

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2009 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

EXPLANATORY NOTES

Numerical ranking questions — judges were asked to rank the following on a scale of 1-5:

- Delivery (Rate of Delivery) — 1 = Slower, 5 = Faster
- Evidence (Amount of Evidence) — 1 = Little, 5 = Lots
- Appeals — 1 = Emotional, 5 = Factual
- Criteria — 1 = Unnecessary, 5 = Essential
- Approach (to Topic) — 1 = Philosophical, 5 = Pragmatic

DO NOT LOSE THIS BOOKLET! Bring it with you to each day of competition.

Experience — G = LD debater in high school, H = Coach LD in high school, A = Policy debater in high school, C = Policy debater in college, E = CEDA debater in college, F = Coach CEDA in college

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
ADAME, HECTOR	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 2	Evidence 3	Appeals 4	Criteria 4	Approach 3	G

Philosophy Statement

Students must be able to effectively articulate value statements and be able to support their position with reasoning and logic and use supporting evidence where necessary.

AGUILAR, JOSH	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 5	Evidence 5	Appeals 5	Criteria 5	Approach 4	GH
----------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----

Philosophy Statement

Background- I debated for four years at Jack C. Hays High School in Austin Tx and graduated in 2006. I debated on the local and national circuit although I had more success in the former. I am currently the assistant coach for Salado High School.

Standard- I vote off of the standard proper unless told otherwise. Off-case, procedural, and theory arguments are acceptable but each one of them needs to have a "standard" built in that tells me how to vote. Each impact should link to this standard; if one is not articulated then I cannot factor it in my decision.

Truth Testing vs. Comparative Worlds - I default negate if there is no affirmative offense and I presume affirmative if there is offense from both debaters but no weighing from the negative. This is a prime example of what has come to be known as the "truth tester" paradigm. This does not mean that I will reject a comparative worlds framework or that you should change your framework to coincide with tt. I will evaluate the framework provided as well as any debate over competing frameworks. However, if there is 1) No alternative framework provided or 2) No argument as to why this should not be my default paradigm, it is the one I will use.

Speaker Points - I believe speaker points should be used to gauge the quality of one's speaking ability as opposed to the quality of one's arguments/strategy. This means clarity and

ALDERSON, LINDA	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 4	Evidence 4	Appeals 3	Criteria 5	Approach 3	HACF
------------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	------

Philosophy Statement

LD is first and foremost persuasive communication. I expect well structure arguments and for he debaters to do the work. Signposting is essential. I expect debaters " You can only extend arguments. I expect an affirmative case that upholds the resolution with value and criteria related to contentions. I expect a negative case with the same emphasis on value, criteria, and the relationship to contentions as well as specific clash with the affirmative. I expect the affirmative to extend al of its case.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2009 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
ALFORD, BRIAN	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	A
		3	3	3	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

At this level of LD, communication skills and analysis are what wins out. You must solidly defend your case and rebut all attacks while analyzing the case and your arguments in an intelligent manner.

AUFDEMBRINK, CONNIE	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		3	4	4	5	3	

Philosophy Statement

I think LD debate should be a blend of philosophy, empirical, and pragmatic argumentation. I think there should most definitely be clash with the opponent's paramount value and criterion. The debater should provide warrants, substantiation, for the claims. Delivery is also an important aspect for the successful LD debater.

BEEBE, BRENDA	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		3	3	4	5	3	

Philosophy Statement

LD is a persuasive speaking contest interwoven with value, moral and philosophical ideas. It is important to show how one value defeats the other with the use of criteria, contention and evidence.

BUCHANAN, RENEE	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		4	4	3	5	4	

Philosophy Statement

I look for clash of the value and criterion. I like evidence but you must have analysis of that evidence for it to be applicable; evidence alone will not persuade me to vote for you.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2009 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
CALDWELL, JANICE	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 5	Approach 3	

Philosophy Statement

Enjoy listening to strong speakers using both pragmatic and philosophical arguments. Require voters in last speech. Value/criterion essential and refutation of opponent's case is important in my decision. I look for strong delivery skills, as well as strong arguments on your case. I like evidence to support contentions.

CARPENTER, LARRY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 4	Approach 4	H
------------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	---

Philosophy Statement

Communication skills are a must. Cases should be well organized and clearly delivered. I am open to all types of approaches in a debate round, but ultimately, in a close round, clear communication is key.

CAUTHEN, KENNY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 3	Approach 3	ACE
----------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	-----

Philosophy Statement

I judge mostly policy debate, but am comfortable judging LD. Debate in the way that will make you feel most comfortable. Don't try and adapt to much to me. In the final rebuttals be sure to give clear voters.

COOK, TRAVIS	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 5	Evidence 4	Appeals 5	Criteria 4	Approach 4	GH
--------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	----

Philosophy Statement

I am open to any type of argumentation. I evaluate the round via a comparative worlds framework (I.e. I don't believe the affirmative has a categorical burden to prove the resolution true, merely needs some net benefit to affirming).

Won't vote on kritiks, absent an alternative. Rarely do I find myself voting on theory or prestandard arguments, because of the lack of justification for why abuse exists or why the argument comes before the standard.

In general, you will win my ballot if you win the standards debate and extend offense back to that standard. Also, I love strategic debaters.... debaters that pre-empt arguments and preclude arguments.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2009 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
DAVIS, ALLISON	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	
		3	4	3	5	4	

Philosophy Statement

Although LD consists of philosophical principles, debaters must be able to tie their ideas and opinions to real life examples. Evidence helps to prove your point and gives me a clear example of what you are explaining. While I do coach LD debate, I did not major in philosophy so you must be able to clearly explain the main principles and highlights of that particular philosophy used. I like a line by line attack and there must be a value/criterion clash in the round. In your rebuttals please give me voters! I do not like rapid fire delivery, nor do I like rudeness toward your opponent. Congratulations for making it to UIL State!

DELEON, ROSS	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		3	2	4	4	4	

Philosophy Statement

I feel that debating is a communication skill. It doesn't matter how much evidence there is if that information is not communicated effectively to the audience (judge) it is not an effective debate. I also believe that LD is still a philosophy debate. I have seen too many Ld'ers trying to do policy debate in LD. (Which is quiet easy , especially with this topic.)

DOYLE, ANNE	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		3	4	3	4	3	

Philosophy Statement

Value and argumentation are equal in my judging. I want to be able to understand what the debater is saying.

FAGAN, EMILY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	G
		3	3	3	5	3	

Philosophy Statement

I would like to hear a strong debate that uses the value and criteria as a base for the rest of the case (basically the body of the case should directly tie back to the value and criteria). I believe that philosophy should be a major component of the case. I want to hear both sides truly stick to the resolution.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2009 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
FLISOWSKI, CHAD	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 2	Evidence 4	Appeals 5	Criteria 5	Approach 3	H

Philosophy Statement

Lincoln-Douglas debate still requires both a value and a criterion/standard in my opinion. Spreading or rapid fire speaking is not acceptable - this is not policy debate. You should be civil and persuasive, and clearly define the arguments and impacts in the round. I prefer line-by-line refutation, but grouping arguments is acceptable. Ultimately, I want a round where the voting issues are clearly defined by both debaters, and the positions of the round are clear and organized.

GANTT, JOE	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 4	Evidence 3	Appeals 4	Criteria 5	Approach 4	GCEF
------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	------

Philosophy Statement

The criterial debate is where I end up making most of my decisions. That's not to say that I don't evaluate the rest of the debate; I do. However, I view the criterial debate as the lens to evaluate everything else. If a debater wins every argument in his/her case but fails to win their criterion (and hence their value), many of the arguments that they've won may not filter through that criterion and will not be a part of my decision calculus.

I think this topic lends itself to some more policy-style arguments, and I'm not opposed to a net-beneficial framework, but that framework needs to be rooted in a value structure as well. On the other hand, you cannot win on this topic without some pragmatic arguments as well- in fact, pure philosophy in a vacuum without looking at the current context is a bad idea in LD in general, but specifically on this topic that is so timely I vote on the substance of the debate, not necessarily on the communication aspects, but they are important to me. Especially, if you show disrespect to your opponent, expect me to reflect that in your speaker points. I know y'all are at state, and the pressure is high. But remember to have fun while you are here!

GRANT, RACY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 5	Approach 3	H
-------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	---

Philosophy Statement

I want to hear the topic debated. I enjoy both pragmatic and philosophical debates. I want the debater to frame the round using the resolution, cases, and argumentation. Make the links. I won't make them for you. I enjoy a great value or a great criteria debate. Voters are essential! Tell me why you should win the round.

Both analytics and evidence are important and should compliment one another. Don't make a claim without warranting it or impacting it. Prove it to me and show me why it is important. Be polite, articulate, and remember that this is a persuasive communications event. I expect the round to remain professional!

HESTER, RON	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 2	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 5	Approach 3	H
-------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	---

Philosophy Statement

L-D debate is for everyone. It adapts itself to every make of student and that adaptability makes it the best speech event. It combines the informative/persuasive speaking skill and the analytical applications of C-X. Add those to the subtle nuances of an individual and you incorporate the interpretation of Prose/Poetry. Each round has its own personality and the learning dynamic is always in the forefront. I expect debaters to challenge themselves in every round and risk their comfort zone to use every second of every minute to convince that judge to buy their product. Debaters must believe in their case and themselves to excel in this event. You cannot fake excellence in L-D. I don't want students to be trapped in the spreading style of TFA, but I do believe that you have to adapt to your judges. I dislike speed because I still want the event to be about clear communication. Politeness and respect are expected at all times and the debater must dress professionally. I want to see contentions interpreted and not just read to me. Tell me why your value is supreme and how it is achieved in your criterion. Give examples in your contentions to show me how they support and uphold your value and above all, tell me why you win the round in the rebuttals. The best rounds for me are those that are so close that I have to take in consideration every small factor to choose a winner. Those rounds always stay with me and validate why I teach this great event. Every debater is a winner because you choose to risk some time/energy to become a better communicator/listener/evaluator/learner. What else is there to say?

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2009 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
HOLMAN, AARON	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		3	3	4	3	4	

Philosophy Statement

I want to understand that you understand what you are talking about. Be sure to fully explain as if I didn't know anything in regards to LD debate. I will listen to anything, as long as it is explained and related to your arguments. If you go fast, I won't flow. I'll just listen. If you are comfortable with that, then I'm fine with you going fast. Otherwise, talk in a normal conversation tone.

HOOPER, JUDY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	AC
		2	3	4	4	4	

Philosophy Statement

I believe debate should be an organized clash of ideas. Persuasion is important as competitors creatively examine the issues. A combination of logic and evidence is ideal. I keep an organized flow. I enjoyed competing in high school and college. I appreciate work ethic of debaters. Be clear, organized, and logical. I do not traditionally vote on conditional arguments.

HUNT, TERRY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		4	4	4	5	3	

Philosophy Statement

A decision is based on the information on the flow at the end of the round. Debaters should clearly tell me how to evaluate arguments, and provide reasons to vote for them.

INNERARITY, JORDAN	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GAC
		4	3	3	5	1	

Philosophy Statement

It is important to me that you use the Value and Criterion throughout the entire debate and make sure it is an important issue in the round. I want you in your last speech to give me voters and tell me why you believe you should win the round. I am open to all types of arguments. But most of all have fun and good luck at state.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2009 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
IXBA, BARBARA	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 4	Appeals 4	Criteria 5	Approach 3	HAE

Philosophy Statement

I expect each debater to have a value and criteria and to support these with their case. I also expect debaters to treat each other with respect. Rudeness will be punished with low speaker points.

JOHNSON, RENITA	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 5	Approach 3	H
-----------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	---

Philosophy Statement

I consider LD a value debate. I believe that the winner of the round is one who shows value superiority within the context of the resolution. Clear standards and argumentation that impact back to the value are important to my decision.

KELLAM, BRENDA	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 4	Appeals 5	Criteria 5	Approach 3	H
----------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	---

Philosophy Statement

In judging Value Debate, I consider practical, logical contentions supported with evidence and examples to support the Value and meet the standards for Criteria. I prefer more pragmatic reasoning, but I also appreciate supporting ideas from philosophers. I like to see a debater give eye contact to the judge and feel a sense of communication between the debater and the judge. A speech can be read as though it is the debaters true convictions. Persuasion is important in Value Debate.

I did not judge Regional competition but I was the Contest Director for Region II

KINCAID, RICHARD	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 4	Approach 3	GHAЕ
------------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	------

Philosophy Statement

This is value debate, so argue values. In my old age I have become less of a fan of speed and much more a fan of clarity. If you cannot succinctly explain to me why you should win this round, then you probably won't.

Remember to weigh the round. It's your job to show me what's most important about your case and why you should win instead of your opponent.

Be nice to each other. There's no need to prove your superiority. If you clearly ARE, then I'll know that because of your argumentation and debate finesse.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2009 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
KIRKSCEY, RUSSELL	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 4	Evidence 2	Appeals 5	Criteria 4	Approach 2	HA

Philosophy Statement

I believe that Lincoln-Douglas debate should use values, criteria/standards, and contentions that affirm or negate the resolution in a rational progression. Value debating should emphasize the debater's ability to attack and defend logically with well-linked arguments. I would much rather hear resolution of substantive issues than theory debate, but I will vote on it if debaters want me to. I believe that it is the judge's position to write an educational ballot that defends his decision. I bring no predispositions to the round and judge only on the argumentation provided.

KLEIN, MARTIN	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 5	Evidence 5	Appeals 4	Criteria 5	Approach 4	HAC
---------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	-----

Philosophy Statement

I believe my judging paradigm is an issue to be debated in the round. By default I will vote for the debater who convinces me that the resolitional action she or he advocates best furthers or achieves the highest value advocated, as measured by a valid criterion. Values, criteria, evidence and the articulation of voting issues are essential. I try to be objective about arguments; I do not rule particular arguments as being "off the table" before I hear them. I like professionalism and good sportsmanship in rounds.

LEE, EDWARD	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 4	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 4	Approach 3	H
-------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	---

Philosophy Statement

I weigh value and argumentation equally. Don't drop anything.

LEE, JW	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 2	Evidence 2	Appeals 4	Criteria 1	Approach 1	GHA
---------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	-----

Philosophy Statement

I believe LD Debate should be LD Debate. Philosophy and communication of ideas.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2009 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
LONDON, CODY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 2	Evidence 2	Appeals 4	Criteria 5	Approach 4	GA

Philosophy Statement

I am a traditional UIL LD judge. To put it simply, coherent value on value, criterion on criterion, and case on case clash is a must in the constructives.

The debaters are required to focus on voters in the rebuttals. Please debaters use the rebuttals as a way of clarifying and answering the round's most important arguments and problems. *I do NOT take pleasure in intervening.

Concerning delivery, I have a problem with speed. Speaking quickly, clearly, and understandable is a much healthier way of debating.

With regard to case content, the rounds need some sort of philosophical basis and to have sufficient evidence.

LONG, CAROLYN	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 4	Appeals 3	Criteria 4	Approach 2	H
---------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	---

Philosophy Statement

I put equal weight on case and analysis, clash and speaking style.

MARTIN, ROBERT	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 2	Evidence 3	Appeals 4	Criteria 3	Approach 4	GHA
----------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	-----

Philosophy Statement

I want a line by line the debate that impacts the big picture debate. Give me voters and tell me why you are winning. I want both evidence and real world examples in a round. Extend and impact drops for me. I am not a fan of extreme/unrealistic arguments. Just because you find one piece of evidence that says it, doesnt make it a good argument. On the other hand it's your job to answer such arguments or tell me why they don't apply to the round. I want you to look the part and play the part. So, dress/look professional, act professional. There is a line between being assertive and just plain rude in CX. I don't mind debate jargon but please spare me of all the fillers. I get sick of hearing people say "like" real fast, and will give you low speaker points. I am not a fan of excessive speed. I give the 1AR a break b/c i know hard it is to cover but neg speading is abusive in my opinion. If the 1AC is too fast, why should I even flow it. This is LD. I used to enjoy a really fast to debate, not so much anymore. It's not my job to work for you, it's your job to win my ballot. Good Luck and Congrats on making it here :)

MAYES, SUE JANE	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 3	Approach 3	H
-----------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	---

Philosophy Statement

By the time LD students arrive in Austin, their speeches should have been made so often that the ease of delivery is evident. And, when their speech is refuted, it is encouraging to note an informed response--not just one that is predominantly emotional in nature.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2009 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
McCARTY, LARRY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 4	Evidence 4	Appeals 4	Criteria 4	Approach 2	HAC

Philosophy Statement

Although style and quality of communicative skills are important debates should be decided, in the final analysis, on the basis of the resolution of substantive issues. Affirmative debaters have an obligation to prove, through evidence and analysis, the validity of the resolution. This is best done by providing a desirable value that supports the resolution and a criterion that provides an effective means of evaluating the affirmative value. The general connection between the resolution, value and criterion is demonstrated through the use of evidence and analysis in the form of observations, contentions, claims, etc presented in an organized manner. Pragmatic arguments, though often not as conducive to Lincoln Douglas debate as those with a philosophical basis, are also a means of support upon which the affirmative might choose to rely.

Negative debaters must counter the resolution in one of two ways; by defeating the affirmative case and thus eliminating the sole means by which the affirmative might prevail, or by presenting a negative case that offers counter arguments to the resolution that are more effective than the affirmative defense of the topic.

McKENZIE, RORY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 5	Criteria 5	Approach 3	GAF
----------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	-----

Philosophy Statement

Here are several tips to consider when debating me:

- 1 - Number your arguments.
- 2 - Impact arguments back to some sort of standard.
- 3 - Warrant everything.
- 4 - Give voters.
- 5 - Avoid performative contradictions.
- 6 - Go line-by-line through the arguments as consistently and clearly as possible.
- 7 - Be polite. Rudeness is NOT tolerated.

I think that the framework debate is probably the most important part of an LD round. As such, debaters should devote time to developing such a framework and explaining how all of their arguments function in that framework. Personally, theoretical debates are very interesting to me, so if that's a route that you'd like to pursue, go ahead. Please have fun and respect everyone in the round. Good luck!

McNAIR, THOMAS	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 4	Evidence 3	Appeals 4	Criteria 5	Approach 2	AF
----------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	----

Philosophy Statement

This is a communication centered event. I want to hear the arguments of the round brought up in a clear and concise manor. I do not mind a faster style but i must understand what you are saying in the process. I always appreciate thinking outside the box.

McNEAL, BRAD	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 2	Appeals 5	Criteria 5	Approach 1	GAC
--------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	-----

Philosophy Statement

I want to hear clash, not just a series of informative speeches. LD debate is a philosophy debate: it doesn't matter whether something works or not-argue the values and how they are measured-this isn't policy debate. Make sure to argue every point of your opponent's case and to defend all points on your own. I am a flow judge, so I can tell when debaters haven't done this and I vote on drops. All in all, clash all points and issues, explain why you philosophically come out on top and keep a clear, organized, coherent line of speeches going and you will have impressed me.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2009 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
MESSER, JENNIFER	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 4	Approach 3	GHACEF

Philosophy Statement

My vision of what an LD round should look like is one in which each student presents a clear, logical case with a direct link between their value and criteria. While overly abusive rounds are not good, a little clash is always welcome. Signposting to a direction of a debate are a must. Going line by line or big picture is acceptable. I prefer quality of speech over speed and voters are also a must.

MILLER, FLYNN	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 4	Criteria 5	Approach 3	GHAC
----------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	------

Philosophy Statement

Standard LD, watch the policy arguments but hard to do on this topic. Definition debate does not work for me. I will be somewhat flexible in relation to 1AR and time restraints. Consistency is important. Assertions without evidence invite intervention by me.

MONTEMAYOR, STEVEN	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 5	Evidence 3	Appeals 5	Criteria 5	Approach 4	GHAEF
---------------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-------

Philosophy Statement

I enjoy an LD debate that is topic centered and focus on the value criteria. I tend to like arguments/analysis that focus on upholding the resolution to be just/unjust. Beyond that it is the round of the LD'ers to set the parameters and voting criteria.

MOORE, DOUGLAS	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 2	Evidence 3	Appeals 4	Criteria 4	Approach 3	HC
-----------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----

Philosophy Statement

The resolution is a warrant or a claim in which should be linked to the value. The criteria is the observable condition that indicates that we have achieved the value. If the debater doesn't achieve this, then they will have a hard time winning the round. After that, everything becomes a matter of balance...who has the superior value...who achieves their criteria...who shows that their opponent doesn't meet their criteria. While I listen to CX, it is not an argument. The argument needs to be made in the speeches, if it isn't, then it isn't on the flow.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2009 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
MOORE, MARK	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 4	Evidence 2	Appeals 3	Criteria 4	Approach 2	

Philosophy Statement

Because L-D is a contest of persuasive philosophical discourse, in order for a speaker to prevail in a given round, the audience must be persuaded that the position(s) taken, argument(s) made, and refutation/analysis employed by that debater is superior to those presented by his/her opponent. A successful L-D debater leaves no question in the audience's mind at its conclusion as to who should prevail. Value/criteria are essential to providing the round's foundation. Philosophical approaches are favored over pragmatic appeals, but the latter is not without merit. While evidence may be useful in supporting one's case, there is no intrinsic need for it in L-D, as it is in policy (cx) debate. The skilled L-D orator knows well the difference between the two debate forms, and performs accordingly.

The use of jargon (e.g., "cross-apply" this, "flow" that, etc.) in a public venue would be inappropriate, and unthinkable in a formal extemporaneous debate. Its use in an L-D round is both unwarranted and unwise. Focus on substance, and the form will follow. Present a logical, coherent case, and the listener will be convinced. Utilize succinct summaries; unambiguously crystallize the issues, and present well-reasoned rebuttals, and the audience will be persuaded. Judicious word economy is preferable to ultra rapid-fire delivery, although increased delivery rates are welcome (provided they are articulate and do not distract from the communicative nature of the speech). Presentational criteria and delivery skills necessarily impact upon determining a winner, particularly when other metrics appear equal. Be confident, coherent, careful and considerate. Above all, be persuasive!!

MOSS, DANNY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 4	Appeals 3	Criteria 3	Approach 3	GHACEF
--------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------

Philosophy Statement

I enjoy judging L/D at the UIL State Meet when I can. I am a retired debate coach and a well seasoned judge. I listen for persuasion and argument superiority. I know the jargon, I can flow, and I will write you a good ballot.

MUNDT, MIKE	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 5	Criteria 4	Approach 5	
--------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--

Philosophy Statement

Link offense to the criterion (burden or some other weighing mechanism) and you stand a very good chance of winning. If neither debater links offense to the mechanism, I tend to default to the negative.

NOWLIN, NELDA	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 4	Criteria 4	Approach 2	H
----------------------	--	----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	---

Philosophy Statement

I judge both the debater's ability to communicate and ability to present a persuasive case equally. I will look at whether the value is upheld by the criteria.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2009 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
PARKS, CHASE	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 4	Evidence 3	Appeals 4	Criteria 4	Approach 3	A

Philosophy Statement

I like a lot of clash in LD. If someone argues against your value you need to argue why their specific argument is wrong. Clash with each argument! I am a flow judge so I will be keeping track of all the arguments as the round progresses. I like a good assertive debater but I don't like people being rude – firm but polite. Value and criterion should be argued every round. I like evidence but tell me why it is important and why it makes your value stronger.

PEEK, SANDRA	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 4	Approach 2	HAC
--------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	-----

Philosophy Statement

I prefer a round that I can flow and one where the debaters roadmap and signpost so that is possible. I evaluate based on both persuasive speaking ability and upholding of value and criterion as is reflected on the flow.

PHILLIPS, CRYSTAL	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 4	Appeals 3	Criteria 5	Approach 3	GH
-------------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	----

Philosophy Statement

This should be a debate focused on the Resolution. Do not get caught up in arguments that do not address the topic! This is a value debate, so be sure to connect your value/criteria to your argumentation. The strongest supported value will prevail, don't neglect yours or your opponents. Also the debater must keep in mind this is a speaking event and maintain professionalism at all times.

PRANTL, DONALD	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 5	Approach 3	HA
----------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	----

Philosophy Statement

Clash in LD should be about the standard/value-criterion in the process of affirming or negating the resolution. The resolution is being weighed in view of the standard. The most appropriate standard is in question, as well as which debater best applies their standard to the resolution. LD debaters should make use of evidence and philosophy supportive of their position but must avoid presenting a plan or policy for me to vote on. Persuasive style trumps piles of info, so debaters should be careful with speed. An assertive advocacy is welcome, but an insulting tone or body language is not.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2009 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
PRITCHARD, ALEX	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	HAC
		3	4	4	1	4	

Philosophy Statement

I believe that debate is debate. The format may change but good arguments are always good arguments. I believe a good argument is one that is succinctly labeled, supported with expert opinion or well reasoned explanation or examples and impacted as it relates to the debate. I think clash is the key to quality debate. I think the negative should begin immediately in the NC to clash with the affirmative case and not wait until rebuttal. I think most debates about definitions in LD are silly and rarely produce substantive clash. I like substructure in case construction as opposed to a stream of consciousness approach. I think "theory" arguments are always debatable. The nature of presumption or solvency is a debate argument. "Rules" arguments rarely appeal to me. I think debate always involves "values" so whether it is explicit or implicit matters not to me. I don't think a "criterion" is necessary just as a formality. But it is obvious that any value must be judged against some standard and regardless of what it is labeled it is important for clash. If your preference is post moderna rgumetns then I need some extra explanation because I am not a philosophy major. I am a long time student of economics so the bailout topic is one in which I am fairly knowledgeable. I am not a fan of high speed speaking in LD. I think decorum matters. Please don't call me "judge" in the debate. If for some reason you feel the need to call on me, "Alex" is just fine.

PROCTOR, CHRIS	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		3	3	4	4	3	

Philosophy Statement

I believe that LD Debate exists in a vacuum, meaning that only the information presented in the round is relevant. I try to bring no outside position or belief into the round. I only know what the competitors tell me I know. I'm willing to follow any debator's idea, no matter how strange or bizarre, as long as the debator is able to support and prove it. In addition, I only give credit for drops or turns if the competitor points it out. Basically I believe I am only an observer and will go wherever the round takes me.

RALLS, PATRICK	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	
		2	3	4	5	3	

Philosophy Statement

I am a value judge. I am looking for value and criteria link. Make sure that you are debating down your flow. Don't leave arguments untouched.

RECKER, NOAH	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GH
		3	2	4	5	3	

Philosophy Statement

Aff must provide proof and neg must provide solid clash. Please give voters at the end of round and weigh values and criteria against each other.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2009 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
REED, ADDISON	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	G
		4	3	3	1	3	

Philosophy Statement

As a debater, your job is to convince me. I don't bring any outside bias or make arguments for you, but just because you make an argument doesn't mean anything unless you prove that it furthers your case and is a legitimate point. With that said, if your argument is a poor one and fails to convince me then I won't buy it. For example, don't tell me that the sky is maroon and then think that if your opponent doesn't respond then you'll win the round. Keep the arguments legit and convincing.

REICHLER, MATTHEW	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GHACEF
		5	5	5	1	3	

Philosophy Statement

I am not a traditional LD judge. Value and criteria are not a must though it makes adjudicating the debate easier for me. I will listen to pretty much any argument and will do my best to make an objective decision without the interference of personal argument predilection. That being said: I like good, warranted argumentation. Voters are nice but not necessary. I am open to alternate frameworks for debate and will make my decision based on how the debaters tell me to vote.

RIGGS, SUSAN	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GHACEF
		2	2	3	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I listen to the arguments and evidence presented by each team. The value and criteria arguments are my primary concern, but the case must explain the reasons I should vote for or against.

ROBINSON, TERRI	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	H
		4	3	5	3	3	

Philosophy Statement

I am willing to listen to almost any framework for evaluating the debate. If no other framework is given, I vote off the criterion/standard. Please clearly signpost arguments so I know where you want me to flow them.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2009 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
RUMSEY, ESTHER	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 4	Appeals 3	Criteria 5	Approach 3	GHACEF

Philosophy Statement

I believe debate is first a communication event and should demonstrate excellent communication skills, second debate should help student develop sound critical thinking and argument skills, these skills should be demonstrated in both the initial case construction and in the clash between cases. Since LD is a value based debate, I am looking for a clear comparison and contrast between values. There also needs to be a clear link between the stated criterion and the value. The case should show how the criterion is met and how that best uphold the value.

SEIMEARS, NIKKI	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 3	Criteria 4	Approach 3	H
-----------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	---

Philosophy Statement

I want to see a lot of clash in debate rounds. Debaters need to prove why their value/criteria are more important within the scope of the resolution.

SIMPSON, BRIAN	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 2	Evidence 4	Appeals 4	Criteria 5	Approach 4	C
----------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	---

Philosophy Statement

I believe that LD Debate ought to be about Philosophy as well as empirical evidence. I believe that LD ought to be more persuasive and thus the debaters need to control their speed and not try and rush or spread. Each debater must properly defend their Value & Criteria and attack their opponent's Value & Criteria in order to win.

SMITH, JIMMY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 2	Evidence 3	Appeals 5	Criteria 5	Approach 3	H
--------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	---

Philosophy Statement

This is a communication contest. I must understand what you are saying and why is it important to the topic.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2009 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
STANLEY, ROB	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 2	Evidence 2	Appeals 3	Criteria 5	Approach 2	GH

Philosophy Statement

Aff must uphold value. Neg must attack Aff case. I weigh communication and substance equally. There needs to be good clash over all substantive issues.

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
STEWART, LORY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 2	Evidence 3	Appeals 5	Criteria 5	Approach 2	

Philosophy Statement

My philosophy is that LD debate is a debate of value and persuasion (and I refer to guidelines set forth by the NFL).
 The better debater proves his/her side of the resolution more valid as a general principle.
 The winner to me is the one who proves their side of the resolution as a general principle and clashes with their opponent in their rebuttal.
 I believe communication/persuasive skills play heavily and "spreading" should be discouraged. I will ask myself:
 Who has proven their side of the resolution more valid?
 Who had quality and depth of argumentation (not mere quantity of argumentation or insignificant dropped arguments)?
 Who established a clear and cohesive relationship between the argumentation and the value structure?
 Who better presented arguments with logical reasoning and appropriate support?
 Which debater best addressed the central questions of the resolution?
 Clash is one of the MOST important issues I consider.
 Who attacked their opponent's case and defended their own the best?
 Who was the best communicator (persuasive, clear and professional without sarcasm, not overly emotional or aggressive)?

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
TONNE, JO	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 2	Evidence 3	Appeals 4	Criteria 3	Approach 3	H

Philosophy Statement

As a predominantly CX coach and judge, I cannot choose weak reasoning over weak evidence, but if the reasoning is strong and based on common knowledge, I will choose the reasoning.
 The affirmative MUST have a value AND a criterion. I am not crazy about the "negative case" because it often precludes clash, so I don't find it necessary for the negative to have a criterion—he/she may argue against the affirmative point by point with counter value and/or criterion.
 Finally, and most importantly, there MUST BE CLASH! Neither debater can earn high speaker points without clashing. The negative will lose without clash.

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
TUCKER, PHYLLIS	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 4	Evidence 3	Appeals 4	Criteria 3	Approach 4	

Philosophy Statement

I like a strong, organized case. My decision lies in the strength of argumentation and final speeches. I like a case easy to flow and follow. I put great value in value clash and argumentation down the flow.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2009 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
VARADI, ELIZABETH	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 4	Appeals 3	Criteria 5	Approach 3	

Philosophy Statement

I look for the following:

1. Student case is well researched and credibly supported.
2. Student finds logical flaws in opponent's case and sites them.
3. Student's language skills are clean and fluid.
4. Student's dress and demeanor is professional.
5. I MUST be able to understand what is being said in order to judge it.

VERM, STEVEN	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 4	Criteria 5	Approach 3	GH
---------------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	----

Philosophy Statement

I look for a well structured case that uses a value and a criteria to prove/disprove the resolution. I am willing to listen to a wide range of or styles of arguments as long as they stay grounded within the value and criteria presented. Following the flow of the debate is important. Ultimately I look to see which debater better upheld his or her value and criteria.

VIDALES, KATY	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 4	Evidence 4	Appeals 3	Criteria 4	Approach 3	G
----------------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	---

Philosophy Statement

Value / Criteria clarity is imperative and must work well within the structure of the presented case. Philosophical understanding and usage within a round will be taken into consideration. I am a Flow Judge, so I will keep track of the arguments presented. However, I will vote off of what is presented by the debaters, rather than strickly off of the flow. Speed is fine as long as diction and articulation is present.

VINKLAREK, CHELSA	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 4	Evidence 4	Appeals 3	Criteria 4	Approach 2	GA
--------------------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	----

Philosophy Statement

LD is itself a philosophy debate. I go in to each round clearing my mind of any pre-existing notions I may have on the topic and wait for the debaters to inform and convince me that their philosophy best meets the needs of the round.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2009 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
WADDELL, DEBBIE	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 4	Evidence 3	Appeals 4	Criteria 4	Approach 3	HAC

Philosophy Statement

I believe debate should be a combination of analysis, logic, and evidence. Speakers should be clear, concise, and organized. Debaters should have a game plan and follow through with that strategy in CX and throughout rebuttals. Creative development of ideas and a sense of humor are appreciated. Crystallize the issues in rebuttals and impact ideas.

WALLACE, KRISTI	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 3	Evidence 3	Appeals 4	Criteria 5	Approach 3	HAC
-----------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	-----

Philosophy Statement

I feel this is an event which should emphasize quality presentation skills (no excessive speed) and that speeches should be well organized. I like to see a lot of clear structure in a case and feel everything should have warrants. All contentions should link to the criterion which should evaluate how the value is to be achieved through the resolution. I try to keep a tight flow, so I like a lot of signposting. Give me voters with impacts and lots of clash. Should always exhibit professionalism in attitude and dress and give this event the decorum it deserves.

WASHER, SCELENA	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 2	Evidence 2	Appeals 4	Criteria 5	Approach 2	HA
-----------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	----

Philosophy Statement

My judging philosophy is what you could call big issue. I am value-oriented and believe that well-developed arguments supporting value and criteria are more important than the overall number of arguments presented.

WESSELS, NATALIA	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input checked="" type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery 4	Evidence 4	Appeals 4	Criteria 5	Approach 3	GA
------------------	--	---------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	---------------	----

Philosophy Statement

LD debate was initial created on philosophy. Use and application of philosophy is a must. Values are judged by theory and practice use the philosophy to show this. Don't have a created value that is not supported by someone's theory/research.

JUDGE PHILOSOPHY BOOKLET — UIL ACADEMIC STATE MEET 2009 — LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE

JUDGE	COMM. SKILLS VS. RES. OF ISSUES	NUMERICAL RANKINGS					EXPERIENCE
WHITROCK, RICHARD	<input type="radio"/> Communication Skills <input checked="" type="radio"/> Resolution of Issues <input type="radio"/> Equal	Delivery	Evidence	Appeals	Criteria	Approach	GHACEF
		2	3	3	4	2	

Philosophy Statement

LD is a persuasive, value debate, and thus I tend to focus on arguments of inherent rather than architectural value. Arguments focused on the structure of the round and/or cases have merit, but will always be outweighed by arguments of a more substantive (either philosophical or pragmatic) nature. The relative merits of the arguments themselves are what's important, not where they fit on the "flow" or other such secondary considerations. It is essential, then, that 1) the affirmative fulfill their burden of proof, as well as 2) the negative fulfill their burden of clash. To do so, both evidence and reason are required, and a grasp of the "big picture"/subject of the debate must be demonstrable (winning an argument extraneous to the resolution does not win the round unless a clear link is made by the debater). The research, preparation, thoughtfulness, insight, strategy, analysis, and overall skill with which these burdens are met will be considered in the overall persuasiveness of the arguments, but speaking skills are also important and should not be ignored. Clarity is essential for a winning argument, and contestants who sacrifice basic speaking skills for the sake of volume are placing that clarity at risk. The crux of my judging philosophy revolves around the idea of "quality versus quantity", and I fall firmly on the qualitative side of the coin. One insightful, thought-provoking, high-quality argument will outweigh many superficial, shallow ones. Each debater must show a clear understanding of the resolution, and the negative must show a clear understanding of the affirmative case (and vice-versa, if applicable) in order to make effective, high-quality arguments; analysis of the round and of the overall picture are crucial.