

Philip Johnson-Freyd  
Puget Sound

Short Version:

To the best of my ability, I aim to judge according to two principles:

1. You can do what ever you want, within reason, so long as you justify it.
2. Argument comparison happens in the framework provided by the debate, or barring that, the one that would make the debate most coherent.

Things I like include: nuance; creativity; clash; scholarship; humor; kindness.

Things I don't like: shallowness; stupidity; failure to rejoin; dishonesty; cruelty.

Various Thoughts:

1. Debate is awesome. But, it is only what we all make of it. Generally, the debaters I enjoy most are those who have found a way to make debate meaningful. Some of them do this by raising technical proficiency into an art form; others treat competitive argument as scholarship; some use debate as a location for political resistance; some always make everybody laugh. The point is, that in the best debates everyone walks out of the round and can say, "That was worth it. I got something from that." I tried to make debate meaningful by finding arguments that were intellectually exciting—it sometimes worked.
3. Knowing a lot about a topic is generally good.
4. Nuance and complexity are good
5. CLASH!
6. Arguments have warrants and impacts. In general, do less claiming and more warranting and you will do better. It's also good to weigh impacts. I have yet to meet a debater who didn't need to be reminded of these things on occasion.
7. Examples help. For example, look to this sentence.
8. I was a 2N. I probably lean neg on theory. My gut tells me that the neg gets unlimited conditional counterplans (if they get fiat at all). I will happily vote aff on Condo though, if you win it. I lost my last debate on Condo.
9. Clash of civ debates are fine, but your ability to win them shouldn't keep you from learning from how the other side debates. Also, CLASH.
10. Hard work can be good. It isn't good by necessity. Regardless, more research is generally better.
12. I like technical debate, but will happily respond to implicit argumentation. Frame how techy you want me to be. Otherwise, we might have different ideas about what constitutes a "drop".
13. It is not possible to be "tabula rasa" in debate nor is it what we want. Judges should still try to avoid intervention.
14. Unless given a good reason why I should think otherwise, what is said in a debate is public record. Once you make an argument everyone gets to know about it.
15. Quality over quantity.

16. Understanding the importance of uniqueness is the measure of “maturity in the theory of argumentation.” UQ is essential, but links matter also.

Games Playing: You are free to change the rules of the game (including changing speech times) with some exceptions

1. I will generally intervene against things that mess with the tournament such as changing speech times so that the round runs over, stealing my ballot, or asking for a double win/extra speaker points.

2. You don't get to physically assault your opponents.

3. The option for rejoinder is important. For example, it is going to be hard to convince me that the 2AR should get to read an entirely new aff if this is a new argument in the 2AR—not impossible to convince me, but hard.

Policy on “offensive” arguments: People have differing ideas as to what is offensive language/arguments in debate. The problem is that it is hard to tell what is “offensive” since people will invariably disagree. It is important that debate be a “free speech zone” but it is also important that people feel safe and comfortable in this community. My policy is to not intervene in these situations, and I won't usually even dock your speaks that much if you say something I find revolting. I do reserve the privilege of verbally castigating you when I feel it is warranted.

My main two goals in making my decisions are: “be reasonable” and “do what the debaters tell me to do”.

#### “Ethical” Issues

I care a lot about approaching debate scholarship in an ethical and honest way. Please debate with integrity. Some things are more important than winning. I apologize about the length of this section, as this is a subject that brings strong emotion for me, but one I also think is very important.

As a debater, there were a few times where I was pretty sure the other team was clipping. In at least one of those cases, the other team were novices who we were going to beat handily anyways, and who might not have known any better. It is extremely difficult to prove clipping allegations. If you have compelling evidence of clipping, share it. If you have less than compelling evidence of clipping, but think it is happening, you can bring it to me later in confidence, and I will do my best to 1. Not allow it to influence my judging 2. Investigate. Accusations of cheating when none occurred can be very painful (I know). Be respectful. Don't assign a motive of malice when you don't have evidence of that. Recognizing that your allegations might be wrong.

I don't like the “all or nothing” approach to ethical issues promoted by some judges. Say you think someone else is reading made up “evidence”. If that is the case, then it is probably bad, but it should not be considered “unforgivable.” We should give people the benefit of the doubt. It might have been a mistake (I have accidentally given cards incorrect citations before). It might not have been them, since people read cards cut by teammates, by coaches, and from backfiles.

It was also a source of much unhappiness as a debater that I frequently discovered other teams reading cards that were at the very best “strawmen” and felt I couldn’t do anything about it. I could cut the author saying the opposite thing, but this wouldn’t be very useful since I either had to 1) risk it all (and go for a punishment that made me feel uncomfortable) going for “out of context” or 2) get very little reading a card impacted as “author concludes neg”. We need a middle option.

Here is what I propose and will default to: challenge other people on these issues, but try to do it with some evidence. If you succeed, particularly if you can demonstrate a pattern, it will lower the credibility with which I take ALL of the other teams evidence. On the other hand, if you present many such challenges that turn out to be spurious, it will reflect poorly on you and reduce YOUR credibility.

Debates about evidence QUALITY and CONTEXT are to be encouraged! “Out of context” is NOT an “ethical challenge.”

It is okay, and academically honest, to cite a card where the author concludes the other way “\_Author\_ in \_Year\_ summarizes but does not argue \_Quote\_.”

Treat the activity with respect. Integrity is not something to trifle with for strategic benefits