

# Daddy Master Notes

The notes for this episode are identical to the previous

The prosecution (Jenna and her assistant Evan Essence [thanks Dylan Caudill]) and the defense (the daddies) are both trying to score points. Whichever side has the most points will win the case.

Each side can call two witnesses, who are open to cross-examination by opposing counsel.

### The charges against Glenn Close are:

Being a bad father

Being a bad person

If found guilty, Glenn Close could be sentenced to any, some, or all of the following punishments:

Hard Labor

Loss of all wealth

Life imprisonment

All other daddies share his punishment

Loss of parental rights over Nick Close, who will become magically incapable of viewing you as a father Execution

You can call objections against opposing counsel for:

Irrelevance

Leading

Badgering/Argumentative

Repetition (asked and answered)

Vagueness

Witness not responding to the question

Question calls for speculation

Hearsay

Whichever team scores the most objections gets an extra d12 to roll during scoring.

#### How to win:

Firstly, even though Glenn is facing two charges (bad father and bad person), we're just gonna treat them like one charge, basically.

As counsel, you can put forth certain specific arguments that support your side. The arguments are specific, evidence- or rhetoric-based premises that support a larger conclusion. So, if I'm prosecution and I'm trying to prove "Glenn is a bad father," then one argument I might make is, "because he smokes pot in front of his child, and smoking pot is wrong." If I were the defense, I might try to dismantle this argument by arguing, "it's okay to smoke pot in front of your child."

The judge will attach a certain dice value to each specific argument, from a d4 all the way up to a d12. This represents how many points that argument is worth for the side that presented it.

At the end of the trial, the judge will roll all the dice for all the non-dismantled arguments on each side (whether or not counsel dismantles an argument will be decided by the jury -- more on that in a second), and whichever side rolls the largest sum of points will win.

In order to put forth an argument, you must be overt about it. You must say something like "the defense argues that..." before making your argument.

## The Jury process:

After both sides have called all their witnesses and made their closing statements, a jury of twelve randomly

selected patreon members will talk amongst themselves in a private discord room I'm in charge of. They will examine the individual arguments made by each side, and determine which, if any, arguments were dismantled by opposing counsel.

The jury does NOT decide whether Glenn is guilty or innocent overall — that is decided by the dice rolls at the end of the game. The jury DOES decide whether something an argument "Glenn smokes pot in front of his child, which is wrong" should be allowed in the final point tally. If opposing counsel did a good enough job of disproving "Glenn smokes pot in front of his child, which is wrong," perhaps by arguing "it's okay to smoke pot in front of your child," then that argument is dismantled and removed, and the judge will not roll dice for it.

Once the jury has accepted or dismantled all the available arguments, the judge will collect the remaining arguments and roll the dice he assigned for them. This gives him the final justice score for each side, which will determine which side won.

#### Punishment:

If Glenn is found guilty, the judge will...somehow...roll for his punishment, and the roll will be worse depending on how much the defense lost by. Maybe the roll has disadvantage if the defense loses by a landslide, I dunno.

Maybe it's a d6, and he rolls X number of times, where X is a measure of how badly he lost? I dunno. I'll figure that out, and you don't have to worry about it right now.

# Audio Edit Notes & Commentary

## Title and Intro Notes

The People's Court is, admittedly, probably too old a reference even for us, but the distinctive introduction allowed us to do a "Glenn take" on it, which I think ends up pretty funny.

Overall (with 6 people) a big part of the editing of this episode had a lot more micro sliding around for banter and comprehension, especially for spacing out quips from different people that recorded overlapped.

# Episode Notes with Timestamps

- 9:30 Prior to recording, both podcast cats were acting up. Weird night for cats in Los Angeles.
- 11:50 Ron/Beth knowing who Danielle Peck is (who, as you probably heard in the episode outro, is a reference to a friend of hers) doesn't quite make sense to the rest of us, so by removing this particular reaction from Ron helps play it as simply a reference, which then gets explained post episode.
- 12:21 The recording, appended to the uncut episode, was just between Anthony and myself. One thing to note is that Anthony probably expected Glenn to withhold more of that information, which allowed for a bit of information discrepancy drama, but as Glenn basically relays the contents of what he heard, ends up being logistically unnecessary.
- 14:30 Keeping the energy up for Danielle's rant against the dads is important for the overall comedy for this which leads to Bill's plan being foiled.
- 16:04 A small section where Beth talks about the Danielle Peck character is omitted as it contained non-pertinent personal information.
- This "return to the quest giver" thing is 100% a side effect of us playing a lot of Destiny 2 lately. The detail of Nick and the anchor raises more questions than necessary at this point in the story, so omitted until it (very likely) will get brought up again when it's more pertinent later. Also the question of where the stuff is becomes relevant, so isn't omitted

- fully, but repositioned to seem like a natural question. 26:52 Now the podcast has captured real hiccups and a real sneeze. 28:54 The question of Nick showing up has a bit of a discussion later on anyway, so there's no need to get into this now and it's better I think to get faster to the trial. 44:00 A lot of the discussion back and forth doesn't require much cleanup - just tightening of spaces between responses and removing unnecessary "yeah's." 48:17 A smattering of out of character discussion on the shape of the argumentation removed. Some clean up with getting the exact right definition. 55:43 Glenn's response to how good he is at weed should've been "HELL YEAH" in retrospect. 1:04:12 1:05:21 (The Destiny 2 clan is now full I'm afraid) A slight addition in terms of the detail of Glenn/Bill's scam as a child. 1:15:13 1:22:42 Matt/Darryl suggests the biggest possible zag direction we could have gone, and it certainly feels like, if we were calling up 3 witnesses, this would be a perfect 3rd witness to call, but pulling Nick into the scenario is both motivated by the terms of the trial as well as would be a good witness to pull to move the Glenn story along.
- 1:24:43 Anthony had taken off his headphones here so as not to hear our deliberations, but we needed him to chime in as Paeden.
- 1:27:38 "Zoom" became a verb this year, huh?
- 1:57:33 As you can hear, when Will gets on a roll, there's very little actual editing necessary.