

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Guerrieri-Long (Francesco Guerrieri & Reggy Long) vs. Xie-Chitre (Brian Xie & Amberish Chitre)

AFFIRMATIVE

A. CHITRE + B. XIE

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

F. GUERRIERI + R. LONG

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from F. GUERRIERI + R. LONG
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Bray Ron

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- neg side provided more consistent arguments from beginning to end.
- neg side more effectively rebutted aff side arguments.
- neg side on offensive throughout, aff side on defensive though most of debate.
- neg. side provided more persuasive arguments and practical solutions to support arguments.

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Guerrieri-Long (Francesco Guerrieri & Reggy Long) vs. Xie-Chitre (Brian Xie & Amberish Chitre)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

XIE + CHITRE

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

GUERRIERI + LONG

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: W. Hunt

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- BOTH SIDES PRESENTED VERY STRONG CASES - THIS WAS A CLOSE DEBATE!
- LOSS OF LIFE WAS IMPORTANT TO BOTH SIDES IN DETERMINING WINNER OF DEBATE
- NEG BASED THEIR CASE PARTLY ON BANNING ASSAULT RIFLES, WHILE AFF INCLUDED ALL WEAPONS IF BACKGROUND CHECK WASN'T MET (ALTHOUGH IN GUN SWEEPS ALL GUNS INCLUDED)
- NEG BROUGHT UP GOOD POINT = FEWER PEOPLE WOULD SEEK MENTAL HEALTH HELP IF THEY WOULD LOSE RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS - AFF DID NOT REBUTE THIS
- AFF SAID FEDERAL GOVT WOULD ENFORCE THIS, NOT "ATF" WHILE NEG POINTED OUT THAT "ATF" IS THE FEDERAL GOVT. (NEG. SAID STATES COULD BETTER DETERMINE + ENFORCE WHAT WAS BEST FOR THEMSELVES)
- IN THE END, I THOUGHT NEG PRESENTED A MORE SOLID CASE; THEY ADDRESSED ALL OF AFF'S CONTENTIONS AND PRESENTED THEIR OWN CASE, PARTS OF WHICH WERE NOT REBUTED BY AFF SIDE.

VERY CLOSE - EXCELLENT JOB BY BOTH SIDES!

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Xie-Chitre (Brian Xie & Amberish Chitre) vs. Guerrieri-Long (Francesco Guerrieri & Reggy Long)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Amberish / Brian

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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:

POB raised ^{by Neg} & accepted by Aff

~~Aff accepted the proposition~~

This was a strongly contested debate. Both affirmative and negative teams brought out strong arguments

In the end of the debate, there were only a few contentious points including

- A) sweep allowed / not
- B) whether the ~~ban~~ ^{check} was only for assault weapons or all firearms.

In my view, the Neg team provided stronger and more coherent arguments

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

^{AFF} Rush-Mills-Strickland (Lance Rush-Mills & Glenn Strickland) vs. ^{NEG} Shahatit-Winston (Amir Shahatit & Faith Winston)

AFFIRMATIVE

Rush-Mills & Strickland

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

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: Mike Daniels

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg team NARROWLY won this debate due to some key points that were made. They pointed out LABOR IS cheaper outside of U.S. so why would ANY BUSINESS WANT to come to U.S. just for a tax Break ALSO other strict Regulations required in US, would still hinder foreign BUSINESS. The Neg team argued that TAXES went up dramatically after Reagan left office - AFF Team did NOT dispute this. LASTLY, Neg team pointed out The AFF Team could not provide ANY proof that supported their theory that the TAX cut would do what he said it would do - NO history from the past could support this.

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Schiffiris-Weigand (Sam Schiffiris & Madisson Weigand) vs. Hunt-Schaaf (Katie Hunt & Katie Schaaf)

AFFIRMATIVE

Hunt - Schaaf

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Schiffiris-Weigand

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Emily Williams

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

* Neg: supporting aff case - make it better - all 3 contentions
of aff case broken down - come rebutt. Too brought up by
aff at the end - good strength prove case can be better
by definition.

~~W.S.B.~~

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Schiffris-Weigand (Sam Schiffris & Madisson Weigand) vs. Hunt-Schaaf (Katie Hunt & Katie Schaaf)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Hunt-Schaaf

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Schiffris-Weigand

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

US gov
equality
Bite the bullet
Allow gay marriage
Human rights, US ideals, 3) saves time/money
gay marriage allowed in 8, should be allowed in 50
taxes, pension, adoption rights
protecting minorities is American
impact: allowing marriage reinforces equal opp.

LG encompasses LGBTs
is that a new contention

NEG

Counter-plan
LGBTQ community
US ideals
no domestic partnership not full rights
3) US hegemony makes it moral imperative
connotation of marriage

The AFF was absolutely right that LG encompasses NEG's LGBTQ counter plan, however this was not demonstrated in a constructive speech

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Schiffris-Weigand (Sam Schiffris & Madisson Weigand) vs. Hunt-Schaaf (Katie-Hunt-&Katie-Schaaf)

AFFIRMATIVE

Hunt - Schaaf

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Katie Hunt 27
Katie Schaaf 26

NEGATIVE

Schiffris - Weigand

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Sam Schiffris 28
Madisson Weigand 28

The better debating was done by the NEG from 1/2
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Hunt - Schaaf -
America v. California - isolated between - better to pick one.
Not allowing questions seems unwise.
Also you argued that G/L same as GLBTQ - was wondering what the difference was - but should have defined earlier.

Schiffris - Weigand -
Agreed, expanded - really no new plan.
Cont system argument it was questionable - good for ^{you} address - well done.
Stayed focus on US.

This house would vote the ballot

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Shahatit-Winston (Amir Shahatit & Faith Winston) vs. Rush-Mills-Strickland (Lance Rush-Mills & Glenn Strickland)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Rush Mills Strickland

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Amir Shahatit & Faith 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: M. Khan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

On "THW bite the bullet" defined as TH would cut taxes by 50%. Right off the bat, we have an issue. "taxes" was defined as "simple taxes", not as personal or corporate taxes. This lead to major confusion in the round. The rationale behind this was that new business would come to the US. & more money would be in the hands of the citizens. The Neg, though not eloquently stated, said that:

- 1) It's speculation
- 2) Hinged on the chance new business would come to US; which it won't because of cheap labor elsewhere.
- 3) The rich would reinvest
- 4) Business will re-invest

Also speculation, Neg pointed out that money is saved in offshore accounts rather than being spent.

For those reasons; neg defaulted at the win. Please don't argue advanced economic theory if you don't know anything about it.

don't know anything about it.

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Rush-Mills-Strickland (Lance Rush-Mills & Glenn Strickland) vs. Shahatit-Winston (Amir Shahatit & Faith Winston)

AFFIRMATIVE

1. Rush-Mills
2. Strickland


NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

1. Shahatit ~~Winston~~
2. Winston

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:

Rush-Mills: Your 80's-era economic theory was presented with gusto. It disturbs me deeply, but good commitment. Clear, articulate style.

Strickland: Good "instructional" speaking style. When referring to Reaganomics, your opponent gave correct info about Reagan tax hikes. Good reiteration of Rush-Mills original constructive, but little expansion of original contentions.

Shahatit: Very unclear about what your value is. Good analysis & evidence in presentation of contentions. Good Rebuttal & Questions. You are correct about Reagan tax hikes.

Winston: Good analysis of why 50% reduction cannot stand. Very strong rebuttal. Nice work. Logic employed.

Based on arguments and factual evidence, the win goes to the NEG.

Thanks to all!

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Serrano-Ottoson (Anthony Serrano & Tyler Ottoson) vs. Mathieson-Nguyen (Hannah Mathieson & Annie Nguyen)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Mathieson - Nguyen

Serran-Ottoson

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Melanie Nadon

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I vote AFF for the weighing mechanism, the definition debate, and for thoroughness of argumentation. They give me a weigh to vote and link to it, NEG doesn't. I buy their definitions, too.

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Mathieson-Nguyen (Hannah Mathieson & Annie Nguyen) vs. Serrano-Ottoson (Anthony Serrano & Tyler Ottoson)

AFFIRMATIVE

Mathieson - Nguyen

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Serrano - Ottoson

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

An accidental ~~clash~~ ^{fake} clash was created. K Economics involves lowering taxes you both ended up argueing for the same thing.

AFF: if you're going to make a motion for Economics at least understand the Economic Theory you advocated for. Hannah + Annie you both argued to increase taxes against Neg's arguement yet Kension Econ means lowering taxes. This round was messy, but neg you didnt mention it so I cant judge it. As far as i am concerned I have to pick a winner based on who messed up the least.

All four of you need to pick up the Economist and Read. Unfortunately Neg you could have redefined the motion for all countries, which AFF suggested, but if AFF wanted this they should not have define U.S.

This was very messy but it was not a truism and I would suggest all you debaters to stop using that word and learn to create a class because i spent 3 minutes watch you both argue to lower taxes without a single one of you both realiseing it. win goes to aff bc you knew about Syria, and tried to create clash while Neg claimed false truism even though AFF clearly did not understand their own case.

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Serrano-Ottoson (Anthony Serrano & Tyler Ottoson) vs. Mathieson-Nguyen (Hannah Mathieson & Annie Nguyen)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Annie Nguyen - Hannah Mathieson

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Anthony Serrano - Tyler Ottoson

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~Aff~~ showed ~~character~~

Aff stuck to contentions, offered solutions to arguments. They spoke well, ^{was} clear + concise and presented a sound argument. ~~Not sure~~. The Neg only supported the Aff's argument.