

# Collin Goemmer Policy Paradigm

## General:

- It's fine if you flex prep
- Keep your own time
- Don't be rude
- I do not consider flashing to be prep
- I don't care which side y'all sit on
- I don't care if you read your case off of your laptop
- **Remember to do the work for the judge, it is your job to communicate to the judge.**
- **Please sign post clearly**
- While I personally do not have any triggers I would recommend giving trigger warnings, because you do not know if your opponent or other judges have any triggers
- Discriminatory or exclusionary language is not okay and not accepted and i will vote you down if you use this language

**Speed: debate is a communication event. It's hard to communicate when speaking so fast. My ability to understand speed is irrelevant**

**Progressive Arguments:** I am fine with progressive arguments, but if you do decide to use progressive arguments then make sure you explain your arguments

**T/FW:** I do not have many predispositions to this in any way. I am down for you to go 1 off fw if that's your planless aff strat. I will default to comp interpretations in a framework debate, but could be persuaded to default to reasonability if you warrant it well enough. I think for the negative to win these debates in regards to framework, you need to find a way to hedge back against their impact turns. This is possible and if I am in the back with this debate I could go either way, but I do appreciate teams that try to hold the line effectively. If the aff is policy and you want to go for T, then I think it might be the smartest to have a nuanced T violation. For me to pick you up as the negative, you need to win why your interp/violation specifically generates abuse, and yes I can be persuaded that potential abuse is abuse. Also remember impacts are pretty important here too :) Do Not think that this is an invitation to only read FW in front of me. I like FW but I am not a hack for it. I like other nuanced and comprehensive strategies too and probably even more so.

## K:

- the more case-specific your link and the more comprehensive your alternative explanation, the more I'll be persuaded by your kritik.

- Do as much of your explanation on the line-by-line as possible - I am not the person that you want to read a 6 minute overview in the back of the room. You could be the best debater at the tournament, but if you drop long overviews - it will be hard to win the debate and your speaks will reflect that.
- You must find a way to weigh the aff and must have some defense to your method so that you have some justification for the 1AC. Think of the 1AC as a research project and you have to defend that research process. A good defense of your process specifically can be pretty devastating.
- I am good with some K's but not all - if I look confused in the back, take a step back and explain what the argument means in my world.

#### **DA:**

- If you have a super unique DA that is spec to the topic and people haven't done their UQ updates then you as the neg have the right to exploit this.
- NEW DA's will be rewarded on level of prep
- I REALLY REALLY LIKE A GOOD DA DEBATE - but Zero risk is possible but difficult to prove by the aff.
- PLEASE justify your internal links very well - I think this is typically one of the weaker points of da's in general.
- I also like generic topic DA's that have a unique flavor to them.

#### **CP:**

- I like a good CP debate against an aff - I am the judge that will be down to hear topic generic CP's or super nuanced ones. Just win that the CP is theoretically justified, solves the entirety of the aff, and has a risk of a NB.
- I am okay with most CP's but you have to have a justification for the CP.
- I am a fan of most CP's. There are cheating CP's out there and a lot of them, but if you don't tell me why the CP is illegit then Ill let them run with it.
- The more spec the research is the better.

YOU MUST HAVE A SOLVENCY ADVOCATE FOR THE CP TOO - unless its an adv cp and you tell me why there is not one that's needed VERY WELL.

**Theory:** I am fine with theory as long as you have an interpretation that generates offense. I hate disclosure theory

**Case:** I like good case arguments and impact turns. I like to see a good impact turn debate, but I also like a strategy where you decimate the case page. I feel like case debate is extremely underutilized and needs to be revitalized.

**Decorum:** Please be respectful to your opponent's I am fine with you being assertive but when you start to become condescending that is where I have a problem. Debate is

supposed to be a respectful exchange of opposing views on a topic, so don't be a jerk no one wants to judge a jerk. **If you are clearly more experienced than your opponent and you berate them the entire round or run some crazy advanced argument that you can tell your opp won't understand just to stroke your ego and show off I will drop your speaks to the lowest I can and I will contact your coach and there's a chance you may loose my ballot altogether.**