

CBSR IE/LD #1 -- Open LD

Yucaipa, CA

Saturday, October 5, 2013

	ROUND 1	ROUND 2	ROUND 3		
Citrus Valley SO Citrus Valley Sarah Osuna	W Yucai CF Pielstick 28 Neg	W REV KL Zeeman Jos 27 AFF	W ClaremSH Maraquin K 29 Neg	3-0 1st Seed 84.00 28.00 1st Spkr	84.00 28.00
Citrus Valley VT Citrus Valley Vicki Tasouli	L ClaremDC Karpouzis 25 Neg	W 26 Bye	L Yucai CF Zeeman Jos 27 Neg	1-2 78.00 26.00	78.00 26.00
Claremont DC Claremont Diana Chao	W CVHS VT Karpouzis 27 AFF	W Yucai BE Pielstick 27 Neg	W Yucai TH Nadon Mela 28 AFF	3-0 2nd Seed 82.00 27.00 7th Spkr	82.00 27.00
Claremont SH Claremont Sophia Helland	W Yucai BE Nadon Mela 27 AFF	W Yucai GF Karpouzis 29 Neg	L CVHS SO Maraquin K 28 AFF	2-1 3rd Seed 84.00 28.00 2nd Spkr	84.00 28.00
Los Osos DL Los Osos Derek Lui	W REV MB Zeeman Jos 26 AFF	L Yucai TH Holland Na 27 Neg	W REV KL Karpouzis 29 AFF	2-1 6th Seed 82.00 27.00 5th Spkr	82.00 27.00
REV KL REV Karan LaLa	W Yucai GF Maraquin K 26 AFF	L CVHS SO Zeeman Jos 26 Neg	L Osos DL Karpouzis 28 Neg	1-2 8th Seed 80.00 26.00 8th Spkr	80.00 26.00
REV MB REV Mason Biggerstaff	L Osos DL Zeeman Jos 28 Neg	L Yucai CF Nadon Mela 27 AFF	W Yucai GF Holland Na 27 Neg	1-2 7th Seed 82.00 27.00 6th Spkr	82.00 27.00
Yucaipa BE Yucaipa Brooke Edwards	L ClaremSH Nadon Mela 26 Neg	L ClaremDC Pielstick 26 AFF	W 26 Bye	1-2 78.00 26.00	78.00 26.00
Yucaipa CF Yucaipa Christopher Fernandes	L CVHS SO Pielstick 26 AFF	W REV MB Nadon Mela 27.5 Neg	W CVHS VT Zeeman Jos 29 AFF	2-1 5th Seed 82.50 27.50 4th Spkr	82.50 27.50
Yucaipa GF Yucaipa Gina Fuller	L REV KL Maraquin K 25 Neg	W ClaremSH Karpouzis 25.5 Bye	L REV MB Holland Na 26 AFF	0-3 77.00 26.00	77.00 26.00
Yucaipa TH Yucaipa Taylor Hutcheson	W 27.5 Bye	W Osos DL Holland Na 28 AFF	L ClaremDC Nadon Mela 27 Neg	2-1 4th Seed 82.50 27.50 3rd Spkr	82.50 27.50

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE	ROOM	JUDGE
Chao	Tasouli	Q104	Karpouzis Gia
Fernandes	Osuna	Q105	Pielstick Fritz
Helland	Edwards	Q201	Nadon Melanie
Hutcheson	BYE		
LaLa	Fuller	Q202	Maraquin Kandin
Lui	Biggerstaff	Q109 P-10	Zeeman Josh

Resolved: In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory.

Room: ~~C-100~~ P-10
Start: 10:15
Open LD

1

Zeeman Josh

CBSR IE/LD #1

Yucaipa, CA

Saturday, October 5, 2013

Resolved: In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Lui

Derek Lui

26

NEGATIVE


POINTS

Biggerstaff

28

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

Well Presented Speech

- More eye contact, less reading

Good consistency of rebuttals
and speaking

Slow down a bit and emphasize
main points more so it is
easier to follow

~~Need to show evidence~~

Neg

Very passionate and well-spoken
Speech

Lack of data is a good point, but
still argue their points instead of
just dropping them.

Contradicted self during Cross Ex 2
- Quality of votes are same vs.
some better than others

Aff pointed out Neg contradictions
that weren't argued against.

Even though Aff failed to produce
evidence, enough alternate points
were made.

Aff Constructive:	6 mins
Cross-Examination	3 mins
Neg Constructive	7 mins
Cross-Examination	3 mins
1 st Aff Rebuttal	4 mins
Neg Rebuttal	6 mins
2 nd Aff Rebuttal	3 mins

Prep Time: 3 mins per debater

CBSR IE/LD #1

Yucaipa, CA

Saturday, October 5, 2013

Resolved: In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

LaLa

Karan
REV

26

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Fuller

Yucaipa
Gina Fuller

25

The better debating was done by the AFF from REV, LaLa
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

- Squirrel!!
- But it worked, so eh
- Please fill in why gaps
- Structure easy to follow
- Have stronger analysis of opponent's case.

NEG

- Did not have confidence in self or case; showed a degree of being unprepared! Must own CX!
- Had no challenge on squirrely definitions of AFF... or any rebuttal
- Overall strong foundations of case, but it needed much stronger analysis.

Aff Constructive:	6 mins
Cross-Examination	3 mins
Neg Constructive	7 mins
Cross-Examination	3 mins
1 st Aff Rebuttal	4 mins
Neg Rebuttal	6 mins
2 nd Aff Rebuttal	3 mins

Prep Time: 3 mins per debater

CBSR IE/LD #1

Yucaipa, CA

Saturday, October 5, 2013

Resolved: In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Chao

Diana Chao

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Tasouli

Vicki Tasouli

25

The better debating was done by the Aff from Claremont
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:

Although the case presented by aff was not sufficiently contested enough so that neg wins, I feel that a case centering around the obligation of citizenry, the role of government in balancing rights, and how to change voter apathy would have been far more topical and engaging.

Key- remember that this is not a US-centric motion, and keep in mind not to misrepresent the arguments presented by aff / your opponents. GOOD JOB, & keep on keeping on!

Aff Constructive: 6 mins
Cross-Examination 3 mins
Neg Constructive 7 mins
Cross-Examination 3 mins
1st Aff Rebuttal 4 mins
Neg Rebuttal 6 mins
2nd Aff Rebuttal 3 mins

Prep Time: 3 mins per debater

CBSR IE/LD #1

Yucaipa, CA

Saturday, October 5, 2013

Resolved: In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Fernandes

Christopher Fernandes 26

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Osuna

Sarah Osuna 28

The better debating was done by the Neg from Osuna
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:

Aff

- You need warrants for your value criterion. You need to give reasons why your impacts should be prioritized over the neg's.
- Your value criterion should also not be something like "Implementing compulsory participation" or whatever.
- The value criterion is not an advocacy — it is a means of isolating the relevant and important issues in the round.
- Both sides should be able to show a link into the VC, and then weigh strength of link.

Aff Constructive:	6 mins
Cross-Examination	3 mins
Neg Constructive	7 mins
Cross-Examination	3 mins
1 st Aff Rebuttal	4 mins
Neg Rebuttal	6 mins
2 nd Aff Rebuttal	3 mins

Prep Time: 3 mins per debater

Neg

- Your responses to it'll be blippy + unwarranted
- Your value criterion of "upholding rights" begs the question of which rights we uphold when they conflict. You should give some sort of way to resolve that issue. Clarify that the standard is ~~not~~ means-based so you can preclude AC impacts with framework.

RFD:

The poll evidence links into the neg VC and also turns the AC. Not a lot of clear offense here, but I can vote on this argument.

CBSR IE/LD #1

Yucaipa, CA

Saturday, October 5, 2013

Resolved: In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Helland

Sophia Helland

27

~~26~~

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Edwards

Brooke Edwards

26

The better debating was done by the AFF from Sophia Helland
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:

AFF: Your definition is really weird, I think you're being a squirrel in defining it as representatives only, there are plenty of arguments that back up the NEG definition (one I think you should probably write a case using). She doesn't call you out on it, but another debater might and I think they'd win that argument very easily. You avoid clash when you define it like that and it's not a fun debate to watch.

RFD: NEG dropped AFF case and did not engage in AFF framework or ground at all, so I have to vote AFF because even the new arguments in the AFF NR. were not substantive enough.

NEG: You can't just drop the ~~case~~ case when you read your NC, you need to devote about 3 minutes or so to rebuttal during that 7 minute speech. I like your case, but I cannot vote for you just because you are right, you also have to prove why AFF is wrong. I would advise dropping a couple of your ~~cards~~ cards to make the case shorter so you can challenge the definition and ~~answer~~ answer the AFF speech in your first speech so that the arguments aren't dropped.

Aff Constructive: 6 mins
Cross-Examination 3 mins
Neg Constructive 7 mins
Cross-Examination 3 mins
1st Aff Rebuttal 4 mins
Neg Rebuttal 6 mins
2nd Aff Rebuttal 3 mins

Prep Time:

3 mins per debater

CBSR IE/LD #1 -- RD 2 -- DIV: OPEN LD Start: 12:20

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE	ROOM	JUDGE
Biggerstaff	Fernandes	Q105	Nadon Melanie
Edwards	Chao	Q104	Pielstick Fritz
Fuller	Helland	Q201	Karpouzis Gia
Hutcheson	Lui	P-10	Holland Natalie
Osuna	LaLa	Q202	Zeeman Josh
Tasouli	BYE		

Resolved: In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory.

CBSR IE/LD #1
Yucaipa, CA
Saturday, October 5, 2013

Resolved: In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Osuna		LaLa	
Sarah Osuna	<u>27</u>		<u>26</u>
The better debating was done by the <u>AFF</u> from <u>Osuna</u>			
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME			
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____			
Signed: <u>[Signature]</u>			

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- | <u>AFF</u> | <u>Neg</u> |
|---|--|
| - Solid Case, Good Examples | - Good Speed & Eye Contact |
| - Slow it down! Speed made writing points difficult | - Need to hit more AFF points |
| - Great refuting and Defending Points | - Variety of info & points was great, but keep new info out of rebuttal. |
- Neg dropped too many AFF points and left them uncontested.

Aff Constructive:	6 mins
Cross-Examination	3 mins
Neg Constructive	7 mins
Cross-Examination	3 mins
1 st Aff Rebuttal	4 mins
Neg Rebuttal	6 mins
2 nd Aff Rebuttal	3 mins
Prep Time:	3 mins per debater

CBSR IE/LD #1
Yucaipa, CA
Saturday, October 5, 2013

Resolved: In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Edwards

Chao

Brooke Edwards

Diana Chao

26

27

The better debating was done by the Neg from Chao
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

- You need warrants for your value criterion. You aren't giving any reason why your VC should be used to filter impacts.
- IAR is too short + drops too many arguments.
- Lots of new analysis in the 2AR. Be careful.

Neg

- Why are you reading ought = logical consequence and then reading a PIC? The PIC assumes that the actor has some normative obligation to do something, which is an assumption your definition of 'ought' precludes.
- You have no offense under ought = logical consequence. I'm confused.
- Good job providing warrants for your standard!
- It's ~~iffy~~ as to whether or not you can legitimately defend a PIC against an AC that defends ^{the} whole resolution w/ no actor, but that's not brought up so whatever.

Aff Constructive: 6 mins
Cross-Examination 3 mins
Neg Constructive 7 mins
Cross-Examination 3 mins
1st Aff Rebuttal 4 mins
Neg Rebuttal 6 mins
2nd Aff Rebuttal 3 mins

Prep Time: 3 mins per debater

RFD:

Neg is only debater who provides clear warrants for the value criterion. Contention level args more than not allowing felons to vote. Neg value criterion.

CBSR IE/LD #1

Yucaipa, CA

Saturday, October 5, 2013

Resolved: In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Biggerstaff

Fernandes

27

Christopher Fernandes 27.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from Fernandes
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:

• Both debaters should look at me during cross-x and speeches, not each other. You are never going to convince your opponent.

• AFF— You set up these US parameters, then you do not listen properly to his evidence and so you do not answer the fact that it is not U.S. evidence. Then you make a new argument against it being from India in your last speech. Be careful with that, listen carefully and answer it the first time.

• NEG— You need to fill time in your speeches, you have a lot to say, explain it thoroughly and impact it fully.

Aff Constructive: 6 mins
Cross-Examination 3 mins
Neg Constructive 7 mins
Cross-Examination 3 mins
1st Aff Rebuttal 4 mins
Neg Rebuttal 6 mins
2nd Aff Rebuttal 3 mins

Prep Time: 3 mins per debater

RFD: This is a hard round to judge because no one properly engages in the framework debate. So, I have to vote on impacts. NEG has more clearly defined impacts about morality and coercion and also does a better job of disproving AFF harms.

Room: Q201
Start: 12:20
Open LD

2

Karpouzis Gia

CBSR IE/LD #1

Yucaipa, CA

Saturday, October 5, 2013

Resolved: In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Fuller		Helland	
Gina Fuller	<u>26</u>	Sophia Helland	<u>29</u>
The better debating was done by the <u>Sophia</u> from <u>Claremont</u>			
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME			
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____			
Signed: <u>[Signature]</u>			

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Although there was a good amount of clash between the two debaters, neg's arguments proved more persuasive and withstood the somewhat weak rebuttal offered by aff.

- Aff Constructive: 6 mins
- Cross-Examination 3 mins
- Neg Constructive 7 mins
- Cross-Examination 3 mins
- 1st Aff Rebuttal 4 mins
- Neg Rebuttal 6 mins
- 2nd Aff Rebuttal 3 mins
- Prep Time: 3 mins per debater

Room: P-10
Start: 12:20
Open LD

2

Holland Natalie

CBSR IE/LD #1

Yucaipa, CA

Saturday, October 5, 2013

Resolved: In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hutcheson

Lui

Taylor Hutcheson

28

Derek Lui

27

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

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

Signed: Natalie Holland Alexander

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This round came to the requirement of a citizen in a democracy versus the freewill of the people within a democracy.

Given that the neg. concedes the immoral nature of free riding, and lacks rebuttal toward much of aff. case, Aff wins on several levels. Neg. must explain why freewill is so much more important than change brought on through compulsory voting. Aff. did also lack rebuttal, but did well enough in substantize matter. Aff. does need better explanation of social contract theory.

Aff Constructive:	6 mins
Cross-Examination	3 mins
Neg Constructive	7 mins
Cross-Examination	3 mins
1 st Aff Rebuttal	4 mins
Neg Rebuttal	6 mins
2 nd Aff Rebuttal	3 mins

Prep Time: 3 mins per debater

CBSR IE/LD #1 -- RD 3 -- DIV: OPEN LD Start: 2:15

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE	ROOM	JUDGE
Chao	Hutcheson	Q104	Nadon Melanie
Edwards	BYE		
Fernandes	Tasouli	Q105	Zeeman Josh
Fuller	Biggerstaff	Q201	Holland Natalie
Helland	Osuna	Q202	Maraquin Kandin
Lui	LaLa	P-10	Karpouzis Gia

Resolved: In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory.

CBSR IE/LD #1

Yucaipa, CA

Saturday, October 5, 2013

Resolved: In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Helland *Claremont*
Sophia Helland

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Osuna *Citrus*
Sarah Osuna

29

The better debating was done by the NEG from Osuna, Citrus
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: *Grady Marano*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I feel as if the definitions given by AFF were innovative, though a bit intellectual. Despite her novel definition, I didn't see any solvency come from AFF world; it's seriously S.Q.U.O, like it's not very nice to say Congressman ought to vote... because it's their job... as a justification. Seemed like a truism a little... BUT, Neg said they could win with it. So.

Although rights analysis of Neg on what the rights of the people are by means of what they want vs. good governance was shaky, I give value to Neg.

Because every other point of controversy ~~is~~ was like 2 trains missing each other, I vote on Aff's truisitic model setting up the train tracks.

↑
Is that anard?
It should be.

CBSR IE/LD #1

Yucaipa, CA

Saturday, October 5, 2013

Resolved: In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Chao

Diana Chao

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Hutcheson

Taylor Hutcheson

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from Chao
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 have a very hard time deciding on this round because on one hand, the ^{NEG} is completely correct in calling out ^{for} the ^{AFF} having a plan text ~~and~~ that those arguments do not really engage ^{on} principle w/ the ~~resolution~~ resolution. On the other hand, the argumentation by the AFF is stronger and more clearly explained. So, I am torn between voting on the ideal ^{L.D.} for debate and voting in general for argumentation. At the end of it, I vote AFF in favor of the level of argumentation.

Room: P-10
Start: 2:15
Open LD

3

Karpouzis Gia

CBSR IE/LD #1

Yucaipa, CA

Saturday, October 5, 2013

Resolved: In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Lui

LaLa

Derek Lui

29

KARAN LALA

29

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Don't argue why you can't do something; argue why you shouldn't. (Lui, you read my mind when you said this... it kind of freaked me out)

Although there was sufficient clash on both ^{sides} ~~parts~~ of the debate, aff's can win much more principles and less involved with the intricacies of the neg case. Even with this being said, aff engaged with the very practical arguments of neg and illustrated why exactly principle > practicality. I would also encourage a reconstruction of the aff speech in the first neg speech... LD times are made so that neg can both construct their own arguments and reconstruct their opponents'.

Room: Q105
Start: 2:15
Open LD

3

Zeeman Josh

CBSR IE/LD #1

Yucaipa, CA

Saturday, October 5, 2013

Resolved: In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Fernandes

Tasouli

Christopher Fernandes

Vicki Tasouli

29

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from Fernandes
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

NEG

Great volume and speed,
excellent speaker

Good coverage of opp
points

Smooth and easy to follow

Very passionate and exciting
to listen to

Slow down your speaking a bit
to compensate for your accent

Good points and strong rebuttal

NEG dropped too many AFF points and
left them uncontested.

6 Aff 1
3 Cross Ex
7 Neg 1
3 Cross Ex
9 Aff Reb
6 Neg Reb
3 Aff Reb

Room: Q201
Start: 2:15
Open LD

3

Holland Natalie

CBSR IE/LD #1

Yucaipa, CA

Saturday, October 5, 2013

Resolved: In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Fuller

Biggerstaff

Gina Fuller

26

27

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

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

Signed: Natalie Holland

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg wins based on the ability to better utilize international examples of compulsory voting systems and how they create an inefficient system and don't create an informed ~~proper~~ voter. Fourth contention is extreme and poorly explained, but Aff. does not address this. Aff lacks examples/evidence to support claims especially in Contention 1 and 3, links are missing throughout claims. Aff never clearly defines what is meant by societal progression.

6 - Aff

3 - Cross X

7 - Neg

3 - Cross X

4 - Aff

6 - Neg

3 - Aff