

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA
February 23, 2013

F. Agrelus (Felicia Agrelus) vs. S. Abdalmalik (Steven Abdalmalik)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Agrelus

Abdalmalik

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff Is justified if majority US citizen against?
Is justified if majority citizen of ^{the} other country against?
Is justified if US does not intervene because we are not able to?
Neg: where is the line between ^{value} dollars amount and human values?
Is intervention justified if the cost is relatively low?

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

S. Abdalmalik (Steven Abdalmalik) vs. F. Agrelius (Felicia Agrelius)

AFFIRMATIVE

Agrelius

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Abdalmalik

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

SPEAKS > AFF : 28
NEG : 28

Signed: *Carl Decker*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: ~~xxxxxxxx~~ The thesis of the debate, as expressed, was founded upon the precautionary principle against vs. sound practice from precedent / the uncertainty principle. Arguments from NEG that were particularly compelling were the prioritization of welfare - US ; Intl - of state peoples, the cost of intervention (\$2.4 trillion for Iraq + Afghanistan), and cycles of dependency (Iraq). Salient argumentation from AFF included the unique capabilities of the US in effecting change w/ human rights abuses (especially where the U.N. has failed, like in Rwanda ; Cambodia), and in how the upheaval of regimes generates long term security for US interests.

Now, the criteria for NEG was expressed to be pragmatics, which rely on sufficient uncertainty to buy into. Although 77% of interventions have failed to generate regime overthrow, alone the metric - even when coupled with cost - was not argued sufficiently to counter the sole change-agent advocated by AFF. AFF's analysis of intrinsic uncertainty even in successful endeavors of intl security was stronger than the pragmatism of NEG. Either way, great job! See me for more information / adjudication

Room: C-68
Start: ASAP
Lincoln-Douglas

FINAL

Reid Kevin

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

F. Agrelius (Felicia Agrelius) vs. S. Abdalmalik (Steven Abdalmalik)

AFFIRMATIVE

Agrelius

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Abdalmalik

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013
Roberts v. Vanderpool

AFFIRMATIVE

John Roberts

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Citrus Valley		
	Speaker:	29	
	Speaker:		

NEGATIVE

Vince Vanderpool

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Hunter		
	Speaker:	27	
	Speaker:		

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

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

Signed: Brian J. Lamb

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Although both contestants presented a spirited Debate, the AFF was more convincing in presenting the resolution. The AFF presented a concise + cohesive relationship between the contentions + his value statement. Presentation skills by AFF was excellent.

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Roberts v. Vantepool

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Citrus Valley		
	Speaker: Jonathan Roberts	29	
	Speaker:		

NEGATIVE

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Heritage High		
	Speaker: Vince Vantepool	27	
	Speaker:		

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg was impressive, but AFF won every argument
 The Aff case was far superior and sustained
 Especially clever to narrow define as current
 conflicts
 The Neg followed the argument well (didn't get
 lost) but was unclear/unpersuasive.
 The Neg relied, among several specious argues.
 on self interest denying the concept of
 humanitarianism. This was disproved
 severally.

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Jonathan Roberts v. Vanterpool

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	School: Citrus Valley	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: J. Roberts	30	
	Speaker:		

NEGATIVE

POS	School: Heritage	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: V. Vanterpool	28	
	Speaker:		

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

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

Signed: Karen Schmauss

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I chose Aff. as winner based on logical, clear debate and more convincing argument, e.g. US is interdependent with other nations and a stable global community is vital. Aff was more persuasive in this round.

Jonathan
 Good speed of delivery, good eye contact
 Excellent responses to 1st crossx
 Great poise.
 Don't talk over opponent during cross-x
 Great passion in Aff Rebuttal
 HDI level?
 ? whats that
 I see you as U.S. President 25 years from now....

Vince
 Your eye contact wasn't as good in this round.... and you spoke too fast in Neg Construct "Puppet regimes"
 → Same - don't talk over opp.
 Don't keep hands in pants pockets
 Good arg. in Neg Rebuttal
 Good passion esp at end