I've been judging policy debate for about 13 years, picked up a couple of CEDA national titles before that, and have very few preconceptions beside the following. First, I'm not taken much by the current trend in creating a variety of voting issues based on extremely brief utterances about theoretical leanings -- such as severance perms, ground erosion, debatability, fiat abuse, and the like. I suppose if one were to develop such an argument, and provide a variety of reasoned assertions for the issue's primacy, then I'd be interested. Presently, however, I see very little of said development. Hence, not so interested in all that. Second, I'm a bit of a stickler on links. This is true for both the Aff's claims of a successful plan meeting need, as well as the Neg's attempts to prove their creative link chains. Third, I'm drawn toward the K more so if the voting implication is well-argued -- how should these ethereal impacts play out with the other policy impacts in fiatland? Fourth, substantively, I'm drawn toward ecological issues, as well as suggestions encouraging deviation from the dominator model.

All of that said, I'm quite tabula rasa. And, in a perfect world, I'd appreciate actually hearing the fruits of your research -- meaning, it'd be lovely if I could enjoy a first hearing of your ev., as well as a secondary recap in rebuttals, then further accented by my own re-reading of the critical items post-round. Unfortunately, I usually just experience the third of the three, preceded by barely comprehensible imitations of the first, and a disregard for the second; but I suppose at this particular tournament things'll be clear as a bell, right?
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