

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division Nov Round 3 Room 1128 Date 1/7 Judge AL-HASSAN, AMIN School Rufus King

Aff Team/Code Janseville Parker

Neg Team/Code West Bend

Names Points (10-30) Rank (1-4)

Brandon Reed 26 (3)
Devin Kondal 29 (1)

Names Points (10-30) Rank (1-4)

Becca Graven 27 (2)
TJ Pitz 25 (4)

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

Comments for 1st Aff Good speed, clear but needs to be louder. very nice ~~ph~~ IAC layout. you had more than a minute left - add more records. maybe another contention. when you ask questions in cx, try to setup arguments for your partner.

Comments for 1st Neg Very good arguments. works on numbering and telling the judge where to put the arguments. Good CX questions. Rebuttal was ok, you hit some stuff your partner missed but not all of it.

Comments for 2nd Aff Very nice job covering everything in a line by line. GREAT FINAL REBUTTAL!! Covered everything, good job.

Comments for 2nd Neg The DA was new ~~out~~ in the 2 (most judges don't allow this) and the warrant never claimed war for the impact. It talked about depression. your rebuttal shipped too much and then just repeated what you said in your constructive

Reasons for Decision: Advantage 1 and 3 (colonization & mining) go essentially unchallenged by Negs, so they Play AFF. Not sure what the advantage of 1 was though and 3's advantage was that helium 3 is valuable, but so what. I would work on stronger impacts for the advantages. Aerospace was closer, but the negs drop it at end so I'm forced to lay into that the aerospace industry is falling now and aff solves this. Also solves war. The DA was new in the 2 and dropped by end. Negs never refute that space travel has bi-partisan support and is popular so there is no Links. (Side note - the Impact card from neg never talks about war resulting from economic collapse, so it never has a real impact unless they cross apply aerospace impact, but negs don't)
Solvency seemed to be the biggest issue in round, but all Affs have to do at this point is prove there is a chance they can solve and they win. Aff does a great job showing that there is ① oxygen, ② moon quakes aren't as bad as predicted by apollo mission, ③ lunar dust can be advantageous, ④ lavatodes solve most problems, and ⑤ that diseases can be researched to stop them eventually (oh well if some lives have to die in process for greater good, I was never given a reason why 1 life is more important than future lives).

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division N Round 3 Room 1132 Date 1/7/12 Judge Russell School Muskego

Aff Team/Code Appleton east AFF

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Molly Conway</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>(2)</u>
Molly Conway <u>Michal Anderson</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>(3)</u>

Neg Team/Code Muskego Neg

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Harrison Woodard</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(1)</u>
<u>Willa Tsao</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>(4)</u>

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

Comments for 1st Aff
 Short speeches, you tended to ramble once you were past what was written, good volume & pace however

Comments for 1st Neg
 Try to Clarify the Aff position better before making your arguments.

Comments for 2nd Aff
 you seemed to understand your case the best of those in round but you still didn't seem to have a solid grasp of what you were arguing

Comments for 2nd Neg
 you have a tendency to mumble as you speak, try to enunciate a bit more

Reasons for Decision:
 As a policy maker in this round I have an Aff that wants to collapse the economy to prevent extinction and a neg that tells me extinction isn't going to happen. ~~can~~ (this wasn't countered)
 As a matter of policy here I vote Status Quo and thus neg because I have every reason not to vote Aff.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division Nov Round _____ Room 1126 Date 1/7/12 Judge N. CHARLES School NICOLET

Aff Team/Code <u>WEST BEND</u>	Neg Team/Code <u>Parker</u>																		
<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Names</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Points (10-30)</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Rank (1-4)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Alex Kopish</u></td> <td><u>27</u></td> <td><u>(2)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Emma Sanborn</u></td> <td><u>28</u></td> <td><u>(1)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Alex Kopish</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>Emma Sanborn</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Names</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Points (10-30)</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Rank (1-4)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Samuel Schendel</u></td> <td><u>26.5</u></td> <td><u>(3)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Crystal Flores</u></td> <td><u>26</u></td> <td><u>(4)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Samuel Schendel</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>Crystal Flores</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(4)</u>
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Alex Kopish</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(2)</u>																	
<u>Emma Sanborn</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>																	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Samuel Schendel</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>(3)</u>																	
<u>Crystal Flores</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(4)</u>																	

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

Comments for 1st Aff
 The IAR needs to be paced better, and needs to examine each negative argument and answer it specifically.
 The IAR needs to focus on why the DA is inevitable.

Comments for 1st Neg
 Don't summarize evidence you just read.
 The INR needs to analyze why the DA case

Comments for 2nd Aff
 Impact calc. - Finally
 YOU DIDN'T ANSWER WEAPONIZATION! why not?

Comments for 2nd Neg
 2NR was way too short, needed overview, impact calculus, line-by-line. If you just read tags and cites of previously read cards.

Reasons for Decision:

EVERYBODY: READ AUTHOR AND DATE - This was really annoying.
 Cover the opponents arguments in a line-by-line fashion. Analytics will stop everyone from reading lots of evidence without actually comparing it.

This round is way messier than it needs to be. Both teams have compelling reasons why they are correct - but not answering arguments.

DEBRIS - will be cleaned up (maybe) by Russians. Maybe the satellites are just used for ground defense. Anyway, the weaponization is inevitable, so its fine. AFF

WEAPONIZATION - Isn't adequately covered in the last two speeches... 2AR doesn't cover at all, but 2NR has no LBL either... um, AFF, I guess, on the overview.



Tournament Date: 1/7/12			Tournament Location: middleton HS		
Round: 3	Room: 1127	Division: WDCA	Judge Name: Summers	Judge School:	
Affirmative Code: Homestead ^{npvce}			Negative Code: Rhinelander 2		
Print debaters' names below; award 18-30 pts.; rank 1-4 →		Points	Rank	Print debaters' names below; award 18-30 pts.; rank 1-4 →	
1A: Sean Zacharias		29	1	1N: Matt Bloch	27 4
2A: MARK USATINSKY		27	3	2N: Ben Eversman	28 2
Decision: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Negative		Team/Code: Homestead		Low-point win? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	

Reasons for Decision (provide detailed justification referring to central issues presented in the round, for debaters and their coaches):

1A - Slow down on tags @ Authors
 - 1.5 min. left in IAC. Use it!
 + (S), pre-empt neg args. Add US space leadership
 - good cx of INC on OST+DA
 - great IAR + analytics, but a generic "pull through our cards" should be specific

1N - I like the summary on OST debate, but did you read evidence? This arg. is better as a solvency turn.
 - You can't just read tags + authors in INC. read 1 (S) card, move on, + blow up in block.
 - SPLIT THE BLOCK -

2A - Only answer cx Q if your partner can't
 - Answer the arguments Negs made in INC in 2AC. It's not worth the time to read answers to cx Q if Negs aren't arguing stuff about it.
 - Extend helpful cards from IAC to 2AC -> cats '97 + woff 03 + Ansy 1'10.
 - Good job noticing dropped 3rd Adv.
 - 2AR should've emphasized neg's lack of offense + conceded Nuk adv.
 Good overview

2N Their terrorism advantage was about hegemony, not economy.
 - Good application of Dennerman card.
 - Most of your 2NC is defensive. You need offense to win.
 - Your OST arguments + (I) arguments contradict each other. Bokey 10.
 - Good overview, ~~talk about + weigh impacts of DAs + advantages of plan.~~ Nice weighing.

Negs conceded Nuclear fallout advantage & Non-Unique on Privatization DA. Without Neg offense + with Aff's Ansy 1'10 card, I have to vote AFF.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division N Round 3 Room 1125 Date 1-7-12 Judge Oswald School Homestead

Aff Team/Code <u>Rhineland AF 2</u>	Neg Team/Code <u>Mukwonago Neg</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>Catherine Brown</u></td> <td><u>27</u></td> <td><u>(2)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Stephanie Belanger</u></td> <td><u>27</u></td> <td><u>(3)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Catherine Brown</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>Stephanie Belanger</u>	<u>27</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>Brynne Reilly</u></td> <td><u>28</u></td> <td><u>(1)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Andrew Patterson</u></td> <td><u>26</u></td> <td><u>(4)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Brynne Reilly</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>	<u>Andrew Patterson</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(4)</u>
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Catherine Brown</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(2)</u>																	
<u>Stephanie Belanger</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(3)</u>																	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Brynne Reilly</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>																	
<u>Andrew Patterson</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(4)</u>																	

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

Comments for 1st Aff
 Nice inflection in your IAC. Good CX. Good rebuttal. You could have claimed abuse on Mars colonization args not really defending SQ but actually being presented as CP.

Comments for 1st Neg
 Flirted with a counterplan in the INC, very thin ice. Very nice delivery - cute commentary that lightened up your speech.

Comments for 2nd Aff
 Good counter to the lunar dust & moonquakes arguments in the 2AC. Didn't think the strategy of reading all cites first was a good one. You didn't get to some cards, so those couldn't be used. Good CX.

Comments for 2nd Neg
 Try not to lean over desk & look down at your cards while you read. Most of your 2AC was spent on advantages of Mars colonization. This is sure sounding like a CP.

Reasons for Decision:

I give the win to the Affs because the Negs relied almost exclusively on their Mars DA to win. There are so many other DAs to the moon base plan that this wasn't a sound strategy. Affs were able to effectively counter this ^{one} because their plan text stated it could be a stepping stone to Mars & interplanetary exploration. Also, Affs don't have the burden of refuting effectiveness of Mars plan at novice level. In the future negs, use Mars DA as one DA amongst many for a stronger strategy. For Affs, don't bring up new arguments in rebuttal (card that was cited but not read in constructive - bunkers). Good round.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division _____ Round 3 Room 1129 Date 1/7/12 Judge Rachel Green School West Bend

Aff Team/Code	<u>Mukwonago Aff (N)</u>	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Nicole Phelps</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(4)</u>
<u>Sophia Dolan</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(3)</u>

Neg Team/Code	<u>Rhinelanders 1 (N)</u>	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Asif Sadik</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>(1)</u>
<u>Michael Greenst</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>

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

Comments for 1st Aff

- Way too fast! You need to at least talk clearly during your 1AR so I can hear and understand all of your critical points.
- nice job in 1st Cx when answering to question that if it already was existing (EDD) then there would be no need for debate. It was a nice comeback.
- your rebuttal was good, and analytics made me laugh in a good way.

Comments for 1st Neg

- You are a great speaker. You're clear, confident, have great eye contact. Also great explanations of cards.
- You had an amazing rebuttal. It really wrapped up the round, and I thought your analytics were awesome. That's a great skill to have. You make all your points sound very logical.

Comments for 2nd Aff

- good questions in Cx just don't come off too aggressive.
- great use of time. You went right till the last second on both speeches, which is very helpful for your side.

Comments for 2nd Neg

- Nice job on touching on every point in the round in both of your speeches. You didn't leave anything unsaid and were organized.
- You weighed the round beautifully.
- more eye contact and work on less swaying from side to side.

Reasons for Decision:

Altogether I thought this was a great debate! Great clash and great analytics/explanations on both sides. In the end I had to choose negative to win this round. At first I was going to vote Aff on the point that if there already was EDD than we wouldn't have this debate, however the NEGs brought up plenty of info showing this. The Affs put up a good fight for the lasers as well but the NEGs won that point too, that they could appear threatening to other countries and accidentally hit something in space that belonged to another country. Although the garbage truck analogy was good, it's a completely different scenario than giant lasers.

Finally I had to vote NEG since they showed how implementing these two plans (one which already exists) would cause everything the Affs tried to solve, to turn on them (ex: economy crash, and bad economy = bad hegemony).

If NEGs wouldn't have won on inherency I might have flowed Aff due to nuclear fall outs, but there already is a company trying to get rid of space debris.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division _____ Round 3 Room 1123 Date 1/7/12 Judge K. Gernerlinger School West Bend East

Aff Team/Code Rhineland One

Neg Team/Code Homestead

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Jordan Koster</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(4)</u>
<u>Dylan Wendt</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Andrey Rainchik</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>(2)</u>
<u>Tej Bindra</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>(3)</u>

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

Comments for 1st Aff

Solid plan

Comments for 1st Neg

good questions in cx

Comments for 2nd Aff

well constructed speeches with lots of real evidence

Comments for 2nd Neg

your 2NC really solidified my vote

Reasons for Decision:

I am voting Neg in this round. Aff had a very good plan with lots of detail and thought, though. However Negs point about their being no need to go to space because earth is habitable for many years and there is very little proof for extinction makes the Aff case irrelevant. I also strongly agree with the Neg quality of life point. Overall a very good round though. I am giving a low point win since I believe the Mars card was abusive. Great job to all.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division _____ Round _____ Room _____ Date 1/7 Judge Cooper Herchel School Shiocharter

Aff Team/Code <u>Muskego</u>			Neg Team/Code <u>Appleton East</u>		
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Jack Williams</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>Myra Medina</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>(4)</u>
<u>Noel Graf</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>	<u>Justin Strue</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>(3)</u>

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

Comments for 1st Aff
 "Finite" Good speech. Focus on advantages related specifically to your plan. A little generic. Be more pointed with your language. You're too vague.

Comments for 1st Neg
 "Longevity" "Validity" "Casually" "Heterogenous" "Coronal" "Cumulative"
 You were evidently uncomfortable. You need more flowing. Your arguments made clear you weren't paying close enough attention.

Comments for 2nd Aff
 Cite more. You forgot a few. You repeated yourself for most of your case.
 "Mechanism". You don't understand global warming.

Comments for 2nd Neg
 You seem uninterested in your case. You spoke to the podium and ignored your audience. Not good. New in the 2. Way too many new arguments.

Reasons for Decision: 1:30

Harms: ASF 1:30
 Extinction scenarios uncountered. "1% risk" card.

Inherency: ASF
 Conceded

Solvency: ASF
 Theory outweighs in ASF favor

Topicality: ASF
 Conceded