

# Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division Novice Round II Room 2003 Date 1/6/0 Judge Devire School Janesville Parker

Aff Team/Code Mukwonago  
 Names Points (10-30) Rank (1-4)  
Nicole Phelps 25 (2)  
Sophia Dolan 26 (1)

Neg Team/Code Rhinelandor 2  
 Names Points (10-30) Rank (1-4)  
Matt Blochman 24 (3)  
Ben Eversman 23 (4)

Decision: The winning team is the (Circle) Affirmative Negative Team/Code Mukwonago  
 Low Point Win (Circle) Yes No

Comments for 1<sup>st</sup> Aff I like the economy scenario, but it moves to a severe impact a little too fast. I really like your rebuttal. You really hit the neg blocks arguments hard.

Comments for 1<sup>st</sup> Neg The privatization DA jumps quickly to the power wars scenario without very convincing linkage. Your inherency and solvency arguments are central to DA.

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Aff Good strong response to the privatization DA. The impact is turned effectively. You do a nice job weighing the round for me.

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Neg Your Economy argument could be seen as weakening your privatization DA too. You move from inherency to solvency to Kessler and back with little rhyme or reason.

**Reasons for Decision:**

DA-privatization - Negs argue that NASA ought to turn it over to private industry for the sake of not "hindering development" and preventing "power wars." I'm persuaded by the aff argument that space debris poses more threat to the economy than NASA does → **AFF**

inherency - Affs convince me that Russia's efforts amount to an inadequate and time-consuming approach, and that the risk will grow in the mean time. → **AFF**

solvency - Negs spend a lot of time telling me not to worry because Russia will take care of the problem (their inherency argument), but then tell me there's no good way to clean up space (their solvency argument). Affs solve this conundrum for me by using evidence to show that the US technology is proven and ready to work sooner with significant advantages to us → **AFF**

# Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division Nov Round 2 Room 2002 Date 1/6/12 Judge CALDWELL School MAD MEN

Aff Team/Code Rhineland AFF 2

Neg Team/Code Janesville Parker Neg

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Catherine Brown</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(3)</u>
<u>Stephanie Belanger</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(1)</u>

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Sam Schendel</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(2)</u>
<u>Crystal Flores</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>(4)</u>

Decision: The winning team is the (Circle) Affirmative Negative Team/Code Rhineland AFF 2  
 Low Point Win (Circle) Yes  No

Comments for 1<sup>st</sup> Aff  
 C-X answers need to seem more definitive, looks like you're questioning yourself

Comments for 1<sup>st</sup> Neg  
 speaking style made you seem skeptical of your own case  
 Avoid allowing Aff to re-summarize their case, it helps them more than you  
 Need a roadmap and signpost during speech

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Aff  
 Neg's w/o CPs don't want to accomplish anything.  
 Good 2AR, but more analysis, less tag reading

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Neg  
 Face the judge during c-x  
 what are you going for in the 2NC? need explanation of why cards matter  
 speak up  
 Signpost much more

**Reasons for Decision:**

space debris DA needs a concrete timeframe  
 C-X is not being used effectively by either side. Try to make an argument using your opponents responses, or set up an argument  
 2NC says capitalism is necessary to keep US afloat; 1NR says capitalism on the moon is bad bc we shouldn't keep the spirit of capitalism alive  
 1AR: don't bother covering things the Neg suggested in c-x, only args they actually brought up  
 Neg: the more experienced debater, or whoever knows the NC best, should speak 2nd so the 2NR knows the round the best

2NR left me very little to vote on. As far as I can tell it went for its econ impacts and tried to apply them to US heg and nuclear war. The Neg has little in this debate other than the spending DA, which goes uncovered. Aff successfully turns this w/ the ~~case~~ ev that says deficit spending ↑ Econ  
 Very little is done to impact existential risk reduction or econ improving, but they are the only impacts and they both flow Aff.  
 Aff also gets all their solvency  
 Aff coins

# Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division Novice Policy Round 2 Room 2055 Date 1/6 Judge Krishna Agrawal School \_\_\_\_\_

Aff Team/Code Rhineland

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Jordan Kaster</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>
<u>Dylan Wendt</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>

Neg Team/Code Mukwonago

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Brynne Reilly</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(3)</u>
<u>Andrew Patterson</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(4)</u>

Decision: The winning team is the (Circle) Affirmative Negative Team/Code Rhineland  
 Low Point Win (Circle) Yes No

Comments for 1<sup>st</sup> Aff

- good composure
- great argument on agriculture
- nice job outweighing on time frame

Comments for 1<sup>st</sup> Neg

- a bit rude in CX!
- good job road-mapping & sign-posting

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Aff

- great job providing lucid explanations for your arguments!

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Neg

- made lots of unwarranted claims
- be more confident!
- You don't need to defend abuse since they didn't go for that arg

Reasons for Decision:

Aff proved that their plan is feasible and sufficient to affirm the resolution. Moon has advs, is realistic, and solves harm, Great Round! protects human life & economy

~~Neg's response was refuted by the aff~~

# Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division Nov Round 2 Room 200 Date 1/6/12 Judge Kim Wasser School Muk. High

Aff Team/Code <u>Janesville Parker</u>	Neg Team/Code <u>Rhinelander Neg 1</u>																		
<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Names</th> <th style="text-align: left; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Points (10-30)</th> <th style="text-align: left; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Rank (1-4)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Brandon Reed</u></td> <td><u>25</u></td> <td><u>(4)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Davis Komral</u></td> <td><u>25</u></td> <td><u>(3)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Brandon Reed</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>Davis Komral</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Names</th> <th style="text-align: left; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Points (10-30)</th> <th style="text-align: left; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Rank (1-4)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Asif Sadik</u></td> <td><u>27</u></td> <td><u>(1)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Mike GUNST</u></td> <td><u>26</u></td> <td><u>(2)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Asif Sadik</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(1)</u>	<u>Mike GUNST</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(2)</u>
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Brandon Reed</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>(4)</u>																	
<u>Davis Komral</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>(3)</u>																	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Asif Sadik</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(1)</u>																	
<u>Mike GUNST</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(2)</u>																	

Decision: The winning team is the (Circle) Affirmative Negative Team/Code Rhinelander Neg 1  
 Low Point Win (Circle) Yes No

Comments for 1<sup>st</sup> Aff  
 You have to respond to questions of solvency during constructive. If the response is given in rebuttal (example, moonquakes), I have to ignore it.  
 Try making your plan more specific.

Comments for 1<sup>st</sup> Neg  
 Very good job interpreting the arguments so a clear connection could be made between cause and effect. Good understanding of the material.

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Aff  
 Good job countering Hawking with Hawking. Next time, don't wait until rebuttal to pull out your good points like getting there first. Having a more specific plan and more good things that come from said plan will give you options.

Comments for 2<sup>nd</sup> Neg  
 Good understanding of the material. Excellent emphasis on the points that the Affs hadn't countered makes your position look stronger.

Reasons for Decision:

The Affirmatives didn't respond to the space treaty argument and couldn't give a good description of how the base would be sustainable. 2 out of 8 solvency issues were addressed but this did not give an advantage to the Affirmative Plan. A more detailed plan may have challenged the Negatives but the Affirmatives couldn't prove that chancing international war was better than a possibility of extinction. The point was made that resource development was not considered to fall under the treaty, however the Negatives gave a solid example of how concerned China is that it be adhered to. This makes for a volatile situation. If the Affirmatives had suggested the US join an international effort, that would promote development without getting into sticky politics. Other points were not responded to at all.

<sup>or that such a venture was sustainable</sup>