

## 2026 – NSDA Campus, KY/US

### Judge Signup

## Show

Hide



Debated for 3 years in LD at Bronx Science. I don't debate in college.

## Paradigms

Generally prefer listening to lay arguments (haven't debated in a while) but I'm fine with spreading if you send the doc (which you probably should anyways). Or circuit arguments as long as you're not dumping offs.

Give a roadmap before your speech, signpost, weigh, slow down on the tags you want to emphasize, a.k.a. make your route to the ballot as clear as possible. Just make it easy for me to vote for you!

Don't be rude to your opponent. I will not vote on arguments about their character (callouts and whatnot), especially for things outside of the debate.

---

**Swapna Ayilliath Kutteri**

Duck Academy

2 rounds



---

hello! i am a lay parent judge!

please speak slowly and clearly so I can easily note down everything you say.

i'm not an experienced judge and i only know the bare minimums of public forum debate.

i'll do my best to be really fair, good luck for your rounds!

---

**Kirti Baldawa**

Dougherty Valley High School

2 rounds



---

*Last changed on Sun October 27, 2024 at 3:25 PM PST*

I am somewhat experienced in speech and debate. I prefer use of technical language over jargons.

I will be open to hear both sides of the arguments and open to new ideas.

I will be taking notes on key argument during the process. Please speak slowly and clearly.

---

**Brendan Bauschard**

NAVI Debate

6 rounds



---

**Denzel Bell**

Briar Woods

6 rounds



---

Hey,

My E-Mail is dbell212518@gmail.com (for docs),

**Read by AI policy at the bottom**

PF: I'm a hyper tech judge I do policy debate in college i'll vote on any absurdity I will catch anything at any speed it's fine for the most part but ofc you have to be clear

(Policy)

tech>truth (unless it's absurdly stupid)

I'm not bias, I haven't been in the activity long enough to develop preferences for everything, just be explanative and argue it well and I can vote on it.

**THEORY**

My only opinion that differs is on theory: "condo bad, pics bad, 50 state fiat bad" ect... is almost never a reason to reject a team but almost always a good reason to reject an argument.

**Generics**

Try your hardest not to drop arguments, dropped arguments are considered true and I will vote on that.

Try your hardest to articulate why I should vote for your stance,

Don't just say "we are winning on xyz" then move on. Spend some time on the 'why' even if it is just 20 seconds.

In the last speeches spell out why you are winning and why the other side is losing.

Basically, project what my ballot should be through proper explanation of your warrants.

Don't assume I know what you're talking about when you explain something (as should with any other judge), in cases where I do know what you're talking about from experience out of round it's unlikely that I'll vote on an unexplained argument.

Have fun, don't be overly bearing in crossx it's annoying and corny, if you have a point that you think you're winning in cross x you don't have to be rude to make me realize that.

If you debate more off of the flow (doesn't mean you have to be actively looking at it, I can tell if you're debating off of the flow) huge speak boost.

AI: (Highschool) (policy/pf)

AI use is very noticeable to me, I graduated high school last year I know when you're using it every single time, if the other team is doing clear thought out line by line and speeches of their own, I will HEAVILY lean on their side on every single flow even negating tech to some extent because as a judge I believe this is one of the only things my ballot and evaluate can actually prevent/solve.

Chat gpt in Highschool rounds is for the most part, very cringe, you won't learn anything if you don't have to mentally process what you're interacting with. I'll probably only nuke your speaks if I realize that your ENTIRE speech is chat gpt. Its use is inevitable, therefor using it in round to explain confusing arguments/extend 1 off cards on the fly can be fine most of the times, but if your prep is just you copying your opponent's entire speech into the prompt and typing "pls respond," then don't do debate... it's not that serious. But I find that in most rounds both teams are using it so it's hard to reflect that in speaks/ballot. If I can tell all of the args are yours, you will get big speak boost like at least a flat 28.5

---

Ken Bhardwaj

Hire

4 rounds



*Last changed on Wed October 23, 2024 at 8:31 AM PST*

Add me to the email chain: kenbhardwaj2@gmail.com

Please let me know if I can do anything to accommodate you in your round.

**About Me:**

Two years of experience at Coral Academy in Public Forum (dabbled in DUO, LD, EXT, XDB, and WSD); competed nationally for one year went to the TOC and won the Nevada State Championship. Now I'm a pre-med sophomore at the University of Nevada, where I'm studying Neuroscience and Journalism.

**PARADIGM**

**Novices:** Be good on the flow and don't be offensive. I give out good speaks for impactful endings, jokes, personality, and efficiency. There are other ways to get good speaks, but without one of those, a 30 is hard to attain.

**TLDR:** Reasonably Tech > Truth. I like weighing. 50/50 chance I adapt on a lay panel. Write my RFD for me in the last speech. I'll disclose my decision (if tournament rules allow for it) and give some level of feedback.

**Pref Sheet:**

- 1 — Tech Substance
- 2 — Phil, Theory
- 3 — Stock/Topical K's
- 4 — T, Identity K's
- 5 — Tricks

**Prep Time:**

Track your own time, I trust you won't lie to me. Flex prep is fine.

**Evidence:**

Make the evidence exchange quick. I may take a peek at your cards, but I won't do anything about it unless the other team calls it out. If you get caught paraphrasing in an extreme manner, I'll dock speaks accordingly. Engaging with evidence is important.

**Speeches:**

You can speak at a faster speed. Do send me docs, but I won't use it as an aid during your speech. You get two clears before I stop flowing. Recently I've found that timing speeches tends to slow my flow, so please raise your phone for overtime responses.

### Cross:

Nothing said in cross goes on my flow unless it's brought forward into subsequent speeches. Be assertive, but not overly aggressive. A good cross will benefit your speaks, even if you lose the round overall. If everyone is in agreement we can skip grand for a minute of extra prep. Open cross is fine if that's your preference, just make sure to ask the other team first.

### 2nd Rebuttal:

2NC disads are fine. Roadmap, signpost, and frontline. If no frontlining, you'll lose and I'll be sad. Generated offense here has to be in the form of turns, no new disads, no new framing.

### Summary:

**No new evidence.** (Unless it's to frontline in first summary)

Defense isn't sticky. Extend defense in every speech; you can't forget to extend a piece of it in summary and do a ritual in final focus to summon it. I should be able to draw a line from the 2AC to the 2AR.

Extensions don't have to be perfect. As long as you extend uniqueness, links, and impact, you're good. Line-by-line frontlines count as extensions. **Collapsing is good here**

Weighing is important. I like seeing comparisons between evidence, impact scenarios, and links. This means that the weighing has to be comparative. Weighing is not "we cause a nuclear war" and nothing else. I want to hear "We outweigh on timeframe because our impact triggers instantly while theirs takes x years" – that's direct. If teams present different weighing mechanisms, please meta-weigh. If neither side meta-weighs, I default to timeframe + magnitude.

### Final Focus:

Everything in FF should've been in summary.

I just want a solid explanation as to why you won the round. You can do it line by line, or go by biggest voting issues. Just make sure you're extending what was said in summary.

### Framing:

I like a good framing debate. I won't accept "Other team has to respond in their constructive" or "Other teams can't read link-ins to the framing" as underviews or general responses.

### Theory:

Disclosure is good, paraphrasing is bad. If there's no offense from either side I err to those positions, but won't hack for them. If you're varsity anything is fair game, "theory is dumb" and "we don't know how to respond" are non-responses.

I won't vote theory down simply because it isn't formatted the 'correct' way. If there is an allegation of abuse and that abuse is **substantiated**, I will treat it the same way I would a shell. Be sure to explain why they should lose the round, not just the argument.

### Content Warnings:

They're okay, but I think there is a very real risk of it being co-opted by structural oppressors to suppress marginalized voices, as history has shown with the censorship of civil rights, queer, and feminist discourse. While I acknowledge the real impact of trauma, I fear that empowering gatekeepers to restrict speech does more harm than good, reinforcing systemic oppression rather than dismantling it. That being said, I'm not debating you on whether the argument has validity or not, I will listen to and engage with the argument, I just think you should be wary of running it in front of me.

### K's:

Just send a doc so I can follow along. Cross is important in these rounds. I won't vote on something I don't understand because you tell me I'm supposed to. Don't run Afro-pess if you're not Black, don't run Fem-Rage if you're not female-identifying.

### Speaks:

I generally give high speaks (28 - 29.5 range), but it's not impossible to get a 30 from me. Have a good strategy (like going for turns, innovative weighing), have a personality, and you'll be guaranteed high speaks. A Taylor Swift reference gets a +0.1, stackable to 0.5.

If you have further questions about why I voted a certain way, you can email me and I'll get back to you as soon as I can. If you have any questions not covered by this paradigm, feel free to hit up the email at the top or ask me before the round starts.

Good luck, have fun, and do your best!

---

Jamie Brashear

Avenues: The World School

3 rounds



*Last changed on Sat October 26, 2024 at 6:51 AM EST*

Send speech docs: brashearjamie@gmail.com

I am a fairly experienced lay judge who can follow spreading.

If you believe the other side has dropped a contention, I encourage you to point that out.

If there is a problem with the other side's evidence, call it to my attention. I will examine the evidence in those cases.



What I Prefer to See in a Debate:

1. Please use sources/references for all facts that you are bringing up. I expect facts as I will not believe you if you don't have your facts backed up.
2. Don't eyeroll your opponent or speak in a manner that's rude. I mean don't be rude with opponent team.
3. Please don't go too fast. I can follow arguments faster but not super, super fast.
4. Don't give me hypotheticals and try not to use just theory to support your points. Real solutions/real things get across to me much better.
5. I'll only call for facts if you and your opponent are saying opposite things about the same exact thing.



parent judge

ill keep track of time but i also expect debaters to

if you are going to send evidence please do it quickly

note: english is not my first language

key points

1. speak **slow**, loud, and clear
2. be respectful
3. explain everything clearly in a logical way
4. compare both sides and explain why you won very clearly in the backhalf
5. **signpost signpost signpost**



I have been judging debate for approximately a year and a half and have evaluated rounds at many tournaments, beginning in Fall 2024, including the GMU Patriot Games. I am a parent judge with experience across multiple formats.

I value respectful engagement above all - toward opponents, partners, and the activity itself. Clear, logical argumentation is essential. I am persuaded by well-structured cases supported by statistics, evidence, and explicit weighing. If you want to win my ballot, tell me why your impacts matter more and by how much. Numbers, comparative analysis, and clear prioritization go a long way.

I appreciate dynamic, engaging speaking, but I am equally receptive to slower, very well-articulated delivery, provided clarity and organization are maintained. Speed is fine if it remains intelligible; clarity always outweighs pace.

I view cross-examination as a critical strategic moment. Use it to expose weaknesses, clarify assumptions, and set up later arguments. Effective cross-ex should advance your narrative or undermine your opponent's case, not just fill time.



**Background:** Parent judge. No HS/college debate experience. CPA by training. I've judged 175+ rounds in ~3 years and I flow carefully (not perfectly).

**How I vote:** I vote off the flow. *If it's not in Final Focus, it's not in my decision.* I compare the Final Focuses, resolve the contested clashes, apply established defense, and decide on the best-explained/weighed world. I won't reconstruct missing links or revive dropped arguments.

**Delivery:** Conversational pace. Don't spread or speed-read. Clear roadmaps/signposting and consistent tags. If I can't flow it, I can't evaluate it. Crossfire isn't flowed; if it matters, say it in your next speech. After any jargon, give the "so what" in plain English.

**Rules/structure:** Not topical = not on my ballot. No new arguments after Rebuttal. New evidence in Summary only to answer new material; no new links/warrants. Dropped then revived = new argument = too late. If you claim a turn, label it and explain the "so what."

**Impacts/weighting:** Do the link chain and comparative weighing (probability/magnitude/timeframe/scope). Don't just name impacts.

**Politics:** No ideology filters. Win the warrants, win my ballot. Ballot isn't a patriotism, or "did I sound left-leaning enough" test.

**Final Focus:** Give me a clear story + weighing, not a frantic checklist. If I can paste it into Tabroom with minimal editing, we're both having a great day.

---

Joel Chen

Dougherty Valley High School

6 rounds



### Background

I'm a first-time judge and still learning debate. I'm here to listen carefully, keep the round fair, and decide based only on what happens in the debate. Clear explanation helps a lot.

### How I decide

I vote for the side that best explains:

- what their main arguments are
- why they matter
- why they outweigh the other side

Please tell me directly how to evaluate the round and why you win.

### Speed & clarity

Conversational or slightly faster is great.

I'm not comfortable with very fast spreading. If I can't understand it, I can't evaluate it. Signposting and organization are appreciated.

### Arguments

I'm open to most arguments as long as they're explained clearly and in plain language. Quality of explanation matters more than the number of arguments. Impact comparison is very helpful.

### Evidence

Explain your evidence and how it supports your claims. I evaluate based on what's said in the round.

### Conduct & points

Be respectful and professional.

Speaker points reflect clarity, organization, and persuasiveness.

### Bottom line

Help me follow the round, tell me what the key issues are, and explain why you win. Thanks, and good luck!

---

Ting Chen

Pacific Blue Preparatory

4 rounds



---

*Last changed on Wed September 4, 2024 at 11:41 AM PST*

Lay Judge. I am super unfamiliar with the topic. please go extremely slow otherwise I will not be able to understand your arguments. I value presence, confidence, and also

argument quality.

---

Young Cho

BASIS Peoria Independent

2 rounds



*Last changed on Sat January 6, 2024 at 1:36 AM MST*

This is my 3rd year judging debates for BASIS Peoria.

You get my ballot if you present clear structure of speeches and contentions/arguments and most importantly, strong delivery. Give off-time roadmaps! I am open-minded to all arguments (no extinction impacts) but, there has to be clear links. If the links are not clear to me, I will not vote you, even if you have simple arguments to understand.

NO SPREADING\*\*

For speaks:

30 - if you are the best speaker I've seen judging so far.

27 to 29 - you fall in the average to good category.

26 below - you need work.

Please time yourselves and raise your hand if your opponents are over time. Grace period is just finishing your sentence and anytime after that I'm docking speaks.

Be respectful - everyone is doing this activity because they love to do it.

---

Kwok Choi

Dougherty Valley High School

4 rounds



I am a fairly new judge with one time judge experience.

---

Beth Cole

Hire

6 rounds



*Last changed on Tue September 24, 2024 at 10:22 AM EST*

My background: I am a former CEDA debater (1987-89) and CEDA coach (1990-93) from East Tennessee State University. Upon my retirement in August 2021 I've judged numerous at numerous debate tournaments for PF, LD, IDPA, Parli, and Big Questions (mostly PF and LD). (FYI, when I participated in CEDA it was quasi-policy, not true policy like it is today.)

Speed: I can keep up with a quick-ish speed - enunciation is very important! Pre round I can do a "speed test" and let you know what I think of a participant's speech speed if anyone wants to. I think it is especially important to make sure cases are comprehensible. I look at speech docs if something only if evidence is questioned. I was never a super speed debater and didn't encourage my students to speed. Please keep all this in mind if you normally utilize speedy delivery.

Theory: I am familiar with topicality and if other theory is introduced, I could probably understand it. (I also used to run hasty generalization but not sure if that's still a thing or not.) Theory is best used when it's pertinent to a round, not added for filler and needs to be well developed if I am expected to vote on it. That being said, I also give the team defending themselves against a theory shell quite a bit of latitude to do so; I look more at the big picture of theory vs. arguing a dropped point or 2 and trying to pull it through to win. Please do not run poorly developed/poorly substantiated disclosure theory especially if you're not meeting the disclosure standards you're arguing your opponent does not meet.

The rounds: Racism/sexism etc. will not be tolerated. Rudeness isn't appreciated either. I do not interject my own thoughts/opinions/judgements to make a decision, I only look at what is provided in the round itself. Re: criteria, I want to hear what the debaters bring forward and not have to come up with my own criteria to judge the round. My default criteria is cost/benefit analysis. I reserve the right to call in evidence. (Once I won a round that came down to a call for evidence, so, it can be important!) As far as overall judging, I always liked what my coach used to say - "write the ballot for me". Debaters need to point out impacts and make solid, logical arguments. I appreciate good weighing and I will weigh the arguments that carried through to the end of the round more heavily than arguments that are not. Let me know what is important to vote on in your round and why. Sign

posting/numbering arguments is appreciated and is VERY important to me; let me know where you plan to go at the top of your speech and also refer back to your roadmap as you go along.

Cross Examination: a good CX that advances the round is always valued. If someone asks a question, please don't interrupt the debater answering the question. I don't like to see a cross ex dominated by one side.

In most rounds I will keep back up speaking time and prep time.

I hope to see enjoyable and educational rounds. You will learn so many valuable skills being a debater! Good luck to all participants!

---

Gist Croft

The Bronx High School Of Science

6 rounds



*Last changed on Thu August 29, 2024 at 5:59 PM EST*

I am a **parent** judge.

I have judged 4 tournaments.

I appreciate maximal respect for opponents.

Please email rhetoric and references pasted as text into the body of an email, not attachment, and include on email chains: gist.croft@gmail.com

---

Bhargava Damaraju

Milpitas



Lay judge, and first time judging, my son is writing this for me. Speak slowly, clearly, and articulate your arguments well. NO PROG (K's, theory, trix, phil, etc) or "layified prog." Avoid FWK debate unless you can explain it REALLY well, but even so, I'd probably not go for it. Try not to speak >150 wpm and always err on the side of overexplaining. Impact weigh starting summary, and do it clearly on impact calc like magnitude, probability, timeframe, etc. No blippy warrants---implicate everything well. NO NEW ARGUMENTS IN FINAL FOCUS!!! Signpost EXCESSIVELY - be really clear when saying "on our case" "down their case."

SEND CASES (CARDS+RHETORIC if read) **AND REBUTTAL CARDS** TO bhargavadm@gmail.com.

use email chain rather than speechdrop

---

Michelle Davies

Summit HS

2 rounds



*Last changed on Wed April 24, 2024 at 4:29 AM EST*

I am a PF lay judge. My daughter competes in PF debate. [Beware ;-)].

I judge based on the rules, not on my personal views or opinion, (which is probably lucky for you). If you say it, I will believe it unless your opponent strikes it down. Crossfire discussions will not be considered in my final decision, so be sure to say what you want to say during the constructive portions of the debate.

I do not respond well to spreading. The quality of your key points is more important than the quantity of words you use. The faster you speak, the harder it is for judges (including me) to keep track of all your points and ensure we can accurately track the flow. You have worked hard building your case so make sure we judges can hear all the important points (i.e., talking like a squirrel who has consumed 200 pots of coffee will not enable judges to hear and comprehend your arguments).

Finally, I worked for many, many years in corporate America. Advice that served me well - and which will serve you well too is - Tell me what you're going to tell me, tell me, and then tell me what you told me. In other words, make the arc of your case crystal clear (extend your case).

---

Hosna Dawlaty

Hire



Hello!



I am a first year at the University of San Francisco studying environmental science and public health. I'm so excited to start judging after all these years of competing!!

### Debate Paradigm

My background in debate is quite long! I have done debate for 6 years, winning 2 ND state championships and runner-up in Public Forum Debate, and going to nationals twice for PF. I have also gone to nationals in congressional debate-senate as well. If you're reading this, I have been exactly in your shoes of reading the judge paradigm 5 minutes before the round starts, so I will (try to) keep it short and pretty.

**Simplicity:** I know you only have 4 minutes to shove a whole plan in my face, but keeping your case straight to the point will grab your judge's attention. I do not want to do research in the middle of the round trying to understand what you are stating for your arguments. Please always clarify what you are saying. It might make sense to you, but will it make sense to someone who has never heard of the resolution? Also, I do not need a definition on simple words such as "ought" or "in" or "be" (real-life examples btw), let's be so for real right now. Your judges don't know a lot about the topic, but they aren't that unaware! Give yourself more time to say your case.

**Logic:** I am sure you have seen the "if you can fix climate change or wars in one 60-minute round, I'll personally fly you to the UN" comments a lot, but I am kinda ok with stuff like that. I think a lot of those problems can be fixed in such simple ways, but we have dumb people running our world. Don't be afraid to expand your horizon in your case, just nothing too crazy like saying the earth is flat or something. I am also a fan of comparison or giving hypotheticals to help me understand your case better. Additionally, do NOT give me a pre-written rebuttal or summary speech, I can totally tell when someone is giving me gibberish they gave 3 rounds ago. Don't shout a bunch of sources and numbers in my face either.

**Etiquette:** Maybe this is me being messy and a former debate kid, but I like some heat in cross fire. Obviously, use proper manners and don't be a b-word, but if you haven't gotten your question in, get it! It makes you look bad if you are just answering questions and not asking...no debate or argument can be generated on your side if you have no answers from the other team. Additionally, please keep chatter to a minimum when your opponent is speaking.

Also, I check cards if they sound fishy. Misrepresenting a card is an automatic loss.

**Rebuttal:** Give me reasons why I should vote for you, AND give me reasons why the other team's case isn't as strong as yours. I always do comparisons on cases. You could have the perfect case, but the other team can give me reasons why they have the *better case*, and they would get my vote. I want big impacts at the end of summary or FF. I don't usually flow the voters given by the competitors, i usually just pick what was discussed the most in the round. (Roadmaps will always help me with that!). Always defend your constructive points throughout the debate, even if your opponent did not touch it. Mentioning the opponent did not touch your arguments discussed throughout the *whole* round weighs *heavily* on my ballot decision.

I want to feel like I made the world better because I chose you. Also, you don't have to do this, but if you could add some one-liners to end your rebuttal speech with some oomph, that would be cool too ;)

I love fun and silly debates that can also be serious and not get too off-track. Have fun, enjoy your final years of debate before it's too late :')

### Speech

I have only done speech for 2ish years, and loved it! I went to nationals my senior year in OO and won state speech in OO as well

I'm not really sure how I write a paradigm for speech... If anything, I would say to please be a good audience member. I have seen kids not pay attention or even start talking in a middle of a student's performance, and that does not make you cool! I am not saying I would deduct a student for such behavior, but it'll be pretty hard for me to find grace for your performance the same way you gave the previous student's performance.

If you stutter, not the end of the world. In fact, It won't affect your ranking. Same with forgetting a line. Take a breath, and retrack.

**Time signals:** Regardless of any event, I will give time signals, you just have to ask :). Asking for them will never make you look less of a performer!

**Extemp kids:** I will say I have always found humor fun in these events. This event is already serious as it is, add some fun to it! Additionally, I would say you need at least 5 sources to make your speech credible. I do how you credit them, as long as I hear some credit.

**Interpers:** I only have ONE thing to say, which is to take a small beat before you go into your introduction! I can never tell when someone starts their introduction or not when they do not do this, and I don't wanna auto 9 you!

---

**Xiong Deng**

McLean High School

4 rounds



---

Hi, I'm a lay judge. My background is not in debate, so I will be evaluating rounds based on clear, logical arguments rather than technical jargon or debate theory. If you want me to consider something, make sure to explain it in a way that an average person would understand.

Please speak clearly and at a moderate pace, as English is not my first language. I value strong argumentation, good use of evidence, and clear impacts. I also appreciate good organization and signposting so I can follow your points easily.

I will do my best to be fair and objective in my decision. Respectful and persuasive debating will go a long way in making your case convincing. Looking forward to judging your round—good luck!

---

**Carol DerSarkissian**

Grace Church School

4 rounds



---

Debate etiquette must always be respectful and professional. I do not tolerate rude behavior to anyone in the room.

I prefer debaters to speak at a moderate pace and clearly outline their arguments. I am convinced when speakers give solid support for their arguments and convincingly refute their opponent's arguments.

I have been judging since 2021.

---

**Gouthami Devarasetty**

Dougherty Valley High School

2 rounds

None

---

**Milind Dham**

MSTW Independent

3 rounds



---

tech only, truth does not exist

Send speech docs before each speech if case is difficult to understand (phil)

Hello,

I am a parent judge. So the round should typically be traditional, I do know how to flow and evaluate arguments.

Things I consider in the round:

- Do not speak fast. If I do not understand your argument I will drop it.
- Evidence. You must have evidence proving your point
- Framework. You must give me good evidence and reasoning on why your framework is better than your opponents.
- Do not run progressive arguments (theory, etc. unless absolutely necessary. As I said above, The round should be traditional.
- Weighing. Weighing is important for me. Please weigh correctly.

Most of all, have fun and be polite.

---

**Kashyu Dua**

American High

4 rounds



I am a lay, parent judge. Please speak slowly and clearly, and put emphasis on weighing to demonstrate exactly why your side should win the round. I will try my best to take notes, but please do not speak fast as I cannot guarantee I will be able to take effective notes. I cannot judge theory arguments or kritiks. Please be kind and respectful to everyone in the room: I look for a fair and educational debate. I do not disclose on the spot.

Joshua Enebo

Taipei American School

4 rounds



*Last changed on Thu November 21, 2024 at 4:36 AM CST*

Blake '21, UChicago '25, WashU Law '28

I did national circuit public forum for Blake for three years ('18-'21). I was the Assistant Director of Debate at Blake for four years ('21-'25). I am currently an assistant coach for Taipei American School.

**TL;dr**

- I flow.
- Tech>truth.
- Please read paraphrasing theory in rounds where the opponents are paraphrasing. Paraphrasing is an awful practice, evidence is VERY important to me, and I am happy to use the ballot to punish bad ethics in round.
- Send speech docs before each speech in which cards will be read.
- Speed is fine but you MUST spread correctly. If you go the same speed on tags as you are going on card text, you are not spreading correctly and I will clear you. IF I CLEAR YOU, IT MEANS I CANNOT HEAR YOUR TAGS, AND IT SHOULD CAUSE YOU GREAT ALARM.
- 2nd rebuttal must frontline, defense isn't sticky, and if I'm something is going to be mentioned on my ballot, it must be in both back half speeches.
- Please weigh.
- I will let your opponents take prep for as long as it takes for you to send your doc or cards without it counting towards their 3 minutes, so send docs pls and send them fast.
- The following people have shaped how I view debate: Ale Perri (hi Ale), Christian Vasquez, Bryce Piotrowski, Darren Chang, Ellie Singer, and Shane Stafford.
- Please add jenebo21@gmail.com to the email chain.
- Feel free to contact me after the round (on Facebook preferably, or email if you must) if you have questions or need anything from me.

## General Paradigm

### Rules

I will time speeches and prep, though you are encouraged to do the same. I will enforce excessive and flagrant intentional violations of speech time rules with the ballot, if necessary. In most cases, this is not needed recourse, and I will simply stop flowing once the time has elapsed.

### Speeches

**Roadmaps:** In most PF rounds, roadmaps aren't necessary, just tell me where you are starting and signpost. If there are more than 2 sheets, then I will ask for a roadmap.

**The Split:** 2nd rebuttal must frontline; turns and defense. Any arguments dropped by the second rebuttal are considered dropped in the round.

**The Back Half:** If I am going to vote on it, or in any way going to be apart of my RFD (all offense or defense in the round), it needs to be both in the summary and the final focus. Weighing needs to start in summary, and final focus should be writing my ballot for me. See below for a caveat.

**Sticky Defense:** In almost all scenarios, defense is not sticky. It is completely incoherent to me that the first summary does not need to extend defense on contentions that the

second summary might go for. However, the sole exception to this will be if a team does not frontline to any arguments on a contention in the second rebuttal. The first summary can consider that contention kicked. This is already pretty solidified as a norm, and allows second speaking teams to kick arguments without literally saying "there is no offense on Contention X." An extension of this contention, that was clearly kicked in second rebuttal, by the second summary will allow the first final to extend defense from the first rebuttal on that contention specifically.

**Speed:** I am comfortable with all speeds in PF. More often than not, clarity matters more than WPM. I know debaters who speak at 400+ WPM, and I can understand every word. Likewise, I know debaters who don't speak fast but are still super unclear. I will say clear if I can't follow. You can spread IF you are doing it like it is done in policy (spreading long cards, not a bunch of paraphrased garbage, slow down on tags/authors, sending out a speech doc is a must). If you spread AND paraphrase, however, your chances of winning points of clash immediately plummet.

**Speech docs:** Please send speech docs with cut cards. This vastly decreases the amount of wasted time in rounds sending various individual cards at different times.

**Weighing:** The team that wins the weighing debate is nearly always winning the round. I start every RFD with an evaluation of the weighing debate, and it frequently is what controls the direction of my ballot. Please start weighing as early as possible, it will help you make smart strategic decisions without making the round a total mess. I would highly encourage you to go for less and weigh more.

**Collapse:** Please collapse. I don't want to sift through a flow with tons of tags and zero warrants or weighing. Pick an argument to go for, and weigh that argument. That is the easiest way to pick up my ballot. Debate isn't a scoreboard, winning 3 arguments doesn't mean you get my ballot if your opponent only wins 1 argument.

**Abusive Delinks:** I cannot believe I have to make this a part of my paradigm, but no delinks or non-uniques on yourself to get out of turn offense. This does not mean you cannot bite defense read, or make new frontline responses to turns, rather it means you cannot overtly contradict your initial arguments with a piece of defense your opponents did not read to get out of offense they read. This applies in situations as clear cut as the aff saying X, the neg responding with X is actually bad, and the aff responds with "not X." This almost never happens, but is astonishingly abusive when it is attempted.

**Framework:** If the 1st constructive introduces framework, the 2nd constructive probably should respond to it, or make arguments as to why they get responses later in the round. I don't know where I stand on this technically yet, but this is where I am leaning now. In general, if the 1st constructive introduces framework and the 2nd constructive drops it, I think its ok for the first rebuttal to call it conceded unless otherwise argued.

**Advocacies/T:** In general, I will evaluate the flow without prejudice on what ground the aff or neg claims to have. Because the neg doesn't get a counter plan in PF, the aff advocacy does not block the neg out of ground. Both the aff and neg can make arguments about what the aff would most likely look at, and should garner advantages and disadvantages based off of those interpretations. I will evaluate whose is more likely to be correct and go from there. An example would be the neg could still read a Russia provocation negative on the NATO topic (September 2021) even if the aff does not read a troop deployment advocacy for their advantages unless it is argued that troop deployment is not a feasible implementation of the aff. Alternatively, if the neg can get a CP then I suppose the aff can get an advocacy. Either way works.

**Safety issues:** I will be quick to drop debaters and arguments that are any -ism, and I won't listen to arguments like racism, sexism, death, patriarchy (etc) good. The space first and foremost needs to be safe to participate in.

**Housekeeping:** I take the important parts of the debate incredibly seriously, but there are aspects that I find frivolously pretentious. Be nice and respectful, but keep it somewhat light and casual if you can! Debate is supposed to be at least somewhat fun, so let's treat it as such. I don't care what you wear, where you sit, if you swear (sometimes a few F-bombs can make an exceedingly boring debate just a little less so!), if you do the flip or enter the room before I'm there, etc.

Evidence

**Disclaimer:** I like cut cards and quality evidence, I hate paraphrasing. This section is going to seem cranky, but I don't mind well-warranted analytics. I just hate paraphrasing.

Evidence is always better than an analytic, but if you introduce an argument as an analytic, I won't mind and will evaluate it as such. But if your opponents have evidence, you will likely lose that clash point.

**Bottom line:** Evidence is the backbone of the activity. I do not fancy fast paced lying as a debate format. Arguments about evidence preference are very good in front of me, and I will certainly call for cards if docs are not already sent. Evidence quality is exceedingly important, and I will have no qualms dropping teams for awful evidence. This applies regardless of if you cut cards or paraphrase, because cutting cards doesn't make you immune to lying about it.

**Paraphrasing:** The single worst somewhat prevalent practice in PF debate today is paraphrasing. Luckily, it seems on the decline! Regardless, it is bad for the quality of debate, it is bad for all of its educational benefits, and it ruins fairness. Please cut cards, it is not difficult to learn. If you insist on making me upset and paraphrasing, keep the following in mind:

1. You must have a cut card that you paraphrased from. It is an NSDA rule now.
2. Your opponents do not need to take prep to sort through your PDFs, and if you can't quickly produce the evidence and where you paraphrased it from, I'm crossing the argument off my flow. I have very little tolerance for long, paraphrased evidence exchanges where you claim to have correctly paraphrased 100 page PDFs and expect your opponents to be able to check against your bad evidence with the allotted prep time.
3. Paraphrasing does not let you off the hook for not reading a warrant. 40 authors in 1st rebuttal by spreading tag blips and paraphrasing authors to make it faster is not acceptable and your speaks will tank.
4. If you misrepresent a card while paraphrasing, not only is that bad in a vacuum, but I will give you the L25. If you realize its badly represented OR you can't find it when asked and you make the argument to "just evaluate as an analytic," I will also give an L25. If you introduce the evidence, you have to be able to defend it.
5. Don't be mad at me if you get bad speaks. There is no longer world in which someone who paraphrases, even if they give the perfect speech gets above a 28.5 in front of me. I used to be more forgiving on this, but no longer.

**Producing evidence:** If reading the header "paraphrasing" meant you skipped over that part of my paradigm, I will reiterate something that is important regardless of how you introduce the evidence. If you can't produce a card upon being asked for it within reasonable time frame given the network or technical context, your speaks will tank.

**Evidence Preference:** Even if not a full shell, arguments that I should prefer cut cards over paraphrased cards at the clash points are going to work in front of me.

**Author Cites:** This is yet another thing I should not need to put in my paradigm. You need to cite the author you are reading in speech for it to be counted as evidence as opposed to an analytic. If you read something without citing an author, I will flow it as an analytic and if your opponents call for that piece of evidence, and you hand it to them without citing it in the round, I am dropping you. It is blatant plagiarism and extremely unethical. In an educational activity, this should be exceedingly obvious.

### **Progressive Paradigm**

**Debate is good:** Deep in my bones, I believe that debate is good. It may presently be flawed, but I believe the activity has value and can be transformative in the best possible way. Arguments that say debate is bad and should be destroyed entirely (often this is the conclusion of non-topical pessimistic arguments, killjoy, etc) will be evaluated but my biases towards the activity being good WILL impact the decision. This does not make them unwinnable, but probably not strategic to read.

**Disclaimer:** I'm receptive to all arguments, including progressive ones in the debate space, but they have been getting very low quality recently. I worry about the long-term impact about some of these in the activity. I beg of you, think about the model you are advocating for, and think about if its sincerely going to make the space better for the people growing up in it. The impact you can leave on the activity could be positive or negative and will outlast your time as a debater.

### **Theory**

**CI/Reasonability:** I default to competing interpretations unless told otherwise, but that doesn't really mean much if you read the rest of this section. I am going to evaluate the

flow, so if you read theory arguments that I won't intervene against, I am going to evaluate the flow normally.

**RVIs:** I generally think no-RVIs. The exception to this is an RVI on an IVI.

**IVIs:** These are really bad for debate. If there is a rules claim to be made, make it a theory shell. If there is a safety issue, then stop the round. Almost all of the time, IVIs are vague whines spammed off in the span of 4 seconds without any explanation. This proliferation is nearly existential for the activity, and it needs to stop. My threshold for responses to these is near zero.

**Frivolity:** I have no problem intervening against frivolous theory (i.e. shoe theory), so if you run theory in front of me, please believe that its actually educational for the activity. This does include spikes and tricks. I don't like them, please don't run them. If the theory is frivolous, and I reserve the right to determine that, I won't vote on it no matter the breakdown of the round. I won't vote for auto-30 speaker point arguments. It has become more common these days to read WPM interpretations (i.e. cannot be more than 250 WPM). I think these are pretty stupid, to be entirely honest. It is not clear to me why disclosure doesn't solve or why being a more efficient speaker doesn't solve. Not saying I wouldn't vote for it in the right round, but its probably more an uphill battle in front of me than most.

**Introduction:** Theory needs to be read in the speech following the violation. Out of round violations should be read in constructive.

**Paraphrasing is bad:** I will vote on paraphrasing bad most of the time, as long as there's some offense on the shell. I will NEVER vote on paraphrasing good, I don't care how mad that may make you to hear, I just won't do it. If you introduce cut cards bad or paraphrasing good as a new off (like before a paraphrasing bad shell) I will instantly drop you. That said, you can win enough defense on a paraphrasing shell to make it not a voter. Paraphrasing theory is the exception to the disclaimers outlined above, I think paraphrasing should be punished in round and am happy to vote on it.

**Disclosure is good:** Disclosure is good, but how you disclose matters. These days I prefer open source disclosure, where tags, cites, and highlights are all included. "Open source" with no highlights or tags, where teams put up walls of unformatted text and expect people to do precisely anything with it, is a huge pet peeve of mine and interps that punish teams that do this will be received favorably. I have decided the activity should probably start moving in the direction of disclosing rebuttal evidence as well, so do with that what you may. I will listen to reasons why that is bad, though I struggle to see the conceptual difference between a link turn and a case link from a disclosure perspective. I used to feel less strongly about disclosure than paraphrasing but now I feel about as strongly. We should be disclosing, and not doing so should absolutely cost you ballots.

**Trigger warnings:** I think trigger warnings in PF are usually bad, and usually run on arguments that don't need to be trigger warned which just suppresses voices and arguments in the activity. You'll find Elizabeth Terveen's paradigm has a good section on this that I generally agree on. You can go for the theory, but my threshold for responses will be in accordance with that belief typically. Obviously, egregiously graphic descriptions are an exception to this general belief, but they are almost never run in PF. The mention of something is not a good enough reason for a trigger warning.

## Kritiks

**General disposition:** I am somewhat comfortable evaluating most kritikal arguments, although I'm not as experienced with them as I am with others. I will be able to flow it and vote on it as long as you explain it well. I am quite comfortable with capitalism, security, and fem IR.

**Disclaimer:** Blake 2021 made me think about this part of my paradigm a lot, and I think the activity is just going through growing pains that are necessary, but some of these debates were really bad. The proliferation of identity, pomo inspired kritiks that vaguely ask the judge to vote for a team based on an identity and nothing else is not good. Moreover, methods that advocate collapsing the activity are unlikely to be well received. In any case, please articulate exactly what my ballot does or what specifically I am supposed to be doing to improve the activity. This means implicating responses or arguments onto the FW debate, or the ROTB.

**"Pre-fiat":** No one thinks fiat is real, so let's be more specific about how we label arguments and discourse. Make comparisons as to why your discourse or type of

education is more important than theirs, this is not done by slapping the label "pre-fiat" onto an argument.'

**Discourse:** I am pretty skeptical that discourse shapes reality. If you go for this, you best have excellent evidence and good explanations.

**Phil:** In the 24-25 season there has been a massive increase in the number of circuit LD phil arguments. Note that my bar for garnering offense is probably higher than it normally is, mostly because I think these arguments as a matter of truth are probably not very useful in debate and almost never is solvency articulated. I have voted on them, probably will again, but I won't be thrilled and would prefer not to.

Speaks

I will probably give around a 27-28 in most rounds. I guess I give lower speaks than most PF judges, so I'll clarify. 27-28 is middling to me with various degrees within that. 26-27 is bad, not always for ethical reasons. Below a 26 is an ethical issue. If you get above a 29 from me you should be very happy because I never give speaks that high almost ever. I will not give a 30, there are no perfect debaters.

---

Kendrick Foster

Lexington HS

6 rounds



---

*Last changed on Thu February 1, 2024 at 2:05 PM EST*

**Background:** I debated at Memorial High School in Houston for 3 years, graduating in 2018. I mainly competed in extemp in high school, and I qualified for TFA State in FX and the TOC in Extemp and Informative. I also qualified for Nationals in World Schools debate twice and reached the quarterfinals of World Schools in 2018. My main debate events were Public Forum and Congress, which I did on and off for the most part. I have largely judged on the TFA circuit in Texas since I graduated high school in 2018, and I consider myself most proficient at judging World Schools Debate, Congress, and public speaking events.

My email for any email chains is knfjudges@gmail.com. My philosophy on email chains is thus: I like to be on them to evaluate any evidence disputes at the end of round, but I will not be flowing off the email chain or using it to cover any gaps in my flow. Debate is fundamentally an oral activity—if it were going to solely be two cut documents warring against each other, there'd be no reason to have everyone compete in the same room and try to persuade a decisionmaker orally—so I prefer to judge rounds based on what's said orally in the round. As a corollary to that, I'm not that good with handling spreading—I generally flow by hand these days, so I can pretty much only process as fast as I can write.

**WSD:** Remember that WSD is not LD or PF, and I will not be "voting on the flow" the way that LD and PF judges do. I will generally try to stick to the 68-72 range for each speaker, although I've found myself going under that range more often than I've gone over. Of course, this means that you might not like my decision at the end of the day. To lessen the odds of that happening, here are some tips to maximize the chances of winning my ballot:

- For content: "The House" is understood to be the whole world unless specified otherwise. Therefore, your content score will not go above 28 unless you bring solid international examples to the table. Generally, the more empirical and the less hypothetical evidence you bring to the table, the better you'll tend to do.
- For style: I would say the easiest way to improve style points on my ballot is with speeches that have personality. Obviously, this will differ from speaker to speaker, but I have rewarded speakers who depart somewhat from the "clean speech without fluency errors" kind of model and bring humor, personal connections to the topic, anecdotes, etc. to the table.
- For strategy: Teams that are consistent down the bench, especially teams that have a consistent team line, will tend to do better in strategy. I also evaluate POIs here; generally, teams should take 2 POIs, usually at the transition between points that were elaborated on during the roadmap.

**PF Debate:** I want to see a clear claim/warrant/impact structure with clear weighing at the end of the day; I've frequently found myself wanting some brief framing analysis or meta-weighing throughout the round as well (especially on evidence quality and strength of link). I am not receptive to theory or kritikal arguments in PF (this includes disclosure theory, etc.). The more that the final speeches can give me clear voters and/or write my RFD for me, the better the round will turn out for you. Defense is not sticky (please carry it

through the flow). Finally, please remember that this is public forum debate, not "shorter policy," so please avoid spreading, and touches of rhetoric are always welcome (and will be reflected in your speaker points).

**LD Debate:** I am open to hearing all kinds of arguments (I do not consider myself a traditional LD judge), but I simply ask that you explain your arguments well. If I cannot explain your argument in the RFD on the ballot, I will not vote for that argument. For Ks, make sure that the link is specific to the case and that the alt makes sense. I will warn you that I have heard many bad Ks in my life, and while I have voted for Ks in the past, that doesn't mean I automatically like every K that I hear. In addition, it's really no fun for anyone to hear rounds where the AFF has never heard of the K, and their only response is "the NEG doesn't have a value and a criterion so we should win." So try to remain respectful of your opponents as well.

Repeated from PF but... I really appreciate good meta-weighting (especially on evidence quality and strength of link), and the more that the final speeches can give me clear voters and/or write my RFD for me, the better the round will turn out for you.

**Congress:** I would say that I prefer content over presentation. When evaluating content, I look to the type of speech being given (constructive, rebuttal, and crystallization) and my expectations for each type of speech... Unfortunately, I have found that there are many constructive speeches given later and later in the chamber, and many so-called rebuttal or crystallization speeches that neither rebut nor crystallize. Please, please, please remember that this is congressional DEBATE and not congressional soapbox. I love clash and I hate repetitious arguments.

Relatedly, I really detest when chambers need to take in-house recesses at the beginning of items because nobody is prepared to debate. I believe that I have somewhat contributed to this problem by stating that I prefer well elucidated speeches over speeches that were extemped in the chamber. To be fair, I don't want to hear these speeches for the sake of giving a speech, but I am now of the belief that I should reward the representatives who are actually prepared to debate in my rankings. So do with that what you will.

**Public Speaking:** In extemp, make sure you answer the question in a well structured manner. Sources are also important to me; I read both foreign and domestic news on a regular basis, and BSing a speech is not the way to win my ballot. (For the record: I have checked sources that sounded fishy, and I have tanked speakers who have egregiously misrepresented sources. Misremembered the date or the publication for a source? Fine, I've done that before, and I'll give you the benefit of the doubt! Told me that Boko Haram has attacked Egypt or that a New York Times editorial praised El Salvador's Bitcoin experiment when, in fact, it panned it? Not OK!)

For all events, I enjoy humor; for the two platform events, I also like to hear a personal connection to the topic throughout the speech, as well as unique takes on common topics. Please elucidate the stakes for your speech so we know why it's important that we listen to you for 10 minutes about a given topic.

---

**Soma Ganti**

Vanguard Independent

6 rounds



---

I have two years of judging experience. I keep a detailed, rigorous flow to track arguments and dropped points, no spreading.

---

**Devesh Gaur**

MSTW Independent

3 rounds



---

I will judge based on the below points:

1. Please try to go slow so that I am able to clearly understand.
2. Please provide the strong evidences to support your case. Theoretical evidences will be dropped.
3. Please be polite to the other team. The argument should be based on facts collected by you.
4. Please ensure to keep the track of time.

Have fun and enjoy!

---





*Last changed on Sat October 23, 2021 at 1:06 PM EST*

### Kian Goldberg (*he/they*)

I did PF in high school, and I'm in university now. I am a flow judge and generally tech>truth. Tournament permitting, I will disclose and give RFD - time permitting, I will be as thorough as possible. My feedback is meant to help you improve in debate, so make sure to ask questions if needed; judges are your resources.

#### How to win the round:

1. *WARRANT everything*. Don't just read card names. Be thorough in explaining your logic and layering your cards to build a sound argument.
2. *WEIGH starting in rebuttal*. Compare your impacts to your opponents', and tell me why yours is better through magnitude, probability, time frame, etc. Good weighing = why I should vote for you.
3. *Have a NARRATIVE throughout the round*, from start to finish. Treat your case like a story, and always be clear, cohesive, and concise.

#### Strategic Advice/Preferences:

1. Collapse and extend. You are really unlikely to win by going for ALL 5 contentions. Try not to bring up new things in summary, and definitely not in final focus (I won't flow it).
2. Framework that is uncontested or conceded will be used to evaluate the round.
3. Signpost where you are on the flow. It helps you, your opponents, and me. I appreciate line-by-line debating.
4. Time yourself. I will also time and let you know when you are over. I would rather hear you finish your point than cut it off abruptly but consistently going overtime is generally disrespectful as tournaments run on a schedule (I may dock your speaker points).
5. Crossfire is to ask questions, not to read cards, unless both teams agree to it. I don't flow/decide on cross so make sure to bring anything important back into your speeches.
6. Read relevant content warnings before case.
7. I prefer sharing case + cards in email chain (or Google doc) as I find it improves the accessibility of debate, but it is up to the teams to go with/without it.
8. I prefer you don't run theory/k's.

#### Finally:

DO NOT be discriminatory, rude, abusive, insensitive, etc - You risk being reported or at best you will get a 25. There is absolutely no place for this in debate (or anywhere else). Always conduct yourself in a way you, your team, and your coaches can be proud of.

Let me know if you need anything extra and I will do my best to accommodate you.

Have fun and good luck!

Email: [kian.kg117@gmail.com](mailto:kian.kg117@gmail.com)




I coach Public Forum at Grace Church School in NYC. My role as a HS English/writing teacher shapes my approach to coaching and judging debate in the sense that I really care about how your speeches are organized, warranted, and evidenced. I'm not highly technical, and my concern is that technical language is often used to bypass the process of explaining your arguments to me. Don't just say "de-link" as a shortcut; be specific and walk me through the logic of *why* there's no link.

Clash is extremely important and I reward teams who respond to the particular nuances of their opponent's logic. I can handle a moderate amount of speed if your speech is well-organized and clearly tagged (at a minimum, slow down for taglines).

You can include me on the email chain (egolden@gcschool.org). I take evidence comparison seriously and I will look at your sources to evaluate their credibility. However, debate is ultimately an oral activity, and I try to base my decision solely on what I heard + what I flowed.

Best of luck in your round!

---

Sreenivasulu Gollapudi	Acton-Boxborough Regional High School	4 rounds	
------------------------	---------------------------------------	----------	---

---

*Last changed on Fri March 1, 2024 at 6:47 PM EST*

I am a parent judge and have little experience with speech debate but I have a lot of experience as a judge in the scientific community. I request to respect each team and avoid harsh/loud speech.

I received a professional development certificate through the Level 2: Judging Public Forum Debate NSDA Learn course completed on: December 6, 2024. Hoping to provide better judgment and feedback.

---

Ajay Gupta	West Windsor Plainsboro South	4 rounds	None
------------	-------------------------------	----------	------

---

---

William Hong	National Debate Club (NDC)	6 rounds	
--------------	----------------------------	----------	---

---

*Last changed on Wed March 20, 2024 at 10:51 AM EST*

**Brentwood '23 | UPenn M&T '27**

**Email:** hongwil@wharton.upenn.edu

Debated for 4 years in PF. Most notably, I won the 2022 Gold TOC and placed Top 5 at NSDA Nationals. Currently private coaching a few teams for fun!

-----  
**Please be in the room by the check-in time so we can start early!! My biggest pet peeve is having to wait on a team to start. Thanks in advance :)**

**TLDR:** Typical tech over truth judge that enjoys weighing analysis and link comparison.

For reference, the main people who taught me debate were Siva Sambasivam, John Nahas, and Nelson Rose so feel free to check out their judging preferences as they are very similar to mines.

**With that said, a few general points (too lazy to write up a super long paradigm but feel free to ask questions if you need clarification):**

1. Please weigh. This means I want in-depth comparative analysis between the links and/or impacts. Also respond to the opponent's weighing pls as well otherwise the whole debate just gets messy
2. Final focuses should be consistent with everything in summary. Extend links (not 7 second blips), focus on warrant comparison, and sign post please.
3. I can handle speed decently well. Just send docs.
4. Be nice in round.
5. Fine if you read theory and Ks but it seems like the prog args that I encountered while I was on the circuit were way less advanced than prog args on the circuit right now. So take that how you will. Always love a good substance debate but I'm confident in my ability to evaluate majority of prog arguments for the most part.
6. If you make me laugh or make the round entertaining for me, I will give you 30 speaks. I hate when rounds get tense, debate is about having fun.

Reach out to me whenever if you need anything!

---



Lay Judge, very inexperienced. I will try to do my best to evaluate the round as a traditional lay.

Speak slowly with clarity, and be respectful to your opponents.

No Theory, No Kritiks, No Framing please. Don't add me to any email chains either.

I am not good at flowing and I will do my best to take notes, and I will judge. If you are winning your arguments you should be very clear as to why I should vote for your arguments rather than your opponents.

Looking forward to some great rounds!

---

**Michael Hua**

Peddie School

4 rounds



Hi, I'm new to debate. Please prioritize clarity over speed. If I can't understand your argument, I can't vote on it.

---

**Alex Huang**

American Heritage Palm Beach HS

2 rounds



*Last changed on Mon September 9, 2024 at 5:53 PM EST*

I'm Alex. I debated for Durham Academy in North Carolina for four years, and won the TOC in 2023. I am now a sophomore at Swarthmore College and coach for American Heritage Palm Beach.

#### PLEASE READ — TL;DR

##### BASICS

\*Tech>Truth to the best of my ability.

\*Please make a speech drop or send an email chain to alexander.huang@ahschool.com (no Google Docs), and label it properly: Yale Round 1: Durham HH (Neg) vs Taipei CW (Aff). Send docs before front-half speeches and send them quickly.

\*I will vote by first looking at weighing and then links into the weighing, but feel free to make arguments for why I should vote otherwise.

\*Every part of an argument must be extended for me to vote on it, and anything I vote on must have a warrant.

\*Second rebuttal must respond to first, and there should be nothing new past summary.

\*Speaks will reflect your strategy and execution, of course, but also the non-content aspects of the round: you'll get high speaks if you show up on time, send evidence quickly, stay organized, speak clearly, and are respectful—you'll get low speaks if you're late, if you take forever to send docs, if you're a jerk, or if you steal prep time.

\*Pet peeves: if you try to call everything by policy terms. If you call the rebuttal the 2AC or your contentions "Advantage 1" and "Advantage 2," I'm going to physically cringe. It's not aura, I promise.

##### HOW TO WIN

The biggest thing you can do to increase the chances you win the round and get good speaks: provide good warranting and analysis using your brain and not the doc.

\***Warranting:** the state of warranting in PF is atrocious. Anything that doesn't have a warrant is a meaningless claim to me and I won't evaluate it. That means

1) If you say try or die or we link-in or we short-circuit without reading a warrant for why and explaining the implication, I'm not evaluating it as weighing. Saying jargon is not weighing. If you say "try or die," I'm ignoring you. If you say "it's try or die – they've conceded that climate change is inevitable by 2050 so extinction is non-unique in their world. The only risk of solvency is the aff. Any risk of offense on climate means you vote for us" that is actual weighing.

2) If you read one line about how 2026 is key for timeframe with no warrant for why 2026 is key I'm not evaluating it as weighing

3) I'm not letting you go for impacts or hidden links that are one line parts of evidence and not tagged as such, and I won't let you sandbag warrants in later speeches

4) "No warrant," if won, is terminal defense to whatever you're responding to

**\*Analysis:** Get your face out of the cards. If you look up at me and do real analysis I will be so pleased. Some policies I've borrowed from Mac Hays:

1) Chances of getting 30 speaks are inversely proportional to the percent of your speech that is read off of a computer.

2) Speaks are capped at 29 if you read more than 50% of summary and/or final focus off of a computer. For TOC Digital, obviously it will be harder to tell, but trust me, I'll know.

## SPECIFICS

**\*Do not sacrifice analysis for speed and/or shenanigans.** While "tech" in place of "truth" means that I try to limit the influence of my own personal beliefs to the maximum extent, it does not mean that the need for your analysis to be coherent and persuasive is absent: a) everything must be sufficiently warranted even if its conceded, b) I'll side with good and persuasive analytics against cards. Smart analysis is always going to triumph over bad, unwarranted evidence. Tech debate that is in-depth and full of smart analysis is so much fun. Tech debate that is fast blips that are unwarranted misconstructions of bad evidence is boring and noneducational.

**\*Speed** is fine, but be clear. Slow down on tags and in the back half. Use speed strategically. 3 slow minutes of the best argument in the round is always going to beat 18 mediocre arguments read at lightning pace.

**\*Cross** is binding, but must be brought up in speech

**\*Implicate good defense against weighing.** There is a trend in PF where both teams try to find the quickest link into extinction, and all defense goes out the window. I am not a fan. If you are winning terminal or near terminal defense against an extinction outweighs + short circuit, tell me why I shouldn't look there first. A 0.00000000000000000001% chance of something occurring rounds to 0, after all.

**\*Theory:** If you are initiating theory against novices/a team that clearly does not know how to respond, I won't evaluate under competing interps, and your speaks will be tanked. It must be read in the speech after the violation. For your information (because I think there is inherently a little more intervention in theory debate, since we are debating about debate, and the persuasiveness of certain responses is going to be based on what I have seen in debate), I generally think paraphrasing is bad, and disclosure is good, but I would be willing to vote any way on theory. I would be receptive to round reports theory about teams that put "OS" instead of writing what they read.

**\*Ks:** I have a relatively high threshold for a quality K in PF. I really believe you can't just port Ks from LD and Policy into PF. I think a quality K is very educational, and also fun to watch. However, to be a quality K, a K should be treated like a research project – high quality work that is clear, done yourself, and disclosed for others to interact with. I have a very low tolerance for Ks that are stolen from LD or Policy, read against teams who barely link, and are generally unintelligible. If I feel like you are reading a K not because you want to debate the K literature but because you are trying to get out of debating anything at all, my threshold for responses will be very low.

**\*Phil:** I'm completely down to evaluate phil, but your explanations ought to be very good. A) I'm not familiar with most of the terms in metaethics and normative ethics, and I won't vote on something I don't understand. B) If you're going for something very complicated, I'm not going to fill in warrants for you - you still have to extend everything relevant to your framing.

**\*Non-starters:** no tricks, no speaks theory, no friv theory, and no ad-homs.

**\*Post-rounding:** Post-rounding is educational, but be polite and curious. I'm not going to change my decision. Ask to learn more about why I wasn't persuaded, but there is no debate between you and me.

*Last changed on Tue September 24, 2024 at 5:21 AM CST*

dulles '25 | yale '29

sherrydebate@gmail.com

**general:** texas and nat circuit pf for 4 years. tech > truth barring objectively discriminatory, offensive, or otherwise problematic arguments—I'm very bad for "debate is JUST a game" arguments

i can flow speed fine, but PLEASE slow down on taglines and analytics, and PLEASE be clear, or i might just give up. i probably have a somewhat higher threshold for warranting and implications than your typical tech judge; your path to the ballot should be clear enough by ff that you can give a flay speech

do not read tricks

i've distanced from the activity a little bit, so assume i know nothing about the topic and that i'm a little rusty

if i'm judging you in policy or ld i'm so sorry

**pref shortcuts:**

larp - 1

K, theory - 2

T - 3

phil, cp - 4

tricks - 5/strike

**trad/policy:** i debated almost solely substance for the first 2.5 years of my career, and i'm probably most comfortable judging this. genuinely read whatever

**K:** i initiated a k in almost every single hypertech round i debated for the latter 1.5 years of my career, but i read mostly topical, stock stuff (cap, sec, etc.). used to love them, but now i'm quite tired of thinking. should still be good for kvk and like anything under the sun, but don't assume i know your lit at all

**theory:** okay with this. you need to extend every part of the shell that you want me to evaluate, and you need to read the shell in the speech directly after the violation. i default reasonability > ci

**T:** definitely familiar with pf T, but there's a 50/50 chance i'll get overwhelmed if you spread through blippy ld warrants

**phil:** i've read some lit outside of the debate space; err on over-explanation

feel free to ask if you have any questions! i probably have opinions :)



I'm the mother of a PF debater, he's writing this paradigm for me (I normally use better grammar).

I'm a lay judge - treat me as such.

**SPEAKING:** Speak slowly and clearly (duh, lay judge).

**HIGH DEBATE:** When you see the words lay judge, you def shouldn't be running theory, kritiks or tricks, but I'll put this in there jus in case someone decides to be weird.

**LAY CASES:** Being a lay judge doesn't rily mean you need to have a rily stock case. I can understand more complex arguments and I've been trained in flowing, so I can follow along pretty well.

**CROSSFIRES:** I don't flow crossfires if you think somethings important bring it up in your speech

**NEW ARGUMENTS:** Ik everyone wants to run new arguments in final focus the moment they see they have a lay judge - don't be a bad person. Also, again, I understand the rules of debate pretty well so I'll probably catch you if you do this.

BEHAVIOR: Be nice to each other, don't say anything discriminatory, hateful, harmful and or profane or I'll vote against you and dock a whole lotta speaker points so obv don't do that (I feel like this goes without saying but most judges put this in their paradigm so i guess i will too)

SPEAKER POINTS: Here's the fun part

If you say ronaldos better than messi i will give you 0 speaker points and give you a loss (joking? my mom wants me to say that im joking idk)

If you even say the word "seahawks" dont expect good speaker points (joking?)

references to My Little Pony will get you bonus speaker pts - if you sing one of the songs even more speaker pts at the cost of your self respect (definitely a joke - but you should test this)

I respect professionalism (even if my son doesn't) and wish you all the best.

---

Lucian Hughes

Castro Valley High School

2 rounds



---

I am a new parent judge, treat me as such. No kritiks, theories, tricks, etc.

I don't flow crossfire - if you want me to evaluate something from cross, bring it up in a speech.

Truth > Tech

Don't bring up new arguments in Final Focus - I will notice, so don't waste your time.

Speak at a reasonable pace - quality > quantity.

Obviously don't be rude to your opponents.

Good luck and have fun!

---

Idris Ibrahim

Harbinger Academy

6 rounds



*Last changed on Sun February 18, 2024 at 4:38 PM UTC*

Hello there!

My name is Idris Ibrahim, and my judging career which spans for over four years has seen me muster up a significant amount of experience in a wide range of debate formats/styles such as; the British Parliamentary Format, World Schools Format, World Scholars Format, Public Forum, Lincoln-Douglas, Asian Parliamentary, and Speech Events.

Judging Pattern:

I always approach any debate I'm about to judge as a globally informed citizen, whilst making sure I toss any conceivable personal biases I may have about a topic aside. This means that to convince me in a debate room you must make sure your arguments are credibly realistic and persuasive within the scope of the debate. A couple of things to bear in mind about my judging pattern -

- State your contentions/arguments clearly and back them up with enough analysis to prove your case.
- Make sure you're creating a fair means of engagement towards your opposition. This means that I do not expect you to just present your contentions in a vacuum and expect them to win - I also expect that you challenge the contentions of the opposition and create comparatives to show why your contentions are superior.
- Ensure you highlight your arguments in a well-organized structure - I do not expect that in the middle of contention A, you then transition to contention B abruptly. Take your time to fully explain your contentions while also being time-conscious.
- Role fulfilment is also important. So make sure you fulfil your roles perfectly.
- For Speech Events - I appreciate absolute creativity during your presentation. I expect that you use all that is within your means to execute whichever role you're taking on in whatever speech event I am judging you in. I take notes of your eye contact, body language, energy, and expressions while speaking.

Side Notes:

- I have a slight preference for medium-paced speeches. This does not however mean that if you're naturally a pacy speaker, you're automatically disadvantaged when I'm judging you. I would give your speech equal attention and assessment on a meritocratic basis regardless of how fast you speak, but if you can, just take deep breaths as you present your speech rather than zapping through.

- I admire it when competitors respect, value, and have a deep sense of mutual understanding for each other during rounds. This means I totally detest irritable attitudes such as rudeness, hostility, and intolerance. Kindly be on your best behaviour and be very conscious of how you interact with your co - competitors.

Whenever you come across me in a debate room, I can guarantee you quality judging and the most accurate feedback (either written or orally) , I also hope that in my little way, I contribute towards the growth of your speaking journey.

---

**Yakub Islamov**

Hunter College

4 rounds



*Last changed on Wed November 20, 2024 at 2:39 PM CST*

## **TOC DSDS#2 General**

Theory - 1

LARP - 2

Topical K - 3

Nontopical K - 4

Else - 5

'We'll send cards as needed' or 'We don't share evidence' or sending Google docs = auto 27s

Making the round actually fun, good strategy, brainrot, etc = auto 30s

## **PF General**

**email:** jakobdebate@gmail.com (send all docs incl. rebuttal)

I coach at my alma mater where I competed at (Lincoln East) and currently I compete in NFA-LD for UNL. I've also co-founded MDP (masterdebaterprepouts.com).

I'd prefer Speechdrop/Tabroom Doc share. If (hopefully not) we have to do email chains, please clearly label them (Tournament Name, Round #, Team1 vs. Team2).

## **TL;DR**

The single best way to win my ballot is if you go for quality over quantity cards, where your turns are fully implicated out and any conceded links/warrants/etc. are fleshed out in the backhalf. Please make the round easy for me to evaluate, as less intervening is a win-win for all of us. It is detrimental to this activity to limit students to what they can and can't read; read anything you want, however you want.

## **Preferences**

- Too many teams tend to impact weigh their arguments without winning the link; you must effectively warrant and be (somewhat) ahead in the link story before you can weigh. This also means all clashing link-ins and prerequisites should preferably be resolved.
- In the debate round nothing is true: everything is tech.
- I can handle speeds upwards of 250+ wpm, but I'd prefer you to be slower on tags & analytics, fast on the rest... thus spread with clarity.

## **Progressive Arguments**

- \* I encourage you to set rules and norms through tricks and theory but don't be morally repugnant.
  - \* I have zero preference on 'debate norms'; I'll vote for paraphrasing good, disclosure bad, and anything else you could possibly think of, as long as you win it.
  - \* My defaults are no RVIs, reasonability > ci, spirit > text, DTA, in-round > out of round, and must respond in next constructive.
  - \* Over-explain the K; any response strategy will do but I'd rather engage in run-of-the-mill framework + perm + alt deficit.
-



Flay judge. LD and IPDA background. Tech over truth.

Contentions must be clearly extended across speeches to be evaluated. Voters and weighing must also be provided. I do not flow CX.

K's and theory are fine.

---

**Ming Jiang**

Dougherty Valley High School

2 rounds



I'm a parent judge and the dad of a 9th grader who currently competes in Public Forum. While I haven't judged PF before, I do have experience judging Congressional Debate, and I believe my scores have fairly reflected student performance.

Here's what I value in a round:

1. Please speak clearly and at a moderate volume — I should be able to hear every word without straining.
2. I prefer logical, well-reasoned arguments over emotional appeals.
3. Be polite and respectful toward your opponents at all times.
4. Provide a clear introduction and a well-organized summary at the end.
5. Don't interrupt your opponents aggressively — civil exchanges are appreciated.
6. Speed is fine as long as clarity is maintained.

Overall, I value clarity, organization, and respect. Make sure your arguments are well-structured and supported by reasoning and evidence.

---

**Timothy Jin**

San Marino High School

4 rounds



*Last changed on Sun March 10, 2024 at 9:15 AM EST*

he/him/his

some familiarity with debate

---

**Alok Kapoor**

NS Independent

2 rounds



*Last changed on Mon March 4, 2024 at 4:22 PM EST*

I am a parent judge.

I would prefer that you speak slowly and understandably.

Please weigh and use good evidence ethics throughout the round.

I will judge based on how well each team argued and defended their point.

I flow a bit too so be sure to address contentions and subcontentions.

Please include me in your case /evidence distribution emails at kapooa01@gmail.com

---

**Arrman Kapoor**

American Heritage Palm Beach HS

2 rounds



*Last changed on Wed July 17, 2024 at 12:47 PM CST*

i'd prefer speechdrop but if not -- arrmanloveschai@gmail.com

--

hi! i'm arrman (he/him) and i debated in pf for 4 years at jasper and plano west and in worlds for 1 year as a member of team usa. i'm now a freshman at ut austin and i coach for both the national debate club and american heritage palm beach.

\*i need verbal trigger warnings for arguments pertaining to self-harm and suicide, graphic or not\*



tl;dr -- read any and all arguments, debate however you'd like, just be accessible and kind, the more complicated an argument is, the more explanation and judge instruction i need.

pf --

i am open to anything and everything, especially styles of debate and debate practices that are often frowned upon because debate is getting too dogmatic. judges who say they're "tech > truth" but are unwilling to evaluate certain arguments or will tank your speaks for making them are just straight up lying.

two exceptions -- a) don't be discriminatory in any way and b) don't lie.

there's no right or wrong way to debate, but i do have varying levels of experience on different types of arguments that might affect the quality of my decision.

speaks --

i feel like i'm too expressive to not inevitably nod for what i think are winning arguments so i might as well try to actively do it.

there's a lot above on how to gain or lose speaks generally. if i were to ever give a 30, here's what you'd have to do:

- win paraphrasing good or disclosure bad
- acquiescence (can't give you any more than this)
- make fun of anuj lohtia or satvik mahendra (has to be good)
- respond to an argument in second constructive and they kick it in first rebuttal
- beat the kritik without reading any evidence (excluding substance and extrapolations of it)
- read gcb (greatest conceivable beings get perfect speaks duh)

the fastest way to lose speaks is being rude or just unnecessarily aggressive. be kind to your opponents, but feel free to post round me in any way. respect would be ideal but emotions run high and i get it.

---

**Tanish Katkar**

Milpitas

6 rounds



---

*Last changed on Thu September 19, 2024 at 7:01 PM EST*

Ex PF debater, Have 6 years of PF experience

Don't speed read, if I don't catch your points I won't flow them. Make sure to signpost where you're responding.

I know the rules, so if I catch you cheating you lose my ballot.

WEIGH WEIGH WEIGH, tell me why I vote for you.

keep it civil

Assume I don't know the topic and explain it to me

I love a good definitions and framework debate and at a varsity level simply saying their definition makes no sense or is too limiting will not be acceptable.

---

**Shikhar Kaul**

Hire

4 rounds



---

*Last changed on Thu March 21, 2024 at 7:27 AM CST*

debated in PF for 4 yrs

westlake '24, cmu '28

[email: shikharkaul1@gmail.com](mailto:shikharkaul1@gmail.com)

important things across all events (as applicable)

-please signpost

-extend key arguments

-do comparative/meta weighing

-share evidence before speech/rebuttal

-try to actually clash with the arguments

-be respectful

-show up ready to go

-don't steal prep

feel free to ask me questions before round

[pf/ld]

**tech > truth -- but make complete arguments**

i'll pretty much vote for any argument as long as it is extended and weighed

progressive debate is welcomed but please make sure you understand what you are reading

please use cross constructively or for fun - I almost only care about the flow

probability weighing needs to be warranted and can't be used to generate new impact d

fine with speed but won't flow off doc

**will boost speaks for making the round faster/more interesting** - bringing me snacks, sending evi before speech/rebuttal so no wasted time, reading prog that you understand, good strategy and clash, or just smart debating

[wsd]

most of the above applies. i like to see smart analysis, actual clash of arguments other than cross applying your arguments to take out the opponents', and smart weighing that compares the arguments and explains why the impact of one is greater/more severe etc (biased from pf i guess)

[cx]

I'm probably gonna come across as a very flay judge since most of my experience is PF-based. I'm not going to hack for kritiks, but will be happy to vote on them if there is a real alternative. fine with plans/cps, non-topical cps, and any sort of theory. make sure to aim for good and direct clash. i'll **default to competing interps and condo good**. also, being from PF, **my tolerance for spreading is slightly lower**. please speak clearly, and I'll say "clear" if I have an issue. I'll flow off the doc a bit to meet y'all in the middle

[congress]

Clash is crucial—make sure to actually engage w/ opposing arguments. professionalism and respect toward your competitors is also super important. I usually look at **depth of analysis, credible sources, and natural delivery** as key factors as a judge

[interp]

**do whatever you want**; i truly believe that if you are confident and genuine in what you are doing, the audience will feel that too. I don't care about profanity, and I enjoy creativity in the performance.

[extemp]

the most important thing to me is how good/well-explained/deep the analysis in the speech is. next would be making sure to sprinkle in credible evidence to support the arguments, as well as a simple speech structure that lends itself well to your position and a natural tone as you speak. make some interesting points!

[parliamentary debate]

most of my general points apply. i prefer specific and well-warranted arguments.

---



This is my first time judging, I am a parent judge with some knowledge of the topic but please treat me as a Lay Judge and speak without spreading and with clarity.

Your points in your topic should stand out with empirics and statistics that show numbers and values rather than evidence that just "states" things.

Do NOT misrepresent your evidence to your opponents and always be clear and directed. Summarize the cases that you believe will make you win the debate at your final speeches.

Using real world examples is very beneficial to your case.

Make sure to emphasize the futuristic implications of you and your opponents case and compare impacts at the summary and final focus.

Please tell me the speech order and the duration of each speech, (constructive, crossfire, rebuttal, etc).

I look forward to seeing an engaging and interesting debate



*Last changed on Fri January 5, 2024 at 1:01 AM MST*

TL;DR

Traditional-leaning **tech judge**. Clear signposting, warranted extensions, and comparative weighing are key. Ks and theory are fine, but need to be **explained clearly**. I don't flow cross, and I'll say "clear" once — after that, I stop flowing new material. Above all, **be kind and have fun**.

Background

I competed in **all major debate events** (PF, LD, Policy, Congress, and Extemp). I broke at **NSDA Nationals** in PF, competed in **Congress semifinals at NCFL Nationals**, and qualified for the **TOC in Congress**.

I come from a **small, resource-limited team** without access to elite coaching, briefs, or camps. Because of that, my judging style leans **traditional**, though I'm familiar with the most common arguments and comfortable evaluating progressive rounds when explained well.

Paradigm Overview

- **Tech > Truth:** I'll vote for warranted, extended arguments even if I personally disagree — **unless they're blatantly false or abusive**.
- **Traditional lean:** Progressive arguments are fine, but comprehension is sometimes harder for me. Please **explain clearly and slow down on theory/Kritik vocabulary**.
- **Speed:** I'm fine with speed, but if I can't understand you, I'll say "clear" once. **High conversational pace** is ideal.
- **Judge instruction:** I'm happy to let debaters decide how the round should be evaluated — just **communicate it clearly**.

Argument Preferences

- **Signposting and Roadmaps:** Please roadmap and group arguments (e.g., "three turns on Contention 1") instead of jumping around.
- **Extensions:** Must include **claim + warrant + impact**.
- **Weighing:** Explicit comparative weighing (probability, magnitude, timeframe) is essential. If no weighing is done, I default to probability.
- **Kritiks/Theory:** I'm fine evaluating them, but they often go over my head if not well-

explained. Define key terms, outline links, and give me a clear impact story.

- **Evidence:** Quality matters. **Empirical or peer-reviewed** sources weigh more heavily than simple news articles.
- **Defaults:** If not specified, I default to tech over truth, drop the argument, not the debater, and presume the least interventionist world.

#### Cross-Examination

- I **do not flow cross**. If something comes up that you want on my flow, repeat it in your next speech.
- **Courtesy matters.** Rudeness or belittling behavior will lower your speaker points. Misunderstandings are not excuses to be disrespectful.

#### Speaker Points

I **don't like speaks as a tiebreaker** and don't want them to keep anyone from advancing when they've won the debate. As a result, I tend to give **high speaks by default**.

- The **only exception** is poor conduct — disrespect, rudeness, or hostility will lower speaks.

Debate is competitive, but it should also be **fun and rewarding**. Do your best, be clear, and enjoy the activity.

Email: [prestongknutson@gmail.com](mailto:prestongknutson@gmail.com) (feel free to reach out with questions)

---

**Surbhi Kocchar**

American High

2 rounds



---

*Last changed on Mon October 12, 2020 at 1:52 AM EST*

▪

Judging style: Lay judge

I have judged LD and PF in the past few years and like both formats.

Please add me to the email chain: [Surbhi.kochhar@gmail.com](mailto:Surbhi.kochhar@gmail.com)

Speaking Pace: I prefer a clear speaking style over speed.

Timing: Please respect speech times.

Expectations:

- Clarity and confidence are key. Speak in a way that is easy to follow.
- Present a clear and well-structured argument. I want to understand your position.
- Show a strong understanding of the topic—demonstrate that you know what you're talking about.
- Use credible citations and solid evidence to support your claims.
- Persuasion matters! Confidence and effective communication will strengthen your case.

Be well behaved and respectful to your opponent(s) and enjoy the debate rounds, good luck!

---

**Rohit Krish**

MSTW Independent

3 rounds



---

Hello, I am currently a college student with no prior years of debate. Treat me as a lay judge; speak clearly and make sure what you are saying is accurate. FYI, I might give extra speaks if you make a Drake reference in your speeches. Good luck.

---

**raj kummariguntla**

Dougherty Valley High School

4 rounds



---

*Last changed on Fri November 22, 2024 at 1:51 PM PST*

Rajanarsimham Kummariuntla:

I am a lay judge with some experience. I prefer arguments with clear links, although I will try my best to interpret anything. Over warrant everything. If I don't understand it, I'm not interpreting it. Try not to run extinction impacts with very little probability. I will interpret it but grant more access to any defense brought up by the other team. At the end of the day, it is your job to refute your opponent's points. If I don't find refutations, then that argument (regardless of how far fetched) is true. I also interpret perceptual dominance and fluency, so just try to speak clearly. And please don't speak fast.

---

Vijayakumar  
Lakshmipathy

East Ridge High School



---

I am a parent judge, I have been judging for the last 2 years.

What I look for in the round?

Clarity and explaining your argument well

Don't make new responses in the back half of the round

You shouldn't have to speak too fast, I would prefer if you would slow down and give more emphasis to your case

Most importantly, be respectful and have fun!

---

Sachin Letchumanan

Fairmont Prep

6 rounds



---

*Last changed on Tue July 9, 2024 at 6:54 PM EST*

Hi! My name is Sachin Letchumanan, and I'm a freshman at Virginia Tech (Class of 2029) majoring in Math & CS with a minor in Philosophy. I debated in Public Forum (PF) for all four years of high school at BASIS Independent Mclean. Some of my notable achievements include 2025 NCFL Grand Nationals Public Forum Champion, 2x NCFL Nationals Qualifier, Northern Virginia Regional Champion, Northern Virginia Regional Runner-Up (2024)

**Email for evidence exchange:** sachin.letchumanan@gmail.com

**TLDR;** I am a flow judge with an appreciation for lay debate

General Preferences:

- **Email Chain:** Please add me to the email chain if one is being used.
- **Tech > Truth:** I default to technical debate. (i.e if something is conceded, it is presumed as true)
- **Substance vs Non-substance:** I am most comfortable evaluating *substance* and *theory*. Please do *not* run Kritiks, Tricks, or other non-traditional arguments—I likely won't evaluate them fairly.
- **Theory:** I will only entertain theories on issues such as disclosure, paraphrasing, or serious ethical violations (e.g., racism or ableism). Don't run frivolous shells.
- **Spreading:** I'm okay with spreading, but you must send a doc
- **Weighing: Weighing is not optional**—it's critical. Lack of comparative weighing makes it much harder for me to decide a round.
- **Turns:** All turns must be *fully extended* in every speech after they're introduced. Think of them like mini-contentions. Even if conceded, they must be extended to matter. [I am more than happy to vote for a turn if it is extended and weighed]
- **Defense:** Not sticky. If it's not extended in the next speech, it's gone. That includes summary.
- **Summary:** Extend the full case chain. Tell me clearly what argument(s) to vote on.

- **Final Focus:** No new responses. I won't flow them.
- **Crossfire:** I value CX—especially from a lay perspective. A portion of my RFD will reflect what happens there. Be respectful and avoid hostility.
- **Prep Time:** I do running prep. Just say, “We’re starting prep now,” and I’ll start the clock. No need to ask for a specific amount beforehand.

#### Other Notes:

- **Presumption:** If offense on both sides is negligible by the end of the round, I will **presume neg**, unless given a strong reason not to. Aff has the higher burden because they advocate change from the status quo.
- **Disclosure:** I will disclose decisions *if the tournament permits it*.
- **Conduct:** Be respectful. Excessively rude or inappropriate behavior may result in an automatic loss.
- **Fun Rule:** Ask me a fun question before round so I know you read my paradigm :)

Feel free to reach out with questions at [sachin.letchumanan@gmail.com](mailto:sachin.letchumanan@gmail.com) — I’m always happy to clarify anything!

#### LD:

Expect me to know the basics of the format and flow, and to have topic knowledge. Do not run anything super complicated with me. Simple = Better

I also work at Champion Brief cutting arguments for upcoming topics --> lmk if u have any good ideas

---

Fiona Li

Walton High School

6 rounds



*Last changed on Fri November 15, 2024 at 6:51 AM PST*

#### Feburary 2026:

THIS TOPIC IS TERRIBLE. I'll literally vote on anything like insane/terrible cases. Please just entertain me I hate this topic. i'm not an aff hack i promise that last topic was just bad. i am so washed and i hate online debate please just like try to slow down < 225 wpm and warrant and weigh and I'll be happy. I have not debated in like two years so I'm not responsible for not getting weird new metas if you don't warrant them out to me.

TLDR: slow down, warrant, weigh, collapse, extend. thanks

#### General:

*please someone say something funny*

Add me to the email chain: [fionayli1004@gmail.com](mailto:fionayli1004@gmail.com)

- Any turns and offense need to be implicated as to why it outweighs another argument or why it takes out an original argument. unimplicated pieces of offense forces me to intervene and usually that's a giant toss up.
- Tech >>>>>> truth
- **Speed < 230 I beg.** Won't drop you for faster but go faster at your own risk because if I don't understand you it's cooked. I **strongly prefer not to flow off speech docs**. If I don't hear something and it's on your speech doc I will probably default to what I hear.
- Frontline in Second Rebuttal, extend defense in first summary, defense isn't sticky (*unless the meta has massively changed or smth in that case probably warrant out why you're doing what you're doing*)
- Generally entertained by funny arguments/niche arguments/sometimes entertained by theory

- Any offense u want me to vote for has to be extended from all the links from fiat to a fleshed out impact.
- **How I vote: weighing first** -> whoever's winning weighting's offense, if they win their offense they win-> if they don't I go to other offense -> if neither team has offense I will presume for who has better weighing unless I get presumption warrants alrdy -> absent presumption warrants, weighing, and offense I will flip a coin to presume. Please do not make me flip a coin. I will be sad.
- **how I evaluate weighing absent being told how to evaluate between diff types of weighing:** short-circuit/pre-reqs/link-ins > magnitude/scope> timeframe > strength of link > probability (*am i washed??? are there new types of weighing??? if there r tell me because id*)
- I don't flow cross. Might pay attention if it's a k or theory round.
- I don't flow overtime at all. There is no grace period.
- new warrants are new arguments and will be treated as such
- if you point out an argument has no warrant and it actually has no warrant I treat it as sufficient defense.
- if u rllly want me to pay attention to smth saying some variation of "lock in this part's important" would entertain me and probably force me to pay attention

feel free to post round. Feel free to argue with me I make mistakes but obviously after submitting I can't change my decision.

If you have questions feel free to email me before the round.

#### PLEASE READ THIS IF YOU ARE READING THEORY:

- Defaults: yes rvis, reasonability, dta, quirky pref but I default if you win no RVIs then a turn or winning competing interps still means I don't vote for the turns/competing interps as offense because the warrants for no RVIs also apply to them. *Any of these preferences are easily altered with warrants.*
- Every single rule for normal substance debate I have applies to theory. I need extensions. i need warranted responses and warranted arguments and arguments need to have implications and weighing.
- even if you win turns/das remember you need to weigh them against the shell in order to adequately win offense on the shell.
- collapse on one or two standard in summary/final focus and just frontline/weigh it fully. It makes the round so much cleaner. I don't require shell extension in rebuttal so please do not waste time doing..

Fuhai Li

McLean High School

4 rounds



I am a parent judge who values clear, logical, and well-reasoned arguments. Please speak slowly and convincingly so I can follow your speeches. Good luck! Something debaters should keep in mind is that eye contact and crossfire are very important to me, even if you are online.

truth > tech

Jing Li

Bergen Debate Club

6 rounds



*Last changed on Thu October 6, 2022 at 11:07 AM EST*

- Treat me like a parent judge
- used to do LD - so I understand some jargon
- persuasion is everything
- ask me questions about my paradigm before the round if confused
- i wont stand for anything that is racist, sexist, homophobic, transphobic, etc.
- dont misgender someone

---

Judith Li

Dougherty Valley High School



---

*Last changed on Sat February 10, 2024 at 1:39 PM PST*

Looking forward to hearing all of your great speeches!

---

YiChuan Li

VDA - Vancouver Debate Academy 6 rounds



---

*Last changed on Wed June 19, 2024 at 8:06 AM PST*

My name is YiChuan Li (Bodie). I debated for over 4 years in both CNDC and PF formats. I like speeches that have arguments that are closely linked and supported with evidence. I really like it when debaters signposts at the beginning of their speeches which makes understanding their arguments easier for me as a judge.

---

Lichen Liang

NS Independent

2 rounds



---

*Last changed on Mon September 30, 2024 at 5:59 PM EST*

I am a parent judge, but I have judged a few tournaments by this point. Please speak with good clarity and no speed.

I value logical and consistent arguments with good evidence to back them up.

Show me how your arguments are better/stronger than your opponents.

Don't use debate jargon; keeping things simple and understandable is very important to me.

Time yourselves, don't go over.

Have fun!

---

Baojun Liu

BASIS Silicon Valley

6 rounds



Parent judge.

Be logical, be convincing, be respectful.

My email: baojun@gmail.com

---

Ethan Liu

SA Midtown West

6 rounds



---

*Last changed on Mon February 19, 2024 at 7:47 AM EST*

**Some background:**

I did PF throughout high school and parliamentary debate (APDA) at the University of Maryland. I've coached students in PF, Parli, LD, and Policy, and I've judged all debate formats, though I'm most up to date with PF and Parli.

**Some general things:**

1. Don't be rude.

2. Rounds are evaluated based on argumentation. Speaks are evaluated based on contribution to the ballot.

3. I can handle speed as long as you remain coherent. I will never intentionally penalize you for spreading **but** you take on an increasing risk that I miss something on the flow the faster you speak. Send me a speech doc if you want to be safe: [thnliu288@gmail.com](mailto:thnliu288@gmail.com)

4. I will stop flowing when time is up (yes, you can finish your sentence). Keep track of each other's prep time.

5. I don't flow cross but will pay attention. For me, cross often helps clarify things (remember, I'm not an expert in the topic you're debating). If there's something from cross



you'd like me to evaluate in my decision, bring it up in your speech.

### Some notes on debate and flow

1. Please signpost and road-map. Telling me where you are on the flow will ensure that I am also there.
2. Tech > truth. The further from "truth" your argument strays though, the lower the threshold I have for what qualifies as a response. For instance, "no they can't" is an acceptable response to "elephants can fly".
3. I (tend to) only evaluate arguments made in the speech where they belong. Constructive arguments belong in the opening speech. Responses should be made in the first speech they can be made in (generally the subsequent speech). New arguments don't belong in the final speech.
4. Extend (and frontline) the offense you want me to flow through. If you forget to extend it, I'll probably forget to vote on it. Blippy extensions are fine in principle, but often insufficient for a ballot in practice. The more you think I should prioritize an argument, the more speech time you should allocate to it.
5. I will only call cards if you explicitly ask me to **and** they matter for my decision. Hint: they almost never do.
6. Tell me how to weigh arguments or I will weigh them myself. I'm bad at weighing.

### Specific argument preferences/biases

1. I am receptive to pretty much any type of argument, so long as you tell me **how I should evaluate it**.
2. Progressive arguments (Ks, theory) are cool. However, I offer no guarantee to keep up to date with the latest acronyms or terminology, so err on the side of explaining things more thoroughly.
  - a. Be very explicit when telling me how to evaluate the argument. This is especially true for anything pre-fiat - if you don't tell me what I should do (and warrant why), I'll probably do something you didn't want me to.
  - b. I prefer "drop the argument" to "drop the debater". I'll consider whatever you run, but I'm more inclined to buy the former.
  - c. Used to be categorically against RVIs, have come around somewhat. I'm down to vote on them, but it's context dependent.
  - d. Still very against tricks, very receptive to theory on tricks bad. If I have to vote on them, you are almost certainly getting a **low** speak win.
3. Tabula rasa is fake. Debate involves a common pool of knowledge assumed to be true unless challenged. If challenged, it becomes another argument to be evaluated in the round. For transparency, my "default settings" are: policymaker role of the ballot, debates should be fair and educational, the world exists, science is correct, ~~the earth is flat~~, words have meanings, consequences matter, equality good, rationality real, people have free will. Feel free to make arguments challenging these assumptions, but keep in mind that you incur the burden of proof.
4. Feel free to ask questions before the round. I don't claim to be perfectly unbiased, but I am very willing to clarify any pre-existing beliefs I may be bringing into the round.
5. My gut is not your gut. If you ask me to gut check something or rely on my intuitions, I'm happy to do so... but you may not like the outcome. The safe thing to do is just read warranted arguments.
6. If you say "baba yetu" in your speech, ~~I'll sky your speaks~~ I'll take it into consideration when assigning speaks.

---

Klil Loeb

Lexington HS

6 rounds



*Last changed on Mon February 19, 2024 at 4:39 AM EST*

my email: klil.loeb@gmail.com

I did debate all four years of high school for Lexington. I debated LD for 3 years and PF for 1, so I'm pretty familiar with any type of argument. That being said, I do have some preferences that'll be helpful for me and you in terms of evaluating a round.

**PF Paradigm:**

- Weigh. Clash is SO important and is too often avoided. All your arguments should be connected and should flow in a way that I can directly compare one to another. If both teams are talking about separate topics that don't interact, that's a pretty unsuccessful round, and I won't know where to vote.
- Extend. If something is dropped in any speech, I won't evaluate it, even if it's brought up again later. Make sure anything you want to factor into the decision is mentioned in every speech, and is especially emphasized in final focus. If its not brought all the way into your last speech, I'll consider it conceded, and won't vote on it.
- Sign post. If I don't know what you're talking about, I won't factor it into my decision.
- Be polite to your opponents. If you're rude, definitely expect me to lower speaks. It doesn't help you in any way to ruin what should otherwise be a good round with a bad attitude. Have fun and be nice and you'll have no problems.
- Most importantly - and what I'll be paying most attention to - use your last two speeches (especially final focus) to CLEARLY tell me why you should win the round over your opponent. The clearer you are, the easier it will be for me to make my decision, and the happier you'll be with the outcome. I vote off both offense and defense so make sure to maximize your voters.

Some little things:

- I'm fine w speed
- Time your own speeches and prep
- I don't flow/vote off cross. Anything you want me to remember should be brought up during speeches
- I love unconventional arguments
- DON'T have a loud conversation while I'm filling out my ballot omg i cannot express how much this irritates me
- Also feel free to make the round fun in any way - whatever that means to you, I love when people make me laugh (when its appropriate)

The debate is about you so have fun! I'm good with anything as long as you do everything listed above:)

Feel free to ask any other questions before the round!

**LD Paradigm:**

- do what you want for the most part i don't care, as long as you just tell me why i should vote for you
- Tech > Truth
- I love plans/counterplans/disads etc.
- K's are fine
- I'm not super into phil but I'll vote on it if it's explained well. Make sure you actually understand what you're saying otherwise how am I supposed to figure it out from you.
- I like theory generally. i don't like frivolous theory - don't read disclosure on someone that's never heard of the wiki and is reading a traditional aff.
- WEIGH AND WARRANT. If there's no clash, I won't know where to vote. The easier your arguments are to understand, the easier it is for me to vote
- FOR ONLINE DEBATES: slow down! It's almost impossible to understand when either my or your computer's slow. I'm fine with speed otherwise though if you're CLEAR!! If i can't understand you though, I'll dock your speaks.

Good luck:)



I prefer to have your case for better understanding; please email to:

[luwenping2001@yahoo.com](mailto:luwenping2001@yahoo.com)

## Background

- Judging PF debate for 2 years
- Lay judge: I prioritize clarity and communication over technical jargon or speed

## ✔ What I Value

- **Clear articulation**— Speak clearly and structure arguments well
- **Eye contact & confidence**— Present with poise and presence
- **Respectful conduct**— Be courteous to opponents and judges
- **Strong evidence**— Use credible sources; quality over quantity
- **Responsiveness**— Directly engage with opponent's arguments
- **Impact calculus**— Explain why your arguments matter
- **Delivery over speed**— Persuasive speaking > fast spreading

## ✗ What to Avoid

- Overly technical language without explanation
- Disrespectful tone or behavior
- Speed that sacrifices clarity
- Ignoring key points from opponents

---

Isabella Maldia

The Altamont School

4 rounds



*Last changed on Mon October 7, 2024 at 11:23 PM CST*

Hi I'm Isabella Maldia! I did debate for 6 years in hs (LD, PF, Policy, and IEs) so you can run whatever you want! I used to be a LARP debater and would spread, so if you do too, make sure to add me to the email chain! ( [imaldia2040@gmail.com](mailto:imaldia2040@gmail.com) ). FYI I don't like Ks, specifically performative Ks, so if this is your thing, you should probably strike me lol. I'll definitely still listen and evaluate it (im not biased lmao) I just don't like debating it/judging it. Good luck!

---

Rajul Mamgain

The Bronx High School Of Science

6 rounds



*Last changed on Sun October 27, 2024 at 4:01 AM EST*

**Opening Speakers: State your key arguments** within the **first few seconds**. Ideally state each argument in **1-5 words** so I can remember it and write it down. Please **DO NOT** make me piece together your arguments after listening to you for 2-3 minutes — state your key arguments in the **first 20 seconds!**

**Avoid Debate Jargon:** Public Forum should be **clear and accessible**. Use simple English— don't turn it into an elite, highbrow format. I've been judging for about 2-3 years but I still don't know what **"C1"** or **"C2"** mean! Simply name the arguments so the debate is easier to follow.

**Speak Slowly & Naturally:** This is a **debate, not a performance**. Your pitch and speed **shouldn't change** just because you're debating. I don't care about accents—I **just need to understand you**.

**Use Crossfire & Rebuttals Properly:** I only give credit if you **ask direct questions** or **challenge** your opponent's arguments. I give you **even more points** if you clearly identify which of your opponent's **specific argument (s)** you are challenging **AND** deliver clear counter arguments against those. **DO NOT** use Cross-fire or Rebuttals to restate your own points

**No Last-Minute Arguments:** I will ignore **any new arguments or evidence** in Final Summary or Final Focus.

I love Signposting: Clearly indicate which argument(s) you're addressing. If you say you are going to follow an order of arguments, stick to it. If you say you'll do a comparative analysis, do it.

**Respect & Professionalism:** Maintain good sportsmanship. Relax—it's just a debate.

### About Me

- ~~Second~~ Third year judging Public Forum
- Parent of a high school debater
- Add me to card-sharing emails (rajul.mamgain@gmail.com)

---

Isaac Mazariegos

Hire

6 rounds



---

*Last changed on Wed November 13, 2024 at 7:31 AM CST*

### tldr:

debate should be a place where everyone feels accepted and respected. whether you win or lose, you should feel proud of yourself! this activity is hard, and just participating in the first place is a real accomplishment.

### experience:

former debater from sf roosevelt in south dakota. qualified to nsda nats & gold toc! now @ georgetown university in washington, d.c.

### key things:

-id say im a flow judge, tech over truth, and also i try to be tabula rasa as best as i can.

-collapse pls!

-SIGNPOST I BEG

-also pls extend (you don't need to extend authors bc i don't write them down but you should def extend warrants, links, impacts etc)

-i listen to cross so don't lie in speech abt what happened in cross

-defense is not sticky

-pre-reqs, short-circuits, and link-ins are gasssss

-EMPIRICS WIN, OFFENSE WINS, WEIGHING WINS

-debater math is terrible don't do it

### evidence sharing:

id prefer y'all setting up email chains before round and sending docs before speeches. it really makes life easier for everyone and prevents stealing prep, delaying the tournament, etc. (also add me to the email chain.... [im540@georgetown.edu](mailto:im540@georgetown.edu) )

### speed:

please don't spread. i can handle a conventional speed, but id prefer not to miss one of your arguments and then you end up losing because i thought you didn't say it. if you think you're going fast but not spreading, then you're probably fine. if i say clear, then you're going too fast. SLOW DOWN ON TAGS PLS

### prog:

theory: i'm most familiar with disclosure theory, but i'm not opposed to trigger warning theory or paraphrasing (any other types of theories will need to be extremely warranted). friv theory is annoying, so pls don't run if u want good speaks. also, have good cut cards pls.

kritiks: i have zero experience with k's so you will really have to dumb it down for me (i'm not against you running k's).

cps, plans, trix: no.

### other:

if you have any questions feel free to email me at [im540@georgetown.edu](mailto:im540@georgetown.edu)

---



*Last changed on Fri November 1, 2024 at 4:12 AM PST*

i'll evaluate anything... or nothing.

speechdrop.net or aramehran@berkeley.edu

I will vote off extensions or lack thereof...

please extend the internal link... please...**im begging**... a nuclear war doesn't cause extinction if u don't tell me the sky gets really cloudy so bob the farmer can't grow corn...

I love K's, but if it's stolen, my threshold for buying responses is lower than my willpower to avoid an Apple Mango Guava Blueberry Deep Fried Cinnamon Roll with *THREE* scoops of vanilla bean ice cream. I would prefer K's being explained to me as if **I am a young orphan still being weaned off my pacifier.**

I LOVE THEORY GOOGOOGOAGAGAGAGAGA ARGHHHHHHH

Weigh? Please? please. PLEASE. Weighing isn't going up and spending five seconds telling me you're winning magnitude. **I am not a jellyfish**, nor am I the parent who voted off persuasiveness in your previous round. Do comparative weighing, prereqs, short circuits, link-ins, metaweighing.

Please post round me i think it's educational and i enjoy verbal jousting.

30 speaks if you win a staring contest in cross, limit 1 per round.

*zan zendegi azadi*

debate society at berkeley; Fairmont MK team code i competed under my senior year if you'd like to view the best record in pf history

---

Deepali Mehrotra

The Golden State Academy

4 rounds



I am a lay judge, and I do not like spreading or any kind of speedy speaking form.

Respect your opponents and be polite at all times, rudeness of any kind will not be tolerated whatsoever.

I enjoy substantive debates and most times I won't vote for theory or any tech argument.

Weighing is super important and most teams forget about framework which is essential when weighing.

Best of luck with your debate rounds!

---

Sibabrata Mishra

BASIS Phoenix High School

6 rounds



*Last changed on Sat February 3, 2024 at 5:13 AM MST*

I am a parent judge, so I'll be looking for overall presentation of your points, without making it over complicated. Please keep your points logical and fact based. Thank You and Good Luck!

---

Aarthi Mohan

Amador Valley Independent

6 rounds



I am a parent judge.

Please speak at a reasonable pace and stay respectful throughout the round. I value clear arguments and good organization.

---

Jayant Namdhari

Bergen Debate Club

6 rounds



*Last changed on Sat April 20, 2024 at 4:52 AM EST*

[namdhari@umich.edu](mailto:namdhari@umich.edu)

Update for TOC 2024:

I haven't debated in a minute but here's my background: Did PF for 1.5 years, switched to LD my senior year and qualified to the TOC. Since college, I haven't actively competed / judged PF occasionally, my overall preferences / views on debate haven't changed significantly but I'd place a significantly higher emphasis on deep research and evidence quality. Additionally, my tolerance for tricks / friv theory / clash evasive strategies is generally a lot lower than it used to be -- that being said I'm probably still more receptive to this than most PF judges and won't hack against it, just might not be as good at judging these rounds and will over-reward high-level strategic round vision in these debates.

With that in mind the below paradigm is largely up to date, and happy to answer any questions in round or prior via email.

Things that might need to have more emphasis given how long it's been since I debated (especially for PF):

1] Clarity -- please signpost clearly and slow down a little on taglines, I don't flow off the doc and won't go back unless you've marked cards.

2] Overviews / Round Vision -- Tell me what you're going to do before you do it, even if this is just 3 seconds of "High risk of a DA outweighs a mitigated case" at the top of the 2NR, it helps me know what's happening strategically, don't feel the need to overdo this compared to other rounds but if you don't do this already, try to do it (I promise other judges will also thank you with speaks boosts!)

3] Packaging / Simplicity -- In and out of debate I've realized that regardless of how complex arguments are going in, the hallmark of competence is being able to explain it simply. I used to be more on the side of thinking I'm stupid in these debates when the 2nr/2ar is unclear and going back through cards, rereading taglines and overviews to try and get an understanding of what was said. Today, I'll err more on the side of punishing you for long jargon-filled overviews, extension blocks that aren't tailored to the round and not being able to explain/contextualize your arguments in a simple way

4] I don't know the topic lol

5] I don't know if evidence ethics / file sharing standards in PF have gotten better over the years but I have absolutely zero tolerance -- send out docs (don't waste time/steal prep asking for cards) and don't miscut/paraphrase.

#### **Paradigm:**

I don't think you should worry about reading this too closely, I'll **evaluate any argument however you tell me to in round and I will try to be as tab as possible but I do have biases** which while I can try to keep them out of debate, some will implicitly be present and I feel like it would be better for me to make you aware of them rather than pretend they don't exist.

**TL/DR:** These are just my preferences as to what I believe is good for debate I won't default one way or another unless there is absolutely no pushback from either side.

#### **Regardless, a ranking of how familiar I am with things:**

Policy/K/T - 1

T-FW/K Affs - 1

Theory - 2

Phil - 2

Dense Phil/ Pomo read as an NC - 3/4

Tricks - 4/5

K vs K debates -- 4/5 (I like them but I'm a coinflip heavily weighted towards the perm)

#### **K Affs vs FW**

- Been on both sides and these are my favorite debates to judge however I probably do lean slightly neg.

- CI's are good to resolve some offense and provide uqs for an impact turn but it's not necessary.

- 2N's need to do a better job winning the terminal impact to FW, don't overinvest into reading long blocks that explain why the aff is unfair/decks clash because let's be honest, they aren't gonna contest that most of the time, focus on implicating why that is important both in the context of debate and in the context of the affirmative.

- Framework 2nr's I've thought were excellent often use the same verbiage as the aff instead of using long o/v blocks.

- TVA/SSD to resolve some offense is good, even if it doesn't

- 7 minute 2nr's entirely on the case page often get confusing for me when they lack good judge instruction -- try and be clear as to what you are doing on the case page before you get into the lbi

## **K**

- good for larp v k

- bad for k v k (biased towards the perm + often get confused a lot); if I do end up unfortunately judging one of these, judge instruction is paramount. I will evaluate these debates generally knowing that theories of power are largely compatible. So, my ballot will be a reflection of differences between the aff and the alternative and the impact to those differences. If the difference between the two indicates the alt is worse than the aff, I vote aff. If the difference between the two indicates the alt is better than the aff, I vote neg.

- lbi > long o/v's

- Framework CI = you don't need an alt unless the aff says you do and winning links is sufficient if you've won framework

- Alts that result in the aff are fine absent a 1ar warrant why they aren't (being shady in cx is kinda annoying tho)

- Only understand cap, Moten/Harney, Warren (never read this in round), and a little bit of Baudrillard -- explanation is good.

- All the interactions that people consider "k tricks" should be implicated in the 1nc or else 2ar answers are justified (saying lines in the card make the claim most often doesn't really count)

## **LARP**

- Like this a lot

- UQS proly controls link direction

- all cp theory can be dtd granted a warrant

- hate reading cards and I will stay away from it as much as possible but end up having to read ev in most rounds.

- defense is underrated and can def be terminal if implicated as such (i.e: bill alr passed proly is terminal)

- solves case explanation can be new in the 2nr as long as it was in 1nc evidence

- perm shields the link/cp links to nb -- explain these args to me! I'm not v smart/takes me time esp since I don't know the topic lit most likely

## **Phil**

- Haven't read anything besides util/Kant and a little prag -- think it's hella interesting doe if that counts for anything

- Weighing is important, spend more time explaining your syllogism and why that excludes theirs.

- TJF's proly o/w and are the move if I'm in the back

- weird complex ev mandates not-weird not-complex explanation

## **Theory**

- Like this

- Weigh between standards

- low threshold to vote on rvis -- still need to justify them and w/e

- reasonability should be explained and is v strategic at times -- I will not vote on an RVI if you are going for reasonability obviously

## **Tricks**

- will vote on these as long they are implicated fully in the speech they are read

- I can't flow for my life so like try and slow down a Lil bit

## Evidence Ethics

- did pf for 2 years, cut cards weren't a thing, people paraphrased, the average card was shorter than T definitions, and evidence was sent via url's + ctrl F -- I really don't care at all about ev ethics until it's mentioned but i'm p sure my standards for ev ethics are very stringent so if you do call it out/stake the round on it in PF you will probably win 90% of the time

- if staking the round, that should happen the moment the violation is called out. -- don't read a shell and debate it out until the 2ar and then decide you wanna stake the round instead

(i.e: Miscut 1AC ev means you should stake the round immediately after you see it BUT at the very latest after 1nc cross)

### Misc:

- I'm cool with post rounding -- not cool w/aggressive or toxic post rounding
- Clear judge instruction is really helpful
- Hate it when people steal prep
- hate unclear signposting
- Record your speeches in case audio cuts out
- time yourself and stop at the timer. (pls)

---

Seon Namgung

East Ridge High School

4 rounds



Hello. I am a parent judge.

When evaluating a round, I place strong emphasis on how clearly and logically each team presents their arguments. A smooth, coherent storyline supported by sound reasoning is crucial. Debate is ultimately a form of conversation, so maintaining a respectful and polite attitude toward your opponents is also important.

I value communication that is efficient, focused, and easy to follow. Condensed and precise explanations are preferred over long or overly complex ones. Excessively fast delivery is not favored, as it often sacrifices clarity and makes it difficult to understand your position.

Overall, I reward debaters who clearly state their claims, support them with rational justification, and communicate them in a respectful and accessible manner.

---

Dawn Paciotti

College Prep

6 rounds



*Last changed on Mon September 9, 2024 at 10:11 AM CST*

*Paradigm Updated 9/27/25*

*TL;DR for LD, PF, and CX - debate is about communicating arguments, not manipulating them. If you both choose to manipulate arguments rather than communicating them I am not going to choose the better manipulator. I am going to choose whoever makes the more vaguely coherent argument that seems like maybe it could be a comparative reason to prefer one world over the other.*

*TL;DR for WSD - Find the essence of your argument, find the implications of your argument, and tell me why it's comparatively better than the opposing team's.*



I have been judging debate for 30 years, and I find it consistently disturbing that our community rewards debaters who try to manipulate a win rather than earning one. If you are attempting to beat your opponents through flow tricks they are unfamiliar with, speed beyond their threshold, or theory and kritiks that hold no meaningful value to you other than a win, I have serious doubts about your respect for the other participants in the debate space. The debate space must be consensual. Debaters enter into the space with the assumption that they have a 50-50 chance of winning, and that they will have equal space to present their arguments and have them legitimately considered by their judges. Judges enter into the space with the assumption that the debaters will attempt to win their ballots rather than exclude them from the round. Speaking faster than an opposing debater or judge is comfortable with is nonconsensual behavior. That's problematic. Making arguments that do not include a warrant, are presented as absolutes that cannot be opposed, and/or cannot be compared to opposing arguments that have equal ground is a strange approach to an activity where judges attempt to make a meaningful choice between two competing claims. Using your knowledge of current debate fads to intimidate your opponents and police their rhetoric and strategy by telling them how they can and cannot respond to you is a) nonconsensual, b) bullying, and c) pretty lame. I understand that organizing arguments into shells can make it easier to follow along. However, using shells as a tool of silencing the other team and not giving them equal space to present their opinion is... c'mon, do I have to say this again? It's nonconsensual. Judges, coaches, debaters - I implore all of you to stop normalizing teenagers acting in nonconsensual ways. It makes the debate space combative and exclusionary, it promotes patriarchal thinking that is never a good idea, and it just makes for blippy, messy, unpleasant debate rounds. Do better. If you come at me with your arguments about tech>truth being more "objective" and leading to less "intervention" I will happily laugh in your face for thirty minutes. There is no such thing as an objective way to choose a winner. There is no such thing as a debate round where a judge does not, at some level, make personal choices about what rhetoric and strategy they valued. The entire glorification of the flow as some 'objective' sacred text is deeply rooted in patriarchal assumptions and preferences, and I like to think that as critical thinkers we can go beyond that as a community. If you want to play a game because winning makes you feel less insecure, go play online poker. If you want to challenge yourself, compare yourself against other worthy opponents, learn something new every round, become a better human, and change the world - stay in speech and debate. Thank you for attending my lecture, and read on for additional paradigm information.

ALL DEBATE: Welcome to my ten second tutorial, 'Answering Arguments Wins Debates.' Notice I didn't say 'repeating arguments wins debates,' because it doesn't. You have to listen to your opponent's argument, then craft a response that shows why your side of the resolution is comparatively better regarding this issue. Telling me their argument isn't well-warranted isn't enough. You have to provide me with a warrant for why your side of the debate wins that point.

**\*\*PLEASE DO NOT SPEAK IMPOSSIBLY FAST.** If you're talking like you've had too many Dr. Peppers, we're fine, but if you blur words together and start double breathing, I can't understand you. Not only is that a consent issue, it's a disability issue. A decade ago I experienced a bipolar break, and since then my brain doesn't work as fast, and my ear-to-brain interaction isn't what it used to be. That doesn't mean I am stupid. It just means that I need to hear things at a normal, conversational speed. I also feel you should check with your opponent and judges before EVERY round to discuss what their threshold for speed is to make sure you are all on the same page and that the debate space is inclusive. That's key to keeping people in this activity. Please don't chase out people who can only compete sometimes. Be better.

GENERAL ARGUMENTS: I will consider anything that isn't offensive, but you have to give me a reasonable explanation for why it applies in this debate. If you're trying to make an argument based on debate jargon explain it to me. Just because you think you sound cool saying something doesn't mean I am going to vote on it. I do not vote off tricks on the flow. Not every dropped argument actually matters. On the flipside, don't ignore arguments. LISTEN to your opponent. Respond to them.

THEORY: I am open to any theory arguments critiquing your opponent's rhetoric, behavior, or advocacy. I am NOT open to resolutional critiques, because in that instance you're basically critiquing the wording committee. We have to have an agreed upon resolution to have a fair debate. It may not be your favorite resolution. It may not be my favorite resolution, either. However, it's the resolution we've all walked into the round to engage with, so do me a solid and actually engage with it. I previously bought disclosure theory at national tournaments, but in updating my paradigm today I feel it's incompatible with an inclusive, consensual debate space. If you believe strongly that debaters should disclose, you should come to the room (physical or online) immediately after posting to make a good faith attempt to discuss arguments with your opponent. Breezing on in at the start time and reading theory tells me you care more about an easy win than fair debate prep.

WEIGHING: I don't need you to use the words probability, timeframe, reversibility, etc. So long as you compare your argument with your opponent's and tell me why your argument makes your world comparatively better than theirs, I'm good.

BEHAVIOR: Be respectful of me and of your opponent. If I am cringing by how rude you are in CX, you won't be getting high speaks. I don't vote for bullies. I vote for debaters. If you have questions about how to get better after the round, you can ask me. If you want to re-debate the round, I will not be tolerant. You had a chance to communicate to me, and if you lost, you lost. I am not going to change my mind, and arguing with me will just mean I will be in a bad mood if I ever have to judge you again. I judge often enough you want to be the person I smile when I see.

#### EVENT SPECIFIC PARADIGMS\*\*

WORLD SCHOOLS DEBATE: Firstly, although I have judged this event for five years or so, I am not necessarily aware of every norm in the activity. If you feel your opponent is using debate norms from other events and they aren't in line with world norms, tell me why their position should be disregarded. Secondly, I like to see a lot of worlds comparison in either the 3<sup>rd</sup> or Final speech. What happens if we pass the motion? What happens if we fail it? What are the implications of that action across broader populations and through time? Especially with impromptu topics, I think it's important to figure out what the effects are of voting either way. I'm not going to want to make a decision about a subset of the motion taken in one snapshot in time. I want to look at precedents the motion might start, or how the motion may change perceptions across the globe. Think BIG. Thirdly, don't ask incredibly long POI's just to waste opponent time. Your POI's should be strategic in terms of their content.

PUBLIC FORUM: Firstly, do not make arguments in cross. Ask questions of your opponent. Weaken their link chains, make them explain warrants and evidence. Please let your opponent have a reasonable amount of time to answer, and only interrupt if they are being purposefully obtuse. Take turns asking. If you have a follow-up, it should be able to be answered with one sentence, or it is a second question. Secondly, I do not believe that policy and LD norms automatically apply in PF rounds. If you would like to access another debate event's norms, you need to give me a reasonable explanation as to why your interpretation is best. Thirdly, I like to see incentive analysis done that helps me to see why certain policies might be preferred over others. This can be from a government perspective, a societal perspective, or even individual perspectives, depending on the argument. Fourthly, you have to give me more than the argument name to count as an extension, and arguments should be extended in every speech if they end up in Final Focus. Give me the evidence, the warrant, the way that argument outweighs the opponent's argument – I'm flexible, but give me something to extend other than a word. Fifthly, be realistic about what you can do in a four minute constructive. You will not be able to go into massive depth with any of your arguments. Low probability, high impact arguments require a pretty strong link chain, and that's probably not something you have time for in PF. Stick with what you can defend. Then defend it. Sixthly, be smart about evidence sharing. Have your evidence immediately accessible and shareable. Better yet, send the cards either right before or right after the speech so everyone can see them. I do not want to have to police both teams while searching and copying and pasting and refreshing emails. I also really, really do not want to see teams using evidence challenge as a way to get more time to mentally prep. PF debate should not take a lifetime. It should take less than an hour.

LD: I'm not judging much LD anymore because the activity is becoming less enjoyable for me. I'm not a tech happy judge, and I won't vote on flow tricks. I will vote on comparative benefit in the overall aff and neg position. I would prefer you take prep time before the NC so that you are responsive to your opponent's rhetoric and arguments. If your entire NC is cards that you don't bother applying directly to opponent arguments, I'm probably not going to vote for you. Clash is key, and clash requires being in the moment of this particular debate with these particular people. Every debate should be different. If you're making them all the same, you're probably going to get the L from me every time, too.

POLICY: I judge policy only when tabrooms really, really need me to, or for UIL Texas debate where speed is not the norm. I recognize that on most circuits, speed is the norm, and I simply can't keep up. If tab needs me to take one for the team, though, please respect my speed issues above. Also, I don't understand all of the intricacies of policy debate norms, so if you want me to judge off something more obscure, explain it to me. My favorite thing in Policy to hear about is the solvency debate, so points there if you dig in deep.

To finish it off, this activity should be something all of us enjoy. If you're miserable during the round, we probably will be, too. Find a way to make each debate interesting, unique, challenging. Stretch your world, and make your opponents and judges think in new ways. Being in debate should inspire you. If it doesn't, there's probably a better activity for you, and I hope you can find that joy elsewhere. We're all spending a day or weekend together, so let's all try to make it pleasant.

---

Yijun Pan

Unionville

4 rounds



---

Im a Lay judge - no spreading and no prog debates please - Be sure to have off time road maps, signpost, and comparatively weigh. I try my best to flow the round but don't count on that. Also, be sure to bring up any arguments made in cross-fire. Speak very clearly and be respectful. If you are any type of \_\_\_ist, I will cut speaks.

---

Jasmine Park

BC Academy

4 rounds



*Last changed on Sat November 16, 2024 at 11:50 AM EST*

- Competed in PF and Public Speaking in HS
- jasminejw.park@mail.utoronto.ca
- Please time yourselves!
- Minimal spreading is fine, but if I can't understand you, it won't end up on my flow
- Clear taglines are helpful
- Tech > Truth
- Weigh in FF with voters!
- I don't flow crossfire; mention it in rebuttal/summary/FF if you want it to go on my flow
- If it takes you more than 5 minutes to find a card, you don't have it
- If you're asking for every single piece of evidence, and I don't see why you need it, it won't benefit you
- Be respectful during the debate

---

Manikanta Patasmetti

Milpitas

6 rounds



---

I would be evaluating arguments based on logical reasoning more than on factual clarity. Ideas would be judged on how well they are constructed, and the depth of thought involved in forming them. Rebuttals that directly address the core idea of the argument that's being debated are given more weight than peripheral responses.

Some things to note:

Make sure you introduce yourself.

1. I will not write anything after the time is up.
2. I will not evaluate new arguments after first summary. Will only evaluate arguments that have been extended.
3. Dropped arguments will be evaluated fully as long as the weighing makes sense.
4. Speak clearly and make sure I can understand you.

PS: I did British Parliamentary before and I evaluate as a 'tech' judge, but treat me as a flay. Do not speak too fast.

---

**Pearl Patel**

West Windsor Plainsboro South

2 rounds



---

Parent Judge, speak slow and clear, be respectful and have fun!

---

**Davida Paul**

Taipei American School

6 rounds



*Last changed on Sun January 28, 2024 at 3:17 PM WAT*

Hey!

The most important thing to know if you're going to be debating in my room is how much I value fair and thorough engagements! This looks like making concessions where necessary (when the cases have been properly analyzed and are logical) and engaging in fair and charitable comparisons.

Next up, don't be rude or disrespectful! Avoid racist and discriminatory slurs. I am more than willing to penalize debaters on this basis.

Thirdly, I am fully cognizant of the fact that speakers have a lot of material to cover in such a small time, but please make sure you don't excessively speed through those arguments! DO NOT SPREAD. If I can't hear it in your speech, I will not flow. Please speak clearly so your opponents and I understand you.

Finally, always be conscious of your burdens in the debate and do justice to them. Do not merely assert, justify those claims.

Good luck!

---

**Christopher Peng**

Winston Churchill High School

6 rounds



---

## PUBLIC FORUM

- Prefer well-explained, compared args > random claims
- Analysis w/ warrants > just throwing out "evidence"
- Don't just say a card exists, tell me why it matters
- 

## Speed

- I can handle speed
- If I can't understand you, i'll clear
- Anything below 250 wpm is good
- Slow down on taglines
- No need to add me to email chain

## Evidence

- If you paraphrase, have cut cards
- If I call for a card, it better be cut — if not, i drop the argument + your speaks take a hit
- Email evidence = must be in cut card format

## Crossfire

- If it's only in cx and not extended in a speech, I'm not evaluating it

## Rebuttal/Frontlining

- 2nd rebuttal needs to frontline at *minimum* the stuff you're collapsing on + all offense
- Implicate responses, i.e., tell me why they matter
- Defense isn't sticky unless you make it matter

## Back half

- You *must* collapse
- Extend the full argument: uniqueness, link, internal link, impact
- No new stuff in final focus bc if it's not in summary, I'm not including it in my decision

## POLICY

- **Tech > truth**, but only if it's warranted and extended (blippy claims with no comparison get minimal weight)
- **Impact calculus is key** so timeframe, probability, magnitude and give me explicit weighing, not buzzwords
- **On structure**, make sure uniqueness → link → internal link → impact is complete and clearly extended in the 2NR/2AR
- **Counterplans:**
  - Solvency advocates preferred
  - Theory should be tied to real, demonstrated abuse
  - CPs must have a clearly extended **net benefit** or they're not viable
- **Kritiks:**
  - Clear link story > jargon
  - The alt needs to be explained in functional terms, i.e., what it *does* and *how it resolves the impact*
  - For the aff: specific perms + impact framing matter a lot
- **Framework:**
  - I'll evaluate it, but give me comparison on why your model of debate is better for education, fairness, or whatever you're weighing
- **Line-by-line matters so** signpost; if I can't tell where something goes on the flow, it won't factor into my decision

## PUBLIC SPEAKING

- **Clarity > flair** so a clean, organized speech with a clear thesis and structure beats flashy delivery with no direction
- **Strong framing matters** (I want a clear intro, roadmap, and takeaway, especially in Impromptu and Extemp)
- Don't just state facts or quotes; explain *why they matter* to your argument or theme
- **Evidence quality matters for me**; in Extemp especially, your sources should be credible and used to support an actual claim, not dropped in for show
- **Delivery:**
  - Eye contact, vocal variation, confidence bc I'm looking for controlled, intentional speaking
  - Avoid overly theatrical gestures; be purposeful
- **Time management:**
  - Don't sprint through the last 30 seconds
  - I'd rather hear fewer points done well than a rushed info dump
- **Originality counts**; especially in OO and Impromptu, unique angles, clever framing, or personal insight can elevate your rank
- **Professionalism:**
  - Respect your audience
  - Humor is fine, but make it strategic and appropriate
- **Overall:** A strong speech is clear, organized, well-evidenced, and delivered with confidence

---

Paul Queija

Livingston High School

6 rounds



*Last changed on Mon November 4, 2024 at 8:23 AM CST*

#### Contact:

Please add me to the email chain before the round begins at **coachpaulqueija@gmail.com**. You are also welcome to use this email for any questions, comments, or concerns regarding the round or my decision.

#### Background & Approach:

I am 21 years old and not far removed from where you are sitting. I competed for eight years (5th-12th grade) and qualified for Nationals multiple times. Now, I have been a coach for four years and have trained four National champions. Because of this, I judge with the same energy and technical focus I wanted when I was a competitor. I do not have rigid habits that come with decades of judging. I am here to let you dictate the round.

#### Neutrality & Philosophy:

I offer a guarantee that is rare in debate: I am completely politically and ideologically neutral. Consequently, you never have to worry about "matching" my beliefs or fearing that I am biased against your worldview. Whether your argument is conservative, liberal, or radical, I am a blank slate. As long as you are respectful, you are safe to explore any perspective. I care only about how well you argue your position on the flow.

#### Style, Speed, & Substance:

Treat the debate round like a professional courtroom. I love passion, but I expect you to treat your opponents with dignity. Aggression is fine, but toxicity is not. Regarding delivery, I have "fast ears" and am comfortable with speed (spreading) and technical jargon. However, clarity is non-negotiable. If I can't hear it, I can't flow it. Finally, make your

arguments real. I am a technical judge, but I am not a robot. I am most persuaded by arguments with real-world impacts. Tell me why your argument matters to real people, not just why it works in theory. I am strict with time. Once the time runs out, so does my flow.

#### Feedback:

My goal is to help you get better. I view the ballot as a tool for learning, not just a scoreboard. If time permits and you want it, I am happy to give live feedback immediately after the round. I would rather give you tips you can use for your very next round than make you wait for the written results.

---

Akash Rajanna

Christopher Columbus High School 4 rounds



---

*Last changed on Sat October 19, 2024 at 11:08 AM EST*

47 yr old father of two kids who do debate. I don't know much so go slow please.

My main source of current events is watching the news every sunday so please explain everything to me.

---

Sanjay Ramaswamy

Northside Preparatory

2 rounds



---

*Last changed on Wed November 20, 2024 at 11:26 AM PST*

I'm a first time parent judge.

Please speak slowly.

I prefer arguments with evidence.

---

Vimala Ranganathan

Northside Preparatory

2 rounds



---

*Last changed on Fri October 18, 2024 at 11:17 AM PST*

I'm a parent judge with some experience judging but do not know the technical nuances of debating.

Please have clear, well-substantiated, logical arguments. I weigh arguments supported by evidence.

Be respectful and have fun.

please add me on the email chain: vimrang@yahoo.com, send all evidence and send rhetoric as well as cards if you paraphrase

---

Zachary Masaomi Reshovsky

Hire



---

*Last changed on Fri January 12, 2024 at 1:52 PM EST*

Zachary Reshovsky Paradigm

Last changed 12/13 10:32P PST

**About me and Overview:** I have a background with 4 years as a high school debater (Lincoln Douglas) and 3 years as a collegiate debater (1 year NPDA parliamentary and 2 years NDT-CEDA Policy) at the University of Washington - Seattle. At UW, I majored in International Relations where I graduated Top 3% of class and was a Boren and Foreign Language and Area Scholar (Chinese language) and nominee for the Rhodes and Marshall Scholarship. My expertise is in China studies, US-China relations and Great Power Relations.

As an LD debater, I was (and still am) a believer in traditional LD rather than progressive LD arguments. I believe that the introduction of policy arguments to LD (in particular on resolutions that clearly resolve around moral/philosophical issues) are inappropriate. As such, I strongly prefer cases centered around a strong Value and Value/Criterion, an explanation of why that VVC is moral, and how it links to the topic. As well, please explain to me in rebuttals why you are winning using specific articulations and spins on your/opponent's evidence. High school debaters in particular struggle with articulating why they are winning in final rebuttals, which oftentimes invites frustrating judge interventions. I will consider consider policy arguments in LD (in particular on topics that

directly involve a policy proposal - e.g. "the US should implement a federal jobs guarantee" topic). However, these type of arguments will get substantial less weight than traditional LD topics. I prefer depth over breath arguments - I've noticed a lot of debaters will extend all of their offense without telling me which argument is the strongest, why I should vote on it, and how it beats out your opponents arguments. This forces me to intervene and attempt to weigh which extended arguments are strongest. In an ideal world, you'll provide me with a single argument where I can feel comfortable voting. Regarding procedurals, ***I have an extremely high threshold for Theory.*** I believe that Theory is vastly overused in LD and distracts from the substantive education that discussing the topic brings. Your opponent needs to be doing something truly abusive for me to consider it.

Likewise, I'm less likely to vote on someone who runs Topicality. Like theory, I feel T is overused. It is possible to win my ballot on T if your opponent is wildly off topic, but the AFF's case needs to be really untypical (e.g. a performance AFF that has nothing to do with the Arctic 2025-26). In LD, I rarely see cases that are off-topic, but if you feel your opponent is feel free to run T.

As well, try to be creative! I come from a family of artists and always have looked at debate as equal parts rhetorical art and logic. Some of the best rebuttals and cases I have seen have had really creative spins on them and really sounded entertaining and compelling. I would encourage debaters to study examples of speeches in which the speaker has articulated not only a strong argument, but also delivered it in a way that delivered with rhythm, well apportioned arguments, was organized cleanly, and had substance that was comparable to strong prose in a novel rather than a rote response to a prompt.

#### **Regarding my views on specific types of arguments:**

- Primarily policy/on-case judge, but certainly willing to consider Kritikal and off-case arguments. DisAd/Ad impacts need to be spelled out clearly and weighed thoroughly in later rounds or else risk judge intervention. Find that debaters oftentimes do not get beyond surface-level tit-for-tat argumentation in later speeches in debate. No attempts made at crystallization of arguments, nor any attempt made to weigh why one impact (magnitude, timeframe, probability) or combination of impacts should OW other impacts and, equally importantly, why they should OW. Magnitude definitely easiest impact to evaluate, but feel free to do other impacts as well.

- For CPs, better to run 1 CP than many. Leaves more room for fleshing out that argument. I'm ok with Consult CPs.

- For Kritiks, I'm familiar with general arsenal of Kritiks, but please do not assume that I know the ideology/philosophy by heart. Explain it as if I am a 200-level undergrad student. Second, please articular impacts as you could an advantage or disadvantage. In particular, the link needs to be strong, specific, and very clearly linked to Case. Unmoored or vague links tend to be the death-knell of kritiks - debaters oftentimes just pull out the first link that they find and then proceed to force it to link to the case the AFF is reading. Make sure you make clear why the AFF is uniquely causing some ideologically-grounded harm or is buying into some existing detrimental framework.

Likewise, the impact of Kritiks tends to be highly nebulous (e.g. the plan causes more capitalism and capitalism is bad). Specific and clearly defined impacts are always good - they are particularly helpful for K debates.

Think of K Alternatives as very similar to a kritikal CounterPlan text - ideologically-driven condemnations that (e.g. "The AFF is evil in some undefined but scary sounding way") never work out well much like CounterPlans like (e.g. "Do the Plan but in a better way" never work). Would always recommend to debaters that they discuss why the Alternative solves or remedies some problem to a greater degree than the Plan.

- For Identity arguments, please lay out specifically how and why the AFF/NEG is engaging with a structure of power or dominance in a specific way that is problematic. That the AFF/NEG simply exists/reifies an existing power structure will get some traction yes. However, given that in order to make positive change in any environment one has to engage with unequitable power structures, it is important to describe precisely how the offending party has 1. in concrete terms, made the situation worse/more inequitable & 2. how this OW whatever benefits the offending party is accruing. Saying the offending party is simply working within existing inequities alone will not be sufficient to win usually, even when those inequities are a valid cause for concern. Again, specificity is important here - how many and in what ways is the offending party hurting disadvantaged communities.



- For Performance-based arguments on the NEG - I have a very high threshold for clearly non-Topical Perf arguments. Many teams seem to be running clearly non-topical arguments on AFF that do not in anyway link to the resolution and then proceed to claim some special framework that neatly fits/justifies their Performance into the resolution - this does not mean that they will get my ballot if the Neg runs Topicality in the 1NC.

- Likewise, for Performance-based arguments on the NEG - NEG needs to clearly win 1. why the Performance should be weighed in opposition to the AFF and within the AFF's FW. OR 2. Why whichever NEG FW that is put forth is clearly preferable. Again, I have a high threshold for clearly non-resolution specific neg performance arguments. So if the Neg wishes to win in this situation it needs to VERY CLEARLY win why a performative FW is the criterion on which the debate should be judged.

- When I truly can't decide because the cases even out to a wash and/or cases are impossibly divergent from each other and thus impossible for me to weigh, I will evaluate the debate on the overall features of each participant, specifically how they did overall in quality of arguments, rhetoric/oration/persuasion, difficult of case run. These type of debates usually require a high degree of judge intervention, so please give me a clear place to vote.

Speaking point scale:

- 29.9-30-near 100% perfect (flawless execution, strong elocution, high degree of erudition in arguments)

- 29.5-29.8-very strong debater, octo/elims performance (highly coherent arguments, well extended, effective execution and thoughtful usage of time, high degree of consideration to opponents)

- 28.8-29.4-average debater, perhaps 4-2/3-3 record level performance (better than average, but includes some dropped arguments, lack of coherency throughout debate but ultimately enough arguments are extended to win and/or come close in debate)

- 27.8-28.7 - un-average debater - unable to make coherent arguments, lots of drops, lack of tactical acumen or strategic skill in debate proper. Able to read first constructive, but unable to recognize with arguments are to be prioritized in final speeches. Relies too much on ASPEC/procedurals in place of on case/Kritikal arguments.

below-27.8 - very un-average debater - does not know how to debate and cannot coordinate correctly with partner. Lacking in basic etiquette towards others.

- Notes to debaters: Evaluation mostly dependent on quality of arguments - however, polish also comes into play. Clarity/clear organization and efficiency in rebuttals will increase your speaker points dramatically. Well run obscure and non-Western philosophies (Eg Baudrillard, Taoism, Shintoism) will also garner extra speaker points on basis that they make judging more interesting and less monotonous/repetitive. Same thing goes for contentions that discuss innovative/non-talked about issues

FOR LD: I debated LD In high school and am comfortable with speed in it. I strongly prefer value/criterion based debate and will not consider policy arguments in LD. From my perspective it is important to win the VC debate, but not essential. I view the VC as something akin to goal posts in soccer (you can still score/gain offense through the oppositions goal posts, but it is harder to win because your opponent controls the scoring boundaries).

Ultimately, I will evaluate offense/impacts through a normal magnitude/probability/timeframe lens and will default to a Utilitarian calculus if nothing else is provided, but will weigh through whatever VC wins. I strongly prefer weighable impacts (Eg X number of people will be helped to Y degree), which creates clarity in judges mind. I see a lot of debaters (especially in LD) not doing  $\frac{1}{4}$  impact,  $\frac{1}{2}$  impact,  $\frac{3}{4}$  impact,  $\frac{1}{2}$  impact,  $\frac{1}{4}$  impact weighing of their impacts vs opponents impacts in NR And 2NR, which is unhelpful and creates judge intervention. I would strongly recommend spending at least some time in each rebuttal evaluating your impacts as to why you are winning on probability/magnitude/timeframe/vulnerability of populations affected/permanence of your impacts. As with all debate, please crystallize in final speeches with concise underviews that explain why you are winning and how your arguments OW/eclipse/precede your opponent's impacts.

several general thoughts on LD debates I've seen:

- on contention level debate, please warrant out your contentions and extend claims and evidence in whole (claim, internal warrant, and impact), in particular in the rebuttals. Greater specificity is better. I've noticed a lot of debaters merely extend the tag lines of their evidence without the warrants/cards behind them and, more specifically, what the evidence does in debate/how I should evaluate it relative to other positions. This is problematic in that it leads to judge intervention and forces me to evaluate evidence after round. In NR/2AR I would prefer that you tell me how to vote rather than ask me to adjudicate between/weigh in on Impacts. A good rebuttal will not just include extensions of evidence, but also point to what parts of the evidence (eg the historical example that the author references, the statistical meta study that the cards author proffered) support your claims and what impacts their ideas will lead to.

- evidence: I prefer evidence that has descriptive/historical/statistical claims rather than predictive/speculative claims due to the fact that the former is based on things that have already happened/is more scientific whereas the latter has not occurred/is based on predilections that may or may not occur. I will prefer the former over the latter absent an argument made to differentiate the two. Expert authors will be preferred to non-experts in a vacuum. Non-contextualized anecdotal evidence is the least preferred type of evidence.

- AFF strategy: I notice a lot of debaters (in particular on the affirmative) have a difficult time extending sufficient offense in the debate to stay in the running. I would strongly recommend extending your arguments/contentions first (esp in the 1AR where there is a timeskew) before moving on to opponents case. Inexperienced debaters tend to get distracted/overwhelmed by their opponents case and attempt to tackle it first, but end up running out of time to extend their own case after getting bogged down in said opponents arguments. The best offense is a good offense - you can win if you extend your claims and leave some of your opponents claims dropped, but you cannot win if you extend none of your claims but shoot down the majority of your opponents arguments. I would strongly recommend starting out with your case first in rebuttals and then moving to refute your opponents case.

The Affirmative needs to be even more strategic/efficient in the 2AR. The 2AR needs to focus down on one to two arguments they are winning and not attempt to cover the entire flow. Past losing 2ARs I have seen have spread themselves too thin and never told me where to vote. In order to ensure that you get your offense on the flow, I would recommend a 20/30 second overview at the top of the 2AR explaining why/where you are winning and where I should vote. This ensures you have a shot at winning even if you do not get to all points you wish to discuss in this short 3 minute speech.

- Timeskew: By default, I will give the affirmative somewhat more room than negative to make less well developed/consistently extended arguments due to the timeskew (The Neg won 52.37% of ballots according to a meta analysis of 17 TOC debate tournaments in 2017-18). Beyond this, if the AFF argues that their arguments should have a lower burden of proof bc of timeskew, I will give the AFF even more room to make blippy arguments.

Kritiks (General): Im a fan of Ks in LD. Unlike Policy arguments that have crept into LD (Plans/CPs/DisAds), I believe that Ks belong in LD on the basis that they are grounded in philosophy rather than practical politics.

Several observations/suggestions for Ks in LD:

- On the Link level, please make a clear link to something your opponent specifically does in her/his case. I've noticed that a lot of Kritikal debaters rely on very generic links (e.g. saying that the AFF proposes a policy, the policy involves Capitalism, and that Capitalism is bad, therefore you should reject the AFF) rather than an indictment of some aspect of the AFF's specific proposal (e.g. the AFF's plan proposes an increase in mandatory minimum sentencing, this will lead to a higher prison population, prisons disproportionately affect minority populations and are therefore structurally racist, mass incarceration is the warrant, therefore you should reject the AFF because they lead to more structural racism). The former example relies on generic appeal to a structure the AFF exists within/likely would have to exist within in order to implement policy, the latter explicitly outlines what specifically the AFF does to increase racism/violence. If and at all possible, please try to articulate what the opponent explicitly does to warrant your K.

- On the Alt, I have noticed that many people who run Ks have a very vague (and at times non sensical) Alternatives—in the past I have voted against Ks often because of their lack of Alt solvency. If you plan on running a K, please make clear what the Alt does and how

the Alt can solve/lead to some substantive change better than AFF can. I have a very difficult time voting for Alts when I don't know what they do. I would recommend making specific empirical examples of movements that align with Alt's views that have succeeded in the past (eg if you're running an Alt that wants to deconstruct settler colonialism, point to historical examples of Native movements that dislodged colonialism or the effects of colonialism—for example protests against the DACA pipeline in S Dakota, Native Americans protests against Columbus Day + what meaningful and lasting policy/public opinion changes these movements imbued). Its my personal belief that movements that lead to most meaningful change not only indicts and identifies a policy/problem with the status quo, but is also able to engage with the political sphere and implement some meaningful change. I believe that a well-articulated K should be able to do the same.

- K Impact: If K Impact involves some degree of indictment of the AFF, please explain to me what the AFF indictment does/leads to out of round beyond merely asserting that the AFF leads to bad impacts - otherwise it is likely that I will default to voting AFF on basis that AFF does/advocates for something imperfect but net positive. Even winning that the Aff leads to bad things (eg that the AFFs deployment of military forces is imperialist/that AFFs passing of a policy leads to more capitalism) may be insufficient to win when weighed against the entirety of AC impacts — the K also needs to prove THAT they do something beneficial as well (see previous paragraph).

- Type of K you run: You are of course welcome to run any K you feel is strategically valuable in the moment. As a personal side note, I personally prefer hearing Ks that come from obscure/not-commonly-run philosophers (e.g. Foucault, Deleuze, St. Thomas Aquinas) rather than commonly-understood philosophies (e.g. Capitalism). I believe that introducing non-traditional philosophers into debate adds substance, flavor, and argumentative diversity to the debate sphere - Independent on whether they win, I will reward debaters who run these arguments with additional speaker points for the above mentioned reasons.

Race/Gender/Transphobic/Homophobic Kritikal indicts - I will consider indictments of an opponent on the basis that they have done said something racist, gendered, -phobic in their personal behavior. The indictment, however, needs to be clearly documented (e.g. a screen shot of a Facebook post, a accusation with references to multiple witnesses who can corroborate the incident) and the offending violation/action needs to fall into the category of commonly understood violations of norms of basic decency surrounding race/gender (eg a racist joke that would be called out at a dinner party, usage of the N word towards a debater of color, calling a female debater the B-word, usage of the six letter homophobic/anti-gay term that starts with F). Microaggressions will be considered, but will have a much higher burden of proof to overcome because they are more difficult to prove/document and have comparatively less negative impact. As well, these arguments preferable should be accompanied by an articulation of what Impact of dropping a debater will have (e.g. will it send a strong sanctioning signal to other debater generally to not make the joke in question in the future(?), will it merely deter the accused debater from another repeated violation(?)) outside of round. Without an articulation of framework, I will default to a standard VC framework in LD and Policymaking Impact calculus on basis of magnitude/probability/TF in CX - if you lose/fail to provide a non-traditional framework, this does not mean that your race/gender arguments will not be evaluated, but does mean you will have to explain how they work/function under a CXmaking/VC framework and likely means you will face a comparatively uphill battle.

Speed Ks-please do not run them - I don't believe they are worth considering and are a waste of time. After having come across them 3-4 times this year, have not voted for a speed K. Unless opponent is literally spreading so fast no they are unintelligible, I believe that it is unwise to spend all our time and energy indicting each other for procedurals when we could be debating about the substantive of the topic.

I am not a fan of Performance/poetry in LD, but will consider it if absolutely necessary. Know that I have a high BoP to consider these types of args.

I generally have a very low bar to granting the AFF RVIs due to timeskew. I have granted AFF RVIs about 70-80% of the time when the AFF has introduced this argument.



Please no spreading, theory, prog, or K's.

Please explain any concepts which are not common as I am not well versed on this topic.

---

Anne Rucker

McLean High School

4 rounds



---

I am a lay judge. I prefer clear, well-reasoned arguments. I prefer that debaters speak at a regular pace to ensure that I hear all arguments. When I judge the round, I first look to make sure each side responds to the opposing side's arguments. Then, I look to weighing and comparing arguments. In terms of speaker points, I value persuasiveness, eye contact, clarity, and civility toward opponents. I do not value off-time road-maps.

---

Shehzad Sami

The Awty International School

6 rounds

None

---

Kyna Shen

Saratoga HS

4 rounds



*Last changed on Wed October 30, 2024 at 3:43 PM PST*

David Shen paradigm:

I am an experienced judge in PF and LD.

Spread at your own risk. Whatever arguments that I can't catch will not be counted in the round. Clarity is more important than quantity. Share your cases with me in advance so it's easier for me to follow. I further prefer that cases are also shared with your competitor; this makes for a better and cleaner debate round as we understand what's being argued. Make sure link to framework. Signposting is important. Tell me why I should vote for your ballot.

Respect one another and respect the rules; no grace period after time is up, keep track of your own time.

K and theory are fine.

Truth over tech

I am certified by NFHS for the following: Adjudicating Speech and Debate, Culture Competence, Protecting Students from Abuse

---

Bhawna Singh

Mission San Jose High School

6 rounds



*Last changed on Fri February 16, 2024 at 1:41 PM EST*

I do not prefer too much spreading so much so that the participant is having hard time breathing. Please keep the talking speed such that I can follow and take some notes while you are speaking.

---

Agapi Spathis

Great Neck North High School

4 rounds



aspathis@greatneck.k12.ny.us

I am a current English teacher and I teach public speaking skills. I have limited experience with debate that goes back to my own high school experiences, but I have not judged or attended tournaments in recent years. This is my first year actively judging since I have taken over the Great Neck North Debate team.

- Speak fast, but not so fast that you are completely unintelligible. I am still new to judging.
- Make sure all of your points are warranted. There should be solid connections between your points and you should establish a strong link to your stated impact. I do not want to hear you just throwing random statistics to make your point sound good.
- Use jargon or technical language if you actually understand what you are saying. Nothing is worse than someone using technical words that they don't actually understand.

- I will be taking notes on the key arguments and whether I feel they are adequately supported. I will keep track of how you counter each other's points.
- I value argument over style, but that doesn't mean that I don't value style at all. Don't push yourself to speak so fast that you are constantly stumbling over words. However, if your argument is strong I will still side with you despite some stumbles
- 
- When I am assessing a debate, the most important factor is how strong the team's argument is and how well they defend it.
- Strong use of evidence and logical links between points and overall argument will sway me
- Be confident, but be respectful.
- I don't mind in-round competitiveness; but if you are rude to the point of interference, it will reflect on your speaker points
- Absolutely no hateful language

Aruljothi Subbaraj

Dougherty Valley High School

4 rounds



### JudgeParadigm: [Aruljothi Subbaraj] The Bottom Line

I am a **Lay Judge**. I view debate as an exercise in persuasive communication and real-world logic. If you could explain your argument to a well-informed neighbor or a teacher, you can explain it to me. I value clarity, civil discourse, and narrative over technical "tricks."

### Speed & Delivery

- **No Spreading:** Please do not talk at a high rate of speed (spreading). If I can't take notes on your point because you're moving too fast, I can't weigh it in my decision.
- **Enunciation:** Clear delivery is better than cramming in five extra sub-points. Use "signposting" (e.g., "My first point is...") so I can follow your roadmap.
- **Eye Contact:** Try to look up from your laptop or flow sheet occasionally. Connection matters!

### Evidence & Logic

- **Quality > Quantity:** I don't need 20 citations; I need two or three well-explained pieces of evidence that actually prove your point.
- **The "Why" Matters:** Don't just tell me "The study says X." Tell me *why* that leads to your conclusion. Logic should bridge the gap between your evidence and your claim.
- **Collapse the Round:** In the final speeches, please don't try to cover every single tiny point. Pick the most important issues and tell me why they mean you win the round.

### Cross-Examination (Crossfire)

- **Civility:** I appreciate assertive questioning, but please avoid being aggressive or rude.
- **Usage:** I don't usually flow (take notes on) Crossfire for points, but I use it to understand your personality and how well you know your material. If you make a great point in Crossfire, make sure to bring it up again in your next speech.

### How I Vote (RFD)

I vote for the team that tells the most **coherent and convincing story**.

- **Impacts:** Tell me who is being helped or hurt by the policy we are discussing.
- **Clash:** Don't just repeat your case. Address what the other team said and explain why your argument is stronger.

### Quick Tips for Debaters

- **No Jargon:** Avoid terms like "card," "link-turn," or "non-unique" without explaining them in plain English.
- **Timekeeping:** Please keep track of your own prep time and speech times.

---

**Hema Subramanian**

Germantown Friends Independent

4 rounds



---

First time judging, parent. Consider me as a 'lay' judge.

Please do not use any technical language as I am new to debate. I do not know about this topic in detail at all.

I will take some notes, I like clear, slow, and coherent argumentation. Please speak at a slow, conversational rate.

I will vote for the team that is the most persuasive in each speech and uses the crossfire most effectively.

Please be nice to everyone. Debate is just a fun activity at the end of the day.

---

**Fardeen Syed**

Dougherty Valley High School

4 rounds



---

I am an intermediate Judge with experience in judging 8 prior PF events and 2 LD events. I would like the competitors to speak / recommend their case in "medium" speed. Competitors should time themselves for each section of the debate.

---

**Ben Targett**

SA Ozone Park

6 rounds



*Last changed on Fri February 23, 2024 at 9:41 AM EST*

Hi! My name is Ben, I debated for Half Hollow Hills for four years. I am an experienced judge and debater. Open to anything.

---

**Garrison M Taylor**

Central HS Springfield

4 rounds



---

Tech over truth, pay attention to your speaks, and run whatever you want, as long as it's not obfuscated.

---

**George Thomas**

McLean High School

4 rounds



---

Go lay, I am a parent judge from DC. Substance > Prog; do not run theory or ks, I won't evaluate them. Logical arguments, don't go too fast, warrant out responses. Comparative weighing > passing args. Be clear & respectful.

Coherent logic + good form + team dynamics

Good luck!

---

**Sampath Thummati**

Mission San Jose High School

6 rounds



---

I'm a parent judge with about six months of experience, having judged 10-12 tournaments. Here's what you can expect from me:

- Speak clearly and concisely.
- Use appropriate and respectful language.
- Treat all participants with courtesy.

- Make full use of your allotted time.

I actively listen, take notes, and provide feedback during speeches and debates. Please be clear in your arguments and responses—avoid overly technical language, and don't speak too fast, or I may struggle to follow.

I focus on the quality of arguments and logical reasoning. Be prepared to provide evidence and sources, and make sure your arguments are well-defended and effectively refuted. I keep an open mind throughout the debate, so convince me with strong, logical reasoning.

---

Tanishka Tomar

Hire

6 rounds



---

*Last changed on Sun March 24, 2024 at 2:40 AM IST*

Judging is a critical aspect of ensuring fairness, accuracy, and quality in competitive events across various disciplines. The following paradigm aims to provide a comprehensive framework on how I assess the participants fairly and effectively.

**1. Clarity of Evaluation Criteria:**

Define clear and specific evaluation criteria tailored to the nature of the tournament.  
I ensure to understand the criteria thoroughly to maintain consistency and fairness in evaluations.

**2. Fairness and Impartiality:**

I emphasize the importance of impartial judgment irrespective of personal biases or affiliations.  
I encourage to focus solely on the performance or presentation without prejudice.

**3. Transparency:**

I maintain transparency throughout the judging process by explaining the criteria to participants and providing feedback when possible.  
I disclose any potential conflicts of interest and ensure they do not influence judgments.

**4. Feedback Mechanism:**

I provide a constructive feedback to participants to facilitate their growth and improvement.  
I also offer specific feedback based on the evaluation criteria.

**5. Ethical Considerations:**

I Emphasize ethical behavior among participants, including confidentiality, honesty, and integrity.  
I Prohibit any form of discrimination or unfair treatment based on personal characteristics.

**6. Continuous Improvement:**

Solicit feedback to all participants to identify areas for improvement in the judging process.  
Regularly review and update the judging paradigm to adapt to changing needs and emerging best practices.

Thank You for going through this Paradigm. **ALL THE VERY BEST.**

---

Tunde Toyin

Able2Shine

6 rounds



---

*Last changed on Tue October 29, 2024 at 6:20 PM EST*

Hi everyone, couple of things to expect from me as a judge.

A, I expect abiding by time rules

B, Ensure you mechanise your claims

C, Cards are essential but ensure that they defend your statement.

D, I am.great at tracking, so you have nothing to worry about.

---

Himanshu Tripathi

Livingston High School

4 rounds



---

*Last changed on Fri November 15, 2024 at 11:17 AM EST*

treat me like a lay judge. I value good speeches.

---

**Surya Tummala**

BASIS Peoria Independent

4 rounds



---

Hi! I am a parent lay judge and this is my first time judging debate. Please go slow and make your arguments clearly.

---

**Sridhar Varakala**

The Quarry Lane School

4 rounds



---

*Last changed on Sun November 3, 2024 at 3:03 AM PST*

I am a Quarry Lane parent and please add my email sridharreddyv@gmail.com to the email chain. This is my third year at judging. I prefer debaters:

- show respect to their opponents,
- speak at a reasonable pace,
- make a strong impact starting in the summary,
- If possible, collapse in 2nd rebuttal and 1st summary to one contention each ("collapse")
- only make arguments in the summary/final focus that exist in the prior speech ("no new args"),
- use cross-fire for clarification and resolution (and not brand-new arguments),
- Read direct quotes when first introducing evidence in a debate (i.e., do not paraphrase).

---

**Sanjeev Vashist**

Emerald High School

6 rounds



Hi everyone! I am new to Judging, (have judged once before) so please be a little patient with me.

I'll be deciding the round based on clear logic, solid evidence, and good explanation — not speed or technical debate rules.

Please speak clearly, signpost so I can follow, and tell me why your arguments matter more in the end.

I really value respectful and organized debating. I'll only evaluate arguments that are carried through both summary and final focus.

My goal is to reward the team that best explains and defends their position clearly.

---

**Christian Vasquez**

Theodore Roosevelt High School

6 rounds



---

*Last changed on Tue October 29, 2024 at 7:09 PM CST*

**Who am I?**

Assistant Director of Debate, The Blake School MN - 2014 to present

Co-Director, Public Forum Boot Camp(Check our website here) MN - 2021 to present

Assistant Debate Coach, Blaine High School - 2013 to 2014

My preferred debates are ones in which both teams have come prepared to engage each other with some reasonable expectation as to what the other team is going to read. Debaters should have to defend both their scholarship and practices in round. If you've chosen to not disclose, are unable to explain why the aff doesn't link to the K, or are otherwise unprepared, you're fully welcome to try to explain why you should not lose in a varsity level competition. However, strategies that are purposefully meant to run to the margins and seek incredibly small pieces of offense in order to eke out a win due to the reliance on shoddy scholarship, conspiracy-peddlers, or outright fabrication will be met with intervention. If your argument will fall apart the moment I spend maybe thirty seconds to confirm something for my RFD, you should strike me.

This activity only exists so long as we implement practices that allow it to. All of our time in debate is limited(though some rounds can feel like an endless purgatory or the tenth layer of hell) but the implications of how rounds are conducted and behavior that is put forth as



an example will echo far into the future. You should want to win because you put in more effort and worked harder.

### **Prior to the round**

Please add my personal email christian.vasquez212@gmail.com and blakedebatedocs@googlegroups.com to the chain.

The start time listed on ballots/schedules is when a round should begin, not that everyone should arrive there. Even if I am not there for it, you should feel free to complete the flip and send out an email chain.

The first speaking team should initiate the chain, with the subject line reading some version of "Tournament Name, Round Number - 1st Speaking Team(Aff or Neg) vs 2nd Speaking Team(Aff or neg)."

I do not care what you wear(as long as it's appropriate for school) or if you stand or sit. I have zero qualms about music being played, poetry being read, or non-typical arguments being made.

### **Non-negotiables**

I will be personally timing rounds since plenty of varsity level debaters no longer know how clocks work. There is no grace period, there are no concluding thoughts. When the timer goes off, your speech or question/answer is over. Beyond that, there are a few things I will no longer budge on:

1. You must read from cut cards the first time evidence is introduced into a round. The experiment with paraphrasing in a debate event was an interesting one, but the activity has shown itself to be unable to self-police what is and what is not academically dishonest representations of evidence. Comparisons to the work researchers and professors do in their professional life I think is laughable. Some of the shoddy evidence work I've seen be passed off in this activity would have you fired in those contexts, whereas here it will probably get you in late elimination rounds.
2. The inability to produce a piece of evidence when asked for it will end the round immediately. Taking more than thirty seconds to produce the evidence is unacceptable as that shows me you didn't read from it to begin with.
3. Arguments that are racist, sexist, transphobic, etc. will end the round immediately in an L and as few speaker points as Tab allows me to give out.
4. Questions about what was and wasn't read in round that are not claims of clipping are signs of a skill issue and won't hold up rounds. If you want to ask questions outside of cross, run your own prep. A team saying "cut card here" or whatever to mark the docs they've sent you is your sign to do so. If you feel personally slighted by the idea that you should flow better and waste less time in the round, please reconsider your approach to preparing for competitions that require you to do so.
5. Defense is not "sticky." If you want something to count in the round, it needs to be included in your team's prior speech. The idea that a first speaking team can go "Ah, hah! You forgot about our trap card" in the final focus after not extending it in summary is ridiculous and makes a joke out of the event.
6. I will not read off of docs during the round. I will clear you twice if I am not able to comprehend you.
7. Theory is not a weapon or a trick. Hyper-specific interpretations meant to box the opponent out of a small difference as to how they've conducted a practice are not something I'm willing to entertain. Objections based on argument construction/sequencing are fine though.

### **Negotiables**

These are not set in stone, and have changed over time. Running contrary to me on these positions isn't a big issue and I can be persuaded in the context of the round.

To me, the activity has weirdly defined what “technical” debate is in a way that I believe undermines the value of the activity. Arguments being true if dropped is only as valid as the original construction of the argument. Am I opposed to big stick impacts? Absolutely not, I think they’re worth engaging in and worth making policy decisions around. I personally enjoy heg, terror, and other extinction level scenarios. But, for example, if you cannot answer questions regarding what is the motivation for conflict, who would originally engage in the escalation ladder, or how the decision to launch a nuclear weapon is conducted, your argument was not valid to begin with. Asking me to close my eyes and just check the box after essentially saying “yadda yadda, nuclear winter” is as ridiculous as doing the opposite after hearing “MAD checks” with no explanation.

Teams I think are being rewarded far too often for reading too many contentions in the constructive that are missing internal links. I am more than just sympathetic to the idea that calling this out amounts to terminal defense at this point. If they haven’t formed a coherent argument to begin with, teams shouldn’t be able to masquerade like they have one.

There isn’t a magical number of contentions that is either good or bad to determine whether this is an issue or not. The benefit of being a faster team is the ability to actually get more full arguments out in the round, but that isn’t an advantage if you’re essentially reading two sentences of a card and calling it good.

I am not a fan of extinction/death good debates. I do not think teams are thoroughly working through the implications as to what conclusions come from starting down that path and what supremacist notions are lying underneath. If a villain from a B movie made in the 80s meant to function as COINTELPRO propaganda would make your same argument, I don’t really want to hear it. Eco-fascism is still fascism, ableist ideas of what it means to have a meaningful life are still ableist, and white supremacists are still going to decide in what order/what people are going to the gallows first.

### *Theory*

In PF debate only, I default to a position of reasonability. I think the theory debates in this activity, as they’ve been happening, are terribly uninteresting and are mostly binary choices.

Is disclosure good? Yes

Is paraphrasing bad? Yes

Distinctions beyond these I don’t think are particularly valuable. Going for cheapshots on specifics I think is an okay starting position for me to say this is a waste of time and not worth voting for. That being said, I feel like a lot of teams do mis-disclose in PF by just throwing up huge unedited blocks of texts in their open source section. Proper disclosure includes the tags that are in case and at least the first and last three words of a card that you’ve read. To say you open source disclose requires highlighting of the words you have actually read in round.

That being said, answers that amount to whining aren’t great. Teams that have PF theory read against them frequently respond in ways that mostly sound like they’re confused/aghast that someone would question their integrity as debaters and at the end of the day that’s not an argument. Teams should do more to articulate what specific calls to do x y or z actually do for the activity, rather than worrying about what they’re feeling. If your coach requires you to do policy “x” then they should give you reasons to defend policy “x.” If you’re consistently losing to arguments about what norms in the activity should look like, that’s a talk you should have with your coach/program advisor about accepting them or creating better answers.

### *Kritiks*

Overall, I’m sympathetic to these arguments made in any event, but I think that the PF version of them so far has left me underwhelmed. I am much better for things like cap, security, fem IR, afro-pess and the like than I am for anything coming from a white pomo tradition/understanding(French high theory). Survival strategies focused on identity issues that require voting one way or the other depending on a student’s identification/orientation I think are bad for debate as a competitive activity.

Kritiks should require some sort of link to either the resolution(since PF doesn’t have plans really), or something the aff has done argumentatively or with their rhetoric. The

nonexistence of a link means a team has decided to rant for their speech time, and not included a reason why I should care.

Rejection alternatives are fine (Zizek and others were common when I was in debate for context) but teams reliant on "discourse" and other vague notions should probably strike me. If I do not know what voting for a team does, I am uncomfortable to do so and will actively seek out ways to avoid it.

---

Deepti Vattipulusu

The Lawrenceville School

4 rounds



---

I am a parent judge, and this is my first time judging. Speak at a moderate pace and don't use any complicated jargon that would make the round inaccessible to me. I will vote for the team that prioritizes clarity, intuitivity, and logic of arguments.

---

Lakshmi Priya Venkateshwar

West Windsor Plainsboro South

2 rounds



---

*Last changed on Sat November 16, 2024 at 4:39 PM EST*

I am a parent judge.

---

Pavel Volkov

Livingston High School

3 rounds



---

*Last changed on Tue February 8, 2022 at 4:19 PM EST*

I am a parent judge who has some experience in judging. I have judged several CFL's, so I have a base experience. I value staying focused on the topic, emphasizing key points, and strong supportive evidence. I recommend speaking calmly and clearly so that I can understand and comprehend all the information in your case.

---

Sameer Wankhede

Emerald High School

6 rounds



---

*Last changed on Wed October 2, 2024 at 8:32 PM EST*

I have some experience judging Public Forum and I'm still getting comfortable with the event, so clarity goes a long way with me. Please speak at a normal conversational pace. I won't be able to follow speed reading.

During the round, I take notes on the main claims, key responses, and important points. My flow is functional but not as detailed as that of a highly experienced judge, so clear structure help me track your arguments. I'm most persuaded by arguments that are explained plainly.

In evaluating the round, I look for clear reasoning and strong impact comparison. I want to understand why your argument matters and how it stacks up against what your opponents are saying.

email -simsgpemail@gmail.com to share the docs

---

Chase Williams

Taipei American School

6 rounds



---

*Last changed on Tue January 2, 2024 at 4:14 PM EST*

[williamsc@tas.tw](mailto:williamsc@tas.tw) is the best email for the evidence email chain.

### Background

Director of Speech & Debate at Taipei American School in Taipei, Taiwan. Founder and Director of the Institute for Speech and Debate (ISD). Formerly worked/coached at Hawken School, Charlotte Latin School, Delbarton School, The Harker School, Lake Highland Prep, Desert Vista High School, and a few others.

Update based on Emory 2025

Put the public back in PUBLIC forum. The jargon, the theory, the nonsense arguments... y'all are killing this event and as someone who has been a part of it since 2006, it makes me very sad. I understand that you want to win and want to do well - but what happened to best practices? When did we stop flowing? When did we stop responding to defense before extending our offense? Why is every extension through ink? Why are we not analyzing the evidence that our opponents are reading? Why are we reading evidence from 2015 in 2025 - has nothing changed in the last decade?

Yes, I'm probably a dinosaur. And maybe I'm in the minority in the judge pool. But I think if you listen to the conversations in the hallways at Emory this weekend, you'll hear a lot of "what is happening?!" "Why is this happening?!" "Where did PF go?!" Etc. Ultimately, it's up to y'all how you want to debate - but I'm done voting for the nonsense. I'm going to hold teams to a high standard going forward. Preserve the public in PF. Please.

### Updated for Online Debate

I coach in Taipei, Taiwan. Online tournaments are most often on US timezones - but we are still competing/judging. That means that when I'm judging you, it is the middle of the night here. I am doing the best I can to adjust my sleep schedule (and that of my students) - but I'm likely still going to be tired. Clarity is going to be vital. Complicated link stories, etc. are likely a quick way to lose my ballot. Be clear. Tell a compelling story. Don't overcomplicate the debate. That's the best way to win my ballot at 3am - and always really. But especially at 3am.

[williamsc@tas.tw](mailto:williamsc@tas.tw) is the best email for the evidence email chain.

### Paradigm

You can ask me specific questions if you have them...but my paradigm is pretty simple - answer these three questions in the round - and answer them better than your opponent, and you're going to win my ballot:

1. Where am I voting?
2. How can I vote for you there?
3. Why am I voting there and not somewhere else?

I'm not going to do work for you. Don't try to go for everything. Make sure you weigh. Both sides are going to be winning some sort of argument - you're going to need to tell me why what you're winning is more important and enough to win my ballot.

If you are racist, homophobic, nativist, sexist, transphobic, or pretty much any version of "ist" in the round - I will drop you. There's no place for any of that in debate. Debate should be as safe of a space as possible. Competition inherently prevents debate from being a 100% safe space, but if you intentionally make debate unsafe for others, I will drop you. Period.

One suggestion I have for folks is to embrace the use of y'all. All too often, words like "guys" are used to refer to large groups of people that are quite diverse. Pay attention to pronouns (and enter yours on Tabroom!), and be mindful of the language you use, even in casual references.

I am very very very very unlikely to vote for theory. I don't think PF is the best place for it and unfortunately, I don't think it has been used in the best ways in PF so far. Also, I am skeptical of critical arguments. If they link to the resolution, fantastic - but I don't think prefiat is something that belongs in PF. If you plan on running arguments like that, it might be worth asking me more about my preferences first - or striking me.

---

Christina Xu

Lincoln East High School

6 rounds



*Last changed on Fri June 14, 2024 at 12:31 PM CST*

please add me to the email chain:christinanaxu@gmail.com

send all docs, including rebuttal

i sometimes debate, most results are viewable here

tech > truth

flow judge

i love theory - esp disclo/paraphrasing

please do weighing starting second summary at the minimum

use ballot direct language - your final focus should basically be what i should type down as RFD, please assume i just woke up for the round

i love good case turns

extend well with the full uniqueness, link, warrant, impact

please collapse

any speed is ok

i dont listen to cross im watching my kdrama

be comparative

i will vote the path with least resistance- make the round easy for me so i don't need to think or intervene

i don't really like Ks and don't really get them

anything else just ask me before round

---

**Jimmy Yang**

Ridgewood HS - Ridgewood, NJ

4 rounds



---

*Last changed on Thu November 14, 2024 at 5:47 PM EST*

Hello!

I'm excited to be judging, and I'm a lay judge. I've judged PF debate before but still please **speak slowly** and signpost. If I missed something, sorry. (so please repeat the important points in your argument in each speech in the latter speeches). BE TRUTHFUL AND RESPECTFUL TO WHAT IS IN YOUR CASE. Enunciate important things you want me to write down and slow down before then so I know it's important. Please time yourselves and don't get into arguments. Do not use fancy wording / debate jargon.

Good luck to you all!

---

**Jing Yang**

Jellyfish Independent

4 rounds



I am a lay parent judge.

I judge the debate based on clear and consistent speeches and which side provides more substantial supporting evidences.

---

**Nan Yao**

Summit HS

2 rounds



---

*Last changed on Wed April 24, 2024 at 6:42 AM EST*

I am relatively new to debate. Please speak slowly and clearly so I can understand you. Please refrain from using complicated debate jargon, as I will not know what you mean.

My judging philosophy centers on clarity, logic, and engagement. I value debaters who can clearly articulate their arguments, link evidence and claims logically, and engage directly with their opponents' points. I believe debate is not only about making persuasive arguments but also about critical thinking and the ability to adapt and respond under pressure. Enjoy the round.

---

**Eman Yarlagadda**

Vista Del Lago High School

4 rounds



---

*Last changed on Sun February 18, 2024 at 10:55 AM PST*

Hi Students

Email for chain - emankumar@gmail.com

Please self-time.

I have judged middle school debates for 3yrs and this is my 3rd year judging high school PF debate. Consider me a lay judge. I do flow during the debate. I will not flow CX.

Talk slow. Please do not run Theory, Ks or another progressive argumentation. Keep it simple and civil. I'd prefer the basics - front-lining, extending, weighing and a solid back half strategy.

Thanks

Eman

---

Patrick Yi

Avenues: The World School

3 rounds



---

*Last changed on Fri September 20, 2024 at 7:26 AM EST*

I am a lay parent judge, and please bear with me that I don't have much experience in debate.

Please do not speak too fast.

Please introduce yourself before speaking.

Please share with me on your email chain or speech documents for anything with evidence to patrick.yi@yahoo.com

Please respect your debate partner and your opponents.

Thank you and good luck to everyone!

---

Sophie Zhang

Hire

4 rounds



---

*Last changed on Fri November 22, 2024 at 12:56 AM PST*

sophzhang10@gmail.com —> add me to the email chain pls

debated on natcir for 4 years @ unionville (LD, CX, PF) || cal '29

would say i'm mostly tech/flay (seeing as i have not heard spreading in a while), but i can be whatever you want me to be

**general:**

- tech>truth
- tabula rasa (as much as one can be)
- implicate + warrant
- have a real back and forth. simply repeating responses said previously is not enough (i.e. CLASH CLASH CLASH)
- signpost!! also would appreciate if an off-time roadmap is given before speeches
- defense is not sticky and concessions in cross are binding but only if you bring it up in speech
- lowest speaks possible if u prep steal (ESPECIALLY in pf i have competed against and judged teams who do this and it is incredibly annoying)
- keep your own time but i'll cut you off if you go too much over time

**theory/prog:**

- fine with most theory arguments just explain it well if you think it's obscure (also kinda would love to eval a friv theory round js cus i think it's fun)
- i hold theory to a higher standard in PF bc there's so little time to actually develop the argument well
- lowk not that comfortable evaluating Ks, but you can run if you want js lmk + you should probably overexplain a bit
- NO TRICKS i think they are so so silly

most importantly, WEIGH. it is so hard to evaluate a round when there is zero weighing, and i'll have to default to what i believe/what your warrants were, which is extremely subjective.

**speaks:**

- lowkey not real, i'll default to 28-29ish
- again, lowest speaks possible if you prep steal

- fun speaks stuff bc i think sometimes debate should be more entertaining

+0.2 if you win off friv theory

+0.2 if you quote a book, movie, or song cleanly in your speech (i.e. has to make sense why you're quoting it)

+0.1 if you fluently debate in another language for 30 seconds

+0.1 if you make me laugh

**important:**

i have not done a lot of reading on the current topics so pls don't assume i'm familiar with the evidence that's going around lmao. that being said, if BOTH teams agree to run a previous topic, i have no issues with that

if you have any questions, feel free to ask :)

---

**Xiaorong Zhou**

Thomas Jefferson HSST

6 rounds



---

I'm a parent judge.

I will take notes on the debate.

If you are going to speak fast, you may want to send the doc ahead of time to me email

[xrzhou@gmail.com](mailto:xrzhou@gmail.com)

---

[Join the NSDA](#)

[About](#)

[Help](#)

[Contact](#)

[Privacy Policy](#)

[Terms](#)