

C-67

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Moraguna/Fereher

Mezaki/Botos (flip)

AFFIRMATIVE


POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
1	RHS		
	Speaker: Fereher		
2			
	Speaker: Moraguna		

NEGATIVE

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
1	LOS OSOS		
	Speaker: BOTOS		
2			
	Speaker: MEZAKI		

M
 The better debating was done by the Neg from Botos/Mezaki
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 has won this round by presenting evidence with more solid sources.

~~A~~ Neg did respond to points made by the Aff.

Neg asked question during cross ex Aff did not answer because it was already answered in speech and redundant.

When Aff asked question brand cross x Neg was able to give an answer that negated the Aff statement.

C-67

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Marquinn (Frehner)

Mezaki/Botros (Flip)

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	School: <u>Redlands</u>	POINTS: _____	RANKS
1	Speaker: <u>Frehner</u>		
2	Speaker: <u>Marquinn</u>		

NEGATIVE

POS	School: <u>Los Osos</u>	POINTS: _____	RANKS
1	Speaker: <u>Botros</u>		
2	Speaker: <u>Mezaki</u>		

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

• the snarky comments level in this debate reached dangerous levels. Very little mutual respect (if any at all)

No one side had a clear and distinct victory in any one area, making this a difficult discussion. That being said, I feel the Neg won this debate simply on the grounds that the neg case was slightly hypocritical and the concept of "non-threatening growth" wasn't introduced in the IAC, and only mentioned once during the debate

C-67

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Maraquina - Frehner

Mazaki - Botros

Flip

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	School: <u>Redlands High School</u>	POINTS: _____	RANKS
	Speaker: <u>Frehner</u>		
	Speaker: <u>Maraquin</u>		

NEGATIVE

POS	School: <u>Los Osos</u>	POINTS: _____	RANKS
	Speaker: <u>Botros</u>		
	Speaker: <u>Mezaki</u>		

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

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

Signed: Meg Jenner

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- This was extremely difficult to decide.
Both sides did so well.

* Concern about ^{AFF} asking to see proof ^(AFF) (papers) from NEG, then when they were asked to give proof they refused, claiming it was against rules and/or their coach told them they cannot. ???

Neg did give papers to Aff, then refused to give their proof to NEG.
(proof)

If against rules or coaching advice, should proof have been asked for in the first place?

Great Job → Both SIDES !!

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Rambhatla-Curlin, (Harsh Rambhatla & Jahnvi Curlin) vs. Rooney-Lala (Megan Rooney & Karan Lala)

AFFIRMATIVE

Rambhatla-Curlin

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Rooney & Lala

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from Rooney & Lala

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

neg was able to define their contentions with more information.

They were able to answer AFF's questions more thoughtfully.

Cited more info.

AFF team - were ^{are} strong speakers.
gave good contentions
gave good information.

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Rambhatla-Curlin (Harsh Rambhatla & Jahnavi Curlin) vs. Rooney-Lala (Megan Rooney & Karan Lala)

AFFIRMATIVE

Harsh Rambhatla & Jahnavi

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT


NEGATIVE

Megan Rooney & Karan Lala

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: _____



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Best in supporting their arguments

- Value & Def'n
- Human Rights / violation
- stable Govt
- Labor
- pollutions
- Jobs
- cost benefit

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Rooney-Lala (Megan Rooney & Karan Lala) vs. Rambhatla-Curlin (Harsh Rambhatla & Jahnvi Curlin)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Harsh Rambhatla & Jahnvi Curlin

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Megan Rooney & Karan Lala

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the

AFF

AFF or NEG

from

Harsh & Jahnvi

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The definition of 'beneficial to US interests', as it was accepted by both sides of the house, included three things: Military security, economic self-interest, and the maintaining of cultural and political identity. ~~This, the core of the debate is the~~ This ultimately ends up including promotion of democracy and human rights, and the affirmative ends up winning on all three fronts. 1) Military: Though China ~~was~~ has supported North Korea in the past, they have agreed to sanctions, and MAD prevents any insecurity. 2) Economics: The only economic ~~by~~ ^{detriment} brought by the negative side was outsourcing, and affirmative both rebutted this and provided a laundry list of positives that showed signs of further improvement. Finally, human rights were addressed by affirmative through two points: that China itself is liberalizing, and that is supporting Democratic regimes in Africa.

Ramsey

C-65

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Barr-Williams

Abbot Shah (Flip)

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
1	Speaker: Ryan Shah	28	
2	Speaker: Tommy Abbott	28	

NEGATIVE

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
1	Speaker: Pilar Barr	29	
2	Speaker: Serina Williams	29	

The better debating was done by the NEG from Barr-Williams

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Mark A Ramsey

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Neg team won the debate because it successfully undermined two of the Aff team's contentions. The economic arguments offset one another, but the Neg team's argument that the industrial pace of growth was unsustainable and built on human rights violations was stronger than the Aff team's claim that China is focusing on increasing human rights. Also, the Neg team's argument that China has increased tensions with long standing allies like Japan undercut the Aff assertion that China is a U.S. ally and no military threat. Thus, the Neg case carried the round.

C-65

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Barr Williams

Abbott Shaw

Flip

AFFIRMATIVE


POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
1	Speaker: Ryan Shaw	26	
2	Speaker: Tommy Abbott	29	

NEGATIVE

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
1	Speaker: Pily Barr	28	
2	Speaker: Serina Williams	27	

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This was a close call, but I believe the Affirmative team did a better job of debating their side in this debate. They ~~argued~~ had slightly better support for their definition of the resolution, a definition that was not disputed by the Negative.

Some of the crossfire and arguments did not get resolved on either side. It seemed at times they did not clearly understand what the other team was arguing. Some clarifying questions would have been helpful.

Bret Hurley

C-65

CBSR DEBATE STATE QUALIFIER

Los Osos High School, CA

February 23, 2013

Barr-Williams

Abbott / Sheh (Flip)

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
1 st	Speaker: Ryan Sheh		
2 nd	Speaker: Tommy Abbott		

NEGATIVE

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
1 st	Speaker: Pilar Barr		
2 nd	Speaker: Serina Williams		

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

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

Signed: Mary Bret Hurley

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

These teams were evenly matched and both teams presentations were very nice. I gave the win to the neg team because they stayed the course and drove home the question of China's "peaceful rise". The Aff. could only respond that the attacks were accusations - until proven guilty. The Neg team's point about the rise with the fast industrial growth couldn't be sustained was also good point.

I am very sorry for the very distracting students who came in to watch. I should have kicked them out. If they were from either of your teams please let them know that their passing notes & note books did distract me but I worried by