

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division V4 Round 2 Room 2001 Date 1/7/12 Judge Gutbrod School Hovesland

Aff Team/Code <u>Sheb South NA</u>	Neg Team/Code <u>West Bend Neg 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>Leah Allen</u></td> <td><u>23</u></td> <td><u>(3)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Boss NUFER</u></td> <td><u>24</u></td> <td><u>(2)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Leah Allen</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>Boss NUFER</u>	<u>24</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>Katie Salter</u></td> <td><u>22</u></td> <td><u>(4)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Cody Harrison</u></td> <td><u>25</u></td> <td><u>(3)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Katie Salter</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>Cody Harrison</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>(3)</u>
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Leah Allen</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>(3)</u>																	
<u>Boss NUFER</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>(2)</u>																	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Katie Salter</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>(4)</u>																	
<u>Cody Harrison</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>(3)</u>																	

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

Comments for 1st Aff
 Avoid making arguments from experience without evidence. Also, don't make things up. One example of many made up "facts" you used was the claim that the moon doesn't experience Meteor Collisions.

Comments for 1st Neg
 Speak up. Don't make up the warrants for your conclusions. You need a more thorough understanding of T structure and Negative strategy, or you need to let your understandings of those things show more.

Comments for 2nd Aff
 Budget your time better so as to not get cut off mid point. Listen to your opponents. You spent the round arguing the definitions of words the neg didn't claim you violated.

Comments for 2nd Neg
 The "Obama will be out" inherent argument you made was atrocious and ungrounded in logic. Claiming Obama leaving office will guarantee the aff plan is absurd. Your speaking style was the best in round despite the strategic errors you personally made.

Reasons for Decision:

The negs only offense was a T violation. They ended up losing it because of a voting standard which did not correspond well to the violation at all. Arguing fairness on such a technicality as "space" not including celestial bodies is unwise. A better voting standard would have been rule of the game.

Since the negs didn't present any offense and no counter-interpretation of the round, I had to vote aff. Every little harms or solvency attack ~~the~~ the negs mustered only chipped away at a plan with no presented disadvantages or critical flaws. Since the aff framework (which became the framework of the round when it went uncontested) required 1 vote to avoid drastic impacts, no matter how unlikely they may be, I did just that.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division V Round 2 Room 1130 Date 1/7/12 Judge Russell School Mukwonago

Aff Team/Code Homestead Aff

Neg Team/Code Sheboygan South CS

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Todd Le</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>
<u>Henry Ballesteros</u>	<u>27.5</u>	<u>(3)</u>

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Sam Steiner</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(4)</u>
<u>Jon Cook</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>(1)</u>

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

Comments for 1st Aff
 Where is the SBSP link to solar sails as your case is written

Comments for 1st Neg
 Slightly muffled as you spoke, try to talk up more.
 Decent rebuttal get a bit more familiar with your evidence

Comments for 2nd Aff
 Very short constructive extend on the case, spend more time on the IC
 spend more time arguing the IC than telling me its

Comments for 2nd Neg
 Excellent cross-x looked like you had quite a bit of fun dancing
 Excellent pace great appeal to my real world philosophy.

Reasons for Decision: rediculous.

I have to vote neg this round because the Aff All but completely conceded the neg IC and Framework.

Very Interesting to watch and Judge.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division V4 Round II Room 2003 Date 1/7/12 Judge Devine School Janesville Parke

Aff Team/Code Mukwonago AM

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Marshall Zemplinski</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>(2)</u>
<u>Andy Russell</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(1)</u>

Neg Team/Code Muskego

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Colin Preston</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>(4)</u>
<u>Matt Boster</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>(3)</u>

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

Comments for 1st Aff
 Good application of evidence in support of your advantages. The economic benefit seems anti-climatic after nuclear war. Effective response to neg; block in your rebuttal.

Comments for 1st Neg
 I don't think your first Jubrin card says what you claim it means. Your NASA evidence supports the aff's inference. Why not run a structural privatization DA?

Comments for 2nd Aff
 Strong response to neg attacks on global warming and ozone. Good turn on the ozone issue. Excellent job weighing all issues in D.A.R.

Comments for 2nd Neg
 Your thesis that global warming is a positive occurrence is not self-evident, yet you offer no evidence in support. Some degree of logic in the SNC, but a woeful lack of any evidentiary basis.

Reasons for Decision:

solvency - Negs raise questions on NASA's effectiveness and whether public-private partnerships can be effective, when neither public ~~nor~~ private is, on its own. Affs convince me the technology can be ready in time to solve and that there is a particular key to solving: public-private partnerships → **AFF**

warming advantage - The only real refutation of the essence of this advantage is that there is no correlation between CO₂ and warming. This is quite a stretch, in light of strong aff evidence to the contrary. I mean, think about it. There are many explanations ~~for~~ possibly explaining an ~~apparent~~ apparent lack of correlation. For example, the effect could be lagging/delayed. Affs reinforce their argument effectively. **AFF**

ozone DA - affs convince me these launders will have little effect on the ozone layer and they make a plausible link between ozone healing and global warming → **AFF**
 Good luck to all 4 of you!!!



Tournament Date: 1/7/12			Tournament Location: Middleton		
Round: 2	Room: 2002	Division: VSS	Judge Name: Vinodh Muthiah	Judge School: App East	
Affirmative Code: Mukwonago AA			Negative Code: Homestead AC		
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: Avonda Fuller		28	1	1N: Austin Cap	27 4
2A: Abhay Koshollek		28	2	2N: Collin Cademartori	27 3
Decision: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Negative		Team/Code: Mukwonago AA			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):

neg:
5:38
2:44

aff:
~~8:00~~
3:48
6:06

Both teams need to spend WAY more time on framework. It is the most important issue but it is undercovered by everyone.

The Neg drops the aff double bind argument and also fails to explain how their alt works → thus the aff wins an framework because only policy options lead to change.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division V4 Round 2 Room 1016 Date 1/7 Judge Robinson School Rufus King

Aff Team/Code Muskego

Neg Team/Code West Bend 1

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Nick Staniszenki</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(4)</u>
<u>Katie Beckman</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>(3)</u>

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Victoria Kay</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(2)</u>
<u>Nathan Holdcomb</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(1)</u>

~~5:10~~
1:35
1:13

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

Comments for 1st Aff
 Good IAC. Work on clarity.
 A lot of the IAR was new.
 and it was all over the place.

Comments for 1st Neg
 The extra internal ^{link} cards aren't needed.
 Signpost more, you were all over the place in
 the INC. Good job extending the
 warrants in the disc.

Comments for 2nd Aff
 Don't get stuck on the smaller
 arguments, answer the big
 picture. You need to
 allocate time to off case
 positions.

Comments for 2nd Neg
 Good variety in the 2NC.

Reasons for Decision:

RFD: I end up voting on T. The aff concedes that space is beyond earth's mesosphere between celestial bodies. Then the aff is outweighed the space militarization da. The impacts of the aff need to be extended for me to give weight to the argument.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division V Round 2 Room 2004 Date 1/7/12 Judge Surprenant School Muskego

Aff Team/Code West Bend Aff 2

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Hallie Cook</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>(4)</u>
<u>John Whattery</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>

Neg Team/Code Mukwonago Neg JE

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Eric Deitzler</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>(1)</u>
<u>Jason Beron</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(3)</u>

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

Comments for 1st Aff IAC was a little fast. I missed some of your organization. Use all of your 1AR time - use more analysis. You had almost 2 minutes left!

Comments for 1st Neg Good delivery of INC - easy to follow your organization. Good rebuttal.

Comments for 2nd Aff Well-organized 2AC - you followed the INC flaw very well and explained all of your arguments. Good CX questions. Good rebuttal, but you didn't have to bring up coal - negs agreed it wasn't an issue, although

Comments for 2nd Neg Good splitting of negative block. Good rebuttal.

Reasons for Decision: it was a good point to make about reducing dependency on fossil fuel.

I voted aff according to the following stock issues:

INH- Affs win here. They claimed lack of funding, but negs never challenged the affs ability to get the funds. Negs never challenged "normal means."

SOLV- Affs showed that technology was available to implement plan. Affs could have done a better job of refuting the argument of increasing global warming by creating satellites.

HARMS/ADV - Affs showed jobs would be created and global warming would decrease.

TOP- not ~~debated~~ debated.

DA's - Affs showed space debris DA was non-unique and impact of Russian DA had not occurred.

This was a good debate. Affs were able to refute neg attacks and didn't drop any arguments.