

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Guerrieri-Long (Francesco Guerrieri & Reggy Long) vs. Rush-Mills-Strickland (Lance Rush-Mills & Glenn Strickland)

AFFIRMATIVE

Rush-Mills-Strickland

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Guerrieri-Long

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the

AFF  
AFF or NEG

from

Rush-Mills-Strickland  
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~What~~ What this round came down to was a simple question: "Why do we have rights?" This round was void of any meaningful answer from both sides which forced me to answer it on my own. "We have rights for two reasons: 1) because as humans we collectively agreed upon them out of our need for them. 2) to protect individual autonomy from the ever-expanding "system". That being said, the team that had most solvency as well as justification was AFF, or rather, the team that contradicted those ideals most with out

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Shahatit-Winston (Amir Shahatit & Faith Winston) vs. Xie-Chitre (Brian Xie & Amberish Chitre)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**NEGATIVE**

Amberish + Brian

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Faith + Amir

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from Amberish + Brian

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

Amberish - slow down to make all points heard. Good eye contact and awareness of timing -  
Brian - voice is very smooth you were respectful to other team

NEG

Faith - good presentation skills and calm demeanor.  
Amir - limit use of word "stuff" and slow down a bit

DEBATE Points

- Good job of developing a value (justice) and reminding NEG that is the appropriate mechanism to prove the case  
You did contradict yourself somewhat  
Your resolution assumed the individual is a terrorist so any judgement that first determines whether or not the individual is a terrorist does not fit with your argument.  
- You did not address all NEG contentions (ie: the cost of due process)

Debate Points

More of your points should have focussed on the Value of Justice  
You made a good point that there is no need to use due process to determine IF someone is a terrorist since the resolution states the person IS a terrorist.  
Good point that terrorist actions abrogate the same basic rights enjoyed by others due to the heinous nature of the actions.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Xie-Chitre (Brian Xie & Amberish Chitre) vs. Shahatit-Winston (Amir Shahatit & Faith Winston)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Xie - Chitre

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Shahatit - Winston

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: This house believes that terrorists deserve due process.

I chose the negative's side because even though the debate began a bit wobbly, all of your points were sound, and the refutation of the Aff team was well done. Please work on slight vocabulary mixups.

Keep up the good work.

JD.

Lola, S.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Hunt-Schaaf (Katie Hunt & Katie Schaaf) vs. Mathieson-Nguyen (Hannah Mathieson & Annie Nguyen)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Hunt - Schaaf

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Hannah / Annie

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both the teams did very well and brought out good points. The Neg team provided good examples and were generally more persuasive. Some of their contentions were strong

- 1) The UN fails to guarantee 36 benefits and right to a due process is not one of them
- 2) NDAA was a good example.

The AFF team also provided some good counter arguments, eg. Countering rights of many v/s rights of few.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Mathieson-Nguyen (Hannah Mathieson & Annie Nguyen) vs. Hunt-Schaaf (Katie Hunt & Katie Schaaf)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Hunt - Schaaf

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Mathieson - Nguyen

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Melanie Nadon

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I vote AFF due to the framework debate. There were dropped arguments on both sides, so it's really hard to judge this round but they sell me on the value and NEG doesn't even attempt to link into it. Also, AFF has more warranted arguments with examples. This was a very close round, congrats to both teams.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Hunt-Schaaf (Katie Hunt & Katie Schaaf) vs. Mathieson-Nguyen (Hannah Mathieson & Annie Nguyen)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Katie Hunt - Katie Schaaf

Hannah Mathieson - Annie Nguyen

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

(28)

(28)

(27)

(27)

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

Signed: *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff team was more composed and defended their arguments more effectively. Aff displayed better speaking skills. Neg was so narrowly focused on rebuttals ~~that~~ and did not use constructive portion to advance their arguments.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

## Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Serrano-Ottoson (Anthony Serrano & Tyler Ottoson) vs. Schiffris-Weigand (Sam Schiffris & Madisson Weigand)

### AFFIRMATIVE

1. Tyler Ottoson
  2. Anthony Serrano
- NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

### NEGATIVE

1. Sam Schiffris
  2. Madisson Weigand
- NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff  
Ottoson : Great signposting. Thanks!

Interesting development of a difficult resolution, Strong Rebuttal.

Serrano : Good defense, but development was minimal.

neg  
Weigand : Clear speaking style. Good rebuttal

Schiffris : Consider speaking more ~~so~~ slowly, as your diction suffers when you go faster.

Good expansion of your C's in the second constructive

Thank you for an interesting debate. Both sides presented compelling arguments. ~~While~~ However, the NEG produced a more factual debate with clear contentions.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Schiffis-Weigand (Sam Schiffis & Madison Weigand) vs. Serrano-Ottoson (Anthony Serrano & Tyler Ottoson)

**AFFIRMATIVE**

(1) Tyler Ottoson & (2) Anthony Serrano  
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

**NEGATIVE**

Sam Schiffis & Madison Weigand  
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed:

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I believe the Negative Team won this debate because they showed the flaws in the Affirmative team's definition of the Resolution. They were clearer in their contentions and their ability to persuade. They had specific examples backing up their contentions.

# CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Serrano-Ottoson (Anthony Serrano & Tyler Ottoson) vs. Schifffris-Weigand (Sam Schifffris & Madisson Weigand)

AFFIRMATIVE

Serrano-Ottoson

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Schifffris-Weigand

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AF from Serrano-Ottoson  
AFF OF NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Monika Mlynarska

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: you failed to tell me why U.S. upholding humanitarian rights by being lenient on terrorists. You successfully provided a value criterion, and tried to uphold the betterment of human rights. I believe your arguments could easily be taken down. Neg I thought you both had more experience in perhaps policy or LD and were the more experienced debaters. You both focused on semantics and that hindered the quality of the debate. Had you answered the Aff with principle ~~as~~ rebuttals about the Neg side upholding human rights better this debate could have gone different