

Double Check Sheet -- Round 4 -- Div 3 Lincoln-Douglas

Brown Ra	S. Abdalmalik	Steven Abdalmalik	28.0	F. Agrellus	Felicia Agrelus	27.0	AFF -- S. Abdalmalik
Bush Emi	M. Ali	Mahnoor Ali	26.0	A. Lenamond	Alec Lenamond	28.0	AFF -- M. Ali
Bustos M	J. Jung	Jae Jung	28.0	K. Davis	Kathryn Davis	27.0	NEG -- K. Davis
Currier	K. Seieroe	Katelyn Seieroe	28.0	D. Tang	Daniel Tang	28.0	AFF -- K. Seieroe
Decker C	L. Flores	Laura Flores	27.0	T. Johnson	Tate Johnson	27.0	AFF -- L. Flores
Guo Zhon	J. Roberts	Jonathan Roberts	28.0	J. Hurley	Joe Hurley	27.0	AFF -- J. Roberts
Hernande	D. Lui	Derek Lui	28.0	C. Fernandes	Christopher Fernandes	28.0	NEG -- C. Fernandes
Lala San	V. Vanterpool	Vince Vanterpool	29.0	K. Macalino	Ken Macallno	28.0	AFF -- V. Vanterpool
McClure	A. Brown	Andrew Brown	26.0	S. Osuna	Sarah Osuna	27.0	NEG -- S. Osuna
Reid Edn	D. Chao	Diana Chao	26.0	N. Kim	Nicole Kim	27.0	AFF -- D. Chao
Ruiz Tri	L. Bassil	Loren Bassil	99.5	A. Lee	Alexis Lee	99.5	AFF -- L. Bassil
Seymor S	N. Mohideen	Naveen Mohideen	27.0	R. Shahatit	Rami Shahatit	28.0	NEG -- R. Shahatit
Singleto	A. Kim	Annika Kim	28.0	C. Yamane	Chaska Yamane	26.0	AFF -- A. Kim
Smith Na	B. Guo	Brandon Guo	24.0	C. Gamble	Chase Gamble	24.0	NEG -- C. Gamble
Williams	S. Helland	Sophia Helland	26.0	D. Lim	David Lim	25.0	AFF -- S. Helland

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

D. Lui

Max = 30

Derek Lui

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

C. Fernandes

Max = 30

Christopher Fernandes

28

The better debating was done by the

Neg
AFF or NEG

from

Christopher Fernandes
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: David Hernandez

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

Neg

I liked that you were a little more direct, the debate came down to justification, I felt like the both of you beat around the bush a little, you guy both kept say how intervention would or wouldnt impact the world but gave examples tailored to your own purposes. I would have liked to see more facts or examples.

I dont think you were able to uphold or state the action to intervene was justified enough, you mostly repeated the same points.

Very nice and clearly stated speeches. would've liked to see more eye contact rather than looking at the begin. Great job.

You lingered a lot on the top on what considers a sovereign nation or not. You continually repeated this idea. You kept saying the same key points over and over; I would've like a few more examples or perhaps a few more reasons how economic turmoil would follow.

You touch better on the value mechanism, stating Aff's was too broad and adequate examples, more variety could've hit home better.

You spoke well & clear enough, I would've liked to see a bit more pronunciation and emphasis. Great speech though!

Brown, R.

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

AFFIRMATIVE
S. Abdalmalik
Steven Abdalmalik

POINTS

Max = 30

28

NEGATIVE

F. Agrelius

Felicia Agrelius

POINTS

Max = 30

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from Steven Abdalmalik
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Randy G. Brown

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff was successful in fending off Neg's attacks, particularly by pointing out that (1) US choose to participate in UN activities, so a UN intervention led by the US is no different than a US unilateral intervention and (2) it is moral for the UN, it ought to be moral for the US (Neg did not effectively counter this). In addition, Neg's contention about the US being delegitimized by intervention used examples that were not relevant to the case of intervention to stop genocide, which is what Aff was discussing (Neg used cont 1 as an attack on Aff).

Overall A good debate with very clear cases.

AFF WINS

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

K. Seieroe

Max = 30

Katelyn Seieroe

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

D. Tang

Max = 30

Daniel Tang

28

The better debating was done by the

Aff.
AFF or NEG

from

K. Seieroe
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Alisa Allen Currier

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Am.... two good debaters / well matched -
One great Freshman (NEG.) - surprisingly brilliant in his debate (#
One experienced great Senior (AFF.) Knowledge) skills!!
They both did well!! Mrs. Seieroe also did answer a? Mr. Tang had during a time that she did not have to.

Neg. - make sure you speak clearly - VERY KIND!
& continue to work on your presentation - stand strong - refine your DONT DROP ENDS OF SENTENCES - ; motions
Look judge in the eye more -
You have a great future in debate - !!
Very good arguments & points -

Aff. wins by a hair - Great Debate!
* "Greater Good For Greater # of People yes, you did prove this"
It's nice to see a humane debater.... Aff did her best... but also was nice & helpful to her opponent - who is in his 1st year of this

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

N. Mohideen

Naveen Mohideen

Max = 30

27 ~~8~~

NEGATIVE

POINTS

R. Shahatit

Rami Shahatit

Max = 30

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from Citrus Valley
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This was a close debate both sides had good arguments. However, AFF states that US should take action with or without UN yet he was trying to promote universalism. He also stated that US should use their own standards to take action yet he said US should assist UN. Neg proposed that if US should assist UN or universalism the Declaration of Human Rights should be used to promote human rights universally and not just one countries ideals.

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

J. Roberts

Max = 30

J. Hurley

Max = 30

Jonathan Roberts

28

Joe Hurley

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from J. Roberts.

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Guo Zhongping

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- 01 - SA
- C1 - SB - 2003
- C2 - Sta R.
- SA.
- SB. prevents war

Smooth well organized
 used example
 calm
 response to CR.


Noise
 used statistics to
 against opponent,
 that's a good strategy.

Standard of freedom

well structured, take on the
 negative first, then present
 the Affirmative.

emphasized what the other side
 didn't do. to let the judge know.

timer made big noise, distracting
 to the other side, minus



CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

M. Ali

Max = 30

Mahnoor Ali

26

NEGATIVE

POINTS

A. Lenamond

Max = 30

Alec Lenamond

28

The better debating was done by the

Aff
AFF or NEG

from

M. Ali
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed:

Emily Bush

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff's case showed that it would uphold its own value as well as the Neg's value of global stability, while Neg focused on semantics and was unclear. Neither case was good but Aff did a better job.

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA
February 23, 2013

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

V. Vanterpool

Max = 30

K. Macalino

Max = 30

Vince Vanterpool

29

Ken Macalino

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME
AFF or NEG

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

-This was a very even contest and both the contestants were ~~also~~ very strong in their preparation, content and delivery. Both were very polite and sportsmanlike. The Aff contestant was generally stronger in the cross examinations and the rebuttals, specially the final rebuttal.

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA
February 23, 2013

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

B. Guo

Brandon Guo

Max = 30

24

NEGATIVE

POINTS

C. Gamble

Chase Gamble

Max = 30

24

The better debating was done by the NEG from C. Gamble
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

aff - did not clearly state his position.
did not express his thoughts clearly.

Neg - was more persuasive, organized
& presented his points clearly.

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

D. Chao

Max = 30

Diana Chao

26

NEGATIVE

POINTS

N. Kim

Max = 30

Nicole Kim

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from D. Chao
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Diana ~~provided~~ proved that the affirma-
tive side of the resolution more valid as a
general principle by presenting ^{some} evidence and
proof to support her case.

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

S. Helland

Max = 30

Sophia Helland

26

NEGATIVE - *used cell phone as timer*

POINTS

D. Lim

Max = 30

David Lim

25

The better debating was done by the AFF from S. Helland.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Emily Williams

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff. Clear definitions easily followed what your position was and where your topic was going and how your definitions fit into the flow of your debate. Fair cross and strong questions as well as answers to your opponents cross.

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Max = 30

A. Brown

Andrew Brown

26

NEGATIVE POINTS

S. Osuna Max = 30

Sarah Osuna 27

The better debating was done by the Neg. from S. Osuna
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Rebecca McClure

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both debate students articulately defended their sides, were poised + respectful.

Sarah Osuna had more points to defend her position and provided counter-points to Andrew Brown's position. She used specific examples to support her argument.

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

AFFIRMATIVE
L. Bassil
Loren Bassil

POINTS

Max = 30

AVG.

NEGATIVE

A. Lee

Alexis Lee

POINTS

Max = 30

AVG.

The better debating was done by the AFF from BASSIL
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

A. Kim

Max = 30

Annika Kim

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

C. Yamane

Max = 30

Chaska Yamane

26

The better debating was done by the AFF from Annika Kim
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- Good mentioning the president's stance early
- Sovereignty derives from a states' ability to protect its citizens
- Strong cards for the responsibility of intervention
- Good references on who get to intervene legally
- The US is the only country that has the capability
- Libya was successful

Neg

- virtue & ethics < Morality
- > cannot correct others if we are not right
- > You will need to prove that the US isn't the most capable
- > The US can have an intervention that is humanitarian enough. X

RFD

Aff showed that sovereignty can be breached legally, and neg spent too much time on virtue & ethics > Morality.

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

L. Flores

Max = 30

Laura Flores

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

T. Johnson

Max = 30

Tate Johnson

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from LAURA FLORES
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Carl Decker

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The round primarily represented a clash of the principles of precedent vs. those of responsibility and novelty. Moral grounds and arguments of moral compulsion were a wash, as both speakers conceded that there is little legal or moral obligation for action. Johnson (Neg) provided very capable, effective arguments for the inefficacy of both economic & military interventions, past & present. Furthermore, a strong case was made by NEG that ^(Lebanon, Syria) the responsibility of the state (U.S.), is to its own people & not those of foreign actors, and that U.S. economic & military mingling has generated significant enough anti-Americanism so as to warrant a more hands-off diplomacy. On these fronts, NEG presented stronger contentions. However, Aff's presentation of economic (trade terms, taxation, technology sharing) incentives, ~~was~~ a main component of the entirety of Aff's case, was relatively unaddressed throughout the round. As presented, incentivization as a novel form of fulfilling long-term responsibilities of any nation-state (especially the U.S.) to provide nation security, both domestically & abroad, stood throughout the round, if only because NEG's response to this key mechanism remained underdeveloped.

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

J. Jung

Max = 30

K. Davis

Max = 30

Jae Jung

28

Kathryn Davis

27

The better debating was done by the Neg from Los Osos
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: Martin Bustos

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Used more eye contact
- Good job keeping control of your floor
- Know the names of the examples of the other team
- Don't argue that people sign their lives to the government
- kept saying, "stop human rights good martyr count, I enjoy numbers"

- Good job steering Gutterinsen to heart him
- Lower your paper, it blocks your mouth and muddles your words.
- Great twist on former troops and bringing it together
- try to use the Aff's definition of justified.
- "we see" count
|||||

While the Aff helped me see genocide should be stopped, the neg made me see the count do it alone and when they try they have problems