

Elizabeth Zeng

NEG

Puyallup DP


POINTS
(0-30)

29

Drake Poirer

Winner: ELIZABETH ZENG
INTERLAKE H.S.
School/Team

debating on the



Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?



Signature: Elizabeth Zeng

Comments & Reason for Decision:

☆ "JUSTICE" SEEMS AN APPROPRIATE VALUE SINCE THIS RESOLUTION CONCERNS THE 'CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM'

⚙️ 'DEMOCRACY' LEADS TO THE SAME ABUSES (TO THE DISADVANTAGED) BEING COMMITTED BY 'CORRUPT POLICE OFFICERS' DOES Q.I. MERELY "ALLOW FOR" RIGHTS VIOLATIONS, OR DOES IT ACTUALLY CAUSE IT?

?! "Q.I. DISTORTS LAW"... WHOA!

💡 "PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF POLICE IS IMPORTANT"... NICE!!

⚙️ INSTEAD OF SAYING "MINORITY", CONSIDER SAYING "DISADVANTAGED".

💡 Q.I. PREVENTS LEGAL REFORM... COOL!

👁️ "RETRIBUTIVE JUSTICE" IS "VENGEANCE"!
(... WHICH IS IMMORAL!!)

💡 INSTEAD OF 'RETRIBUTIVE JUSTICE', CONSIDER USING 'REFORMATIVE JUSTICE'

👉 "PUBLIC SAFETY" --- RIGHT ON!

💀 SLOW DOWN! WHEN YOU SPEAK SO FAST, COMMUNICATION SUFFERS!

🌀 "REDUCING RISKS TO INDIVIDUALS" SOUNDS GOOD... BUT I'M NOT SURE HOW 'RETRIBUTIVE JUSTICE' ACHIEVES THIS...

💡 "REDUCING RISK" ≠ "ELIMINATING RISKS"

👉 "IMPROVED POLICE TRAINING"... TRY NOT TO SPECULATE TOO MUCH ABOUT WHAT THE POLICE WILL OR WON'T DO IN THE FUTURE...

👉 "IMPROVED POLICE TRAINING" IS COOL, BUT IS IT THE ACTUAL INTENTION OF Q.I.?!?



I PREFER AFF'S VALUE OF (REGULAR) JUSTICE TO NEG'S "RETRIBUTIVE JUSTICE". Q.I. CONCERNS POLICE & LAW ENFORCEMENT; IT HAS LESS TO DO WITH COURTS OF LAW, PRISONS, OR THE 'CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM' WHICH ARE MORE INTERESTED IN 'RETRIBUTIVE JUSTICE' (PUNISHMENT).

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Federal Way AM

POINTS
(0-30)

28

Annamarie Meyers

NEG

Puyallup KH

POINTS
(0-30)

27

Kaylie Haven

Winner: ANNA MARIE MEYERS
FEDERAL WAY (-TO-GO!) debating on the AFF!
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)


Low point win? nope.

Signature: ♡ 77 味 外 真

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- 'OUGHT' ... I PREFER "OBLIGATION" INSTEAD OF "DUTY"
- "RETRIBUTIVE JUSTICE" IS 'VENGEANCE!' (...WHICH IS IMMORAL!!)
- INSTEAD, PERHAPS IT WOULD BE MORE EFFECTIVE TO USE "REFORMATIVE JUSTICE" ...
- "ALLOWS" ≠ "CAUSES"
- TRY NOT TO SPECULATE TOO MUCH ABOUT THE MOTIVES OF 'CORRUPT POLICE OFFICERS'
- ★ POLICE SHOULDN'T BE AFRAID OF THE LAW ... GOOD CALL!
- Q.I. PREVENTS LEGAL REFORM ... GOT IT!
- ⑥ "I WEIGH MORE" ... WHOA!

- DO WE REALLY NEED A DEFINITION FOR "LIMIT"?!?
- 'CONSTITUTIONALITY' IS KINDA FLIMSY; THE GOVERNMENT, POLICE & PEOPLE ALL VIOLATE THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ALL THE TIME. WHAT MAKES Q.I. ANY DIFFERENT?!
- CONSIDER LOSING THE LAPTOP; IT MAKES YOU APPEAR LESS PREPARED & DISTRACTS YOUR AUDIENCE...
- POLICE DON'T "CREATE JUSTICE"; THEY 'ENFORCE THE LAW'
- WHAT IS THE ACTUAL 'HARM' OF "FRIVOLOUS LAWSUITS"?!?
- INSTEAD OF "PURPOSEFUL", MAYBE SAY "INTENTIONAL"
- TOO MUCH 'POLICE ADVOCACY' (ALL PUBLIC FORUM); WHY IS 'POLICE SECURITY' GOOD FOR ALL?



AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Interlake HS AL

Alex Liu

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Puyallup AS

Ashley Simmons

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27.5

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

Signature: [Signatures]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF - I think that CI isn't topical. Cards are specific to policing institutions, which can't be sued, but institutions don't get QI, so I fail to see the link.

You shouldn't let her speak out of answers in CX, you need to press harder on issues.

IAR coverage was good on neg args, but you NEED to make extensions from your offense.

There were like ZERO extensions on the aff in the IAR or the 2AR.

NEG - Your CX wasn't really strategically compelling, lots of loose, disparate threads when you could have asked questions to set up links into neg stuff, forced concessions, etc.

I don't think your CI contains an internal warrant - nothing read indicates QI is K2 solve.

also I think the answers to the aff were not particularly responsive.

You NEED to answer his IAR impact turns.

I don't think that FW matters, but if it did I would flip neg, I buy neg CI doesn't do anything and that aff wins turns to neg offense - for some reason aff doesn't extend ANY of offense.

Kho

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

| AFF | POINTS (0 - 30) | NEG | POINTS (0 - 30) |
|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Interlake HS EZheng | | Puyallup AA | |
| Effie Zheng | <u>28</u> | Angeline Ashbaugh | <u>27</u> |

Winner: INTERLAKE EZHENG debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO
School/Team

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

BOTH AFF + NEG VALUES ULTIMATELY WEIGHED BY AFF
VAL OF SOCIAL CONTRACT. THE AFF ASSERTATION THAT THE
US CONSTITUTION IS THE CONTRACT TO BE EVALUATED WAS
UNCONTESTED. THEREFORE, AFF CONTENTION THAT 9th AMEND
RIGHT TO ONE PROCEEDS OUTWEIGHED IMPACTS OF COURT
CLOG. NEG ARGUED Q1 CARD THAT THE JUDICIAL SYST.
WOULD COLLAPSE EFFECTIVELY UNTELED BY AFF
KERRIGAN II EVIDENCE SHOWING CASE LOAD DECREASED
BY 50% IN CHICAGO - A VERY PRAGMATIC EXAMPLE.
AS TO AFF ADMITTING IN CX THAT LIMITING Q1 WOULD
LEAD TO MORE CASES, THE KERRIGAN CARD WAS USED
BY AFF THAT MORE CASES WAS NOT THE SAME AS
COURT CLOG.

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Puyallup HM

Hunter McGuire- Floyd

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

NEG

Puyallup LG


Lukas Graham

POINTS

(0 - 30)

27

Winner: Puyallup HM School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO (TIE)

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

COIN TOSS - SAME SCHOOL AFFILIATION, AGREED TO BY BOTH PARTIES.

SPEAKER POINTS AWARDED AFTER BOTH AC AND NC READ CASES OUT TO JUDGE.

LaMourea, Tessie

~~Shiroma, Garrett~~

Raisbeck Aviation

ECHS

m: 512
Light 1 Start: 4:00 PM
Open LD

6

AUBURN RIVERSIDE INVITATIONAL AND NIETOC QUALIFIER

Dec 9 - 10, 2016

AFF

Newport LH

Liam Ho

POINTS
(0-30)

29

NEG

Interlake HS ZL

Zitao Li

POINTS
(0-30)

27

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

neg had no unique offense
aff had clean extensions
in the 1AR and made
clear weighing impacts in the 2AR