

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division VSS Round 3 Room 2004 Date 1/7/12 Judge Vinodh Muthiah School App East

Aff Team/Code Howstead Aff

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Todd Lee</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(4)</u>
<u>Henry Balmsteros</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(3)</u>

Neg Team/Code Mukwanago JE

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Erica Deitzler</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(2)</u>
<u>Jason Baron</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(1)</u>

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

Comments for 1st Aff
Good IAC speed

Comments for 1st Neg
Good job going down the flow.

Comments for 2nd Aff
Do more work on the K!

Comments for 2nd Neg
Dont read cards as utl if they die/ie bring it up.

Reasons for Decision:

Aff uses an coercion (K) and Petro '79 which is dropped

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division V4 Round III Room 1130 Date 1/7/12 Judge Devine School Janesville Parker

Aff Team/Code West Bend 1

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Samantha Warr</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(2)</u>
<u>Zach Beaver</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>(1)</u>

Neg Team/Code Sheboygan South LW

Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)
<u>Case Whitman</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>(3)</u>
<u>Mereda Lawrence</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>(4)</u>

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

Comments for 1st Aff: Very clearly written. IAC and excellent delivery as well. Great clarification in CX. Your IAR was a really nice focusing of all positions in the round.

Comments for 1st Neg: Please give a road map. You spending DA leads structure. It just says that Clean-up (which the IA said in CX they are not doing) is expensive.

Comments for 2nd Aff: Excellent (and tactful) explanation of how the spending DA has no linkage to your plan. Very good job wrapping up the case for this plan.

Comments for 2nd Neg: Is your "ridiculously expensive" card referring to avoidance technology or to Clean-up? Very short DAC. You seemed lost in your rebuttal.

Reasons for Decision: In your 2AR

DA-spending - This really wasn't a DA (no impact, for one thing), but in any case it did not apply, as it linked only to debris Clean-up, not avoidance. → **AFF**

inherency - Negs did a nice job explaining how there are already Clean-up operations going on. Unfortunately, the aff plan does not implement a Clean-up plan but rather an avoidance plan. Therefore, there is no link → **AFF**

solvency - Negs take an early (INC) shot at this by saying that debris is inevitable and effective removal is not feasible. But once affs respond that they agree on inevitability and are ~~therefore~~ therefore advocating avoidance they take this issue → **AFF**

Thanks to both teams for debating with respect and class.



Tournament Date: 1/7/12			Tournament Location: Middleton		
Round: 3	Room: 1010	Division: V	Judge Name: Surprenant	Judge School: Muskego	
Affirmative Code: Mukwonago Aff AA			Negative Code: West Bend Neg 1		
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: Amanda Fuller		28	3	1N: Victoria Kay	
2A: Abby Hostoltek		27	4	2N: Nathan Holcomb	
Decision: <input type="checkbox"/> Affirmative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Negative		Team/Code: West Bend Neg 1		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):

Well-delivered 1AC, but you had about 1 minute of speech time left

Well-delivered 1NC - able to explain all of your arguments in a logical manner. Good speaker presence.

Well-delivered 2AC, although you tried to pull some arguments ^{through} that negs covered when talking about extinction. Also, what are non-traditional launches?

Well-delivered 2NC. Great analysis.

1NR - good logical arguments

1AR - good response to negative, but you make some illogical arguments about not cross applying extinction and prolif when they both lead to death

2NR - I agree with the abuse argument - affs are unclear about how their Transorbital RR works. Good argument about Cuban missile. You need some evidence about how close we came to nuclear war.

2AR - Good summary

I vote negative according to following stock issues:

Ink - aff Cost of space travel not contested

Adv - Extinction (Get Off The Rock) - Negs showed extinction also likely in space, and nuclear prolif leads to war and human death. Also showed aff plan doesn't save majority of human life. Affs killing more than they're saving. Also, radiation effects.

Solv - Not sure how Transorbital RR works.

Weaponization DA - Negs showed that we're more likely to die from DA than extinction threat.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division V Round 3 Room 2002 Date 1/7/12 Judge Bourassa School RHS

Aff Team/Code <u>West Bend 2</u>		Neg Team/Code <u>Homeslead AC</u>	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	Names
<u>Hallie Cook</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>Austin Cao</u>
<u>John Whattey</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>	<u>Capt. Colemattori</u>
			Points (10-30) Rank (1-4)
			<u>29 (1)</u>
			<u>28 (4)</u>

Decision: The winning team is the (Circle) Affirmative Negative Team/Code West Bend 2

Low Point Win (Circle) Yes No

Comments for 1st Aff
 Nice job going against some difficult K's with very little evidence. Pointed out Negs

Comments for 1st Neg
 Your K's are interesting but I am not sure they hold a real policy and plan and Aff's did a good job at pointing this out

Comments for 2nd Aff
 Good job at beginning of constructive. The Negs K ~~was~~ didn't have a plan/policy. Didn't like your point that we can protect life since humans have been responsible for a great deal of extinctions in the last few centuries.

Comments for 2nd Neg
 Good understanding of your K's and good voice and pace. It feels like you are asking the aff's "what is the meaning of life"

Reasons for Decision:
 Aff needs to point out that even if the K is a policy with a plan is it a plan by the Federal Gov. This may be a good thing to point out

↑
 you did this in 1AR good job.

Aff's should ~~not~~ say ^{preK} is unrelated and you did and the Aff's schweny and interang were not contented. Good job pointing out that the K was a philosophical debate and not a policy debate

↑
 main Reason for decision

We solve for the universe" - Nick

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division V4 Round 03 Room 2001 Date 1/7 Judge Kayla Gerick School Mukwonago
~~Robinson~~ ~~Rafos King~~

Aff Team/Code	<u>Muskego</u>
Names	Points (10-30) Rank (1-4)
<u>Nick S</u>	<u>25</u> (<u>4</u>)
<u>Katie B</u>	<u>29</u> (<u>1</u>)

Neg Team/Code	<u>West Bend 2</u>	4:18
Names	Points (10-30) Rank (1-4)	3:00
<u>Katie S</u>	<u>26</u> (<u>3</u>)	
<u>Cody H</u>	<u>27</u> (<u>2</u>)	

Decision: The winning team is the (Circle) Affirmative Negative Team/Code West Bend 2 Katie S + Cody H
Low Point Win (Circle) Yes No

Comments for 1st Aff

- "Inbreeding screwed us all over"
- Relyed on partner in CX.
- Good pace on case.
- I smell Bervbe! ← Big smile
- Really stumbled on points during questioning. OWN YOUR CASE
- Did you just try to flatter me?

Comments for 1st Neg

- AWESOME (T)! (WOULD HAVE VOTED ON!)
- Very clear. You could smile once in a while 😊 25s left - Very standoffish
- "What do you want?"

Comments for 2nd Aff

- extremely good speaker. Great analysis.
- Quite a few "uhs"
- Thank you for upholding the tags.
- Help partner be self sufficient in CX, I take lots of stock in /A

Comments for 2nd Neg

- Thank you for upholding tags.
- Very nice analysis
- Little spaced / choppy
- 43s left in 2NC.
- I don't think you realized you won round. But you said everything

Reasons for Decision: GOOD ROUND - nice manners. right
Really poor responses from AFF on ozone D/A. TO WIN

- So your solution to ext + poverty is to make another ext cause, but its okay because we will already have a sustainable moon colony?

But the IAC states that even if failure happens we will get new tech for earth?

- If you can't give me a legit reason to save ozone, you can't have weight on volcano. ← contradicting

- And if you rely off only moon colony alone, (that MAY fail) ← but that's okay) where are these jobs that solve dehum

I don't think they had any idea they won. Half hearted reb's but said ALL the right things!

- 2N really took cake + ran, I don't think the 1N realized it, but followed obediently. 😊

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division V4 Pol Round 3 Room 2003 Date 1/7/2012 Judge Emma Kestel School Brookfield East

Aff Team/Code <u>Sheb S RD</u>	Neg Team/Code <u>Mukmanago AM</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>Alyshia DeLaRosa</u></td> <td><u>28</u></td> <td><u>(3)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Heath Reinl</u></td> <td><u>28</u></td> <td><u>(4)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Alyshia DeLaRosa</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>Heath Reinl</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(4)</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>Andy Russell</u></td> <td><u>29</u></td> <td><u>(1)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Max Gshad / Zemplinski</u></td> <td><u>28</u></td> <td><u>(2)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Andy Russell</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>(1)</u>	<u>Max Gshad / Zemplinski</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Alyshia DeLaRosa</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(3)</u>																	
<u>Heath Reinl</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(4)</u>																	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Andy Russell</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>(1)</u>																	
<u>Max Gshad / Zemplinski</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>(2)</u>																	

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

Comments for 1st Aff
well read IAC

Comments for 1st Neg
Super interesting INC.

Comments for 2nd Aff
Should have been more organized ~~in~~ 2AC.

Comments for 2nd Neg
be more clear and organized in your speeches

Reasons for Decision:

→ K/CP/thing-Anthropocentrism/Cyborgs/Xenocide.

Only thing on my flow.
 Aff attacks are few and weak. Aff makes a good point about brink but it's well answered. Perm to do Plan then CP from Aff but as Negs point out their plan is brink and CP needs to be done now according to their cards.

- Framework (FW)
 I had 2 separate frameworks Negs argued against other FW and their own. Affs brought up own FW but didn't tell me why I have to buy it. Neg FW was well constructed.

- Impacts (imps)
 K/CP/thing is Xenocide, this obviously outweighs as Negs argue. Affs say it won't happen and argue 'try or die' for 'Get off the Rock'. Affs argue possibility over probability in 2AC.

⇒ Neg Affs never took a strong offensive against CP/K.

Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association Policy Debate Ballot

Division V4 Round 3 Room 202 Date 1/1/12 Judge Gutbrod School Honesbead

Aff Team/Code <u>Sheboygan South CS</u>	Neg Team/Code <u>Muskego</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>Sam Steiner</u></td> <td><u>21</u></td> <td><u>(4)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Jonathan Cook</u></td> <td><u>30</u></td> <td><u>(1)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Sam Steiner</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>(4)</u>	<u>Jonathan Cook</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>(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>Colin Preston</u></td> <td><u>25</u></td> <td><u>(3)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Matthew Boster</u></td> <td><u>29</u></td> <td><u>(2)</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)	<u>Colin Preston</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>(3)</u>	<u>Matthew Boster</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>(2)</u>
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Sam Steiner</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>(4)</u>																	
<u>Jonathan Cook</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>(1)</u>																	
Names	Points (10-30)	Rank (1-4)																	
<u>Colin Preston</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>(3)</u>																	
<u>Matthew Boster</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>(2)</u>																	

Decision: The winning team is the (Circle) Affirmative Negative Team/Code Sheboygan-South CS
 Low Point Win (Circle) Yes ~~2nd~~

Comments for 1st Aff
 This affirmative was a one man show on the part of your partner. Became more involved in the debate!

Comments for 1st Neg
 Familiarize yourself with T structure. Your delivery has the potential to be impressive, so be confident and work on organizing your thoughts when speaking.

Comments for 2nd Aff
 Your speaking is impeccable. Tuck your shirt in.

Comments for 2nd Neg
 I commend you for your honesty. My respect for your conduct as a debater was the strongest force pushing me to vote for your team.

Reasons for Decision:
 The only lesson to be taken from this round is for the negatives: don't drop framework.