Stefan Bauschard Judge Philosophy: 39 rounds, 10 tournaments

Preferences: I prefer traditional policy debates where the affirmative reads a defendably-topical plan, has advantages, and defends their affirmative against disadvantages and counterplans. I give anyone who engages in this style of debate at least 28 speaker points unless he or she is otherwise rude or incomprehensible. Kritiks that work to prove the plan is desirable or undesirable are welcome.

Tolerances: I’ll tolerate, and have voted for, representation and/or language kritiks. I don’t think it is very difficult for a team to defeat these arguments by offering an even basic defense of the traditional policy debate framework. I generally don’t give great speaker points for teams that debate this way, but you can take your best shot if you wish.

Untolerables: Topicality bad, 1Acs without traditional plans, the massive proliferation of independent voters (usually don’t flow them), chair dances, siskel and ebert imitations, playing video games, not talking for most of your speech. I’d much rather see a novice debate in another language instead of this nonsense.

Theory Presumptions: pics ok (except exclude specific tribes); 1 conditional cp ok; process cps bad (we should probably debate the topic and plan implementation more than the process through which the plan is passed); multiple, non-textual K alternatives are bad. If the aff runs a “new” case (defined as being a refusal to show their plan to the neg before the debate), I think the neg can do almost anything they want theoretically. To win theory arguments a team needs to articulate very clearly the unfairness that has resulted and why it rises to the level of a voting issue.

U and I: I think it is hard to beat a DA on U alone. If you concede the links and the impacts, it seems that you’ll always increase the risk of X catastrophe relative to the status quo. I don’t know of too many Das that are 100% nu (I think I’m still alive), and when the aff concedes the links and internal links they seem to substantially increase the risk. Conceding a rhetorical impact card that says “end of the world” doesn’t help matters much since a small increased risk of the end of the world seems to outweigh a lot.

Presumption for Understandability: I like to hear all of the arguments and cards in the debate. I don’t hold teams responsible for answering arguments that I didn’t hear. I’m a hack for arguments that are well-articulated at some point in the debate.

Strengths as a Judge: know most of the literature and the arguments on the topic very well, very thoughtful about the final decision

Weaknesses as a Judge: poor evaluator of the winner of kritik-style arguments, low tolerance level for theoretical cheap shots

Presumption against swearing: (though I don’t think it is a voter).

Good luck,

Stefan