

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division V Round 1 Room 2002 Date 1/7/12 Judge Russell School Mukwonago

Aff Team/Code Muskego Aff

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Nick Stanisowski</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>(3)</u>
<u>Katie Beckman</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>(4)</u>

Neg Team/Code Homestead Neg

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Austin Cao</u>	<u>27.5</u>	<u>(1)</u>
<u>Collin Cadornatori</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(2)</u>

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

Comments for 1st Aff
 Pace and volume were good
 If you wanted to go for abuse in the 1 AR you should have spent more than the 20 sec you did.

Comments for 1st Neg
 Interesting end to your cross-x, interesting ?'s
 very nice Policy weighing of the round
 I would have liked to see a bit more on the 20k years past due the yellow stone volcano is.

Comments for 2nd Aff
 Didn't seem like you understood the Alarmism argument so it was under covered in the 2AC
 Decent weigh of the round

Comments for 2nd Neg
 Don't forget to read authors of cards
 good continuing explanation of your militarism/militarization DA good Job with the life support issue.

Reasons for Decision:
 I have a pure Advantage vs Disadvantage debate at the end of this round so that is where I ~~re~~evaluate the round.
 The neg points out to me that the Aff Poverty Advantage is being based around skilled Masa Workers who are likely to find jobs again so I have no weight to the Advantage.
 The other advantage scenario that I am left with is a get off the Rock Super Volcano advantage that I give some weight though it is mitigated due to a lack in tech now and no closed loop life support.
 I have to weigh this against permanent threat of extinction in within 20-30 years and nuclear war now if I enact the plan so I vote Neg
 On the Abuse Issue, I personally see no issue with specific on-case arguments in the 2NC.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division _____ Round _____ Room _____ Date 1/7 Judge Cooper Hendel School Rhineland

Aff Team/Code <u>WB #1</u>	Neg Team/Code <u>Sheb South NA</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>Samantha Wanta</u></td> <td><u>28</u></td> <td><u>(1)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Zach Beaver</u></td> <td><u>28</u></td> <td><u>(2)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Samantha Wanta</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>	<u>Zach Beaver</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</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>Ross Nuffer</u></td> <td><u>20</u></td> <td><u>(4)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Leah Allen</u></td> <td><u>27</u></td> <td><u>(3)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Ross Nuffer</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>Leah Allen</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(3)</u>
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Samantha Wanta</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>																	
<u>Zach Beaver</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>																	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Ross Nuffer</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>(4)</u>																	
<u>Leah Allen</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(3)</u>																	

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

Comments for 1st Aff
 Good speech! Eye contact great. Very interesting framework! Cross was a bit weak. You caught their contradictions. Awesome. What was the analogy? Odd. Not necessary for your point.

Comments for 1st Neg
 If you're going to speed, do it well. You slowed down later. IF I'm not writing, what you're saying is meaningless. Loud and you might see that. You're not speedy so I expect you to speak well.

Comments for 2nd Aff
 Your very collected manner bolsters your credibility. Good use of your framework to force the Negs to work on your ground.

Comments for 2nd Neg
 Don't clearly waste his time. Very rude. You wasted your 20. You left too much for your partner.

Reasons for Decision: 1:30
1:00
1:10

My barely addressed AFF. Your speech left your DA on disease totally off the flow. It seemed that you misunderstood their case. You were also very internally contradictory. Given their framework, which you agreed to, your case was very weak. Contradictions are not logical. Your tags were unsupported by your evidence/cards. Not good.

Your multi-world neg should have been done in the 1, not the 2. You're saying things your cards don't. You also misunderstood almost every analytic they made.

Feedback:
 IA caught everything I wanted to hear. It's not weakness to use evidence in a limited fashion to support your arguments. Very weak ANR. If you're going to argue impacts, make impacting speeches. Your lack of structure weakened you greatly. Creating, adding, and arguing a turn in the IWR doesn't get flawed. Not fair. "This is real world" doesn't make it real world.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division 1 Round V Room 2004 Date 11/7/12 Judge Kretzger School West Bend

Aff Team/Code mukwonago BD

Neg Team/Code Shebs CS

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Erica Deltzler</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(3)</u>
<u>Jason Brown</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>(2)</u>

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Samuel Steiner</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>(4)</u>
<u>Jon Cook</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(1)</u>

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

Comments for 1st Aff

New args in 1AR aren't flowed. It's an art the way you read it. Sorry.

Comments for 1st Neg

lack of clarity makes it difficult to flow. 1NR isn't as clear as you need it to be. There are some areas where good analytics will do a lot more than reading cards.

Comments for 2nd Aff

2AR refutation is good, but if you make it just a bit tighter it will be great. You also need a viewing computer. Per the rules

Comments for 2nd Neg

Nice job on the line by line in 2NC.

Reasons for Decision:

off the top, I tell you ~~that~~ that I'm looking for something policy/thinkable to vote on. ~~was~~ Losing most of the round to a lackluster discussion of Heidegger isn't that. 2NR tells me that they found a card just for me so I'll vote on a K as a policy judge. Problem is, the Alt doesn't exist in a real way. Even if 2NR can beat both turns, I reject and let earth be works only if the negs can beat Australian '10 from case. when they can't the K effectively goes away.

Case This is underdeveloped, compared to the (K) The Alts are enough on competitiveness @ extension to win that Case or will solve. If the negs put a ton more work into their alt, they could have won the round.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division V4 Round 1 Room 1010 Date 1/9/12 Judge Gibson School Homestead

Aff Team/Code Mukwonago AM
 Names Points (10-30) Rank (1-4)
Marshall Zemplinski 26 (4)
Andy Russell 29 (2)

Neg Team/Code West Bend 1
 Names Points (10-30) Rank (1-4)
Victoria Kay 27 (3)
Nathan Holcomb 30 (1)

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

Comments for 1st Aff
 Budget your time better. In both speeches you got out off mid card or mid point. Other than that flaw, your presentation is top notch.

Comments for 1st Neg
 Be careful to read what it is you mean to read. Multiple times today you had to backtrack after reading the wrong tag. This wastes time and makes you sound less confident. Otherwise, flawless job.

Comments for 2nd Aff
 Your constructive made me smile it was so well delivered. In cross examination you have an amazing ability to sound extremely confident while verbally running in circles. I see that as a valuable talent.

Comments for 2nd Neg
 Everything you do is perfect.

Reasons for Decision:
 I would have called it a draw had I the authority.

Warming Advantage: Goes Neg. The plan helps fight manmade warming by collecting data on temperature cycles, but does nothing to fight natural warming and cooling.

Competitiveness Advantage: Neg. Bottom line on impact: Asia won't make someone who owes them trillions. The cards below the impact level were a wash.

Weaponization DA: Aff. Exact same reasoning as the Competitiveness Advantage.

Inherency: Aff. Shuttle launches (sqw) are expensive but the transorbital railroad (plan) is cheap. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

Privatization DA/CD: Too many eggs in the private sector could be dangerous, therefore the perm is simply a safer option.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division V4 Round I Room 2001 Date 1/7/13 Judge Devine School Jamesville Parker

Aff Team/Code <u>Homestead</u>			Neg Team/Code <u>West Bend 2</u>		
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Toddle</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>Katie Salter</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>(3)</u>
<u>Henry Ballesteros</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(1)</u>	<u>Cody Harrison</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>(4)</u>

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

Comments for 1st Aff Well-supported contentions in 1AC. Logical application of advantage scenarios 1-3. The global warming issue seems more strenuous, since it's hard to predict how direct the effect of solar sails on fossil fuel consumption would be.

Comments for 1st Neg You seem kind of down. Speak up clearly so the judge doesn't miss anything. Good use of solvency evidence. Very thorough exposition of the space debris DA. Good attempt at direct refutation in your rebuttal.

Comments for 2nd Aff The debris link that is weak because it's kind of tautologous: If space debris causes and results from collision + seems like a significant problem. Excellent job pointing out the contradiction on DA vs. inherency.

Comments for 2nd Neg Don't forget to cite your cards. You had ~~some~~ some worthwhile things to say. By quitting your 2NC after less than 5 minutes (after taking almost 2 minutes of prep), you missed some opportunities. Don't confuse ozone depletion with global warming.

Reasons for Decision: (Non-unique)

Only two issues are carried through this round:

Solvency - aff evidence convinces me that the technology for solar sails does exist and that it can be deployed effectively using US technology → **[AFF]**

space debris DA - This argument goes in circles. ~~Affs~~ tell me that new ~~launchers~~ launchers don't cause collisions, only old debris. Yet debris will still result eventually, right? I think so, BUT, aff plan is also actively removing space debris (and they convinced me they can solve) so they ultimately neutralize the DA. → **[AFF]**

The negs just didn't do enough to overcome the effective way the affs ~~backed~~ backed up their solvency and refuted the uniqueness of the DA. Good luck to both teams!



Tournament Date: 1/7/12			Tournament Location: Middleton		
Round: 1	Room: 2003	Division: VSS	Judge Name: Vinodh Muthiah	Judge School: App East	
Affirmative Code: West Bend 2			Negative Code: Muskego Neg		
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: Hallie Coon		27	3	1N: Colin Preston	
2A: John Whattey		28	2	2N: Matt Boster	
Decision: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Negative			Team/Code: West Bend 2		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 - Good speed on IAC, be a little more clear on tags
 1N - Run more arguments!
 2A - Good line by line on the flow
 2N - Copy the parts from your book so you don't need to read straight from it.

Neg drops aff's NU argument on the DA flow so DA ⇒ Aff
 All I'm left with is case defense which doesn't do much for the neg so I'm left with voting for the aff on the chance of risking extinction.