

2013 Final Round Ballots

Foley

Foreword

First, I would like to congratulate both teams and their coaches on incredible NDT performances all around. Beating the Copeland winner you finish second to in semis (including winning 4 of the only 5 ballots they dropped all NDT-long) and making a run to the finals from the 15th first round slot as the first ever openly gay, black male partnership are both huge and historic feats. Nothing about the words in this decision should take that away from any of the competitor's accomplishments this year. NU and Emporia's 'thank you' speeches stand as testaments to their character and their dedication to the activity.

Second, I am honored to have been selected by both Northwestern and Emporia State to be a part of this NDT finals experience. I cannot say that I imagined myself in such a position before the tournament started, but I was beyond excited to participate and make the best possible decision that I could. It's one thing to be a spectator watching teams give 'thank you' speeches in the finals of the NDT, but it's quite another to be given one of the ballots that makes those speeches so emotional.

Not many first-year-out judges have the opportunity I was given. Whether that opportunity was the result of a true preference of both teams to have me judging their final debate of the season or simply a radical pref sheet disparity, I will not know. But as a debater making the transition to a judge and an educator, the experience was priceless and, for that, I am grateful. It has helped me become a better judge in more ways than the debaters or coaches that influence each team's pref sheet can know.

Third, both teams were very much on the top of their games and were articulating their positions in some of the best forms that I've seen them presented in quite some time. While the total number of rounds I have judged either team is relatively small, I can confidently say that these were the best speeches I have seen all four competitors give. While the decision will include several criticisms and suggestions for shifts in focus, the speeches as they were given all deserved high marks.

It was because both teams were debating so well that decisions like this end up, for me at least, being decided on a variety of small details that coalesced into larger issue for one team or the other.

Given that, I am not surprised that this was a 3-2 decision.

The Decision (short)

I voted Affirmative for Emporia State.

The short, boiled down version is this:

Emporia State's role of the ballot claim resolved enough of Northwestern's offense that the residual risk of the accessibility DA turned and outweighed what was left of the deliberation/policy-making good DA.

The Decision (long)

My decision to vote for Emporia can be framed around two issues: the permutation and the role that accessibility plays in impact calculus.

The Permutation

The most frustrating thing about resolving this debate is that both teams spent far too much time attacking a caricature of the other team's role of the ballot without investing a lot of speech time in the permutation ***and its relationship to the other team's offense***. NU attacked Emporia's argument as if it said "focus exclusively on identity and psychic violence" and Emporia approached NU's argument as if it said "only focus on policy-making." In reality, I thought both teams positions were more nuanced than this.

Reconciling the possibility of combining methodologies and attempting to compare the residual risks of each team's respective links was a part of this decision that I felt was left far too much in the hands on the judges. This is a one portion of the debate that I thought could have been vastly improved by both teams. In my estimation, it can largely be held responsible for the 3-2 split on the panel. Thirty to forty-five re-allocated seconds on this question by either team would have had a substantial effect on the ballot count in either direction.

My resulting decision had a lot to do with who was missing the mark too much and who best re-articulated their position in response to the other team's caricature.

First, I will start with the 2nr's approach to resolving Emporia's offense on the perm. The 2nr has two portions that speak to the permutation in an attempt to 'solve' the affirmative:

Switch side solves.

Admittedly, this is the most developed portion of "solves your offense" type debating the negative is doing. As the debate progressed, Emporia did a good job of making their offense interact with this argument when they made the point that a 'scripto-centric' policy focus approach would not force participants to 'switch sides' in the sense of actually confronting individual identity or oppressive practices that become normalized in the debate space. This component of the argument was not responded to in very clear terms. While I am fairly certain that going negative allows teams to have the ability to play some sort of activist role and challenge state based practices in a number of instances, I am unsure that it resolves Emporia's concerns about the broader accessibility and self-reflexivity of this method for the debate community.

The other side to this argument is the question on "using the master's tools" productively to better understand the policy process and effectuate change in more concrete ways given state institutions centrality to the carrying out of all of our daily lives. This is a part of the debate that I thought that NU should have more aggressively re-framed Emporia's evidence. Emporia was very adept at framing their evidence about of 'disidentification' and working 'on and against' the systems of oppression as necessitating a space for critical reflection of debate practices. I think there are several ways interpret lines of their evidence as being very much in support of NU's switch side argument but without an explicit re-framing of the way Emporia is deploying the argument, it is hard to attribute these lines in

their evidence as a negative solvency. Emporia's position seems to be that while using the master's tools may be a productive venture for some, it is not an all-encompassing strategy for dealing with the alienation and exclusion of certain bodies and does not promote a sense of self-reflexivity about debate praxis itself. Emporia emphasizes that such an approach is an attempt to "separate theory from our flesh" and can act to exclude and alienate certain bodies (in this instance, quare bodies) from participation.

An additional issue that I had with the SSD argument was Emporia's position about the usefulness of NU's model to those who feel alienated from it. The key question to me is: To what extent does a model that would force those who feel totally alienated from the State in general or the debate community specifically to engage these institutions result in a productive engagement? If they win access to a psychological violence impact, how can a marginalized body productively engage that institution? The negative interpretation would seem to tell such a debater that they should suck it up and deal with it because they need to learn more about how the government works to challenge it, but if that alienation is so strong that it prevents a student from productive engagement how does this function to solve their offense. The affirmatives Johnson evidence substantiates this argument by arguing that the "performance of self...in a moment of self-reflexivity that has the potential to transform one's view of self in relation to the world," and that "[p]eople have a need to exercise control over the production of their images so that they feel empowered."

This, combined with the 2ar's framing of their accessibility DA discussed in more detail below, made me conclude that NU's switch side method would have issues successfully incorporating alienated individuals using this strategy both because of the lack of a mechanism to adequately allow for 'disidentification' as the affirmative describes it and because of the difficulty I have in conceptualizing how an alienated student can internalize the decision-making skills and policy knowledge proffered by the negative.

Narratives solve.

It is definitely true that teams can read narratives, personal or otherwise, to justify topical policy actions. The issue that I end up having with this particular argument is that it is very under-invested in by the 2nr. NU would have been far better served unpacking more of the language of their evidence in relation to the 'topical version of the aff' argument instead of merely saying 'including narratives solve' and referencing their authors. Providing more examples of the various ways identity and performance can be incorporated successfully to make the activity more accessible would make the 2ar's framing of NU's position as hostile towards some members of the community much less impactful. As it stood, I thought several great portions of NU's evidence were left underexplored by 2nr and limited my willingness to apply various portions of them to this particular argument. I perceived Emporia's argument to be far less about utilizing narratives and far more about a method of debate that builds in the ability of the marginalized to challenge exclusionary practices.

A more fundamental problem with the way the negative approaches this debate is that the strategy for 'topical version of the aff' centers far too much on the question of 'who do we think we theoretically include?' and not enough on the question of 'how does our method deal with those who already feel excluded?'

It's odd because this part of the debate feels somewhat like a throwback threat construction debate with the sides reversed. NU makes the argument that Emporia's perceived threats to their debate 'home' are constructed (i.e. SSD and narratives exist that should resolve the issue). Emporia comes back with the standard policy team's defense of such an argument by pointing to the materiality of the situation. Just like a more policy team would argue that even if the threat is constructed and there are obvious solutions to wars over Taiwan, the perception of a threat itself is enough to drive the dynamics that push countries across the Rubicon, Emporia similarly appeals to the effect that their perception of exclusion in the debate community can create material exclusion by making students feel alienated.

This is what I think the 2ar is getting at when he criticizes the negative interpretation for focusing too much on 'method' and not a lot on the 'performance' that ties "theory to the flesh." The affirmative's model for strategies of 'disidentification' as their Johnson evidence describes seem to necessitate far more than the 'assimilation' strategies proposed by the negative. At the very least the 2nr needed to incorporate how such a strategy would be possible under their model for debate. As I mentioned above, their evidence provides fertile ground for such a re-interpretation but, as it stood, telling the other team how to fit under a model they have already said they feel alienated from was a large enough link to Emporia's offense to make me think that NU's role of the ballot would have a very difficult time incorporating the kinds of discussions the affirmative thinks should be part of the debate model.

One thing that I believe also hurt NU in this debate is that the 2nr does not establish very clear demarcations of what their role of the ballot claim was. The clearest statement that I have from the 2nr is that I should vote negative to "Use [my] ballot to affirm that public policy debate is a relevant and powerful force for change." Although there are the questions about the permutations ability to solve the limits DA and the deliberation/policy-making DA that will be discussed below, the contours of that discussion are guided by the specific wording of each team's method. NU's wording left very little in terms of guidance for what the ballot would be determining in this debate. Wording it as "affirm public policy as important" makes it seem much less competitive than "your ballot should represent an affirmation or negation of a topical policy simulation."

The 1ar/2ar explanation of the permutation for the debate community to "ease on down the road together" made the permutation seem more feasible given the "affirm public policy as important" framing because the affirmative's method was not about a single static method to incorporate more voices in the debate community, but rather a move to acknowledge that multiplicity of ways individuals relate to debate as 'home'. If phrased differently, a clearer articulation of the negative's role of the ballot could establish more defined criteria for competition than simply "affirming public policy as good."

Not only did I perceive the question as being approached from an odd angle by the 2nr, but I also felt that the amount of time invested in explaining this angle is relatively light compared to its overall importance in deciding the debate.

As mentioned above, this debate had a lot to do with who was best re-articulating the other team's caricature of their position. On the permutation, I thought the affirmative was doing a relatively better job of articulating their affirmative in a way that made it difficult to square many of the negative's solvency arguments with Emporia's overall position in the debate.

Although I did think that the permutation had some issues resolving what I thought was the core component of Emporia's affirmative, the negative did gain a significantly higher level of traction with their net-benefits of deliberation/policy-making.

Links: Limits/Crowd-out

At the outset, I will say that I found it nearly impossible to distinguish the general deliberation/policy-making offense from the energy DA offense. The latter seemed to simply be a topic specific version of the former. There are several places in this ballot where I suggest more time be spent in various places. The overlap between these two positions is the first place I would suggest to gain back the time to do so. The energy DA extension seemed to be part of a division of labor between Peyton and Arjun that resulted in too much explanatory overlap between the 2nr's overview and the portions read from Arjun's laptop.

With that said, I considered there to be two links to the negative's offense: limits and crowd-out

It is undoubtedly true that the affirmative's role of the ballot would encompass a far wider range of issues to be discussed in debate rounds. The level of preparation is certainly diluted in relation to the negatives method for engaging debates. Although the limits argument was used more as an internal link to the deliberation/policy-making impacts, it had very important implications for the solvency of the affirmative's role of the ballot and for the permutation.

This is a part of the 2nr that I think should have been far more aggressively pursued. Though the link to the argument is clearly extended several times the impact to it was consistently phrased as deliberation "would be better if" and not "would be impossible without." The end of the 2nr lightly re-visits this question and gets very close to this, but leaves me wanting for more speech time on the question.

This framing, for me, had important implications on my decision. It sold short the potential of a crucial 'turns case' argument. The full implications of the radical expansion of affirmative choice under the Emporia's model for debate were an under-explored component of the speech. The impact to a more diluted and shallow research preparation experience, and its subsequent impact on deliberation in the debates themselves, was too focused on proving the level of deliberation would not be 'optimal' instead of not being 'sufficient'.

This open-ended question of what makes for sufficient policy deliberation is what I think allowed Emporia's permutation to get far more traction than might be imagined.

This stems in large part from how I understood the affirmative's conception of 'home' throughout the debate. As early as the cross-x of the 1ac, when Peyton asks directly about the implications of incompatibility of their respective methodologies, Ryan uses the "its not either/or, its and/and" phrasing to elaborate on this vision of debate. This and other early portions of debate established an understanding of the affirmative that the 2ar pop-culture imbued permutation explanation encapsulated.

The broader defensive argument in the permutation did not so much deal with its inherent subjectivity as it relates to the concept of 'home', but rather its propensity for intersubjective understandings of debate as 'home'. The notion that we should all 'ease on down the road together' did not seem to be a prescription that there should be every debate that occurs to be about what Emporia wants to talk

about or even that there should be no topic at all. Under Emporia's method, it would seem as though if certain teams valued a resolutorial focus and policy-making discussions, they could have them as much as they wanted against one another. Just because one team views a certain form of engagement with debate as making it closer to 'home' does not mean other teams debating other teams have to view debate the same way. If Georgetown AM and Northwestern LV want to have a debate about the energy topic with a massive disad/case debate over a natural gas export terminal in Alaska in the semis of the NDT, I find Emporia's overall method hospitable of that debate. If two teams were so concerned about limiting the activity to policy-making questions, those debates, according to Emporia's conception of debate as 'home' would still take place.

The missing element for me in these discussions is an application of the 'competitive forum' argument that is made when discussing the impact of voting for one team or another in relation to personal narratives/performances/etc to the extension of the limits argument. If this argument is broadened and applied as a 'strategic bad faith' argument that more fully explores the extent to which such a method can be strategically abused by teams who are not necessarily marginalized for the sole purpose of winning debates it has the potential to undermine a significant amount of affirmative solvency. This also a place where I think the 'falsifiability' discussion could be given a far more influential role in deciding the debate. As it was debated, the falsifiability component was minor and not impacted very well.

Not pushing harder on this claim allowed Emporia to set the terms of the debate and set the bar higher for NU's argument. In a lot of ways, the affirmative's model for debate would allow for teams to disingenuously act indignant over a host of communal and policy practices while also generating unverifiable solvency deficits to any negative counter advocacy. NU lets Emporia get away with a much more benign interpretation of how the debate community operates strategically. There needed to be less focus on the impact on the judge/ballot when personal identity becomes a question in the debate and more focus on the impact of the type of distortions that competition can place on the debaters and their preparation for tournaments.

While the 2nr leaves me with the impression that debates could be theoretically limitless, my understanding of the affirmative's position combined with the lack of a more detailed 'on-the-ground' description of the link and impact of the limits argument makes me think that Emporia's strategy would have a potential mechanism for accessing a sufficient amount of deliberation and policy-making in the sense that Northwestern describes.

Part of this also has to do with how the negative used the Galloway evidence to support their argument. The 2nr is the best on the limits debate when describing the aff's method as 'destroying 'home' for the negative by de-limiting the topic. Galloway uses the language of 'silencing' the negative's year-long research and preparation by expanding the dialogue beyond resolutorial bounds.

The 2nr makes some arguments that make the application of this evidence much more difficult –

First, after extending the 'fairness' turn to limits, Peyton plays heavy impact defense to the idea that voting for or against another team demarcates their inclusion or exclusion from the community. If debates merely determine who won or lost, then it is difficult to assign such a risk of a 'denying personhood' turn to the Galloway evidence. The 2ar references this rhetorical move when Ryan asks how it is "that you can vote negative and justify a form of debate that would be good but if you vote affirmative you somehow penalize Northwestern in this debate. Why isn't that the same thing?"

Which is to say that if it is true that the ballot penalizes both teams in some way individually (either by affirming/negating personal experience or silencing months of insightful research about the resolution when voting for a team), then it seems like we should weigh the relevant impacts for each penalty when deciding who to vote for. But, if the ballot is simply to determine a winner and a loser, then the merits of each method deserves consideration and that justifications for each will be considered as well. In either case, Emporia's arguments based on their individual identity and their arguments about accessibility do not seem implicated by this line of reasoning any more than the negatives arguments and does not give either side all that much strategic leverage.

This also highlights some of the difficulty I have squaring some of the evidence Northwestern is reading to the arguments that they are making. One portion in particular struck me during Arjun's cross-x of Elijah when he pointedly questioned the affirmative about why research practices were important and again, more explicitly, in the 2nr when Peyton went so far as to disavow the research process as it related to their offensive arguments when she says "Research doesn't solve offense, it's about the process of the debate space."

It was lines like this that left me in the difficult position of evaluating dropped 2nr arguments that clearly cut against the offense extended by the negative more than, or at least as much as, they do the affirmative. It was difficult for me to grant as much of an impact to 'denying the personhood' of the negative by 'silencing' their research when the negative is forwarding an argument about how unimportant the research process is for their offense. This is not to say I discounted it entirely, but it would certainly have made a decision in the other direction seem odd to me given the negative's position on the issue.

To be sure, the affirmative's form of deliberation is far shallower and occurs in fewer rounds than in Northwestern's interpretation. There is definitely a solvency deficit. But the impact to that solvency deficit is not as large as I think the 2nr calculated that it would be.

While I thought each teams role of the ballot could address portions of the other team's offensive arguments (with Emporia slightly ahead in that department), the impact to the opportunity cost of having more diluted, sub-optimal policy debates and the risk that some identity focused debates may supplant more normative policy discussions are still large as they are not directly addressed and are given the traditional 1% risk type of impact framing in the 2nr.

Accessibility DA

One argument that got as much of a response by the negative as their terminal impacts to policy-making got from the affirmative was on the question of marginalized people's access to policy discussions and deliberations in the status quo. Not just in debate, but in society writ large.

The negative does not adequately come to grips with the scope of this uniqueness argument and, in fact, I think makes implicit concessions to its overall importance. The top of the 2nr begins with "debate is bigger than this room, bigger than any one particular perspective"

Emporia is using this framing to say that these debates always extend beyond our argumentative deliberations in these spaces. They incorporate lived experience and cultural identity that filter how individuals are psychologically able to access institutions (governments, debate communities, etc).

While the 2nr contains several indictments of the positive solvency claim that focusing on questions of identity leads directly to normative political prescriptions, there is not really an answer to the reverse causal argument forwarded by Emporia about the exclusion of marginalized voices from that process being detrimental to the success of the policies themselves. The 2nr appeared to be banking heavily on their advocacy sucking up more of this 'accessibility' offense than addressing it head on. While the Anderson evidence is by far the best on this question, its application in the 2nr is too focused on the link level of whether or not a focus on identity can create policy proposals and not on the uniqueness question of whether or not the lack of some form of accommodation for those who already feel excluded and alienated from the process can have detrimental effects on the policy-making process that does end up happening.

Put another way, I cannot say that I have an abundant amount of confidence that many debates that occur over the identity of someone who claims to be suffering from environmental racism will bore out a too many normative political proposals to rectify the ills of global warming and other environmentally damaging processes on its own. However, I do think that I can quite confidently say that if we do not find a way to incorporate those many alienated voices willingly into the process that the policies we eventually come up with will suffer from blind spots that can make the policy ineffective or, at the very least, sub-optimal in many of the same ways that I end up concluding that Emporia's role of the ballot would make NU's vision of deliberation/policy-making.

There is some similarity at the internal link level between having to prepare for too many affirmatives and creating an alienating model of debate. An un-limited topic results in potentially important voices being left out either by virtue of 'silent' research that never gets read because no one has time to cut the article or cards that get cut never get a chance to be read in a debate. An alienating topic with no built in method for critical self-reflection on its various communal practices can similarly result in important voices in deliberations about policy that affect their implementation and success.

The question is the scope of that internal link. This is an area where I think NU's reliance on their role of the ballot to resolve many of these came back to hurt them. Once I conclude that the negs role of the ballot would still link to Emporia's argument in significant ways, there is little in terms of a response to many of the internal link claims being forwarded by Emporia. In particular, the 2ar does a decent amount of work to create accessibility as a filter for other arguments. He uses Linsenbard evidence to contextualize the solvency for such an approach. This evidence and the 2ar's explanation cast the net far wider in terms of the number of people affected by such an approach. Their evidence says that Emporia's method/performance can "forge the conditions for cooperation...by unveiling and valorizing our own freedom as situated and responsible projects that participate in what he refers to as the adventure and unveiling of the other's existence...I make the Other exist and thematize her contingency while perpetually surpassing it: I enrich the Other...and give meaning to the Other's existence."

I concluded that the risk of the accessibility DA was very sizable and accessed a significant portion of the solvency of the negatives position. The 'no accessibility now' uniqueness argument combined with its ability to access the quality of deliberation and the success of policy-making made generating sufficient impact uniqueness difficult for NU.

Conclusion

Ultimately, I thought that while Emporia's affirmative would create a model of debate that would include fewer policy debates and could create relatively more shallow deliberations in the policy debates that did occur, their affirmative included components that helped make their level of solvency for the negative's net-benefits notable and, in a decent number of situations, sufficient.

While a solvency deficit existed, the magnitude of its importance was minimized by how influential the affirmative's 'accessibility' DA was in terms of both its 'turns case' element and its ability to influence the direction of terminal impact uniqueness of the negative's offense.

Comparatively, I thought that the negative's role of the ballot had such a significant difficulty resolving core components of the affirmative that the risk of the accessibility DA was high enough to turn and outweigh what ended up being a mitigated residual risk of the policy-making impacts.

To the extent that policy deliberation's happen, this debate left me with the opinion that the wider scope of accessibility in terms of making debate a 'home' would have a more positive impact on every student's ability to internalize the educational benefits of such a practice (policy or otherwise).

While the negative has phenomenal evidence set to work with, the speeches that gave me a window into their applicability to the affirmative were lacking in their attempt bring the evidence read to its full argumentative potential.

Thus, I voted for Emporia on the basis that the 'ease on down the road together' permutation created enough room at the metaphorical table for a decent, while sub-optimal, amount of policy deliberation while providing a critical site for the empowerment of alienated individuals who would otherwise be left out of the discussion to the detriment of the policy discussions that do end up occurring.

There are a lot of storylines at play in this debate. A lot of things can be read into a decision either way in a debate such as this one. I wanted to end this ballot with the following thought:

Our community as it exists today is the embodiment of permutation. Whether you personally ascribe to one side of an ideological divide in the community or not, we all exist in a constantly dynamic, awesome group of people who want nothing more for each member than to enrich their intellectual development. While logical extremes dominated our in-round discussions, we need to remember that debates like these (as well as the subsequent community discussions that follow) are decided in the trenches of the permutation rather than the intellectual purity of either side's position.

This final round was an absolute joy to watch and adjudicate. I wish the seniors good luck in their post-debate endeavors and I wish the returning competitors good luck in their debates next year as well.

Debate is most definitely a place I consider 'home' – and this debate did everything to re-affirm that to me.

Harris

What would I do if I could feel?
What would I do
If I could reach inside of me
And to know how it feels
To say I like what I see?
Then I'd be more than glad to share
All that I have inside of here.
And the songs my heart might bring
You'd be more than glad to sing.
And if tears should fall from my eyes
Just think of all the wounds they could mend.

The Tin Man from "The Wiz"

This ballot will make me no friends. This ballot is not intended to make friends. This ballot is about my experience judging a debate. It was an unusual debate and this will be an unusual ballot. Many things will be read into the meaning of my vote in this debate, more so than in most debates, because it decided a debate about debate. Identities will be ascribed to this ballot that I have no control over. A ballot, once cast takes on a life of its own. This ballot will be read by some as playing a part in a historic revolution. This ballot will be read by some as a signal of where I belong or don't belong on their pref sheets. This ballot will be read by some as a sign of incompetence by a crazy old man. This ballot will elicit disagreement from those who saw the debate differently. This ballot will frustrate both teams and probably make them both mad. This ballot will be seen as a sell out by people from both sides of the ideological divide in debate. This ballot will lead debaters to say "but I said that." This ballot will make somebody angry. This ballot made somebody cry. This ballot may raise more questions than it answers. Unlike my preferred form of post round ballot this ballot is presented as a monologue and not a dialogue so those questions will hang in the air without answers. This ballot will take me hours to produce because I can't type. This ballot may be the most unusual thing I have ever written. This ballot will be filled with non sequiturs. This ballot will switch tenses randomly. This ballot will meander. This ballot is about my voyage to and through this debate. Like any debater who has ridden in a van with me there is a good chance that you will get lost several times on the voyage. This ballot may be so long that

no one will actually read it. This ballot says too much. This ballot says too little. This ballot will leave most people including me unsatisfied. This ballot is about a debate. This ballot is about debate. This ballot is about me and my relationship to this debate. This ballot was cast for the affirmative from Emporia.

Several years ago I was in Chicago for a National Communication Association convention and I took my family with me since I had not spent much time with them in the fall. NCA comes at the end of the fall semester after we coaches have spent most weekends traveling away from our families. In debate "weekend" is such a funny term since the debate weekend runs Friday through Tuesday leaving two days in town for family and teaching and cutting cards for the next "weekend." Upon arriving in downtown Chicago a man ran up to me and asked for money because his daughter had a crisis and had run out of gas and desperately needed money for her car because she had to get somewhere important. He pointed to a distraught looking young woman and pleaded for help. I gave him enough money to get some gas. He thanked me and we headed down the street toward the convention hotel. It would surprise no one to know that I may have made a wrong turn in heading for the hotel so we ended up backtracking a bit en route to the convention site. As a result of my meandering I had another chance encounter with the man who had asked me for gas money. I spotted him asking someone else for money. In a move unusual for someone as introverted as I am I went up to him and his new target and heard him tell the same tale of woe he had told me. I told the new target that she was being lied to because I had already given him gas money and it was obviously a con and I walked away. The man followed me down the street and argued with me trying to convince me that he was not a con man and that his daughter really needed gas and that I was wrong to question his sincerity. A half an hour later I was standing in the lobby of the convention hotel with my family when I was approached by two police officers who informed me that they had been tracking the father/daughter con artists and had arrested them and that they might need me to return to Chicago to testify. One of the officers gave me the money that I had given the con man and told me to spend it on my children. He told me, "Home comes first." This story may or may not have anything to do with this debate. I will let people determine its potential meaning for themselves.

In the pre-debate introductions John Fritch introduces me as having first judged the final round of the NDT in 1985. Lindsey Shook leans over to me and observes that the debaters and most of the judges had not yet been born in 1985. Lindsey reminds me that I am old. Old coaches are not frequently thought of as a meaningful category in debate but we are a somewhat rare creature. Debate coaching is a high burn out profession. Long term coaching of debate at an intense level is difficult to do. The sleep schedules, food schedules and stress levels experienced over time do not seem conducive to a healthy life. I am sick while judging this debate. I'm sure the diet and multiple all-nighters I have experienced in the past two weeks are a contributing factor. I am even sicker at home writing this ballot and I have pulled another all-nighter working on this ballot which is probably insane. I am depressed because my team lost three straight break rounds on 2-1 decisions and I feel like I failed them as a coach. I have tremendous respect for all of the coaches who devote their lives to helping others have an opportunity to debate. I have a special admiration for those who do it with sustained excellence like Ken Strange and Dallas Perkins and Sherry Hall and Roger Solt and Donn Parson and George Ziegelmueller. (The above is not to suggest that Sherry is old. She is clearly a young and vibrant member of the debate community. I would like to announce as President of the AFA that I have appointed Sherry to serve another term on the NDT Board of Trustees. We are all extremely grateful that she has agreed to

continue to serve in this capacity). Ahh George Ziegelmueller. The thought of George just made me cry while typing this ballot. I owe my life to George in so many ways. He is my father in debate and my role model. I was in Chicago for the Northwestern tournament not long ago and I did not go visit him. I feel terrible that I do not visit and call. I am a bad son. I do not love him any less despite my inattentiveness. I have never considered myself to be on the level of the iconic figures in debate I mentioned above. I'm just a guy who lucked into a world that has allowed a strange bird like me to have a place. Being recognized with the Ziegelmueller award was one of the proudest and most humbling moments of my life. I am no George Ziegelmueller, I have been a college debate coach for over 30 years. I am old. In some cultures being old is thought to be a source of wisdom. In debate being old means you are thought to be out of it. You are thought to be less relevant. You have voted against so many debaters and teams on so many different arguments that it is easy to be categorized as a bad judge. It is an activity that thrives on youth who think they are inventing what debate is and are better and know more than those who preceded them. As this ballot makes clear I do not have much wisdom to pass on despite my age.

I am unsure why my voyage has led me to judge this particular debate. I have avoided judging the final round many years because the NDT directors have been kind and acceded to my request not to be placed on the final round panel. I have always thought the opportunity should go to those who want to judge the debate more than I do. This year the tab room rejected my request to avoid judging the debate. While I was counting on the tab room to keep me out of the debate I am surprised that Emporia did not strike me from the panel. If I were Emporia I would have struck me. I judged Emporia against Northwestern LV at Kentucky in an elimination round earlier this year and voted for Northwestern on framework as part of a 2-1 decision. I judged Emporia against Northwestern LV last year in the octofinals and voted for Northwestern as part of a 4-3 majority. I judged Emporia against Northwestern in the semis at Texas last year and voted for Northwestern on Framework. My judging philosophy makes it clear that I believe passionately that topicality is a voting issue. I have told various teams that have prefed me who do not defend topical action that they are playing with fire ranking me highly because I believe you should defend resolutorial action. I did not seek this debate but it appears to have sought me.

The subject of the debate is about debate as a home. The introductions by each of the debaters and the 1AC are about debate as a home and how much debate and the people in it have meant to each of the participants. I found a home in debate in the fall of 1972. Debate changed my life. Without debate I don't have any idea where I would be today. I was a painfully introverted young man growing up. I didn't talk to other people. I did not speak in class. I would do anything to avoid speaking to an adult. Debate somehow empowered me to stand up and speak in front of other people. My mother could not believe that I was speaking in public and had to come see it for herself. I grew up with four brothers (and for a while a monkey but the story of JoJo is a story best left untold) in a home that was rich in love and spiritual guidance but low on finances. My father was a part time Pentecostal minister and part time salesman. My mother was a saint. We were blessed in many ways. They raised five rambunctious boys without health insurance and miraculously we avoided any catastrophes. There was always some form of food on the table and love in our hearts and church to attend. I wore hand me down clothes from my cousins and my brothers and the older boy next door and went to school and tried to avoid drawing attention to myself. I debated four semesters in high school but had no idea what I was doing. Debate camp was not a financial option for my family. I was better at oratory than I was at debate. One

of the ironic things that allowed me to do debate was that the schedule did not conflict with church nights. We had Tuesday/Thursday fall league debates so I didn't have to miss Wednesday, Friday and Sunday church services. Sports were not an option for me because the schedule conflicted with Friday church services. (The fact that I wasn't big enough or good enough for sports might have played a role as well). It's ironic because when I got to college the debate schedule played havoc with the ability to attend regular church services. Debate is an activity that in the long run conflicts with religion more than any sport ever would have. My brothers might argue that debate was on balance a bad home for me to choose because it drove a wedge between me and my church home. They might be right. In high school I was greatly influenced by my coach Lynn Donges and colleague Jon Mason. Debating in college was never really a plan for me. Going to college was not really a plan. I never took the SAT or ACT because college really wasn't thought of as the normal track in my social cohort. Working on the assembly line or driving a truck like my brothers seemed like a more likely path. I took vocational classes in High School to learn to do printing. I never learned how to type but instead learned how to set type by hand (a skill that was obsolete by the time I graduated). My father got me a job sweeping out a Midas Muffler shop after graduation. When the fall came I had grown disillusioned with sweeping up rust and looked into Wayne State University as the only school that would admit me without requiring college admission tests. I initially didn't find school much more stimulating than the muffler shop. One day I spotted a sign on campus encouraging people to come to a reception to join the debate or forensics team. The sign said "Richard Nixon debated—you should to." I decided to go to the reception to look into joining the forensics team. At the reception one of the members of the squad told me I didn't want to do individual events but should do debate instead. I did and my life has never been the same. I learned how to debate in college. Two practice rounds every week were required. My world was rocked by George Ziegelmueller, Jack Kay, Ron Lee, Vince Follert, Mike Wavada, Gerry Cox, Bill and Pam Benoit, Tuna Snider and other coaches who taught me how to debate, how to breathe without sounding like a wounded animal, and how to think. It was in debate that I first stayed in a hotel room. Family vacations in the Harris family involved sleeping in a packed car at a rest area. Debate allowed me to fly on a plane. Debate allowed me to experience eating in restaurants (although many of my colleagues on the Wayne squad questioned whether Bill Knapps qualified). I would never have finished college if I had not found debate as a home. My voyage has taken me from Wayne State to Northwestern to Louisville and finally to Kansas. I did not ever have a plan to make debate the rest of my life it somehow just happened. I found a home in debate and I have never left. I am very passionate about my belief in the value of this activity.

The content of this debate is about the role of the ballot. Each team wants this ballot to make a declarative statement about the debate activity. The affirmative wants my ballot to make a declaration about inclusivity for argumentative diversity. The negative wants my ballot to make a declaration about the relevance and power of switch side debate as potential for impacting the external world. A debate in which each sides is saying a vote for them is about making a declarative statement about the role of my ballot is problematic for me. Several years ago after I had voted for Emory in a debate in which they discussed their Jewish identity in response to a Louisville team that discussed their identity I was braced by Louisville coaches with the question "What is the role of your ballot." My response then was that the role of my ballot was to decide who won the arguments as presented in the debate. I have not changed my judging philosophy. I view my role in a debate as centered on declaring who I think won the arguments in the debate. This ballot is not intended to be an endorsement of the resistance movement Emporia claims to represent nor is it intended to send a signal rejecting the use of the framework

argument by Northwestern. This ballot represents my opinion on who made an argument in the debate that was more persuasive to me. My core philosophy on debate is unchanged by this debate. I still fundamentally believe that debating the topic is important and valuable and that affirmatives ought to debate the resolution. This ballot is not intended to be a repudiation of that core concept. I also believe that debate needs to do more to promote diversity within debate in a wide range of areas. Both final round teams are a representation of diversity within the activity. This ballot argues that Emporia won this debate in a very close decision based on a couple of arguments that could have been handled a little differently by Northwestern.

For me this debate was decided around one core framing issue which might be called the permutation. Permutation is a misleading label because it is Emporia's advocacy from the 1AC. As I interpret the affirmative argument it is a call based on the hail of "The Wiz" to "Ease on down the road together." It is a call for moving hand in hand forward to a future that includes multiple forms of debate which include switch side policy debate and debates in which an individual may make a home through performance as a site of resistance within the debate space. It is partly an argument about debate as debate generally and partly an argument about what Emporia should be allowed to do to access their agency in this specific debate. It is not premised on a rejection of policy debate writ large but as an argument for spaces of exception for individuals whose personal experience and agency do not fit in that model of debate. There are many other potential interpretations of "The Wiz" and there is some fascinating literature on the differing progressive political allegories in Baum's original book version of "The Wizard of Oz and its transformation into racial allegories in the movie "The Oz" that may make this permutation an unusual reading of the movie but that has little relevance to the debate as it takes place. Arguments about the meaning of "The Wiz" and its relationship to home and community might have made for an interesting but very different debate.

The negative argument is based on the claim that all debates must be oriented around the pursuit of government policy as advocated by the resolution. The principle warrant for this claim is based on the idea that policy debate about government action is good. Northwestern clearly wins that traditional policy debate is valuable in its production of trained advocates on policy questions. Emporia's argument in the 1AR and 2AR is that traditional policy debate is good for those who can make use of those skills but that there should also be a space for individuals whose needs are to performatively challenge oppressive structures in their everyday lives. The affirmative advocacy is for the both/and or in the affirmative's words "the and, and, and." The negative vision creates a world of forced choice—of debate as an either or—of debate the resolution or don't debate. The affirmative model advocates a model of debate that captures the advantages of political debate and the advantages of socially inclusive sites of performance that allow the excluded to speak.

For me the negative under develops the extent to which a forced choice that excludes the affirmative approach in every debate is essential. I think the negative should have developed more of a traditional limits type argument. The argument that allowing this affirmative to make the debate about their social location would enable every debate to be framed about a different social location and that there would be a tremendous incentive for fewer and fewer debates to talk about the topic. That the permutation is a bad idea because in the world of the permutation there would be a vested interest in more and more debates crowding out the political debates. In other words, I think the link to the loss of traditional political research and debate from embracing the affirmatives approach in some debates is not developed enough by the negative. The 2NR does say that under the affirmative vision there would be

no limits to what the affirmative talks about but the focus is on how that impacts on the ability of the negative to prepare for debates rather than making it about an argument of what debate would look like in the world of the permutation. The negative could also have argued for the importance of Quare individuals specifically to discuss questions of politics and energy policy in particular or answered more specifically the affirmatives assertions that government policy had no relevance to them. The affirmative Quare specificity arguments are late breaking in the debate since they only appear in CX and in rebuttals but the negative does not really address them explicitly. Had these arguments for why the permutation was a bad idea been developed more I would most likely have voted negative in this debate. I am sure that Northwestern's reaction to this explanation will be to feel "that is what we said." While I think it is the implicit intent behind their arguments I do not believe that these arguments as a response to the perm are explored sufficiently in the 2NR. I believe that the permutation absorbs most of the negatives offense for why policy debates will be good and then some debates that encourage performative resistance will also be good. I think the negative wins that the framework argument itself is not violent and that voting negative to exclude the aff would not be an act of violence. That does not mean, however, that there is not an inclusion advantage to voting affirmative.

The negative defensive argumentation against the permutation is that you can have narratives that talk about policy questions. This is indisputably true. However, I don't think it answers the affirmatives claim about how their advocacy creates a unique ability to access sites of resistance that are not confined to institutional issues. While I don't think the Johnson evidence is quite as "on fire" as the 2AR thinks, it does make an argument about the importance of the ability of the LGBT body to direct performance as a site of resistance through the strategy of disidentification. The permutation allows the affirmative to access the exploration of exclusion within the debate activity itself that the negative permutation of combining performance with institutional focus cannot access. The negative methodology does not allow a performative site of resistance that can focus on making debate itself a home. Perhaps the negative could have talked about alternative ways of approaching debate institutions as a means of reforming debate to create a permutation that would talk about how institutional focus would be a better methodology for reforming debate but I don't get how the method advocated in this debate allows the affirmative to offer a site of resistance directed at debate. The negative is left without a method that makes debate performatively and methodologically a home. For me they needed to talk about how their methodology achieved that goal. Instead they chose to offer a methodology that made debate exclusively about pursuing different goals.

There are two pieces of offense I think the negative still has against the permutation. The first is the fairness argument. I am very unclear what the impact to the fairness argument is in the 2NR. She says that "it turns the inclusion argument" but I don't understand the warrant for that claim. I don't understand how fairness makes the affirmative more included in the debate space or how the Quare body is more included or how it enables sites of performative resistance as articulated in the Johnson evidence. The 2NR chooses not to extend an independent impact to fairness itself which puzzled me. It allowed the 2AR to make arguments about fairness for whom and why access comes first. This could/should have been developed more as an impact in its own right as an overarching indictment of the affirmative mode of debating.

The second piece of negative offense is the case turn that focuses on the claim that focus on identity politics in a debate trades off with the government focus limiting the energy that can be focused on solving problems like warming. The evidence for the case turn argument is quite good. The affirmative

says that there is no link because they are not identity politics but I am unclear how this distinction avoids the link since they clearly do not focus on government policy. The problem is that the permutation makes the magnitude of the link pretty small. If the number of debates in which individuals of identity who feel they don't have access to the political space is small (Quare individuals being the individuals who it is argued to apply to in this debate) then the link is pretty tiny. The idea that if the Emporia debaters only had done this debate about warming then they would have slightly better advocacy skills (although they seem to have pretty good advocacy skills in this debate) and they might make a marginal improvement in our ability to find a solution to warming somehow. This link is pretty tenuous at a pragmatic level. The 2NR tries to frame it as "even if you think there is only 1% chance of spill over the impact is extinction." I think the risk that this debate or a handful of debates about debate prevented us from solving global warming to be 1 to the power of infinity not 1 percent. For me the pragmatic impact the affirmative wins that their methodology facilitates the opportunity to create a home for individuals who can't find one anywhere else outweighs. While the impact to the affirmative argument impacts a small number of individuals the magnitude of the link seems fairly large. Having a home seems important. While the negative framed the case argument as a magnitude risk impact I don't find it very compelling given what I perceive the infinitesimally small link to the argument in the face of the permutation.

Northwestern makes an argument in the 2NR that I think is an important argument. They argue that tying the ballot to whether or not someone is included is problematic because someone has to lose the debate. I think this argument had the potential to be a powerful indictment of the affirmative's methodology. For me, the argument could have been impacted more as an offensive argument on the impact of that method for the home. I perceive it to be deployed more as a solvency argument. The affirmative answer is that it presupposes that the only way to debate the affirmative is to reject their ability to make arguments in the first place. The affirmative suggests that there are other ways to debate them that don't require negating their ability to have talked about their identity. What those other forms of argument might be are never developed but are left at the level of the claim that those debates can take place (there was an oblique reference to Wake's strategy earlier in the tournament) and the claim that it is Northwestern who is refusing to engage the arguments in the debate. The implication is that it is only the framework strategy that forces a rejection of identity and not the inclusion of performative identity based arguments themselves.

The 2NR uses the word home only once. There is a brief line that the affirmative destroys home in the context of the negative. For me this argument needed to be made a larger part of the negatives argument. It would have been more compelling if the negative talked about how the competing methodologies impacted on the nature of debate as a home. The bulk of the impact framing instead concentrated around how policy debate impacts on the world outside of debates. What was missing for me from the negative strategy was a discussion of how traditional policy debate positively creates a home for debaters. I do not see a positive vision of debate creating a home in the negatives arguments. The affirmative gets away with saying that Northwestern can only make assumptions about what nontraditional debates look like because they have never tried to be in one of those debates. They have never switched sides on those questions. How those debates impact debate itself is left unclear for me based on the arguments in this debate. The negatives argument would have been more powerful for me if it had discussed the impact of Emporia's methodology on debate as a home. What effect does a methodology that privileges the ability to say whatever is important to you have on everyone else in the

home? How does a demand for inclusion impact on the foundations of the home? How does it do violence to everyone else in the home? How does it impact on the pedagogical value of education that occurs in the home? What kind of home does it become if the right to talk about yourself trumps all other values the home stands for?

For me the negative's arguments end up too centered around why their method is good and not centered enough around why the affirmative's method is bad. It is what for me allows the "and, and, and" to access the idea that it is possible to construct a method of debate that includes promoting the values of switch side debate and opens occasional moments for individuals to access their performative agency as a site of resistance within debate. I think the negative could have done more to develop arguments on the implications of the competing methodologies for the home and less about how debate training can stop environmental destruction. There are momentary glimpses and hints at those arguments in the negative speeches but I do not perceive it to be the central framing of the arguments. This may be one of the frustrating dilemmas surrounding framework/topicality debates where different judges value different impacts. In a post round discussion with a judge earlier this year who did not vote for one of my teams making a framework argument she said that our impacts on limits and destruction of the ability to debate were not real impacts but we needed external impacts like warming or something. I was frustrated by that response. Here I find myself saying that I wanted the negative to make more impact claims about how choosing to refuse the resolution impacts on debate itself and talk less about external impacts like warming. The Northwestern coaches will be frustrated by that response. It is the nature of debate. Judges always seem to want us to emphasize a different aspect of the argument and judges view different impacts as more important. I am very close to voting negative in this debate but at the end of the day I did not think that the negative did a sufficient job in answering the value of creating a home and decided that the world of the permutation created the best vision of a home based on the arguments advanced.

I understand that there has been some criticism of Northwestern's strategy in this debate round. This criticism is premised on the idea that they ran framework instead of engaging Emporia's argument about home and the Wiz. I think this criticism is unfair. Northwestern's framework argument did engage Emporia's argument. Emporia said that you should vote for the team that performatively and methodologically made debate a home. Northwestern's argument directly clashed with that contention. My problem in this debate was with aspects of the execution of the argument rather than with the strategy itself. It has always made me angry in debates when people have treated topicality as if it were a less important argument than other arguments in debate. Topicality is a real argument. It is a researched strategy. It is an argument that challenges many affirmatives. The fact that other arguments could be run in a debate or are run in a debate does not make topicality somehow a less important argument. In reality, for many of you that go on to law school you will spend much of your life running topicality arguments because you will find that words in the law matter. The rest of us will experience the ways that word choices matter in contracts, in leases, in writing laws and in many aspects of our lives. Kansas ran an affirmative a few years ago about how the location of a comma in a law led a couple of districts to misinterpret the law into allowing individuals to be incarcerated in jail for two days without having any formal charges filed against them. For those individuals the location of the comma in the law had major consequences. Debates about words are not insignificant. Debates about what kinds of arguments we should or should not be making in debates are not insignificant either. The limits debate is an argument that has real pragmatic consequences. I found myself earlier this year

judging Harvard's eco-pedagogy aff and thought to myself—I could stay up tonight and put a strategy together on eco-pedagogy, but then I thought to myself—why should I have to? Yes, I could put together a strategy against any random argument somebody makes employing an energy metaphor but the reality is there are only so many nights to stay up all night researching. I would like to actually spend time playing catch with my children occasionally or maybe even read a book or go to a movie or spend some time with my wife. A world where there are an infinite number of affirmatives is a world where the demand to have a specific strategy and not run framework is a world that says this community doesn't care whether its participants have a life or do well in school or spend time with their families. I know there is a new call abounding for interpreting this NDT as a mandate for broader more diverse topics. The reality is that will create more work to prepare for the teams that choose to debate the topic but will have little to no effect on the teams that refuse to debate the topic. Broader topics that do not require positive government action or are bidirectional will not make teams that won't debate the topic choose to debate the topic. I think that is a con job. I am not opposed to broader topics necessarily. I tend to like the way high school topics are written more than the way college topics are written. I just think people who take the meaning of the outcome of this NDT as proof that we need to make it so people get to talk about anything they want to talk about without having to debate against topicality or framework arguments are interested in constructing a world that might make debate an unending nightmare and not a very good home in which to live. Limits, to me, are a real impact because I feel their impact in my everyday existence.

I want to make a side comment (as if it's possible to identify anything in this ballot as the front or back) about Northwestern. While Northwestern has become a debate machine with a record of success that is frightening, the work effort and commitment that Northwestern puts into debate is to be respected and admired. This year I voted against all three Northwestern teams at this NDT. I may move down their pref sheets as a result but that is the nature of judging. Last year I voted for all three Northwestern teams in elimination rounds and was on the top of a 4-3 and two 3-2 decisions so they probably won't drop me too far. One of the things that impresses me most about Northwestern teams is their work ethic and desire to get better. I have had Northwestern students e-mail me on multiple occasions to ask my extended thoughts about arguments in debate rounds I have judged. The desire to learn how to get better is an amazing commitment that Northwestern students bring to the table. I mention this with a bit of trepidation because I do not want to be inundated with e-mails from debaters asking me about rounds and arguments. To be fair I haven't even responded to many of the e-mails Northwestern debaters have sent me (or as my debaters can attest to many of their e-mails either). I only mention this as an acknowledgement of the commitment that Northwestern brings to working on debate. That commitment is not unique to Northwestern but I thought it bore a mention in this ballot. Northwestern does not deserve to be treated as if it is symbolic of problems in debate, the Northwestern program represents things that are right about debate.

While this ballot has meandered off on a tangent I'll take this opportunity to comment on an unrelated argument in the debate. Emporia argued that oppressed people should not be forced to role play being the oppressor. This idea that debate is about role playing being a part of the government puzzles me greatly. While I have been in debate for 40 years now never once have I role played being part of the government. When I debated and when I have judged debates I have never pretended to be anyone but Scott Harris. Pretending to be Scott Harris is burden enough for me. Scott Harris has formed many opinions about what the government and other institutions should or should not do without ever role

playing being part of those institutions. I would form opinions about things the government does if I had never debated. I cannot imagine a world in which people don't form opinions about the things their government does. I don't know where this vision of debate comes from. I have no idea at all why it would be oppressive for someone to form an opinion about whether or not they think the government should or should not do something. I do not role play being the owner of the Chiefs when I argue with my friends about who they should take with the first pick in this year's NFL draft. I do not role play coaching the basketball team or being a player if I argue with friends about coaching decisions or player decisions made during the NCAA tournament. If I argue with someone about whether or not the government should use torture or drone strikes I can do that and form opinions without ever role playing that I am part of the government. Sometimes the things that debaters argue is happening in debates puzzle me because they seem to be based on a vision of debate that is foreign to what I think happens in a debate round.

This ballot recognizes that reality is socially constructed. The reality of my interpretation of the arguments in the debate can be disputed and disagreed with. When I judge debates on panels I sometimes agree more with the reasoning of the judges who vote against me than the judges who vote with me. Being in a 3-2 decision on this panel does not make me "right" and the judges who voted the other way "wrong." This ballot could have been written to justify a win by the negative. There are many areas of the flow where the negative is clearly ahead and there are arguments the negative made that are not answered by the affirmative. This ballot is not more correct because it is part of a majority. The last time I judged the final round of the NDT I was part of the minority of a 3-2 decision and in my socially constructed reality the Emory team of Bailey/Ghali won the NDT on topicality. Rod Phares and I saw the debate in exactly the same way. It is why when ranking the greatest teams of all time I rank Bailey/Ghali higher than others do because I define them as an NDT winner. Some may dispute this ballots reading of what is and is not the nature of the arguments in this debate or the relative importance given to those arguments. Northwestern will think they made the arguments this ballot says they needed to have made to win this ballot. Reality is for each of us a product of our social constructions.

The fact that reality is socially constructed is manifest in other ways in this debate round. The 1AR makes a claim during the debate that during the awards banquet whites stood up for whites and blacks stood up for blacks. I know this claim to be factually incorrect. I was present in the room. I know when I stood or didn't stand and I know when many others stood or did not stand. The awards ceremony has long been a process that fascinates me. The process of standing to recognize the achievements of particular teams or individuals is used in many different ways. It is most often used as a sign of the solidarity of Districts. Most people stand for teams from their district. There are many other reasons people stand for particular teams. Some people stand to recognize seniors. Some stand to recognize their friends. Some stand to recognize people who have dealt with some adversity such as being pulled up four consecutive years in round eight. (That seems like one of the most unfair things I have heard of at the NDT). Some stand to recognize debaters they have judged frequently. Some stand to recognize first round teams who did not clear or who lost in the doubles. I have always thought that the most important ovations are for the debaters at their final NDT who did not clear but are uniquely respected by the community. There are individual students over the years that I have had a certain amount of pride in watching the community stand up for at the award ceremony. I felt good that Melanie and Amanda got a large ovation this year. There are two that stand out as particular memories for me. I felt

pride for two students who debated for me but finished their careers debating for others. I was proud of the ovation Chris Thomas received his senior year. I was proud of the ovation Daryl Burch received his senior year. I know that the claim made in the debate is factually incorrect and yet for some it is perceived to be a reality. Reality is socially constructed. What this ballot wants to reflect on is why reality gets constructed the way it does. I have always wanted my standing to mean something special which is why I stand less frequently. I stood for Emporia because it meant something to me. They are from my district, they are a first round, they are persons of color and one of them is a senior who is a four time qualifier for the NDT who I think is a phenomenally talented debater. Those are auto stand check boxes for me standing. I have never given much thought to the feelings of debaters for whom I do not choose to stand. While standing is an act of affirmation the debaters who I do not stand for can read it as an act of rejection. It can be interpreted in ways it is never intended. I do not know where the perception that standing is racially divided comes from but I cannot deny that someone's perceptions of reality are reality for them. Meaning is given to behaviors that become reality for individuals regardless of the accuracy of those perceptions. I do not talk to very many people in the debate community. While debate empowered me in many ways I am still an incredibly introverted person for whom social interaction is often a painful experience. I have never really reflected on the fact that people whom I don't talk to will read my not talking to them as a sign of dislike or disrespect or just some kind of dis in general. I cannot control how others will construct reality around my actions but I do need to be more self-conscious about the fact that my communication behaviors have influence beyond my intentions.

This ballot, like the introductions by the debaters, is running and rambling far longer than intended. This ballot is going to say things that might be better left unsaid. This ballot may say things that will get me in trouble and make people angry with me. This ballot seems to have taken on a life of its own. Like the honey badger this ballot doesn't give a (word that starts with my initials) about what people think. Actually, this ballot probably cares too much about what people think. This ballot is not intended to be a Jerry Maguire type manifesto but this ballot feels the need to express opinions about the events of the past few weeks. This ballot is intended to be self-reflexive about my own role in the debate community. This ballot is intended to be a call for self-reflexivity by everyone in the debate community. This ballot is not intended to tell people what to think but to encourage people to do more reflexive thinking.

This ballot believes that there is much for the debate community to be proud of at this NDT. Weber State did a phenomenal job hosting the tournament. Idaho State did an equally fabulous job in hosting CEDA nationals. Both Emporia and Northwestern should be proud of their achievements in reaching the final round. Emporia should be especially proud to be the first team to win both the CEDA and NDT championships. There was success for minorities at the top of the bracket and in elimination rounds that is historic. All four members of the final round represented underrepresented minorities in debate (although oddly the content of the debate acted as if one of the teams were composed of two white males). The debate might be read as a historic moment in debate as significant as Obama winning the presidency. The fact that two students who are the product of urban debate league backgrounds won the NDT is a tremendous moment in debate that reflects on the opportunity for achievement and success that can be obtained in debate. This debate has affirmed that debate can be a welcoming home.

This ballot believes however that there are many ways in which the debate home has a long way to go and many issues to work on. Participation numbers for minorities are still too low in debate. We also have significant gender problems in debate that seem to be invisible and unacknowledged. Last year I

did not even notice that my team was the only team competing at the NDT composed of two females. This year there were only four such teams. This year 34 of the 156 competitors were female. From 1947 until 2013 I believe the percent of female participants have ranged from 14-24%. This year it was 22%. Given that women make up 57% of the collegiate student population those numbers seem incredibly consistently low. The number of women and minorities in the judging pool and coaching ranks are way too low. The diversity of the judges in the elimination round pool is too low. This ballot does not purport to know the answer to these problems but the community needs to continue to work on making opportunities in debate broader than they have been to this point. I do not tend to believe that the key to participation lies in letting people say whatever they want in debates. I think the answer lies in more minority scholarships and more connections between the collegiate community and urban debate leagues that result in opportunities to attend college.

This ballot has concerns about the messages this debate sends about what it means to be welcomed into the home of debate. Northwestern made an argument that spoke to this concern that could have been more developed in the debate itself. This debate seemed to suggest that the sign that debate can be your home is entirely wrapped up in winning debates. The message seems to be that the winner is accepted and the loser is rejected. I believe that the arguments Northwestern advanced in the debate that being voted against is not a sign of personal rejection and that voting against an argument should not be perceived as an act of psychic violence are important arguments to reflect on. To me one of the most important lessons that debate teaches is that there is a difference between our arguments and our personhood. One of the problems in our contemporary society is that people have trouble differentiating between arguments and the identity of the person making the argument. If you hate the argument you must hate the person making the argument because we have trouble differentiating people from their arguments. The reason many arguments end up in violent fights in society is the inability to separate people from their arguments. People outside of debate (or the law) are often confused by how debaters (or lawyers) can argue passionately with one another and then be friends after the argument. It is because we generally separate our disagreements over arguments from our opinions about each other as people. There are two concerns this ballot has about the implications of where this debate has positioned us as a community. First, the explosion of arguments centered in identity makes it difficult to separate arguments from people. If I argue that a vote for me is a vote for my ability to express my Quare identity it by definition constructs a reality that a vote against me is a rejection of my identity. The nature of arguments centered in identity puts the other team in a fairly precarious position in debates and places the judges in uncomfortable positions as well. While discomfort may not necessarily be a bad thing it has significant implications for what debating and deciding debates means or is perceived to mean in socially constructed realities. I hope we can get beyond a point where the only perceived route to victory for some minority debaters is to rail against exclusion in debate.

The second concern is the emphasis on winning as the sign evidence of debate being a home. The reality is that many debaters do not win the majority of their debates. The majority of debaters will never win the NDT. The majority of debaters will never attend the NDT. Every debate has a loser. Losing should not be a sign of expulsion from the home. Years ago on van trips we used to play a game which we called the green weenie award. We would take the results packet and have everyone in the van guess who was the team that was the bottom seed of the tournament. The game may have had a certain amount of arrogant cruelty in it. I would sometimes wonder what it was that made the teams

who didn't win debates, who didn't ever clear, come back the next week. As a community we get so caught up sometimes in defining our wins as successes and our losses as failures that we have lost sight of what it is that makes debate a special home in the first place. Debate cannot only be a home for the winner or it would by definition have become not a home for the majority of its participants. This ballot hopes that we can learn to recognize that the experience of losing debates is part of being welcomed in debate as well. Getting the opportunity to debate itself has tremendous value. The value is not contained in the win but is contained in the experience itself. As a coach I have to remember sometimes that my failures are only failures if I view them as failures. I need to make sure that I value all of my debaters equally whether they win their debates or lose them. When my teams lose I need to not view them as losers or the judges who voted against them as villains. Debate is an educational process. We often learn more when we lose than when we win. Debate tends to attract hyper-competitive people who hate to lose. I hate to lose. I do not want to lose at anything. Losing is an inevitable part of life. Debate needs to feel like a home for both the winners and the losers because all of us experience losing in debate. Learning how to win with class and lose with dignity is an important life lesson that I need to constantly work on myself. Learning to value the losses as much as the wins is the hardest part for me but I believe it is vital if debate is really going to be a home for all of its participants.

This ballot is a call for reflection. It is a brief glimpse into my own post NDT final round reflection. I hope that the community as a whole will reflect on the positive and negative lessons to learn from this NDT. I also hope that members of the community who self-identify with the resistance movement will be reflexive as well. Any revolution leaves violence in its wake and there were many signs of violence in the past couple of weeks as well. There was what was described to me as an ugly confrontation in the quarters of CEDA that left one of my debaters severely disillusioned with what she thought was a solidarity movement. I watched a debate in which a woman was not allowed to answer questions in cross examination that made me incredibly uncomfortable. There was post round treatment of judges by losing teams that left judges whom I respect highly devastated and questioning whether or not they wanted to be part of this community. I have heard from NDT alumni who found the online comments during the debate so offensive that they questioned whether they wanted to continue considering debate a home they should be financially supporting. There have been perceptions of reality produced that leave me puzzled. I heard there were claims of a vast media conspiracy that Emporia's win would be less reported in the media than the wins of other teams because of the color of their skin. That is so absurd in so many ways that the fact that anyone would perceive it to be reality leaves me sad, and maybe a little frightened. If debate is to be truly a home we all need to look beyond our narrow self-interest of winning debates or pursuing our own social agenda and think about the reality of how we treat others around us. If this is to be a home we all need to be more reflexive about the social realities we construct. I am concerned that some members of the resistance are so busy socially constructing enemies that they may lose sight of who their allies are as they throw them under the bus. I have had people tell me that Kansas will never win CEDA because we aren't peopley enough to win "The People's Championship." Clearly many believed prior to this weekend that there was a conspiracy to keep teams with alternative forms of arguing from winning the NDT. I think both of those constructions of reality are, and always have been, a bunch of nonsense. I have faith in the people in this community. I have faith in argument and arguing. I believe that the way to win debates is to make better arguments and that better arguments are what get rewarded in debates. I believe that one of the most important things said in the final round was the claim made by Northwestern that "debate is bigger than any one

person.” I believe in debate. I believe in the debate community. I believe that debate is one of the most valuable educational programs in the country and I am proud that it is my home.

Everybody look around

Cause there's a reason to rejoice you see

Everybody come out

Everybody look up

And feel the hope that we've been waiting for

Everybody's glad

Because our silent fear and dread is gone.

Freedom, you see has got our hearts singing so joyfully

Can't you feel a brand new day?

Can't you feel a brand new day?

Can't you feel a brand new day?

Can't you feel a brand new day?

Hello world

It's like a different way of living now

And thank you world

We always knew that we'd be free somehow in harmony

And show the world that we've got liberty.

“A Brand New Day”

Dorothy from “The Wiz”

Whitmore

I want to begin this ballot by saying what a tremendous honor it was to be chosen to judge the final round. I'm no stranger to either team, but I've judged both less than I would have liked. When I heard the news of who was debating in the finals, I knew there was an outside chance I might be on a card, but I didn't get my hopes up too high. I've judged very few 'big' debates in my career. In particular I want to say what a privilege it was to judge both of the seniors in this debate:

I remember watching Peyton as a middle-schooler doing a demo debate for campers at the ENDI. Even then, there was buzz about how good she and Jenn would be. I'm sure Shuntá is so proud of you, Peyton, but I'm certain she's probably already told you that.

Ryan, I didn't think I would get to judge you again after that Minnesota round. It was clear that we weren't on the same page, and I could sense your frustration. I'm happy you gave me another chance. The things you said about debating with Elijah making you better really resonated with me. It was clear that you were debating on another level. Those rounds against MSU were masterpieces. Though you and Elijah only debated at three tournaments together, you've put your names in the conversation for one of the best teams of recent memory.

I voted negative for Northwestern.

The negative has advanced the argument that the affirmative's choice to not argue for a topical action has undermined the value of the debate.

The affirmative advances several arguments in response:

- The negative argument is presumptive of an equal playing ground that doesn't exist
- The negative's argument is exclusionary of certain people. In this particular instance, black quares (sp?).
- The affirmative is able to achieve/have a valuable debate without meeting the negative's requirements.
- The negative should just accept the affirmative for who they are (or rather how they debate).

The negative doesn't seem to discount the existence of inequality. Numerous arguments in the round and pieces of evidence make recognition that social ills do exist. The Lundberg evidence in particular speaks to "issues of class, gender, and racial justice." Rather, both teams seem to be in agreement that finding a strategy to address those ills would be advantageous.

The affirmative has an additional argument that negative's demand for a text is a form of exclusion (Conquergood). I really didn't think the scriptocentrism evidence was very good. The Affirmative did a much better job debating this argument without the evidence, which makes some reference to western eurocentrism. It's here that I think the several pieces of Anderson evidence that the negative reads are particularly effective. I can't stress how good this evidence is for refuting many of affirmative's exclusion claims. It is possible to acknowledge that identity matters and is important, but it can never be used as a reason for why argument should be avoided. The imposition of a standard for argument is not a

'coercive norm.' The use of identity to avoid argument on a common ground undermines democratic debate in a way that is impacted by the negative's Lundberg evidence.

Additionally, the negative has advanced the Galloway argument that a failure to engage the negative on the resolution is exclusionary of the negative. As I have stated in my judging philosophy, this argument has a lot of salience with me. I think it also highlights the negative argument that any decision is necessarily a decision to exclude. The argument that the ballot is not a condemnation of either side, but rather a determination of who has done the better debating is also one that I find myself receptive to.

I think the more important aspect of the affirmative argument is that inequality informs the way people approach debate. It is here that Ryan and Elijah make some of their more impassioned pleas and arguments. I think the affirmative makes good/strong arguments about why structures of oppression can be confronted. I think the trouble with these arguments in the context of the Johnson evidence is that they support the negative's claim that one can use narrative/personal experience to inform advocacy of policy. As such, I don't think they function as offense against the negative's framework claim. This is where my ballot differs largely from Harris'. I thought the Negative did a better job on the 'perm' debate. I don't think 'perm' is the appropriate term. Rather, I think the negative did a better job of arguing that there could be a place for the affirmative in a world where everyone reads a topical plan text.

The last argument concerns whether the negative has presented an actionable argument against the affirmative. This is the argument I struggled the most with. The argument seems to be that, even if there is a value to the way the negative thinks we should debate, I should just let the affirmative be. The affirmative does a good job in cross-ex of explaining that the negative can have a policy debate when they debate policy teams. They even do a good job of pointing out that when they debate teams like Oklahoma, neither side has made a framework argument. I thought that the Affirmative was lacking in the response to the question of "what do we do when we debate you?" I think there are several arguments for why I should encourage the most effective skill building if the end goal is achieving change. A phrase from the 2NR that resonates with me... "Debate is bigger than any of us." There is value in encouraging others to get the most out of debate. There was a line in the affirmative evidence about Dorothy's friends wanting to make sure she got home safely. If they are truly concerned, shouldn't they encourage Dorothy to take the safest path? I don't think debate will end global warming or cure all social ills, but I do think the negative has won that policy debate is the more effective method of achieving change.

Asides:

There has been a lot of talk about the importance of this round and the need to change the way we structure our resolutions. Ironically, I'm reminded of George W.'s claim to a "mandate" following the Bush v. Gore decision. I sincerely hope nothing comes of this. Obviously my decision in this round will be used to discount my opinion on this matter. I hope that those who are calling for a radical change in the way we debate will look closely to Harris' ballot. This was an excellent debate. It was very close (as the decision would imply), and there is no doubt that Ryan and Elijah's identities made it a historic event. I don't want to take anything away from their accomplishment, but also don't want to see their victory hijacked by some in the community who have an agenda for changing the resolution. The topic process was mentioned only a few times in the debate. At one point, Ryan asked, "Did I get to vote for the topic?" If I had been Dallas (...and sometimes I wish I was), I would have said, "YES!" More appropriately,

your school got to vote, Ryan. The topic process is fundamentally a democratic one. I fully encourage everyone to participate in forming and shaping the topic.

There has also been some discussion of Ryan and Elijah's behavior in the round. I couldn't disagree more with the criticism. While I did judge a rather heated debate in the elims of Northwestern where aggression may have come close to crossing a line, I thought they debated with a firm unwavering confidence and assertiveness that is emblematic of good debate. They debated with swagger, and they shouldn't be ashamed nor condemned for it.