

# Double Check Sheet -- Round 4 -- Div 1 Parliamentary

Bassil L	Seymore-Halverson	Ariana Seymore Kristina Halverson	25.0 28.0	0 0	Su-Rivas	Tatiana Su Cesar Rivas	26.0 29.0	0 0	NEG -- Su-Rivas
Bray Tom	Hunt-Schaaf	Katie Hunt Katie Schaaf	28.0 28.0	0 0	Reddy-Han	Dwarak Reddy Alex Han	27.0 28.0	0 0	AFF -- Hunt-Schaaf
Daniels	Webb-Strong	Cody Webb William Strong	27.0 27.0	0 0	Lee-Su	Brandon Lee Walter Su	25.0 26.0	0 0	AFF -- Webb-Strong
Hunt Wen	Zhang-Pantoja	Alex Zhang Elijah Pantoja	26.0 27.0	0 0	Huerta-Zarglis	Gabriela Huerta Sara Zarglis	25.0 25.0	0 0	NEG -- Huerta-Zarglis
Itkis Mi	Clement-Patel	Joshua Clement Akshar Patel	25.0 26.0	0 0	Pascua-Sirski	Jilly Pascua William Sirski	24.0 25.0	0 0	AFF -- Clement-Patel
Khan Mum	Mathur-Saric	Devanshi Mathur Ivana Saric	27.0 26.0	0 0	Khandakar-Azam	Alvi Khandakar Humza Azam	25.0 25.0	0 0	AFF -- Mathur-Saric
Marshall	Ganime-Richards	Farid Ganime Brooklyn Richards	27.0 27.0	0 0	Xie-Chitre	Brian Xie Amberish Chitre	28.0 28.0	0 0	NEG -- Xie-Chitre
Mathur Y	Rush-Mills-Strickl	Lance Rush-Mills Glenn Strickland	28.0 28.0	0 0	Harcarik-Johnson	Austin Harcarik Erica Johnson	28.0 26.0	0 0	AFF -- Rush-Mills-Strickl
Mlynarsk	Ramsey-Murillo	Ta Myra Ramsey Vanessa Murillo	23.0 23.0	0 0	Pai-Duro	Anant Pai Carolann Duro	30.0 30.0	0 0	NEG -- Pai-Duro
Nadon Me	Sanchez-Bergh	Jesse Sanchez Michael Bergh	25.0 24.5	0 0	Shahatit-Winston	Amir Shahatit Faith Winston	26.0 25.5	0 0	NEG -- Shahatit-Winston
Pielstic	Lopez-Greene	Andrew Lopez Gavin Greene	28.0 27.0	0 0	Aurajo-Cappelli	Camila Aurajo Kathy Cappelli	26.0 28.0	0 0	AFF -- Lopez-Greene
Schmauss	Cortina-Itkis	Luis Cortina Sasha Itkis	26.0 27.0	0 0	Allen-Gutierrez	Allen Allen Mirelia Gutierrez	29.0 29.0	0 0	NEG -- Allen-Gutierrez
Sullivan	Guerrieri-Long	Francesco Guerrieri Reggy Long	27.0 27.0	0 0	Corral-Duke	Emilee Corral Ashley Duke	24.0 24.0	0 0	AFF -- Guerrieri-Long
Thompson	Schiffiris-Weigand	Sam Schiffiris Madisson Weigand	29.0 30.0	0 0	Sanchez-Massini	Juan Sanchez Adam Massini	29.0 27.0	0 0	AFF -- Schiffiris-Weigand
West Lau	Yun-Tan	Justin Yun Tori Tan	28.0 28.0	0 0	Jekki-Marshall	Diana Jekki Sydney Marshall	26.0 26.0	0 0	AFF -- Yun-Tan
Wolf Aus	Serrano-Ottoson	Anthony Serrano Tyler Ottoson	29.0 29.0	0 0	Mathieson-Nguyen	Hannah Mathieson Annie Nguyen	29.0 29.0	0 0	NEG -- Mathieson-Nguyen

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Serrano-Ottoson	POINTS Max = 30	
	Anthony Serrano	29	
	Tyler Ottoson	29	

## NEGATIVE

POS	Mathieson-Nguyen	POINTS Max = 30	
	Hannah Mathieson	29	
	Annie Nguyen	29	

The better debating was done by the NEG from Mathieson-Nguyen  
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:

▲ Serrano 1

Mathieson 1

Ottoson 1 1/2

Nguyen 1

Extremely close, both sides presented strong evidence and arguments.  
NEG was more successful at rebutting and providing counter-examples.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA  
February 23, 2013

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Team Name	POINTS Max = 30	
1	Ganime-Richards		
2	Farid Ganime	27	
	Brooklyn Richards	27	

## NEGATIVE

POS	Team Name	POINTS Max = 30	
1	Xie-Chitre		
2	Brian Xie	28	
	Amberish Chitre	28	

The better debating was done by the NEG from Xie-Chitre,  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: William Marshall

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Neg proved that while more money creates problems these problems are more prevalent in cases of less money due to Need

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

## AFFIRMATIVE


POS	Team	POINTS Max = 30	
1	Lopez-Greene		
2	Andrew Lopez	28	
	Gavin Greene	27	

## NEGATIVE

POS	Team	POINTS Max = 30	
1	Aurajo-Cappelli		
2	Camila Aurajo	26	
	Kathy Cappelli	28	

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

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

Signed: 

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: Lopez - you have fairly good awareness of Keynes, but you don't need to give a 7-minute econ lesson. Cover key points, & ~~discuss~~ Spend more time discussing relationship between more money = more problems, which was the resolution. Good rebuttal in rebuttal.

Greene: Good follow up.

Neg: Aurajo & Cappelli: Good navigation of topic considering that you didn't know how resolution would be framed. Consistent follow-through of contentions.

I observed that both teams held up their side admirably. However, on balance, the AFF was able to articulate their views with more evidence and clear understanding.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Rush-Mills-Strickland	POINTS Max = 30	
	Lance Rush-Mills	28	
	Glenn Strickland	28	

## NEGATIVE

POS	Harcarik-Johnson	POINTS Max = 30	
	Austin Harcarik	28	
	Erica Johnson	26	

The better debating was done by the AFF from Rush - Mills - Strickland  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Lucy Gray Math

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

### PROP-CONSTR (PM)

- Clear definition and 3 areas where they apply
- Clear elaboration of how <sup>money</sup> affects 3 areas
- No examples provided for 3 areas

### OPP-CONSTR (LO)

- Gave clear examples of how money does not corrupt for "Personal" & "Business" corruption but not for Govt. corruption
- Gave arguments that supported NEG

### PROP-CONTR (M.G)

- Very clear explanation of Aff stand.
- Was able to provide counter arguments to examples provided by ~~OPP~~ NEG for "Personal" & "Bus".
- Was able to provide examples of how "Bus" & "Govt." get corruption due to money

### OPP-CONSTR (M.O)

- Examples provided to counter personal corruption were not very convincing
- Brought out arguments that were somewhat convincing for "Bus" & "Govt"

### PROP-REBUTTAL (PM)

- Gave arguments countering opp
- ~~Gave~~ Gave examples that countered opp claim
- Brought out lobbying as example of political corruption.
- Very convincing Rebuttal arguments

### OPP-REBUTTAL (LO)

- was clear in defining stand
- ~~was~~ Repetition of ~~what~~ what was said earlier
- Brought up examples again but were not convincing enough how various entities (specially Business in the case of A.C. or Rockefeller or McDonalds) did not use influence/corruption to grow their bus.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

## AFFIRMATIVE


POS	Schiffriis-Weigand	POINTS Max = 30	
	Sam Schiffriis	29	
	Madisson Weigand	30	

## NEGATIVE

POS	Sanchez-Massini	POINTS Max = 30	
	Juan Sanchez	29	
	Adam Massini	27	

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

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

Signed: 

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I was for the Aff (Schiffriis-Weigand) because the clearly knew what they were talking about. The Neg. was unprepared. The AFF actually added in their rebuttal ~~to~~ what the Neg could've sided with/used in their arguement. Overall, amazing speakers and it was great to watch. Neg. needed to do more/different research to better their debate. Great round to watch!

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

## Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

### AFFIRMATIVE

POS	POINTS Max = 30
Seymore-Halverson	
Ariana Seymore	25
Kristina Halverson	28

### NEGATIVE

POS	POINTS Max = 30
Su-Rivas	
Tatiana Su	26
Cesar Rivas	<del>28</del> 29

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

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

Signed: Diana Bassil

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

negative team was more persuasive in their reasoning and logic. Especially due to the idea that in-n-out serves only one item. Very persuasive idea.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

## Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

### AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	
	<b>Guerrieri-Long</b>		
	Francesco Guerrieri	27	
	Reggy Long	27	

### NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	
	<b>Corral-Duke</b>		
	Emilee Corral	24	
	Ashley Duke	24	

The better debating was done by the Affirmative from Guerrieri x Long  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Sullivan Alayne

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative's claims about super pacs & ~~the~~ claims that too much money hurts & causes problems for democracy were not successfully refuted by the negating side. Negative did not use their time to refute arguments of the affirmative. Affirmative offers a stronger rationale in defense of their argument. The argument that more money causes more problems in terms of super pacs & damages democracy stands unrefuted. Affirmative also successfully addresses points of the negator.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

## Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

### AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Webb-Strong	POINTS Max = 30	
1	Cody Webb	27	
2	William Strong	27	

### NEGATIVE

POS	Lee-Su	POINTS Max = 30	
2	Brandon Lee	25	
1	Walter Su	26	

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

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

Signed: Mike Daniels

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

(Prop) AFF TEAM did say up front that their comparison was between Rich AND AVERAGE incomes. This was mentioned throughout debate. (Opp) NEG team kept their argument to the poor not the AVERAGE income. When Neg team was questioned by AFF Team if they considered Average & poor alike or the same - they said yes. This was a deciding factor as clearly they are not in the same class. Focus for Neg team needed to remain on Resolution topic of Rich compared to AVERAGE income not the poor. Neg team focus on poor did not allow a true debate.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

## Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

### AFFIRMATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	
	<b>Ramsey-Murillo</b>		
	Ta'Myra Ramsey	23	
	Vanessa Murillo	23	

### NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS Max = 30	
	<b>Pai-Duro</b>		
	Anant Pai	30	
	Carolann Duro	30	

The better debating was done by the Neg from Pai-Duro  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Marlene Mlynarska

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg brought Clear analysis of the motion. They cleverly refuted the Aff points. The Aff failed to outline a problem, and set up the round, which led to confusion. The Aff needs to work on clear reasoning and explaining why what they have to say matters. Neg be careful contradicting yourselves, ~~and~~ you didn't get called out which left you in the clear win.

Good job guys, please make your 1st and 2nd Constructives different from each other, if you don't the matter is Super repetitive and becomes disengaging. Great job both teams work on drawing impacts and telling your judge why the impacts matter. Good luck. ☺

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

## Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

### AFFIRMATIVE


POS	Team Name	POINTS Max = 30	
1	Mathur-Saric		
2	Devanshi Mathur Ivana Saric	27 26	

### NEGATIVE

POS	Team Name	POINTS Max = 30	
1	Khandakar-Azam		
2	Alvi Khandakar Humza Azam	25 25	

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

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

Signed: 

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Great round w/ great theory. Unfortunately  
the NEG brought no constructive argumentation.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

## Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

### AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Zhang-Pantoja	POINTS Max = 30	
2	Alex Zhang	26	
1	Elijah Pantoja	27	

### NEGATIVE

POS	Huerta-Zarglis	POINTS Max = 30	
1	Gabriela Huerta	25	
2	Sara Zarglis	25	

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

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

Signed: Wendy Hunt

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- AFF/PROPOSITION DID NOT DEFINE/ADDRESS "MORE MONEY" ALLOWING NEG/OPPPOSITION TO DEFINE IT AS "UNLIMITED MONEY."
- AFF/PROPOSITION STATED, "THEIR DEFINITION OF MORE MONEY COMPLETELY NEGATED ALL OF MY CONTENTIONS." IF TRUE, HOW CAN AFF/PROPOSITION WIN DEBATE?!
- AFF/PROPOSITION BROUGHT UP "RECESSIONS" A COUPLE OF TIMES IN THEIR DEBATE, FAILING TO RECOGNIZE THAT THERE WOULD NOT BE A RECESSION IF ~~SCARCITY~~ RESOURCES/MONEY WAS UNLIMITED AS STATED BY NEG/OPPPOSITION.
- AFF/PROPOSITION WERE BOTH STRONG SPEAKERS; THEY "LOST" THE DEBATE MORE THAN NEG/OPPPOSITION "WON" IT.
- AFF/PROPOSITION STATED THAT HELPING OTHERS IS A PROBLEM AND NEG/OPPPOSITION WAS ABLE TO REFUTE THAT BY STATING THAT WITH MORE MONEY WE WERE IN A POSITION TO HELP & LESS MONEY HINDERS ABILITY TO HELP.
- AFF/PROPOSITION DID A VERY NICE JOB OF SPEAKING CLEAR; GOOD EYE CONTACT; GOOD FLOW OF WORDS, ETC. BUT THEY CONCEDED THIS DEBATE BY INDICATING THAT ALL OF THEIR CONTENTIONS WERE NEGATED BY NEG/OPPPOSITION. THEY ALSO ALLOWED (AND AGREED) WITH NEG/OPPPOSITION'S 3RD CONTENTION AND LEFT IT UNCHALLENGED.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

## Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

### AFFIRMATIVE


POS	Hunt-Schaaf	POINTS Max = 30	
1	Katie Hunt	28	
2	Katie Schaaf	28	

### NEGATIVE

POS	Reddy-Han	POINTS Max = 30	
2	Dwarak Reddy	27	
1	Alex Han	28	

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

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

Signed: 

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Excellent speakers!!  
Great job defending your contentions & arguing theirs.

Excellent speakers!!

This was really hard to decide, but AFF won because they were able to defend their contentions better

Be sure to outline your contentions more clearly, I was following along fine until you added more & restructured older contentions. But that was not the reason Neg lost

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

## Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

### AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Sanchez-Bergh	POINTS Max = 30	
	Jesse Sanchez	25	
	Michael Bergh	24.5	

### NEGATIVE

POS	Shahatit-Winston	POINTS Max = 30	
	Amir Shahatit	26	
	Faith Winston	25.5	

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

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

Signed: Melanie Nadon

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I decided to ignore the definition debate because it was a wash. I vote for NEG off of the level of argumentation and examples/analysis. They present clear arguments, they stick to them, and they explain them decently while AFF ignores their case and doesn't rebuild their own.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POS		POINTS Max = 30	
	Cortina-Itkis		
	Luis Cortina	26	
	Sasha Itkis	27	

**NEGATIVE**

POS		POINTS Max = 30	
	Allen-Gutierrez		
	Allen-Allen	29	
	Mirella Gutierrez	29	

The better debating was done by the NEG. from Allen/Gutierrez  
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:

'More money, more problems'

Sasha	Luis	Allen	Mirella
<p>Good job setting out contentions although it seemed somewhat scattered</p> <p>Don't swing your foot while the others talk - distracting</p> <p>Answered this Q in rebuttal</p> <p>Careful with the 'ums'</p> <p>Not planned debate</p>	<p>Good poise. Taxes good</p> <p>Lost steam at end? had nearly 3 min left out of 7!</p> <p>Why isn't it AFF's burden to state the debate?</p>	<p>Good response to rather meandering affirmation</p> <p>Rebuttal (muddled) debate by Aff. - which they dropped.</p> <p>Where is AFF's \$ coming from?</p> <p>(Both me &amp; my partner brought up "watch your sentence structure")</p>	<p>Points out it is Aff's job to state debate, so Neg will pick it up.</p> <p>Excellent poise &amp; presence.</p> <p>Great eye contact.</p> <p>Be careful with *** sarcasm &amp; voice tone. (I would have given you top speaker but for too much sarcasm.)</p> <p>Lower taxes → increase spends</p> <p><i>← You also do the foot swinging!</i></p>

Voted for Neg due to superior debating & more persuasive argument.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Clement-Patel	POINTS Max = 30	
	Joshua Clement	25	
	Akshar Patel	26	

## NEGATIVE

POS	Pascua-Sirski	POINTS Max = 30	
	Jilly Pascua	24	
	William Sirski	25	

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

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

Signed: M. Itkis

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Great debates!

AFF team was evaluated higher for the following reason: NEG team built many examples using the case of poor people with no money which is a change of subject compare to too much money case.

On the other hand the arguments of Jilly and William on human nature were good.

In summary, Akshar and Joshua presented stronger case better matched to the topic, and Akshar pointed on a weakness of some of the NEG team arguments

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

## AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Yun-Tan	POINTS Max = 30	
1	Justin Yun	28	
2	Tori Tan	28	

## NEGATIVE

POS	Jekki-Marshall	POINTS Max = 30	
1	Diana Jekki	26	
2	Sydney Marshall	26	

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The resolution was that American Companies outsourcing jobs to China has caused problems.

The neg was not able to refute this.

By stating, "the US is changing its ways" neg essentially conceded the case.

Also, neg please try to be careful to avoid eye-rolling. It looks unprofessional 😊