

SUPPLEMENTAL PHILOSOPHIES

Granger, Marcus 202

Thornton, Tyler 203

Marcus Granger

Carroll College

Years competing: 8

Last year competed: 2007

Years judging: 1

Background of the critic:

4 Years Parli/IEs at Carroll College. High school LD x 4 and Congress x 3.

Relative importance of presentation/communication skills to the critic in decision-making:

If I can understand it enough to flow, communication won't be my Reason for Decision. I reflect communication in speaker points, but persuasion helps a lot in a "he said, she said" debate.

Relative importance of on-case argumentation to the critic in decision-making:

Rebuttals should weigh arguments, whether on case or off.

Openness to critical/performative styles of debating:

See below in "cautionary notes" below.

I vote on the flow and do my best to check my biases at the door. I sometimes see debates I don't like, but I hate intervention most of all. It's not your job to debate me. I would describe my concepts of debate theory as "average." Who wouldn't? Anyway, I'll do whatever you ask and I'm fine with meta debate. I use my concepts of theory until you offer me your own.

My requests:

1. Basic courtesy.
2. Voters...so I don't have to pick them for you.
3. Impact comparison...so I'm not left picking the ones I like.
4. Sign-posted flows and good roadmaps.

My Quarks:

1. I will only vote for in round and articulated abuse.
2. Call all new arguments in rebuttals—so both sides get a chance to respond.
3. Speed is fine. If my pen is in the air I'm crying out for help. That happens rarely.
4. If the round becomes "yes it is, not it isn't" I'll revert to the best analysis and story

Cautionary notes:

I try to be tab, but I'll admit that I rarely find myself voting for performance or K. I'm open to either of these, but I have yet to see performance run well in a round I've judged. I wouldn't punish you for running these arguments, but do so knowing I have a higher than average threshold. I think you'd prefer that I be honest about this rather than claim to be fully tab. I've routinely voted for poorly run Ks than went dropped by the other team, and there's nothing wrong with a good K. Again, the flow takes precedence and intervention might be the worst of all debate sins.

Decisions:

I examine each argument in turn and then look to see if it was weighed in the rebuttal. If the rebuttals attached weight to a winning argument, things are looking up for that team. If neither team weighed anything in the rebuttal I am left picking arguments that I think will outweigh. Standard CBA/Net Ben stuff.

Thornton, Tyler

12 years experience in college debate 5-NDT/CEDA, 6 Parli.

ASK ME IF THIS ISN'T ENOUGH. I stick to my flow to make decisions. Debaters must extend their own arguments and explain their importance. I don't listen to new arguments in rebuttals unless speakers justify why I should. The PMR can answer new MOC arguments unless you justify otherwise. Be strategic in rebuttals, don't shotgun me with voters and assume one will be the best to vote on. I want the easy way out of the round, and I like big impacts. Speed is only useful if it is clear. Mumbling speed will not win a round. ALSO LET THE CRITIC MAKE A DECISION ON POINTS OF ORDER, don't debate back and forth, let me deal with the issue. I have seen too often that people are rude to each other and the critic never says a word. Let me make the call or take it under consideration, don't just start arguing with each other about whether it's a new argument or not!

GOVERNMENT CASES I like well-developed cases providing examples and clear understanding why I should do or believe something. Justify your use of evidence/examples. Cases lacking examples may become more difficult to win so be sure to justify your claims right from the PMC. Whether a case is fact, value or policy, necessary terms should be defined in the PMC, and provide a weighing mechanism on how to evaluate the case at the end of the debate. Cases on metaphors should have a fair, obvious link, unless you can defend your interpretation.

RESOLUTIONALITY / TOPICALITY I need a definition, standards, and a voter that are extended and discussed throughout the debate. I don't expect you to spend your entire

rebuttal on this position but if you believe you are abused, then you need to spend a large portion of the debate here. I like a good T debate but don't assume you can just go for T because I like it. I am as likely to vote for T as a K or a policy option given the debaters arguments are there to vote for it. I do think the government has some leeway if they are obviously trying to be reasonable about their interpretation of the resolution.

CRITIQUES I don't think a lot of debaters do justice to the K. You need to distinguish Pre/Post fiat issues, and have a specific link to the case or discourse or whatever. Again, I vote for the K or T or policy option justified the arguments are there to vote on it. I don't like seeing debaters run a K they don't understand because they didn't read the literature. Most critical positions take time to understand and you have to be really strategic on how to fit them into a short debate round. If you are uncomfortable on the K you may want to avoid it. Just because I know the critical arguments doesn't mean you can assume I will vote for you. **YOU MUST EXPLAIN ARGUMENTS WITH WARRANTS.**

COUNTERPLANS CP can be topical or non-topical and be competitive with mutual exclusivity or net benefits or both. I need to understand the CP text, just like the gov plan. If you are arguing agent specification, then you better have an agent on the CP. Ya, reciprocity sucks, but it's the only fair way to look at the debate.

DISADS Must be a developed story, not just a claim. Provide a link, internal link and an impact and extend those throughout the debate, and explain how they impact the case. I will look at a well-developed case over small disads with minimal impacts. Everything must be weighed out in light of everything else being presented throughout the debate.