



Wisconsin State Debate Tournament
Judge Philosophy Statements



2014-15

VARSITY SWITCH-SIDE JUDGES	2
	3
CEKANOR, MATT	4
ERNST, TIM	6
FEUDNER, ERIC	7
GORDON, DREW	8
HAMBURGER, BENJAMIN	9
HENNING, DAVID	11
KOMAS, HEATHER	14
LARSON, CHAD	15
MCGUIRE, MOLLY	16
MOORHEAD, MICHAEL	17
PARKES, MELZORA	20
PAYNE, ELIAS	21
REINL, HEATH	22
ROBINSON, MILORAN	23
SCHAMS, GREG	24
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS JUDGES	25
BUCK, SERA	26
CHOMICKI, ERNEST	27
FROH, KALI	28
HANSEN, DAN	29
HOFFMANN, ISAAC	30
HORVATIN, MARK	31
KESTREL (HILL), EMMA	32
LARGIN, BRANDON	33
LEIGH, ROWAN	34
MAIER, MICHAEL	37
MIKIC, JAKE	38
NEAL, DR. KAY	39
NEAL, STEPHEN	40
PALMBACH, ANDREW	41
SCHUMANN, MORGAN	42
SHREEKUMAR, ADVIK	43
STUMBRIS, NICK	44
SUMMERS, EMILY	46
SYRON, ABBY	47
TIDBERG, BECKY	48
TRUSSELL, VICTOR	49
UMPIR, EVAN	50
WAGNER, THOMAS	51
WALLS, DEDRA	52
ZEMPLINSKI, MARSHALL	53
VARSITY FOUR-SPEAKER JUDGES	54
BARRETTE, MEGHAN	55
GEENEN, JODY	56
GOETSCH, STEVE	57
LE, TODD	58
LEPIEN, KIMM	59
MEDVED, CASSANDRA	60
MOFFITT, ANDREW	61
PAYNE, CHARLES	62
SHIRCEL, ANTON	63
WALKER, JERROD	64
WANTA, SAANTHA	68
YEP, ANDREW	69

Varsity Switch-Side Judges

Cekanor, Matt

Experience- This will be my second year as the Assistant Director of Debate at Marquette University High School. Before coaching, I debated at Marquette High for four years. During that time period my partner and I had great success in the state of Wisconsin, broke at many national tournaments, and qualified to the TOC. I do a large amount of research for the Marquette High squad and am therefore more familiar with the topic than most, however, I have not had the opportunity to judge too many Varsity rounds on the topic so some degree of explanation as to the intricacies of some of your arguments that you might think are obvious to anyone debating on the topic might need a little bit more explanation in front of me.

I know that I tend to rant on and on about some of my opinions regarding particular arguments or argumentative styles in debate so for the sake of efficiency, here are a couple of major highlights about my thoughts and predispositions as a judge.

-I believe that rounds often lack comparative claims about the relative quality of arguments and how this impacts the interactions of arguments. Put another way, impact calculus does not only pertain to weighing the magnitude, timeframe and probability of impacts against each other but also pertains to comparing the way in which defensive arguments, claims about qualifications, evidence quality or other similar arguments impact how I should evaluate certain arguments within the round. When debating, always ask the question "Why?", such as "If I win this argument, WHY is this important?", "If I lose this argument WHY does this matter?". If you start thinking in these terms and can explain each level of this analysis to me, then you will get closer to winning the round. In general, the more often this happens and the earlier this happens it will be easier for me to understand where you are going with certain arguments. This type of analysis definitely warrants higher speaker points from me and it helps you as a debater eliminate my predispositions from the debate.

-I debated in, and currently coach in, a team culture that places high importance on evidence quality and this fact is evident in how I judge. I believe that part of my job as a judge is to evaluate evidence as a way to compare arguments made by either team. Quality of cards without a doubt beats quantity of cards, in my opinion. This does not mean that I will decide rounds only on evidence, or call for cards without there having been moments in which the particular cards in question were not highlighted in the round. Again, it is your job to tell me why you think this particular card is important within the narrative of the round. I also find it easier to make decisions one way or another in which debaters describe the comparative lens through which I should view evidence ie. author qualifications, recency, predictive vs. descriptive claims, etc.

- I do believe that terminal defense is a real possibility in debate rounds. This means that I will not always evaluate the round through a lens of offense-defense. Again this plays into evidence questions and the relative impacts of arguments claims made above.

With those three main paradigmatic questions out of the way, here are my thoughts on particular arguments. This list is by no means exhaustive and if you have any questions about specifics, feel free to ask. Again, these are just predispositions that I would like to eliminate as much as possible while judging but I cannot shy away from the fact that they exist and will impact the way I think about rounds.

Case- Debates are won or lost in the case debate. By this, I mean that proving whether or not the aff successfully accesses all, some or none of the case advantages has implications on every single flow of the debate and should be a fundamental question of most 2NRs and 2ARs. I think that blocks that are heavy in case defense or impact turns are incredibly advantageous for the neg because they enable you to win any CP (by proving the case defense as a response to the solvency deficit), K (see below) or DA (pretty obvious). I think that most affs can be divided into two categories: affs with a lot of impacts but poor internal links and affs with very solid internal links but questionable impacts. Acknowledging which of these two categories the aff you are debating falls should shape how you approach the case debate.

I will say that I think the strategy of going for the K with case defense is an argument combination that is rarely taken advantage of. I think that case defense allows you to provide substantive ways in which I can call into question the assumptions of the aff. I think that it is very difficult in high school debate for an aff team to come back from a block that consists of the K and case defense exclusively (NOTE: This is not me encouraging you to exclusively debate like this in front of me, I just think that it is an under used strategy).

DA- I most often evaluate the DA through a lens of probability. Your job as the aff team when debating a DA is to use your defensive arguments to question the probability of the internal links to the aff. Likewise, the neg should use turns case arguments as a reason why your DA calls into question the probability of the aff's internal link. I think that an interesting argument that is often not taken advantage of by the neg is DA is the prerequisite for the aff argument.

K- I am not completely immersed in as much critical literature as some other judges but I would think that I am a decent enough judge for the K. I by no means want you to avoid reading it in front of me. I think that the best critiques are

critiques that directly engage the action of the affirmative, however, criticisms or the representations of the aff are also fair. Most rounds on the K are won in front of me when the 2N explains how the K turns the case or is somehow a prerequisite for the aff. I do find permutations persuasive when this sort of analysis is lacking, however. I also find that I will give higher speaker points to the team that explains links to specific lines in their opponents' evidence or to the logic within cross-x answers etc.

T- I will say that T is not necessarily my strong suit. It never was as a debater and I am still trying to figure out the best way to judge a T debate. This does not mean that you should not go for T in front of me, however, you should be warned that my knowledge on this issue is limited. I think that portable skills are the best impact teams can make when they are engaged in T or theory debates. Comparative impact calculus and a discussion of how each team accesses their impacts will be important in winning my ballot in T debates. I find it incredibly problematic when there are multiple T interpretations in the round, especially when there are multiple definitions of the same word.

Theory- I debated on a team that engaged in a lot of theory debates in high school. There were multiple tournaments where most of our debates boiled down to theory questions, so I would like to think that I am a good judge for theory debates. I think that teams forget that theory debates are structured like a disadvantage. Again, comparative impact calculus is important to win my ballots in these debates. I will say that I tend to err aff on most theory questions. For example, I think that it is probably problematic for there to be more than one conditional advocacy in a round (and that it is equally problematic for your counter interpretation to be dispositionality) and I think that counterplans that compete off of certainty are bad for education and unfair to the aff. Again, portable skills are the most important to me in terms of my predispositions so you will need to do work in round to explain your arguments in this context.

Ernst, Tim

Debate history: 4 years High School Debate, 4 years college debate (2 in CEDA/NDT and 2 in NPDA), 10 years judging, 10 years coaching (HS policy, LD, and public forum; College parli and NFA-LD)

Number of rounds judged on this topic: 20

Paradigm: Policymaker

There are a few key things I look for in round:

- 1) Weighing of impacts--Impact calculus is critical to debate. I need specific reasons why I need to evaluate your arguments. This requires framing the debate, using "even if" statements, as well as standard impact calculus.
- 2) I believe Kritiks should have competitive alternatives to the plan. Without competition, the kritik is nothing more than a non-unique case turn, and the aff can address it as such.
- 3) I will vote on topicality Topicality is competing interpretations for me. This means that you need to focus on the standards debate. Again, this requires framing of the T debate, as well as impact calculus.
- 4) I will listen to performance, but I don't think a debate can be won just on the fact that you perform. I view performance as a means of claiming personal agency, but that in and of itself is not enough to win a debate. You still must defend the warrants of your arguments, and I will listen to policy oriented responses to performance.
- 5) Theory is not my strong suit. Explain yourself well and, go slow.
- 6) I don't mind speed, but clarity is necessary. You ought to go slower on tags and cites. I like to keep a complete flow, so this will be to your benefit.

Most importantly, be yourselves and have fun. I like a good natured, competitive debate with lots of clash.

If you have other questions, I will do my best to answer them.

Feudner, Eric

Debate/Judging Experience

Debate:

I debated three years in high school policy for Sheboygan South High. One year was novice and the other two years were varsity. All three years I attended state, and the two years of varsity I attended CFL Nationals in Policy.

Judging:

I am currently the assistant coach at Sheboygan South High. I have judged for two years (school year of 13-14 and 14-15). During the first I judged Novice and VSS but mostly PF. During the second I judged mostly Novice and VSS.

Other:

I was also involved in forensics for four years. There I did storytelling, solo humorous, but mostly student congress and extemp.

Judging Conflicts

Sheboygan South High

Paradigm

Speed:

I am fine with speed. As stated above I debated varsity for two years so I am used to it. I will let you know if you are going to fast or you are unclear. Generally when I have a problem it is because you are unclear not because you are too fast. I do prefer to here internal road maps or signposting. Slow down and tell me when you are switching to a new flow. Also be really clear about what the flow is (I.E. Now I am moving on to DeDev). Otherwise I just make up my own names for the flows based on what I think they should be called, and then I end up getting lost. Slowing down when reading taglines/cites and indicating you are on a new card (either through numbering/lettering/or saying 'next') helps me stay organized.

Topicality:

I will vote on topicality, but only if the plan is clearly off topic. I prefer to see in round abuse. Also just listing things like "fairness, bright line, jurisdiction" etc. is stupid. Anyone can list off a bunch of words, you need to actually explain it. In the end topicality is a voting issue not because of 'jurisdiction' or something like that. I see it as a voting issue for cases where there is actual abuse, or when the aff is really truly off topic (i.e. running Moon colonization on oceans), not some debate on grammar and semantics.

Kritiks:

I am not a philosophy major. Slow down and cite scholarly sources. I don't want to hear your interpretation of philosopher x, because you are not qualified to make those interpretations. I also don't want to here long taglines and then one line of the card actually highlighted. That one line never seems to have anything to do with the tag or the topic in general. I prefer policy alternatives or at least alternatives that are not simply reject the aff. Also you need to make it clear why the alternative works and you need more then just "the aff was written in x mindset" because as the judge I don't have to vote for it on the affs mindset.

Theory:

Theory is boring. Don't run it, or do. In the end I will listen to it and maybe even vote on it, but I will hate you forever. '

Summery:

I would consider myself a tabs judge, but with leanings towards policy making. I will listen to all sorts of arguments, and as long as you do a good job explaining the argument, and your evidence is good, there is a chance I will vote on it. My big thing is I like to here impact calculus in the rebuttal, as well as going line by line and flow by flow. Explain to me why you are winning each flow, or why a flow doesn't matter. Explain the impacts of that flow and why they are bigger, faster, or just generally more important then the opponents impacts. It helps when you go through important cards and explain why this card beats out the other teams evidence. Otherwise I end a debate with a bunch of evidence on both sides but no one telling me why there evidence is better.

Gordon, Drew

School: Stevens Point Area Senior High (WI)

Experience: I've got three years of high school debate experience, I'm the assistant coach of the SPASH debate team, and this is my second year judging.

I'm a tabs judge, I'll always vote off the flow, but I have a few preferences:

Topicality: Thoroughly explain your standards/voters. In round abuse will be more persuasive, but I'll definitely listen to potential abuse.

Kritiks: I'll default to a policy framework if none is presented, so I guess I'm a little biased against Kritiks, so having strong framework/ impact framing args is important. I also probably have a higher standard for alt solvency.

Impact calc/ framing the round is key. In the end I'll vote on anything, but you need to tell my why I'm signing my ballot.

Email me at dgord325@uwsp.edu if you have any questions

Hamburger, Benjamin

Information about me:

*I have judged and coached in what would be considered "national-circuit" style midwestern high school debate since about 1998 as a card-cutting coach, as the primary policy coach, as a head coach, and now as an assistant coach and teacher in the Department of History and Social Sciences at Cedar Rapids Washington High School in Cedar Rapids, IA. I recently moved to the La Crosse region of Wisconsin. I am now getting old in debate terms--33 at the time of writing--which means I have old ideas and am grumpy about certain things.

1993-1998 Policy debater at Hastings High School, Hastings, NE

1998-1999 Judge/minor card cutter, Hastings Senior High School

1999-2005 Assistant Coach for Policy Debate at Fremont High School, Fremont, NE

2005-2007 Director of Debate, Iowa City High School, Iowa City, IA

2007-Present Assistant Varsity Coach, Cedar Rapids Washington High School, Cedar Rapids, IA

B.A. in Political Science (emphases in international relations and political theory) and History, a minor in Women's Studies from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln

M.A. in Secondary Social Studies Education and History from the University of Iowa.

Argument choice issues:

*Choose your arguments. I try to avoid evaluating rounds based on what I like to hear. Even if I don't like your argument, it doesn't mean you've lost it, etc. My self-estimation is that I am fairly even on the K vs. Policy question. I believe that both are very interesting and useful styles of debate. Most of the time framework debates aren't particularly productive, the aff will win that they get to weigh the case, the neg will win that they get some form of an alternative, etc. (hint: if you are serious about winning framework, don't waste your time on the rest of the debate--prove that you're serious about it and go for it.)

*It is my academic/pedagogical belief that debate happens best when there is consensus on a topic to be debated, but I have no loyalty to the particular version of fiat that is expected by traditional policy teams. However, in practice I have voted for performance teams more often than I have voted against them, probably because in the circuits I have judged these strategies have been pursued by more experienced teams. I have also voted negative on some very reactionary framework debates when those arguments have won. However, if you want to curry my sympathy and speaker point favor, making substantive arguments and responding to a 1ac is always preferable to a framework debate.

*However I will note that there are a small list of critical arguments where I have demonstrated very little ability to understand and vote for. I understand but dislike Nietzsche's arguments viscerally. I have made headway on like the IR/security version of psychoanalysis, but 99% of psychoanalysis/Lacan I have great difficulty understanding. Bataille is impossible for me to wrap my head around. In spite of my feminist leanings, Donna Haraway makes no sense to me. In each of these cases, if this is your only game, I am probably not a good judge for you.

*I will explicitly note some critical arguments with which I am well acquainted. I'm fairly well read in Foucault, Heidegger, lots of feminisms, critical international relations business, objectivism, cap bad, etc.

*I have increasingly found myself somewhat lost in fast debates about security policy which include multiple interacting internal links--not because I am incapable of understanding them, but because I am not as familiar with these arguments as you all are. On occasion debaters need to slow down and explain some arguments. 98% of disad/counterplan debates I am in for. If you are going for something high tech, be explanatory.

*I'm probably a decent judge for a T debate. I do not enjoy them particularly, but most of the theoretical issues are up in the air--competing interpretations vs. abuse as a standard. If you concede a competing interpretations arg, though, be aware that you'll need offense on your interp.

*I am not aware of any major side biases that I have on theory issues--in both cases, potential versus real abuse and competing interps versus reasonability seems to be a valid debate about how to evaluate those debates. I will say that I don't *like* a theory debate, and there is a natural dislike towards theory debates that I see as unnecessary. I'm not the ideal judge if you *plan* on going for theory a lot, but again, I try to evaluate those debates fairly. I will note that I do not have a neg side bias when it comes to counterplan debates--be it issues of conditionality, fiat, or competition issues. Some people see that fact in and of itself as an aff side bias on those theoretical issues, but what it means is that I am more than willing to vote aff because a counterplan is cheating, if you win that debate.

*I have found that I am getting older and more dinosaur-like on counterplan theory: I think I have an aff bias on these issues: multiple counterplans, consult counterplans, and conditionality.

Decision-making Process:

*I believe my job as a critic is to evaluate a debate as it occurred, rather than retroactively applying my standards of what debate should look like to your round. I try as hard as I can to stay to this standard, but some intervention is inevitable. Read below in the “self-observed biases” section. I try to remain agnostic about the various frameworks for evaluating debates, so that means that if there is a difference in the round as to how I should evaluate it, you should propose your framework explicitly and defend it. My presumption is that debate should be an educational activity, and it would be hard to shake me of that idea, as I am an educator by trade. However, I am open to debates about what kinds of education debate should bring, and how it does so.

*My decisions are nearly always decided by a close review of the 1AR, 2NR, and 2AR, with references to the negative block as necessary. I am not, however, a perfect flow, and you should be aware of that and flag important arguments as such. I believe a part of persuasion is correct emphasis.

*It is very uncommon for me to read evidence after a debate--use the evidence yourself, refer to warrants, etc. If you think you have good evidence, you need to show it off. The "in" thing to say is that I reward a team for good research, but the most important part of good research is understanding why your evidence is good, and exercising your ability to explain and use the evidence. Evidence is easier to come by these days than ever—the only way you can prove to me that you deserve credit for your good cards is by understanding and explaining why it is better. I do not plan to do evidence comparison for anyone.

*As regards "offense/defense" distinctions: I understand the importance of offense, but I do not discount the art of defensive argumentation. The fact that the other team does not have a turn does not mean you are winning. I have probably evaluated the risk of a disad or other impact as zero (or close enough to not matter) more than the average judge.

*I generally speaking will not seriously consider any independent issue that is not in your final rebuttal for at least 2 minutes--I do not reward a refusal to put all eggs in one basket. This is particularly true for theory arguments. If you feel that a theoretical issue is strong enough to justify a vote, plan to spend the better part of your final rebuttal on it, or don't expect my ballot on it.

In Round Decorum:

*Not much here--but I absolutely cannot stand when debaters talk loudly when their opponent is speaking. Increasingly it is hard for me to follow what a fast speaker is saying anyhow--when you're talking too, I am liable to get angry at you.

*I think most of the time you will tend to get better speaker points if you stand up when you speak. Also, pay attention to where your opponent is and where you are when you cross-ex--it is a speech. Cross-ex's where all the debaters are sitting across the room from one another and staring at their computers is not a good persuasive strategy.

*I will also likely get grumpy at you about your paperless crap, especially when it makes a debate round last 20 minutes longer than it should. Don't worry about that too much. Unless it gets out of hand. If you don't know the difference, watch me, and you'll be able to tell.

Henning, David

David Henning—Policy Debate Judging Philosophy

Version 4.9bis(c)—January 14, 2015

2015 Wisconsin State Debate Tournament Edition

School Affiliation: Lakeland College, Sheboygan, Wisconsin Position: Director of Debate and Forensics

School Affiliation: The Sheb--Sheboygan South High School Position: Director of Debate

Hired by: Homestead High School, Mequon, Wisconsin Position: Judge

Rounds judged this season (College/High School): 0/31 **Lifetime (C/HS):** 60/2000+ **Years Judging (C/HS):** 3/31

Experience with academic debate: I began my debate career during the Carter Administration. I was a policy debater in high school and college during the 1980s. I was an independent (mostly high school) policy debate judge for many years. This is my fifth year as a high school debate coach and my second year as a college debate coach. I've had some success as a debater and as a coach.

Paradigm: Tabula Rasa, but please don't insult my intelligence or agency. Be aware that if this is not argued, **I do not default to a policy-making paradigm.** That also holds for Framework arguments. Ignore my philosophy at your own peril.

Important Note: There will be some changes to this philosophy by the state tournament. I posted this now in order to meet the posting deadline. This philosophy is 90% complete, and there will be no radical changes in my philosophy between now and the tournament. There will be minor edits and changes and a few quotations added to this philosophy. The addendum on performance/advocacy/non-traditional debate will be revised and extended, although it does lay out my current but ever-evolving views on this type of debate. There will be printed copies available at the tournament, and if this infernal machine allows me to update the philosophy here, it will be.

Topicality: Show me the abuse in this round. I care less almost by the week for the current state of the topicality debate, especially the "standards." They never mean anything. "Broader topics increase breadth, narrow topics increase depth." That's nonsense. Nor do I like topicality debates that devolve into "we increase education" or "they decrease ground." I want actual abuse. Tell me which arguments you can't run, what education you are losing. If the affirmative has disclosed their case/plan prior to the round (I will ask), I will not be impressed by negative claims that they couldn't predict this affirmative or have nothing against it. You must also explain why topicality should be a voting issue in this round. By that I mean more than a list of words. "Topicality is a voter for fairness, jurisdiction and education"—that's garbage, and I don't know what that means. Give me good, logical reasons why I should vote on Topicality. I will vote on topicality, but you must present me with a clear story of the abuse and explain why I should vote against that abuse. Actual abuse, in this round. Potential abuse is not enough. That means an abuse greater than the negatives not getting to run a particular or favorite argument. For the negatives to win the round on topicality they must commit to it seriously. This is a high standard for negatives to meet, but it is not insurmountable. I vote on topicality, even in elimination rounds, but not often. In the past, when I did vote on topicality, negative teams went only for topicality in 2NR. But that is no guarantee—over the last five years teams with such strategies are 5-5 with me. Bottom line: I don't like Topicality.

Counterplans: Counterplans are fine. You must tell me why the counterplan is competitive and what advantages result from it. A counterplan that is mutually exclusive with the affirmative plan is a good standard. I am open well-constructed exotic and agent-of-change counterplans. Try to make your counterplan net benefit something more than "we avoid the disad and the affirmative doesn't."

Advantages/Disadvantages: Put the bodies on the flow. That's a good way for me to evaluate the advantage or disadvantage (or any argument), especially in a policy context. A nuclear war or the destruction of the biosphere and/or all life on earth are all fine terminal impacts for an advantage or disadvantage, especially since "all life on earth" includes me, and a nuclear war is (usually) one of the only exceptions to my next sentence. Do not assume that something (anything) is inherently good or bad. If you say the affirmative team stops (or causes) economic growth or saves money, so what? Growth or saving money are not inherently good or bad—show me what results from that growth or that saved or wasted money. It should be the same for all arguments. Impacts that are worse than death, such as dehumanization or loss of liberty and the like, are fine as long as there is some tangible evidence to that effect. Please be aware that most rhetorical evidence has limits, and often source quality issues, especially in comparison to actual or "real" impacts either in or out of the round, impacts that result from my ballot, or impacts on the activity itself. Claims that an advantage or disadvantage is "generic" or "not real world" or "not common sense" are disingenuous or an excuse for poor preparation; don't whine about it, win it. This isn't the real world, and let me state for the record that I oppose common sense, especially in debate rounds.

Kritiks: Kritiks must be explained. I really like the idea of the kritik, but rarely do I like the way kritiks are run. A one or two card kritik is usually insufficient. If you are making the argument, make it. Give me reasons, explanations, solid evidence from (hopefully) quality sources. Be aware that not all kritiks are created equal. Please explain your kritik

clearly—shouting “Derrida” is neither explanation nor clarification, and rapidly slurring a phrase like “Marxism without Marx” proves and means nothing. Such a kritik would be inferior to a well-developed and evidenced kritik such as American Exceptionalism, an argument that has both historical precedent and contemporary merit. Present me with an interpretation as to why I should vote for the kritik. How and why does the kritik matter in this round? What will happen if I sign the ballot in favor of the kritik? Does my ballot mean or do anything? Will it impact the world outside of the round? Framework arguments often make or break kritiks. What should I look at (or adjudicate) first and how should I do so? What level or “world” are or should we be in for this round? Winning Framework is often the key to winning the debate. That also holds true for critical affirmatives. Losing or conceding Framework is dangerous—the debate then occurs (and is adjudicated) at the level or in the “world” that the Framework demands. An alternative is nice but not essential for a kritik. Please be able to explain your alternative. A straight-ahead alternative like Marxism or eco-authoritarianism is usually preferable to esoteric “graduate school” notions such as metabolic restoration or Le-con or Foucault. I’ve come around on some K authors, perhaps due to my increasing temporal distance from them, and I’ve always liked Goldust and Roland Barthes. As with any argument, the clearest explanation of the K and/or the alt has the best chance to win my ballot.

Debate Theory: Theory has its place, but don’t read cards from some debate coach at me, especially if I debated against them in college. Why is that coach any more qualified than you, me or someone judging in the next room? Explain your theory positions to me and tell me why they matter in this round. What are the in-round impacts to your theory argument? Are there impacts on the activity itself? Does my ballot have a role in your theory argument? If you are claiming some kind of “abuse” of theory, show me the in-round abuse and tell me why it should be a voting issue. As for conditional arguments, they are neither inherently good nor bad. I am not a fan of junking up the round with lots of conditional arguments or vacuous theory, about conditionality or anything else. Conditional arguments should usually be of the nature that you could maybe win them if you chose to go for them. If you choose to run your position(s) dispositionally, be sure you understand what that means and can explain it to me in the round. If there is abuse, show me that abuse and tell me why it is bad. Most of what I said about topicality also applies here. Arguments predicated upon “punishing” the other team are ill-advised; such arguments usually hurt the team making them. And remember, **I do not default to a policy-making paradigm.**

Delivery Style: Speak loud and be clear. That is the most important thing. I work hard to try to get down as much of each speech as possible on my flow. Speed is a tactic, not a strategy. Speed for the sake of speed helps no one; it’s not “cool” in its own right, outside of legitimate tactical purpose. Please speak slower and clearer on tag lines and analytics, and also on any Topicality or debate theory. If I can’t understand or follow what you say it doesn’t go on my flow, and then it’s not in the round. I will shout “loud” if needed. I will shout “clear” if a speaker is unclear. Each speaker gets two “clear” and two “loud” warnings per speech. After that, the speaker is on his or her own. Third and subsequent warnings may **each result in a loss of half a speaker point.** Far too many debaters ignore my “clear” warnings, and there will be consequences to serial ignorance of my verbal warnings, not least of which is that the arguments will not be on my flow. Be aware that if something is not on my flow it is not in the round. I will not call for a card or look at a block just to fill in stuff that I missed because a speaker wasn’t clear or loud enough. **More importantly, failure to adapt to my “clear” or “louder” warnings will piss me off, and result in my discounting, or outright ignoring, your arguments. And I’ll probably nuke your speaker points.** Purposeful speed is fine, but too often speakers try to go too fast and sound as if their mouths are full of *potatos Foucault*. Go only as fast as you need to and choose your arguments wisely—do you really need those last three vague and garbled blurbs on some topicality standard? Watch me periodically to see if I am getting everything. Don’t allow me to do any extra work for teams that are problematically unclear in delivery or argumentation.

Performance/Advocacy/Non-Traditional Debate: See attached addendum.

An “Ideal” Round: There are no ideal rounds. That becomes clearer to me each year. Each round is unique and has its own (de)merits. A good round usually consists of an affirmative case with big, clear advantages or well-explained and evidenced small ones. The negative will present disads, counterplans and/or kritiks that are also specific and hopefully big sig in nature. Negatives should narrow the number of issues in rebuttals. Specificity is always good, as long as it applies, and usually more is better. Bodies on the flow, nuclear wars and things that outweigh nuclear wars make it easy for me to vote for you. Anything that could result in my own death is especially persuasive. Arguments on why these (or other) impacts are important, hopefully the most important thing in this round, or something that says when I sign the ballot it will have an impact on the world outside of the round, are good ways to go. I like arguments about mindsets and language, although these are almost always done poorly. I like speakers who directly respond to and clearly resolve arguments. I don’t find it helpful when a speaker groups a bunch of arguments, and rather than responding specifically to any one of them just reads some block of arguments against the grouping. Clash directly with the arguments of the other team. I prefer fewer positions, ones that are more substantial, have more evidence and invite more clash. As long as you have evidence, no position is too bizarre or counterintuitive, so be creative with your arguments. I’ve voted for immortality in an elimination round, and one of my high school teams ran (with my approval) Nazi Moon Base. And have fun—a little humor in a debate round goes a long way. If you are unclear about my philosophy, ask me and I will do my best to explain

it. The same holds about my decision. I am quite willing to explain my decision and discuss how I saw the round.

Performance/Advocacy/Non-Traditional Debate Addendum

Please note that I am open to this type of debate, and have voted for it recently. However, do not take that as license, since a bad Performance/Advocacy/Non-Traditional debate is worse than a traditional policy approach. These terms are somewhat nebulous and interchangeable, so I will use "performance" to cover them all. As for such approaches, specifically, I like advocacy statements, and arguments that make a real, tangible, real-world impact, be it in the round or after it. Anything that changes a person's opinion or view in the round is OK, as is something that has an impact after or outside of the round, say in the debate community as a whole.

Teams should argue that by voting for them, I am acknowledging that whatever problem or issue does exist, either in debate or the world outside. My vote alerts other coaches/judges to this issue. The best performances argue that increasing awareness is more important in the real and debate worlds than another debate on some policy topic.

Don't bother with The Project at this tournament. Since this tournament is the last of the year within the state, there is no accountability, nothing to point to see if the team actually did their project. During the regular season I am more open the project debate. Nor will I participate in "interactive" debate, where the debaters form a dialogue with the judge during the round. This type of debate destroys the purpose and educational value of debate. My role is to listen and adjudicate arguments, not engage in conversation with the teams.

Identity debate is more problematic. Arguments that state I must affirm a team's particular race/gender/class/status for the sake of affirming it by voting for them, and by implication can't ever vote against them, is seriously problematic. I don't like any form or interpretation of debate in which one team "could never win" the debate. Of course, that doesn't mean that the other team can just complain that "they could never win"--if I can think of arguments against an identity approach, you can too.

Should you want to do a performance with me as a judge, you should have strong arguments both for their approach and against traditional policy debate or whatever it is that you are challenging. Teams facing a performance team would be advised to contest the narrative and counter the role of the ballot position in substance. Teams should also defend policy debate, and/or make arguments that voting for them would also have an impact outside of the round (by telling the debate community that I rejected this type of argumentation), or that there are no impacts or results outside of this debate room.

Organization and flowing are major concerns in a performance debate. Since they do not follow the traditional debate structure, how am I to flow speeches? Anything a team can do to divide up their speech into clear areas--like narrative, role of the ballot, impacts or results, or the like is most welcome.

I am certainly not opposed to the genre, and think it might be a good thing for Wisconsin debate. As long as a team can justify their approach to me, defeat the other team's arguments against this type of debate, and convince me that there are real benefits, in the debate and/or the real world, I will vote for them.

Komas, Heather

I am a TABS judge with a focus in policy. I am not a fan of topicality and theory. Topicality is usually just a time suck and unless you can prove in round abuse, I am unlikely to vote on it. The same goes for theory. I have years of policy debate experience and therefore am very familiar with DA's and Kritiks. However, I think framework is important if you are going to run a kritik. I think brinks are crucial when it comes to the DA debate, as well as internal links. I think the impact debate determines a lot of rounds, and therefore you need to be extending and actually utilizing your impacts. You also need to be extending all parts of a DA or K if you expect me to vote on it, the same goes for the aff case

Larson, Chad

Affiliation: Hired Judge

Experience: I debated 3 years of policy at Sheboygan South. I'm a sophomore currently debating policy at Lakeland College. I judged as well as coached public forum last year at Sheboygan North, although I like policy much better. I have not judged any debate rounds this year.

Policy Paradigm: Tabula Rasa- I will vote on anything (policy, kritiks, performance, weird stuff, etc.) that is argued well. I want debaters to do what they're best at.

A few specific things:

Topicality- I never really liked topicality. Even though I dislike it, I have no problem with topicality being run and I will consider voting for it. Just make sure you actually do the work and spend time arguing it if you plan on winning the round with this argument.

Framework- I'm fine with frameworks. My main issue with these arguments is when they aren't explained. First, I need to know why I should prefer your framework: education, fairness, more real world, etc. I just need some explanation here, not just reading a generic statement like "We increase education". I need to know how we benefit from your approach to debate and how the other team does not create these benefits. Second, I need to know how your opponents' approach does not fit within your framework. I think an effective argument against framework is to prove that your case also fits in their framework, in combination with a counter-framework.

Theory- I tend to see theory as a reason to reject the argument, not the team. Also, slow down when reading theory.

Speed- I'm fine with speed as long as the taglines are clear. I'll say something if you're unclear.

Line by Line- Something I saw in a few of the policy rounds I've judged is a lack of clash. It is the most frustrating thing possible as a judge. Please answer your opponents' arguments. If neither team is being responsive to the other, I end up having to make my own decision. Don't let it happen. Line by line is really important and is the best way to win my ballot and get good speaker points. That being said, if line by line isn't one of your strengths, there are ways to make it easier, such as frameworks or performances. Even so, at some level you will have to explain why your arguments are better than the other team's. If this doesn't make sense to you, just ask.

Number of arguments- This is mostly about negative teams. I'm fine with a team running many offcase positions, as long as they narrow the round down to one or two arguments by the 2nr. Going for five off in the 2nr will not end well.

If you have any other specific questions, please ask me before the round. I would be glad to explain anything. Seriously, you should ask me questions.

Lincoln Douglas:

I have no experience in LD at all, so I'm not sure what sorts of arguments are run in these debates. Basically, you should just debate the way you like to debate. Line by Line would still be important here. If you answer your opponent's arguments, you'll be more likely to get my ballot. I know I didn't write much here, but make sure you ask questions before the round if there's anything you want to ask specifically.

McGuire, Molly

I will listen to whatever you want to read, however I ask that you make good warranted arguments. I default policy maker, if you do not give me an alternative way to evaluate the round. This does not mean that I do not like critical arguments. At the end of the day, if you have good warranted arguments I will listen to it. If there are any specific questions that you have, please feel free to ask.

Moorhead, Michael

Affiliation: Appleton East

Updated: 8/16/13

Experience: I debated in high school for Appleton East. Although it is a small school in northern Wisconsin, my experience is predominantly on the national circuit at bid tournaments. My 2NRs in high school were about an even split between policy based arguments and Ks.

I have judged ~40 rounds on the Latin America topic.

Short Version (to be read during pre-round prep)

I believe debate is about hard work. If you do not believe the same or do not put much work into debate, you should not pref me.

I prefer good argumentation/execution above all else. I would much rather see someone get rolled on death good than a K team try to run a politics disad or vis-à-vis. As more of an abstract concept, you should do what you do best in front of me. I should not affect the strategy you were planning on running against the team you are now debating. Nearly everything in my philosophy is debatable, and you as a debater should realize that my opinions are merely that: things that are open to change. This is the part where I give the schpiel about me trying not to intervene except when only left with that option. Being involved in debate as a debater gives me an interesting perspective in that I try to judge as I think that my favorite judges did while adjudicating me. I genuinely believe I am better at judging debate than doing the debating first hand.

Long Version

Miscellaneous:

1. In complete honesty, I don't believe I have the personal ethos to be like "I refuse to let this argument be read in front of me" and have probably read a variation of whatever you could possibly read at some time or another. The bottom line is that if you have a consult counterplan that some big wig coach wouldn't listen to, don't think that their opinions apply to all of us. This should NOT be interpreted as "I want to hear a time cube debate," but more like, if someone can't beat a cheater counterplan, then they deserve to lose to one.
2. This should go without saying, but you can read as fast as you want. If you are fast at reading, and know you can do it reasonably clearly, we will not have problems. If I am telling you to be more clear while you are speaking, you will likely have heard you have clarity issues before.
3. I am very firmly tech over truth. I believe a dropped argument is a true argument, except in the instance in which that argument is objectively false. It is worth noting, however, that you first need to meet the criteria of an argument before it has the ability to be dropped by the opposing team.

Topicality: I default to competing interpretations. Whenever I see a good T debate with the aff emerging victorious, it is generally because their interpretation is better for debate for reasons of limits or education rather than because it seems reasonable. Reasonability (taken in any other context of debate) seems silly, and seems to necessitate intervention. The times when I am likely to lean more towards reasonability are instances in which the neg reads arbitrary definitions or has trouble defending their own. Don't get me wrong, reasonability is very good for the aff, but is not a round winner in all instances. The real question you should ask before embarking on a T debate while neg is if you have a contextualized definition that is specific in excluding the aff you are trying to prove is untopical. If the answer to that question is yes, you will likely do well in front of me providing you can argue T technically and proficiently. Clash and impact comparison is just as important in a T debate as in any other aspect of debate. Ks of T essentially function as impact turns, which means impact calc is still a must, but make it contextual obvi (or just don't do it because it is dumb). Aspec, Ospec and all other relevant spec arguments are generally not round winners unless the other team is pulling even more intellectually deficient shenanigans. These arguments are better suited either on CPs for questions of competition or as instances of abuse on different T violations.

Counterplans: Bread and butter of a debate. They should be competitive both functionally and textually. While counterplans that only compete off one of those have won in front of me, my presumption is that they are not entirely competitive. Just as a precursor to reading my thoughts on which counterplans are most competitive, this should mean little when preparing for a debate. What I have found generally is people willing to run process counterplans are best able to defend them theoretically. I don't roll my eyes when someone reads a process/consult counterplan, I just think there are often more strategic options. With all of that being said, I do think the best strategic decision for the affirmative when faced with a process/consult counterplan is to go for theory (in most instances).

In order from most legitimate to least:

Advantage CPs (ran individually)
 Plan Inclusive Counterplans (not including word PICs)
 Actor CPs
 Multiplank CPs
 International CPs
 Multiactor CPs
 Conditions CPs
 Threaten CPs
 Process CPs
 Consult CPs (i.e. commissions, qtr, etc.)
 Delay CPs

Theory: I don't mind theory. I default to rejecting the argument except in the instance that the debate proves irrevocably altered by the theory violation (i.e. condo). I went for condo a decent amount while in high school and think it can be a round winner but only in select circumstances. In round abuse is probably a pretty standard prerequisite to getting me to vote on theory unless you can somehow convince me otherwise. I find myself leaning neg on condo (and most questions of theory), but closer to the middle than most judges you will probably find. Being double twos in the later part of my high school career, I am sympathetic to negs that run 2 CPs and a K, but could also paint a very reasonable picture of someone going for condo in that scenario. It will truly come down to how well you argue theory in that instance. On this thread, I believe performative contradictions in a debate beg the question of why the aff couldn't sever their representations/methodology/whatever in a similar fashion. I don't find "they introduced those reps/methodology/whatever first" to be a captivating argument or even a logical response to perf con. A defense of multiple worlds debate being good is probably a better answer, or better yet, just not contradicting yourself. Dispo is probably condo in disguise, and if you are running a CP/K dispo together, you will likely find yourself in a pickle. Otherwise, cheap shots are a reason to reject the argument and not the team, but first need to rise to the level of being an argument. Saying "politics isn't intrinsic" is not an argument. In the instance that someone were to drop that in the block, then you explode on it in the 1AR, I would likely not credit their arguments in the 2NR as being new simply because you didn't make an actual argument until the 1AR. I also believe theory is a question of competing interpretations, but could see a more logical argument for reasonability on a theory flow than a topicality flow.

Criticisms: I like GOOD K debates. I have a good background in psychoanalysis specifically, typical reps Ks, and then random flourishes of epistemology based k tricks I would typically deploy while running more normative kritiks. This should mean relatively nothing to a talented debater. If you are actually good at running the K, the amount of background I have in the literature should be relatively irrelevant. I generally think that the framework debate is a race to the middle in who allows the most ground for both sides. Affs should probably be able to weigh their advantages but that shouldn't discount questions of ontology/method/reps/etc. I can play out many instances in which the aff wins they should be able to weigh their impacts but then loses on the K turning solvency, so that is something you should look out for if you are aff. Link/impact questions are more important to me than the alternative provided you are making the proper framework arguments. As Gabe Murillo once told me, alternatives are generally 2 things. 1. Dumb and 2. Uniqueness counterplans for your K. As such, so long as you can defend that your alt can solve whatever you are criticizing, it can be as dumb as you are willing to make it. Good Neg K debaters will: Employ all of the typical K tricks (Framework, Method First, Epistem. First, Reps First, Floating PIKs, etc.); have a short overview (if necessary) articulating their position on the K in the 2NC, but a larger overview in the 2NR that would reasonably answer most levels of the K debate via embedded clash, and be talented technical debaters that do not group the perm debate. Good Aff debaters answering the K will: Leverage FW as a reason they should be able to weigh their advantages, have a defense of their method/reps/etc., make perms (double bind is probably most captivating), and attack the link of the K.

K affs/Performance: These are generally fine. They are better/more easily judged if they include a topical plan text and defend the resolution, but if your thing is running an aff with a plan you don't defend because the state is bad or whatever then that is cool too. I find topicality arguments to be more captivating than less definitionally sound framework interpretations. I don't think that non-traditional debating is bad, but I do think resolution based debating is good. That means I probably slightly err neg on an "ideal" topicality debate, but if you are a non traditional debater and win on it often, I will be a more than adequate judge for you.

Disads: Obviously they are good and you should run them. In the context of the current high school topic, case/disad being in the 2nr makes for a very winning strategy, especially because every aff on this topic is dumb. I love a great politics debate more than anything. Refer to my theory section above about cheap shots/politics theory for more information on that. If you have generic evidence, it's important to frame the disad in the context of the aff. Do impact calc – absent so your disad holds little relevance to the aff. If your turns case argument is garbage, it won't get you very far unless dropped, if it's well developed, it could be a round winner. For the aff: Don't just contest the impact,

differentiate your aff from the generic link; if the impacts of the case interact well spend some time drawing differentials/making comparisons. Conceded turns case arguments in the 1AR can be problematic if developed properly.\

Parkes, Melzora

Experience: I did 4 years high school policy debate in Kansas and 3 years college Parliamentary debate.

Coaching Experience: While in Kansas I worked as an assistant debate coach at Buhler High School and a mentor at Sterling High School.

Judging Paradigm: While there in Kansas, I was a game play judge. Because that is not allowed in WI, which is unfortunate, I usually default to Tabs or Hypothesis Tester. I adapt to the need of the round.

Argument Preferences: I love seeing Spec arguments, DA, CP's are definitely okay. I'm fine with K-AFF and K's. I would say if you're going to run them-know them. Don't just think you know them because you can regurgitate a card. As a former parli debater, we lived on K's and CP's. So, please-run them correctly.

I'm not a stock issues judge, at all. I don't think that the neg "only needs one stock issue to win". That's silly.

Rate of Communication: Speed and spread are fine. If you think you can speed and you can't, I will call Clear. If you don't slow down and you're unintelligible, I will dock speaker points.

Schools I Can't Judge: Mukwonago-as I am their head coach.

All of this said, because my background in high school was also very traditional, as opposed to my college career, I think that speeches should be incredibly signposted. Cards should be analyzed and articulated as to how they apply to the functionality of the win. I believe in JOY. Judge-Opponent-YOU. Always figure out what the judicator likes, what your opponent is capable of, and what you're able to do. If one those things is lacking in some way, change it.

Debate is an educational and should be an inclusive activity but everyone should be willing to push themselves to learn the most and adapt for the better. I firmly believe that. Good luck!

Payne, Elias

I'm a **policy maker** judge... I guess.

Speed: Do it, but be clear. I usually don't have any problems flowing it, but I have found that debaters don't know when to slow down. Meaning, take a break when you move to the next card or the next contention, and read T and theory slower... become a judge and you'll understand why.

DA's: Ok.... run them.... if you want. DA's are not that complicated, and you should have enough knowledge to know how to run them correctly. Simply extend the uniqueness, link, and impact, and please answer the other team's arguments. If the impact of the DA proves that the issues of the DA take priority over that of the plan, then I will vote for it.

Topicality: You really shouldn't run topicality unless it's a viable neg strategy. For example, if you know the other team is blatantly topical then don't run it- it's just a time suck. On the other hand, if you think topicality should be ran because the team really is untopical (even though they may not be) then run it... I won't penalize your speaker points or your team because you thought it was a good option. Here's how to win topicality: prove the case is untopical and how that's bad for this specific round and debate in general. Extend your voters and standards, and impact T.

Theory: You can run it, but please.... just be RIGHT (i.e. know what you're talking about).

Counterplans: They're fine, just have a net-ben and prove that the counterplan really is a better option than the plan, and you must impact that (i.e. the net ben). Don't just tell me that China can do it better because the affs can easily get up in their next speech and say "perm, let's just do it together". That being said, tell me why it's ten times worse for the plan to be done by the USFG.

ASPEC and Rights Malthus: can we just not...

Kritiks: I'm fine with kritiks, but a lot of times they get messed up really badly, and it usually comes down to the alternative. I know I said I'm a policy maker (meaning I'm going to choose the best policy), BUT if the alternative really is a better option to the plan (or if the kritik simply outweighs the case) then I will vote for it. The problem I run into with kritiks is that teams forget to actually explain what the alternative even does. Don't just tell me what you're going to do, but explain to me the role of the ballot with respect to the alternative. What does signing "Neg" mean? Another big problem with kritiks is the link.... please just make sure they link. That is all.

Performance: I think performance is pretty cool, and I actually do love to hear it. Here's where the problem is- can we just not make cases that say black people (or any race for that matter) should overthrow or kill any other races? Also, let's not make cases that argue that people outside your specific race isn't good enough to engage in this discussion. At the end of the day, performance affs and/or negs need to tell me two things: 1. what is the role of the ballot (I literally need to know why I'm voting for this argument) and 2. What effect will that have? Answer those two questions clearly (and obviously do all the other work) and you should be just fine.

Reinl, Heath

Policy Debate Paradigm:

I'm a Policy Maker unless I'm told otherwise in round.

1. I debated for Sheboygan South.
2. I was a policy debater in high school for 3 years. I have also done Congressional Debate and [[#|forensics]] for 3 years. I have not judged any rounds on the topic this year, but I have judged Varsity at the NCFL Grand National Tournament last year and judged a few in state rounds last year as well.
3. I have been involved in the activity for about 5 years now. I am currently a sophomore in [[#|college]], so I am not a first-year out.
4. Speed is fine. If you are unclear, I will say something. Do not speak fast if you are not [[#|clear]]. If you [[#|continue]] to be unclear, I will not flow. [[#|Open]] Cross-Ex is fine with me.
5. I like debate that is well thought out. Just do the strategy you think is best against the opponent you are facing.
6. I am not a huge fan of topicality and usually put no vote on it unless the plan is actually untopical and there is in round abuse. Potential abuse is not enough.
7. I'm fine with any kind of counterplan as long as it is explained clearly what exactly they do.
8. I'm ok with Kritiks. Be sure to explain them very well. I weigh different kind of impacts based on what is presented in the round. I prefer real world impacts, but if I'm told to vote on something else, I will if it is argued well enough.
9. I'm ok with conditionality and negation theory.
10. My background with theory is not as strong as one would perhaps like, but I can follow it. I don't like it that much, but if you want to have a theory debate, don't let me stop you.

Basically, I am ok with anything as long as it applies to the round and is explained well. Do the work to prove why your position is better. Line by line is great. If you have more specific questions, you can ask me.

Robinson, Miloran

Name: Miloran "Milo" Robinson

Current Affiliation: North Division

Conflicts: Atlanta Urban Debate League

Debate Experience: 4 years in high school, 2.5 years at Georgia State University. Debated in the Milwaukee Urban Debate League since from 2006-2009 and coached since then. Worked with the Atlanta Urban Debate League while at Georgia State. Worked with North Division for the last 2 seasons.

How many rounds have you judged in 2014-15: This year I have judged only about 30 rounds, don't let the number fool you. I think I'm pretty awesome, debate doesn't change a lot so try me.

- If you do not want an honest judge that won't sugar coat my decision, then don't have me in the back of the room*

List 4 types of arguments that you prefer to listen to/debate. For example, do you like to debate disadvantages? Do you like disadvantages as long as the disads aren't the politics DA?

1. Case Arguments: generics are acceptable, but I like to hear arguments that are more specific and show that you but some work in. A good case debate can either win or lose the round when it comes down to off case.
2. Kritiks: some of them are over my head, but I have a pretty good grasp of them. Know what you are reading
3. Disads are nice. If you do run them make sure you did the work on the internal link story and have updates especially for politics and econ. I like politics as long as you can explain the story and it would make perfect sense.
4. I like performance/advocacy debate. It is refreshing to see debaters that are passionate for their cause and willing to be different from the norm not just because it's cool but also because they want others to understand. I do believe that with these arguments there needs to be either a plan text or an advocacy statement.

What I haven't voted on a lot

1. Topicality- my threshold for voting on T is very low because a lot of the rounds I have seen and even been in are very shallow on the explanation of voters and standards, but if you feel you can do it go for it!
2. There isn't much that I won't vote on.

List 4 stylistics items you like to do or like watch other people do. For example, do you like debates that go line by line, meaning debaters use their flows to answer each argument that is presented in the order it was presented?

1. Line by line
2. I love when ppl tell me what the aff/neg world will look like post plan
3. Clash is important, tell me how the arguments interact. The best example is on framework debates. Show me how your framework as compared to the other teams allows for the most educational or fair debate

List 4 stylistics items you do not like to watch other people do. For example, do you dislike when other debaters answer their partner's cross-x questions?

1. Don't tool your partner, yes it's important to help your partner but answering every question or telling them where to go next during their speeches is annoying and doesn't help them learn the skill better.
2. The faster we speak the more clear you need to be. I say clear twice, if you are still unclear I drop my pen.
3. Breadth over depth. Go in depth with your arguments

Schams, Greg

Jan 6, 2015

I am the head coach at La Crosse Central High School. My debate experience is limited to the six years that I have held this position; I did not debate in high school, nor in college.

POLICY: My general paradigm is tabula rasa, with a smattering of policy. That being said, kritiks and topicality arguments must both be well-run for me to vote for them. Weak T or K is a waste of my time.

I am not a huge fan of speed, either. If I cannot understand what you are saying, I will simply stop flowing. It is very difficult for me to judge a round on an argument that I did not flow. I would like teams to have a DEBATE, not a Micro-Machines ad.

This is the Wisconsin State Debate Tournament, and there should be no open cross-x; however, I will allow open cross-x. Be prepared to lose speaks for it.

I think that about covers it. Good luck!

Lincoln-Douglas Judges

Buck, Sera

School: Appleton East

Experience: While in high school, I partook in policy and public forum debates. I did extemporaneous and student congress as well. This is my second year judging - and have been doing so in the South. I spend most of my time in the experienced PF and LD pools though have been found in impromptu and extemporaneous pools as well. At the University of Tennessee, I have done tournaments at the collegiate level in Parli-Style debate (a mash up of extemporaneous and public forum).

Speed – I can handle about a 7.5 on a scale of 1 – 10 (ten being the fastest). Just be extremely clear on your tags and signpost. Teams forget that sign-posting is necessary – I don't like guessing what you're trying to tell me. Make it clear and easy for me.

Overall – I like a clean debate. In that, don't make a mess of fifteen arguments because you feel it is best to have a larger quantity of arguments than your opponents; quality is key. I would rather you have 10 well thought out arguments instead of 15 muddled arguments that have no links, no direct impacts, and are really just a time suck. Give me solid reasoning as to why the Neg is abusive with their K, or how the AFF's plan text is abusive. Tell me why the impact is crucial to the round. I need to know why your impact should be considered instead of your opponents. Give me a method to how I am to weigh the round. If I don't have a set of guidelines, then I may choose something ridiculous.

Additional Information:

1. Open cross-ex is fine by me; I do not mind taking evidence either as long as both teams are okay with this.
2. Topicality is fine. If the Neg is going to use T as a central argument, then they need to provide a clear and complete T-shell. Abuse needs to be outlined. Simply saying "they are abusive. Vote them down." is not enough for me. I am willing to vote on it...when done right. The AFF needs to respond with "we meet" or a sufficient counter-interpretation with their own standards. I feel that debate should be about more than the interpretation-game...but I will still listen and entertain your arguments if that is your route.
3. Counterplans are fine in my eyes. As long as it has all its parts - and is sufficiently presented, I will listen to it. Please make it competitive by tossing out a DA or something of that nature. However, using it simply as a time-suck is annoying.
4. I struggle with Kritiks in that I can never find them to be sufficiently presented to me. You should have a solid grasp of your argument if you are going to use it. Again - don't use it just as a time-suck.
5. I am not a personal fan of theory, simply because I do not find it adequately presented. A team that can present it to me sufficiently, may earn just a few more points in my book.

Chomicki, Ernest

Constraints: Bradley Tech High School

Background: Coach of Bradley Tech High School for 15 years, 4 years high school debate, 2 years of college debate (CEDA) 15th year judging policy debate, 3rd year judging LD

The following are my views and preferences

Clash: Clash is very important. Don't run arguments that really don't have a link. If there is a link you need to provide explanation on how your argument links. In general, I like a lot of explanation of the evidence that you read in how the evidence relates to the round.

Speed: To be blunt, I DON'T LIKE SPEED!! Read at a reasonable pace so that it is understandable. If I can't understand it, then I can't flow it.

Road Maps: I really like road maps and I don't time them. Make it concise, however. 15-20 seconds max.

In short, I am a traditional type of judge for LD. This means having a Value and Criterion are extremely important. I will not vote for a case that does not have both of these as well as how the contentions link to the Value and Criterion.

Theory: I know sometimes that it can be important but I really don't like theory arguments too much. If there is a clear need to run theory arguments then go ahead. But don't zip through them. Again, provide explanation and don't make it blippy.

Synopsis: In general, I am pretty open to all kinds of arguments and different aspects of Lincoln-Douglas Debate. I will vote for anything as long as you can convince me to do so in the final rebuttals. Just remember, the round is not lost or won until the final rebuttals, which is really where I want to hear you tell me exactly why I should vote for either side. So weighing the round is REALLY important to me. Remember to pull through all your arguments and point out any that were dropped by the other team. Good Luck!

Froh, Kali

I debated LD for four years at Schaumburg High School and have coached for Whitefish Bay High School for the past three.

Theory: Check abuse if it's present. I really disagree with frivolous theory, but I won't penalize you in round for my personal preferences. That said, if you expect your abusive shells to be a major voter for me then you're going to be disappointed. If you have a theory strat planned out, strike me. If you DO run theory, tell me why it matters. Clearly weighted/impacted theory is the only theory I feel comfortable deciding a ballot on. That said, I probably don't want to decide rounds on theory so keep that in mind.

K: I really like kritikal arguments. If you're going to run them though, please do good weighing with your role of the ballot and have a solid link. I don't think the reading of the K should be sufficient to win the round, so plan on telling me specifically how you are linking in that round and how the K is interacting. Also K v. K debate is often atrocious so if you are a neg K debater and you hear a kritikal aff, I'm sorry but you have to change your strat. I won't intervene in these rounds, but expect lower speaks in K v K rounds.

Policy args: Run something interesting, I don't feel strongly either way.

Presumption: Will not vote off presumption triggeres or skep triggers.

Philosophy: Be creative, run something interesting, don't bastardize the philosophers I love. If you're going to run a framework, please do something with it in the round. Dropped/poorly impacted frameworks make rounds unnecessarily muddled. Please keep in mind that I do need SOME way to vote other than flipping a coin, ideally a framework/standard will tell me how to do that.

Traditional Debate:

Do your thing.

Speaks: I reward good strat, good args, and hilarity. I drop speaks if you do crappy things like argue with my RFD, be noisy/obnoxious/rude during your opponents speeches, say offensive things.

General stuff:

-I get that the 1AR is too short so I will be pretty lenient with 1AR extensions. Meaning, if you say "extend X" that will be enough for me, you don't need to do a lot of analysis/weighing with the extension. Just tell me what to do with that extension in the 2AR.

-Don't try to shake my hand. I don't know your life.

-If you run some really morally unacceptable argument (oppression good) or fail to give proper respect to arguments dealing with sensitive issues, I will intervene.

Hansen, Dan

I've judged plenty of LD this year and here are my top five thoughts about winning my ballot:

First, you NEED to show me the world of the aff vs. the world of the neg. This doesn't mean policy plans; it means if I uphold your value, what does the world look like? How is it so much better than the other side?

Second, I will listen to "counterplans", but be aware that this does NOT excuse the negative from defending their whole side of the resolution. You can't JUST defend the CP. Think of the CP as a great way to do #1, above.

Third, I'm okay with theory in general, but I don't like a round full of it.....because those rounds are, well, full of it. Specifically, telling me how your value assumes theirs or is a pre-requisite, etc. (aka framework theory) is a wise move as long as we don't forget to also talk about the resolution. Proving their value is invalid is fine; telling me the resolution automatically makes them unable to win is not.

Fourth, I hate speed. Ask the policy kids that remember me. Then, don't do it.

Fifth, I very much appreciate line-by-line refutation. Tell me where you're attacking before you do it.

Hoffmann, Isaac

James Madison Memorial class of 2012
Four Year LDer, One Year PPer.

LD

I am a very flow judge. I like debates that are highly logical with good clash and that tie back to a value/value criterion. I like to use values and value criteria to determine the offense in LD rounds and love good voters at the end that tie back to them. I believe that LD should not start with an outlined set of morals, but should be built in the round, so I am open to all sorts of values and moralities as long as they are well argued and reasoned. I prefer extensions with warrants and that extension is done through the entire round (if you drop it and they call you on it then it is your loss). I find it very hard to give offence for an argument that was ignored all round till the very end. Good weighing at the end of the round will also serve you very well. Speed is no issue as long as you are clear. Self written logical arguments are perfectly acceptable, but all empirical evidence should have a reputable source. I also dislike policy arguments in LD. While I do understand them I don't think they belong in the LD format.

Horvatin, Mark

Former PF debater from Brookfield East. Been judging LD for some time now but I'm certainly not as familiar with progressive argumentation styles than I'd like to be. to win my ballot you should... Articulate your arguments clearly and succinctly, with impacts that make sense and link under your proposed framework; you should also provide me with a weighing mechanism to weigh those impacts, as well as voters throughout the round.

Don't spread.

Kestrel (Hill), Emma

School: West Bend

I'm a flow judge or a policy judge. I will listen to any argument as long as the person presenting it understands the argument and explains it well. I'll flow every argument and I'll vote on any that don't get destroyed or forgotten. I like debaters to weigh the round in their last speeches and to give brief roadmaps before speeches.

Experience: I did four years of policy debate in High School. I graduated High School in 2010 and college in 2014 and I have judged all divisions on and off.

Speed: I can listen to speed as long as it isn't excessive or unclear. I'm not a fan of the whole idea of speeding as a strategy to confuse your opponents or to get in so many arguments that they don't have the time to respond to them all. I must prefer a few well argued arguments.

Largin, Brandon

My name is Brandon Largin, ive been involved with Debate for four years now, my background is in public forum but i have been involved in LD as well both watching and judging, My judging preferences can be simplified by the following statements

Decorum: I look for great deal of politeness and a friendly disposition during rounds, rudeness will not reflect well on my decision.

Weighing: impacts are important tell me why, if I don't here why something is important it may as well not be, an analytical comparison of aff and neg impacts is also important for swaying my decision.

Speed: make sure you are comprehensible, if I can't understand you, I can't take flows.

Voters: be sure to tell me as the judge why it is that I should be voting for you, if you don't I may look to other points of your case.

Organization: I understand that papers can be misplaced, please be prepared for the round as soon as possible.

I expect a significant amount of clash and flexibility.

and if the values dont clash i will be looking at analytics above all, should they clash my focus will be on them.

I hope everyone will have an excellent time debating.

Leigh, Rowan

Judging Paradigm - LD - Rowan E. M. Leigh

TL;DR

Don't be a jerk or a bigot.

I'm a liberal utilitarian who loves Rawls and thinks the concept of rights and liberties is pretty cool.

Debate on clash is more important than reiterating ideas with no impact.

The debate should be entirely about impacts, which are measured by value structure.

VC debate is usually more interesting than value debate, especially when the values are compatible.

Don't argue which value is better if there isn't a clash, argue who accesses it better.

Really, just tell me about accessing the benefits of the value. I don't care if your value is better if you didn't achieve it.

Framework debate is pretty nice, but shouldn't take up too much time.

Cross-ex should be exciting and productive.

Speed is fine, but signpost like crazy, and enunciate everything, especially your taglines.

Voters are super awesome. Provide me with them.

I'm not dumb, don't expect me to miss things or not understand what you're talking about.

I don't inherently accept real-world over theoretical. If you and your opponent differ here, you both need to explain which is better.

Really, read the full paradigm I wrote. It's comprehensive, and I put a lot of thought into it. It will also help you to read it, especially if I'm judging you.

Feel free to ask me questions on my paradigm if you don't understand components of it or want me to expand. I'm friendly, and pretty casual about most things.

I'm almost overly logical.

Me:

I was a Brookfield East LD debater for 3 years ('08-'10). I dabbled in forensics and mock trial as well, and did a bit of student congress once. I also did a couple of tournaments in PF, but for the most part was purely an LD debater. I don't debate in college, and I don't coach, but my college pursuits largely range around LD-like skills. I have a philosophy major that focuses on ethics, logic, and political theory, and an English minor that revolves around rhetoric, composition, and critical theory. I have also been a writing tutor, with an emphasis on helping students with logical and rhetorical inconsistencies in their writing, as well as research errors. I currently study at UW-Milwaukee, and plan to get my masters' there in Library Science and English (dual-degree program).

Communication/Organization/cross-ex:

I am good with speed. I can talk quickly and listen to speed as well as all but the best of you. Make sure you're enunciating though. If you speed through things but your words blend into each other, you are doing speed wrong. Feel free to speed if you can do it somewhat well, though. That said, please slow down for the tag lines at least a bit, and enunciate your signposts extra-clearly. This is not just for me, it is for your opponent as well. While most debaters should be able to understand what you're talking about in general if you speed through cards and explanations, there is nothing worse than a debate in which your opponent does not know what your contentions are, but only thinks they do. This is not their fault, it is yours, and if I wasn't sure what your contention was for sure, I'm not counting it as a strike against them, but against you. And no, that isn't what cross-ex is for. That is a really boring use of cross-ex, and while it is an acceptable use, I'm not particularly interested in the time being used for that more than it needs to be. If your opponent needs to ask you about one tag, no fault on either of you, but if they have to ask about nearly all your tags, that usually means you didn't make them clear. (Obviously, switch this around and realize that if you are a debater who needs to ask your opponent a question, I won't hold it against you.)

As far as other aspects of communication go, I do value decorum. Your demeanor should be professional, and I won't tolerate mocking of your opponent. You can surely find a way to point out that they're wrong about something without being downright rude about it. You might still win the round, but I will tank your speaks if you exhibit downright disrespect, or worse, if you patronize them. On the converse, I do not expect friendliness between you and your opponent, and you may feel free to be blunt and brisk during both your speeches and during cross-ex. There is a fine line between blunt and rude though, so if you are unsure, try to err on the politeness side I suppose. This is a skill you'll develop at some point.

Grammar and organization are reasonably important in your speeches, and make sure to signpost clearly, not only in your constructive, but in your rebuttals as well. Give clear voters at the end. I might not vote on them, but they give me an idea of what you thought was important in the round, and this will weigh into my judging process to at least a small extent. If you don't give voters, you haven't let me know what you want the round to be weighed on, and that means either I go with my own weighing mechanism (woah! unpredictable!) or with the mechanism provided by your opponent (probably not good for you)

CWI is the most important thing you can do. Far too often, I see a claim with a warrant. Give me an impact. Without an impact, I don't care about the claim, and I also have nothing to judge on. Impacts are what the round is judged by. Make sure the "I" is about the impact in terms of your value. If you don't give me a link back to your framework, the impact is essentially dropped, because the V/VC is your way of telling me how impacts should be evaluated.

This brings me to cross-ex. I love cross-ex if done right. I like my cross-ex fast-paced, interactive, and most important, exploratory. If you're the questioner, ask questions, ask follow-up questions. Listen to responses respectfully, but don't let your opponent waste your time. Be cordial if you need to ask them to move on. Don't spend time rehashing obvious points, but rather ask questions that show contradiction in your opponent's case, or that ask for elaboration on an unclear point. Make sure that if one of their ideas seems sketchy, you've checked if they actually know what it means. This is the best time to show if an opponent is just reading a card that their coach suggested, or if they actually understand what they're talking about. Don't wait for your rebuttal, because I will have made a mental note that you never gave them an opportunity to expound. If you are the responder, make sure you answer the questions posed to you. I will notice if you avoid the question. Don't spend a lot of time repeating what your tags said, but explain things in your own words as much as possible. Don't waste time in the round going on and on (this is a crappy trick, cx can help you as much as your opponent). Answer succinctly.

Weighing Mechanisms:

I suppose I believe that both sides have equal burdens to prove their sides. I'm mostly going to judge on which world is better, and I'm using the resolution as a general rule. Finding one example where the aff turned out badly is not the same as proving the aff wrong. This sort of has to do with my general moral viewpoint, which I will explain in a bit. Aff, prove that accepting the resolution usually is a good thing in your value structure. Neg, prove that accepting the resolution is usually a bad thing in your value structure.

Ah yes, value debate. The value is not the most important part of the round, but it is the way I evaluate impacts. As I said earlier, your impacts should always be about how your stance (aff or neg) would benefit the world, as measured by your value. This said, if your value is not at inherent odds with your opponent's, feel free to point that out in-round, and go on with the points of real clash. If your value is "Justice" and your opponent's is "Morality", there's going to be a chance I can link in to either value using your case and your VC. I don't want to hear the circular argument of which comes first, or which evaluates which, as they're both pretty nice things. If one is "individual welfare" and one is "social progress", for example, there might be clash, there might not be, depending on the topic. If one is "environmental welfare", and one is "technological progress", there is certainly clash, and I'll have to decide between the two when weighing the round. Take a second during prep to decide if you actually have value clash, and if you don't, or if the values have a chicken-egg relationship, just say this in your first rebuttal and move on. Your other option, of course, is demonstrating that you can access your value and that of your opponent. This is a nice thing, and if it is an applicable move, use it. I'm a fan.

Bottom line on value debate: don't debate whose value is better unless actually necessary, use your value as a tool to show me how I should weigh the round.

Value criterion debate is really where it is at for me. To me, the VC is the soul of the case. It can be both how you achieve your value and how you measure your value. Especially if both of you have similar or compatible values, tell me how your VC is the best way to reach and evaluate if the value has been achieved. Your VC almost certainly clashes with that of your opponent, so show me why yours is better. If they don't clash, there's usually a flaw in how one of you is using the VC. Let's assume it's your opponent's; show me why their VC doesn't mesh with their case.

You can debate this in terms of "the aff world is better/neg world is better", but I can't judge in terms of inherent "betterness". This quality is measured by some sort of value structure, so remember that.

My Personal Philosophy:

This brings me to my basic philosophical stance. I'm a fan of J.S. Mill, Rawls, Rousseau, and Kant to varying extents (I also buy into some ideas of many modern utilitarian philosophers). These are my favorites, but, especially in terms of the last two, I am not always convinced of their ideas as being able to exist in the real world. I don't inherently buy real world over ideological, so if you and your opponent aren't on the same page on that divide, you're both going to have to tell me why I should go real world or theoretical.

Ideologically, I'm a huge fan of rights theory, both in terms of natural and socially-granted rights. These days, no one seems to go theoretical in LD though, so while I'd absolutely love to see someone take an ideological stance on a resolution, I'm probably going to be disappointed, so I won't go into this.

In terms of pragmatic philosophy, I'm a utilitarian both in terms of ethics and in terms of political and social policy. I am much more of a rule utilitarian than an act utilitarian, because let's be real, act util is impractical and unpredictable. If a policy produces good results in general, it is good. If it tends to produce bad results most often, it is bad. Keep in mind, I really like Mill's consequentialist defense of liberty (look up the harms principle, it'll give you something of an idea, if not a complete one). I will certainly buy empirical proof that a policy is good or bad though, and please do not assume that I am buying into the concept of a "nightwatchman" state. I am not. My ideal government uses utilitarian thinking to set up a

Rawlsian society. If it isn't clear, I'm more into the liberal end of utilitarian thought than the conservative side.

Other Important things:

I will buy pretty much any idea, if defended and explained clearly and logically. Feel free to go radical and philosophical. I'm game.

Do not be a bigot. I will not buy that any group of people (including the mentally ill, homeless, substance abusers, obese, or the poor) have any sort of inherent moral or intellectual failing. No homophobia, trans*phobia, racism, sexism, etc, obviously, but socioeconomic differences and behavioral and physical health issues are sometimes seen as acceptable characteristics to disparage, and I'm not fine with that. I will generally not buy these as arguments, and your speaks will drop.

This said, I am highly open to arguments about how a particular position will cause these prejudices to become worse, or that a side promotes, say, sexism. Institutional oppression as a harm is great.

Don't misdefine terms please. I will understand them, and know that you misdefined them.

I will realize if you don't understand a philosophical concept (or a non-philosophical one, generally). Only use ideas that you understand.

Extend ideas on cards, not the author's name. "Extend the card where I say ____" works way better than "Extend my Helvetica/Smith/Johnson card". I write down that you used a card, not which name it is.

Debate definitions if necessary, but only if there's clash.

Debate sources if there is a reason to. If one is by a conservative/liberal think tank, and the topic is politically biased, debate this, especially if you and your opponent have competing statistics.

I have voted many times for positions that I disagree with. It's about logic and clash.

If your opponent drops something, pull your point through, but don't go on and on.

Observations are fantastic if used well. I love them.

I'm exceedingly logical. I'll go for an emotional appeal if used well, and personal stories can be interesting, but they tend to be a waste of time. Logos almost always beats out pathos for me, if you have good enough ethos.

Maier, Michael

I am a parent/volunteer. My son is a junior so this is my 3rd year as a judge. I did not debate in High School or College. I have judged PF and LD. I prefer LD in terms of the time it affords debaters to develop an argument and that it can include philosophy.

Use good evidence--meaning use reputable sources (peer-reviewed is better) with proper citation. Have your evidence ready to show your opponent should they ask for it.

Clarity above all else. Speak clearly and direct your speeches. In cross, direct your questions to your opponent. I like roadmaps (off-the-clock) and "sign-posting" within the speech to help with my flowing. Be clear in your arguments in terms of how you are linking everything together (claims, warrants and impacts).

In terms of speed, talking faster than 300 words/minute (wpm) you do at your own risk. I read at about 300wpm. Most audio books are read at about 150wpm. Anything being read faster than 300wpm is faster than most auctioneers. I find "spreading" to be a lazy tactic--trying to throw everything you can at your opponent also means you want the judge to sift through your pile of arguments as well. If you speak faster than 300wpm, then you run the risk of me not catching the important parts of your argument.

Opponents should be respectful. I understand the adrenaline can get flowing, but being abusive or sarcastic won't help your cause.

Mikic, Jake**Hi, I'm Jake.**

I've been involved in debate for a few years now, and it's one of my major passions. As a debater I always enjoyed the opportunity to learn new things and see alternate points of view on topics. As a judge I wish to see two major things: sportsmanship and uniqueness. Despite the fact that debate is a competition, debaters should maintain some level of politeness at all times. I also encourage debaters to explore ideas and concepts in ways they haven't before in order to surprise opponents and help develop critical thinking skills.

Overall in a round I like to see causation and correlations connect, as well as framework being followed. I don't dislike laptops, I have one myself, but using one in round instead of a pen and paper tends to slow down a round, and I prefer you keep them shut during round. I like to see a heated argument but not to the extent of name-calling or personal attacks. In high school I was a PF debater and thus do tend to pay special attention to the quality of your evidence as well as your values

Neal, Dr. Kay

Kay Neal, Chair of the Department of Communication Univ. of Wisconsin Oshkosh

I have been involved as a policy debater..both high school and college and as a college coach and debate judge for over 40 years. (Yes....we had electricity and indoor plumbing back then). My primary experience as a debate and coach was in policy....not L.D. debate. (It did not exist when I was competing as a student). However, I have judged L.D. debate for over 15 years and actually have co-authored an argumentation and debate text book for the college level. The chapters I contributed to the book had to do with value debate (how to write an affirmative/neg case involving values and value criterion). I see debate as a communication activity which really embraces the philosophy of L.D. which requires debaters to speak clearly and at a rate that is comprehensible. It does not have to be oratorical (although that is nice to hear every now and then), but should be clear what the voting issues are and why you should win the round.

Because of my policy background, I do believe that the affirmative does have the burden to prove his/her case in order for me to support the resolution. Therefore, the negative only is required to prove the resolution false. However, if affirmative carries the value in the round, which is hopefully supported most effectively through his/her case, affirmative is likely to win.....so the value debate is very important.

Every L.D. debate should have a core value, a value hierarchy (how values "stack up" against each other) and a value criterion (the standard by which we judge the core value in the overall value hierarchy). The value and value criterion are different animals. Many L.D. debaters treat the value criterion as just a different value. It should not be this. For example, societal welfare (core value) can only be obtained by promoting public safety (value criterion). Therefore, the direction that promotes more public safety is necessary for gaining societal welfare.

I think it is difficult for Affirmative to win the round if he/she doesn't carry the value....assuming both sides are arguing different values. So, yes....I believe that winning the value/criteria debate is essential for a debater to win (especially aff.) However, if both sides are defending the same value....then I vote for the individual that best meets that value. It would be difficult to "sell" me on the most desirable world/worldview independent of the value being defended. It could only be sufficient to win the round if the worldview encompasses the better value or the agreed upon value by the debaters. However, with that said....every round is different. Sometimes the value is not a big issue in the round for whatever reason....So don't hold me to this statement literally. Debating is fluid.....and as a judge, I try to do my best to judge fairly and not be held to an inflexible, rigid standard of what a L.D. debate round must always be. Sometimes, it is not that.....especially given the number of policy resolutions we have seen in the last couple of seasons.

Ideal Debate: Debate is an argumentation and communication activity and there is CLASH between the two teams. I do not like lots of silly, trivial arguments...but do like issues that are well developed and discussed fully. Good arguments, well supported, clearly presented should prevail. I like clear, case specific analysis that is delivered in a comprehensible manner and rate. Make sure you weigh the issues and focus on the voting issues in the final rebuttals--especially why the value you are defending should prevail-- so that I am not left with that task myself.

Neal, Stephen

I have been a policy, public forum ,and Lincoln Douglas debate judge for the past 5 years. I see debate as a communication activity which really embraces the philosophy of L.D. which requires debaters to speak clearly and at a rate that is comprehensible. It does not have to be oratorical, but it should be clear what the voting issues are and why you should win the round.

I believe that the affirmative does have the burden to prove his/her case in order for me to support the resolution. Therefore, the negative only is required to prove the resolution false. However, if affirmative carries the value in the round, which is hopefully supported most effectively through his/her case, affirmative is likely to win.....so the value debate is very important.

Every L.D. debate should have a core value, a value hierarchy (how values "stack up" against each other) and a value criterion (the standard by which we judge the core value in the overall value hierarchy). The value and value criterion are different animals. Many L.D. debaters treat the value criterion as just a different value, but it is different. For example, societal welfare (core value) can only be obtained by promoting public safety (value criterion). Therefore, the direction that promotes more public safety is necessary for gaining societal welfare.

I think it is difficult for Affirmative to win the round if he/she doesn't carry the value....assuming both sides are arguing different values. So, yes....I believe that winning the value/criteria debate is essential for a debater to win (especially aff.) However, if both sides are defending the same value....then I vote for the individual that best meets that value. It would be difficult to "sell" me on the most desirable world/worldview independent of the value being defended. It could only be sufficient to win the round if the worldview encompasses the better value or the agreed upon value by the debaters. However, with that said....every round is different, and sometimes the value is not a big issue in the round for whatever reason. Debating is fluid, and as a judge, I try to do my best to judge fairly and not be held to an inflexible, rigid standard of what a L.D. debate round must always be. In general, the team that presents the most consistent and logical case, backed up by a lot of evidence, is going to win the round.

Ideal Debate: Debate is an argumentation and communication activity and there is CLASH between the two teams. I do not like lots of silly, trivial arguments...but do like issues that are well developed and discussed fully. Good arguments, well supported, clearly presented should prevail. I like clear, case specific analysis that is delivered in a comprehensible manner and rate. Make sure you weigh the issues and focus on the voting issues in the final rebuttals--especially why the value you are defending should prevail-- so that I am not left with that task myself.

Palmbach, Andrew

I'll try to keep this succinct. Apologies if it seems like at times I'm insulting your intelligence - I am growing bitter in my old age, after all. Experience: 3 years high school debate (culminating in one and a half or so years of varsity debate), and 2 years judging (this year is my second). I've judged in most every Wisconsin debate tournament this year so far, and most last year. Out-of-state experience is pretty limited - the only such tournament I've judged at is Glenbrooks last year.

Restrictions: Appleton East Paradigm: I fancy myself a Tabula Rasa judge insofar as I'll listen to most any argument and I rather frown upon putting constraints upon your speeches; this is your competitive activity, after all, and I say this as a request that you run what you think are your best argumentative positions, and all I am is a referee. Until you give me a set of reasons why I should vote otherwise for your beloved arguments, I'll default to a policymaker framework. Don't take either of those statements as a license to get away with sloppy argumentation. As for speed, I'm going to paraphrase a quote from a really good Wisco policy judge- speed is a tactic, nothing more. Don't expect me to pull through minute blippy details from the 1NC to the 2NR (or from the 2AC to the 1AR) every time, unless you ask me to look at a card after the round (though often I'll ask to look at a card or a few after the round if it's a big point of contention in the round). This is especially true for T violations, Ks and other theory arguments. T Violations- They're fine, but if you really want me to vote on it you should make it a central part of your strategy all the way through. DA- Try to keep em plausible, I <3 really fundamental things like specific links and thorough well-warranted internal link stories. Same goes for advantages CP- They're fine. I might even look favorably upon you if you have the courage to run one unconditionally. Even more so if you go for it and a K and your K doesn't bite it. K- I am really close to saying to I won't listen to Ks, but I continue to allow them out of the glimmer of hope it affords me that I'll hear reasoned academic discussion about deep philosophical issues. Too often I think high school K arguments are essentially debate coaches blocking out their pet philosophies and using their students as proxies for their ideological quibbles; the reason why I say that is often students don't seem to fully grasp the philosophical content of their K and how it functions as a reason to vote down the Affs. I am of the conviction that students should read a book or five about the philosophy they advocate before they run a K about it. I don't think most Ks this year are really competitive with most Aff plans at all, and if you're going to want to win on a K you're going to want to show me why it is. Many a K debate I've heard this year are just terrible for debate; usually it's just that the Neg runs some block about how despair is a fundamental part of human nature or how men are evil and we need to reject the normative framework from the 1AC and then the Aff horrifically mishandles it so then the Neg just blows it up in the block and I'm lamenting the fact that I'll have to "send a message to the Tab room" that isn't "a pox upon both your houses" and a double loss. If this sounds intimidating to you and you're doubting that I'll fall in love with your K, feel free to send me to the bottom of your judge preferences list. If you think you've got what it takes... challenge accepted. Here are a few things which I think of as "breaking the rules of debate": New arguments in the 2NC are stupid. Please use the time advantage granted to you in the block to extend the arguments you made in the 1NC to the point where the 1AR gets a panic attack. Please don't drop your plan text on the Aff. Also please read your solvency cards (which should be OMG AWESOME with strong warrants if you want me to vote for you) in the 1AC. Pretty fundamental stuff but I've seen people not do this. Any other questions? Just ask Cheers, Palmbach

Schumann, Morgan

Background: I debated primarily in LD for all four years of high school at Brookfield East. I am a couple of years out and currently a student at UW-Madison.

Speaking Style: I don't care. Speak as fast or as slow as you want, but please be clear. As long as you articulate, I will be able to understand you and get it on my flow. I greatly appreciate clear signposting, so although it won't help you win the round, it will make my flow look more like yours, which is to your advantage.

Value/Criterion: This is crucial to me. The way that I decide a round is to look at the value structure that was established in the round, then consider the arguments that were linked to that value. It honestly doesn't matter to me whether you win "your" value, as long as your arguments link to the value of the round. If you are smart, you will clearly defend why your value is superior, how you link to it, and if at all possible, how you link to the other value. This way, you have a shot at winning no matter which value I use. I love "even if" statements! The only thing that can really trump this is if there is a clear burden or standard that is either mutually agreed upon or argued and clearly won by one of the sides. In this case, obviously, I will look at who best meets the established burden.

If you haven't gathered from before, links are crucial. If you make a brilliant argument, but don't tell me how it fits in with the standard for the round, don't expect to win on it. Further, make sure to weigh your arguments. I need to know why your points achieve the standard better than the arguments your opponents will also link to the standard.

Overall: I will listen to pretty much any argument, but it must be explained clearly. This is particularly crucial if the debate comes down to one particular card, as I believe that the arguments in debate need to be 100% oral. Because of this, I will not ask to see a card after the round to try to figure out what it was saying and whether or not the other side's response correctly answered the card. This is something I should be able to do entirely from what was said in the round. If an opponent misconstrues your card, it is your responsibility to point that out in round and clarify the card. I won't vote on an argument that I don't understand unless it is dropped by your opponent, extended, and linked to the standard. Since this isn't often the case, I would suggest that your arguments are clear.

Other than that, you will have the most success with me if you use the style that you are best at. If you want to debate technically, then by all means do, and if you prefer a more rhetorical style, that is also fine. However, you should be conscious that I will judge on the arguments on the flow, so you must be able to keep up with your opponents style, however technical that may be.

Burden of Proof: I believe that the Affirmative has the burden of proof and the neg only needs to prove why we should not affirm. This still must be done by extending offense regarding why the Affirmative world is bad rather than just simply what is wrong with the Affirmative world (i.e. why it is hard to implement). I suppose that pure refutation could theoretically work in front of me, but only if it took away every piece of Aff offense. If, however, Aff extend even a single piece of offense and Neg gives no offense regarding disadvantages of the affirmative or unique advantages of the negative, I would affirm. If you want me to use a different burden of proof, establish that in round, and I will vote accordingly.

Voters: Yes!

If you have any further questions, feel free to ask me before the round. Otherwise e-mail at morgan.schumann@gmail.com.

Shreekumar, Advik

I debated LD for 4 years at Brookfield East High School (WI). I now judge for Brookfield East and Boston Latin School (MA) depending on tournament location. Exception: I'm a tournament judge during the Harvard tournament.

My Ballot

- **Set a rule for me to use.** LD started off as values debate, so expect to debate values. You can set a V/VC, standard, or some other kind of weighing mechanism. Define it well so I know how to use it.
- **Weigh impacts through the set standard.** I'm not voting on who sets the criterion. I'm voting on whose impacts are the most relevant through that criterion. Dropping your standard and linking to your opponents is an acceptable strategy.
- **If you want me to use my ballot as a tool, explain very clearly how and why.** I default to using my ballot to evaluate who best accessed the criterion. I'm willing to use my ballot as a tool *if and only if* I get a clear ballot story from you.
- **I carry a highlighter.** I highlight voters and significant analysis. It's in your distinct advantage to identify the most important issues in round.
- **I default competing worlds but can be convinced otherwise.** That means I'm positing some world where the affirmation of the resolution holds and another world where the negation holds.

Your Arguments

- **Run whatever kind of case you want,** but remember to give some sort of standard. A plan without some sort of impact-weighing standard won't get you far. A stock case without an impact-weighing standard won't get you far either. Be ready to justify your style of advocacy; I'm open to arguments that your US-spec case doesn't normatively affirm or negate. If you run an atypical case (e.g. a PIC) without telling me how to adapt my judging paradigm I'll have a very hard time squaring your advocacy with my baseline conception of affirming and negating.
- **Extend warrants, not tag lines or author names.** If you just say "extend Cohen", all that gets you is Cohen's name. If you want me to extend your links and impacts, then extend those.
- **I'll flow speed, but I can't flow spread.** I'm not a fan of speed used to obfuscate your arguments or spike your way to victory. If you get too fast, I'll audibly drop my pen, fold my hands and stare at you. I won't shout 'clear' or 'slow'. It's on you to notice that I'm not flowing.

My two cents on theory: I will vote on it, but reluctantly.

I appreciate theory as a check on abusive practice. That said, theory currently represents a huge barrier to debaters who want to enter the circuit, and is often used to sidestep substantive debate. If you want to run theory in front of me (especially if I'm supposed to vote on it), there had better be a real, egregious violation that you're criticizing.

Articulate theory clearly. I'm only loosely familiar with the formal structure of a T-Shell, so it's not in your advantage to shout "Interpretation!" and blaze onward. Tell me (1) what sort of debating norm I should be endorsing and why, (2) where the violation of the norm happened, and (3) what that implies for the round or my ballot. I am extremely unlikely to vote on the risk of offense coming from a T-Shell - I need to be convinced that a violation actually took place.

Strong defense on a T-Shell can be enough for me to disregard it; I'm also very open to dropping arguments instead of debaters; you'll need to convince me that your opponent is doing something so wrong that I need to reject not just that practice, but them as a debater.

Stumbris, Nick

I am Affiliated with Appleton East High School. .

Speed: As long as you are clear, I would probably classify myself as being able to listen/comprehend/flow at a 7.5 or 8 on a ten point scale. (ten being the fastest). I will make it very clear to you if I am not keeping up with you, and I expect the debaters to be responsive to those very clear signals.

Expectations: I expect and enjoy a clean debate. I am not offended terribly easily- so I wouldn't worry. I'm not offended by strong language. Again, it will be very obvious if I feel that any of the debaters are being offensive. However, I am pretty comfortable with an informal debate setting, i dont care if you sit or stand, make eye contact, or leave the room *quietly* to go to the bathroom, get a drink of water whatever.

Policy- General:

Do the work for me and be clear: I don't want to be stuck at the end of the round trying to figure out what you meant when you rattled off the two second blippy arg "CP is not functionally competitive"- that doesnt actually tell me anything. Instead of relying on debate jargon to convey your meaning and arg to me, explain what the arg is. I have seen a lot of debaters get up and say that the card has no warrant and move on to the next argument. That's not good enough. You need to explain what isn't warranted in the card, and how that impacts the round. If you take the time to explain the arguments you will save me a lot of trouble at the end of the round and increase your chances of picking up my ballot.

give a good story: When you are giving me any sort of scenario, ADV, or DA's whatever the scenario might be- I want you to tell the story, meaning, that it has to have some sort of link or logical progression. An impact- not only does the arg have an impact, you need to tell me how it impacts the whole round: how does the argument operate on other flows. You need to be telling me why the arg is true, why it is important, and how it impacts the round. Weigh impacts- i dont care how you do it, but you need to find some sort of weighing mechanism that tells me how i choose between nuclear war and dehumanization. If you dont tell me, i get to choose and you have a 50% chance of my choice not being in your favor- so dont let me choose.

Style: I prefer good arguments- it sounds redundant, but I hear a lot less of them than i would like. I understand that generic blippy responses are part of the debate culture- but try to stay away from them. I would much rather have you argue 5 really good, persuasive, logical, specific, and tailored args than 10 mediocre ones or 20 blippy ones. I like clash, please don't try to avoid it because you dont think that you can win.

Squirrely args: dont use them.

new args- dont like them. I really hate hearing a brand new counterplan in the rebuttal- and yes it's happened, and im telling you not to do it. If there is a situation in which a team is spewing out new args, please dont just whine and tell me that it they're new- i know that. Tell me if/why i should vote on it.

Prep: As long as there aren't any tournament specifications, I typically allow 8 minutes. Unless for some odd reasons both teams agree to do five minutes of prep, i usually just say eight is good.

LD:

Value/ Value Criterion Debate: I like to hear a very clear standards debate. I strongly believe that most v/vc args should be resolved going into the final rebuttals. Please don't feel that you *have* to win *your* vc. Just make sure you articulate what standard you are using, and then tell me a clear story of how your args impact the standard, and why it wins you the round. I'm not particular about having a "formal" value-criterion structure- just some kind of standard for me to weigh the impx on. Articulate some sort of standard, or impacts story- and I will probably buy it. I am not big into values unless one of the debaters articulates why the value is central to resolving burdens/creating a brightline between aff/neg ground.

Likes/Dislikes:

I don't like people saying "This is how it's done in LD.... you can't read fast...." Really, as long as you provide a warrant for doing XYZ (be it evidence or logic) I will probably buy it. Note: New args in the 2ar/nr are not appropriate, and that's really all that needs to be said.

I like theory- as long as it is explained clearly and impacted.

Definitional debate: Please only spark one of these beasts when necessary. If you aren't going to use it to exclude or include args, then don't bother at all. Provide warrants for your interpretation- pretty standard expectations here.

Non-traditional args: See above; I will listen. I am very open to most ideas, I flow well, and I am fairly intelligent.

Other:

Extend warrants, not tag lines. I'm not saying that to be funny- I've seen it happen: "Please extend my tag from Contention 2"...

Impact: Seriously, just do it!

Weigh impacts: I can't stand when debaters don't weigh args. Typically, I feel that weighing of impx should really begin in the nc/1ar just because sometimes the weighing structure is complex enough that it can appear as if it is a new arg in the 2ar- so begin weighing as soon as you can. Honestly, don't leave unresolved impacts on the flow. My decisions tend to make debaters unhappy when I don't vote based on (whatever scenario with X impact). Turns out, I probably voted on (whatever scenario with Y impact). Do the work for me.

Anything else-just ask

Summers, Emily

Milwaukee Debate League Program Director

I did policy debate and congressional debate in high school at Rufus King. This is my sixth year judging- while I have judged more policy rounds than anything else, I have also judged a number of LD and PF rounds in the last few years.

Arguments- I will vote on anything that happens in a round- critiques, theory, abuse, etc. I'm fine evaluating a traditional round, though I like critiques if they're argued well.

I'm a flow judge- regardless of what your arguments are, I should be able to follow a logical, evidenced progression of thought. Signpost, extend, and compare your arguments to your opponents.

Winning the round- Most of my rounds are decided by the strength of evidence, proper extension of evidence, and weighing and analysis of arguments in a round. Weighing the round is key to getting my ballot. The best debaters use nuanced analysis to win clash debates.

Speed- As a former policy debater, I should be able to keep up with whatever speed you're comfortable with- though your speaks will suffer if you're going too fast for your capabilities. I'll let you know if you're not clear, but only a few times.

Syron, Abby

Background: I debated for West Bend West High school for four years, three in PF and 1 in LD. I graduated in 2013 and have been judging since then.

In general: I vote based off of what's on the flow. If you're speaking so fast I can't understand you, I won't be writing anything. Similarly, I think it's important for you to extend arguments, not cards. Telling me to extend Jones 2 doesn't have nearly the effect of saying to extend whatever point you're making, because in the end, the card is just what you're using to prove the argument.

Clash is very important. Don't just read evidence contrary to your opponent's evidence and say that that's why it should flow to you—delve into the warrants/methodology/source/analysis/etc. and tell me why what you're saying better fulfills the value/criterion. Don't just say that because you read something in your case that contradicts your opponent's case I should cross-apply everything you said and flow all their points to you.

I don't flow CX, but I do pay attention. Don't be rude.

Make sure to clearly state your voters and weigh their impacts. When deciding how to vote, the value/criterion are terribly important because they're really the ultimate weighing mechanism. Don't forget about them; it's likely that unless there's a disagreement I'll vote on the criterion.

I'm not going to disclose or give oral critiques.

If you have questions or there's anything I missed, feel free to ask.

Tidberg, Becky

I've been a member of the Wisconsin Debate community for two seasons now and have developed the following preferences and paradigms:

1. Don't speed. And by don't speed I mean go slow for debaters. Not because I want to prevent you from getting in more arguments, but because you want to make sure that I flow your arguments and your support for those arguments. You also, as the round comes to a close, can start stumbling over yourself and making verbal stumbles which will affect your speaker points.
2. Don't spend the whole round debating framework/criterion. I flow and utilize the flow in my decision but do tend to be more of a big-picture judge. Paint me a picture of the world your criterion would create but I'm not interested in a technical theory debate. Show me what the world looks like on each side with real world scenarios and impacts.
3. Don't be a bully. Some teams have taken to putting words in the mouth of their opponents and trying to convince me that the opponent has said something they clearly haven't said. This also comes in the form of attempting to badger your opponent into agreeing to something ridiculous during CX. I'll have far more respect for a team that stands up to a bully and holds his/her ground than someone who attempts to get someone to agree to something stupid.
4. Use quality sources with enough evidence to show your opponent simply couldn't be correct. Make sure you're comparing apples to apples. If one party is claiming a 44% increase in widgets and the other party claims a 150K decrease in widgets I can't vote for one being more effective than the other.

Trussell, Victor

LD:

Rufus King High School

Milwaukee, WI

Hey everyone, as you can see I'm from Wisconsin. We rarely utilize certain arguments that are commonly seen on the national level. However, I do have a background in policy debate. I have no problem with CP, Kritiks, DA's, etc but I will not listen to speed so slow down. LD in Wisconsin is at conversational speed typically. If I have a blank stare on my face that probably means I'm not following you.

Umpir, Evan

I participated in Public Forum Debate in high school and subsequently coached PF for the past three years. That being said, this is not Policy debate and speed-reading isn't going to win me over. I value clarity and persuasion in a speech, not a deluge of information that gets lost in gasps for breath. While LD is theoretical in nature, I like concrete examples that can help clarify your position and give me a realistic reason why your position is the best course of action. I like evidence but don't vote strictly on the preponderance of it (quality is key). Cogent analysis goes a long way for me. Presenting voters and giving me the bare-bones of why you win at the end of a round is expected. If you have any further questions, please don't hesitate to ask.

Wagner, Thomas

Schaumburg High School, Illinois (2006 - 2008)

Buffalo Grove High School, Illinois (2009)

I am a judge and coach for Lincoln Douglas (Value Debate), Public Forum, and Congressional Debate. While I have participated in Policy Debate, I do not feel that I make for an adequate judge of the sport.

Value Debate Paradigm:

Speed - I can flow any degree of speed (up to roughly 300 wpm) as long as it is enunciated and clear. If I am holding my pen(s) I can understand the debate and am flowing regardless whether I am writing something or not. If my pen hits the desk, table, or whatever medium is currently used as my platform to flow on, then I am no longer flowing and not taking into account the arguments you are making.

If you decide to blitz through your case and you are grossly short of time (more than fifteen seconds off) I will be very angry and look down upon you, also, docking speaker points. While speaker points are less valuable than the win overall, remember this: if I am upset with you for any reason it will subconsciously translate into a decreased chance for my ballot, regardless if I can recognize this or not.

Decision Calculus - While this may be the most important of any judge's paradigm, I recognize that debaters using this wiki will likely be most inclined to know my spreading preferences first, so I placed that at the top.

I am impartial to an actual value / value criterion system, a burden structure, or net impacts, as long as you provide a lucid and *explicit* calculus for me to evaluate the round. Furthermore, if your opponent and you do not agree on a system to weigh, you must either tell me why yours outweighs or how you also can meet your opponent's system.

Walls, Dedra

Affiliation: Whitefish Bay High School.

I have judged High School Forensics for 5 years and this is my third year judging debate. My background is in Fine Arts and I spent 20 years developing interpretive programs and educational materials for the Milwaukee Art Museum.

My Values: In LD I look for clearly stated positions that are supported by well researched facts. I like logical arguments.

Arguments: I am open to any form of argument as long as it is developed in a logical manner. I am a tabula rasa judge in that I let the debaters make their points, while I leave my knowledge outside the room.

Value/Criterion: I am not very interested in the values debate. It is more important that there is evidence to support the selection of a particular value. I want the speaker to know their warrants and present it in a manner that makes me believe their commitment to what they are stating.

Speaking style: Clear concise language that is direct, to the point and void of jargon is much appreciated. I don't know a lot about Theories and other argument styles, so make sure to run structured cases with clear outlines and signposting.

Important Elements: I look to the first questioning period as the moment for each side to demonstrate their understanding of the entire issue and their opportunity to suggest flaws in the other side's position.

Etiquette: I expect civility between competitors and dislike sarcasm and superior attitudes. Speedy delivery often seems a mean to showcase the speaker and not often obscures the content of what is being said.

Voters: I'm not so interested in seeing an appeal to the judge on how I should vote, but more of a crystallization of the round.

Zemplinski, Marshall

PF: It's all about logic and a foundation. If you wish to make an argument it needs both evidence and the impact to back it up. While I don't mind arguments based on theories I do need something viable to be able to think it is possible.

Policy: I am such. I view the round as a governmental policy maker and need the case to be viable to the real world. Now this does not mean I will not listen to a K, in fact, if you can run some viable CP or real world alt then I say go for it. I don't have any real problem with speed, but I do have my limit and I will let you know in round if you are going to fast.

Varsity Four-Speaker Judges

Barrette, Meghan

In its truest form, I am a “Tabs” judge. I enter every round as a blank slate. I am willing to vote on anything from reverse voters on Topicality to Theory to a lack of inherency. While I do have preferences, at the end of the day, I do not like judge intervention, so even though there are arguments that I am not a fan of, that does not mean that I will not vote for them, if they are the winning argument at the end of the debate round.

If there is any advice that I can give debaters that are debating in front of me it would be to debate what you are most comfortable debating, there are no arguments that I am going to disregard completely and there is nothing that when run appropriately, I will not consider in my judging decision. After this brief overview I will get into the nitty gritty of my preferences, but please remember, these are simply preferences.

My history in debate is that I debated both V4 and VSS for Mukwonago, and then debate at Michigan State University in the NDT and CEDA circuits. That being I have been out of debating for about 3 years and in that time I have judged at Glenbrooks, and many VSS tournaments around the country. I am very comfortable with the topic this year.

When it comes to my philosophy on debate. I really like when a team truly understands the evidence and arguments that they are running. Whether it be the Kritik, Theory, or standard case attacks, a lack of understanding of what your arguments are and how that argument related to the round in my experience leads to a muddled debate. Below you can find a bulleted list of common arguments and my feelings on them.

- **Topicality:** I think that it is a vital component of debate when run correctly. The negative however does have to prove that there is abuse, and has to put effort in the standards and voters debate in order to win. As I said above everything is a voting issue and I have voted on topicality and on the affirmative reverse voters for Topicality. Make sure that you are able to articulate the abuse in the round.
- **Counterplans:** I am ok with all different kinds. I honestly really have no opinion regarding them. I do believe however if you are going to have a counterplan and go with in the 2NR there needs to be a lot of work on describing why the world of the CP is better than the 1AC world, especially if you are capturing most of the 1AC solvency. For the AFF I am ok with perm theory as well as other types of Theory as I will discuss below. I do not care if your CP is topical or not, but just make sure that you are ready for the theory debates if you choose to run those arguments as I will vote on theory if it is under covered or dropped.
- **Kritiks:** I always start this explanation by stating that I have a bachelors degree in Political Theory and Constitutional Democracy, as well as a Master’s Degree in Law Enforcement and Intelligence Analysis, and a Master’s Certificate in Homeland Security Studies. That coupled with High School and college debate provides me with a large breadth of knowledge on the books and literature that support most of the Kritiks that are run in this state. That being said, please make sure that you understand the theory and meaning behind the Kritik your running as well be able to explain to the other team in cross ex and in the rebuttals if you choose to go for it how their argumentation bites the Kritik and the impact of the that. I am willing to evaluate K’s first if the framework and theory debate has determined that is the way I should frame it. Otherwise, I will look to the impact calculus done in the rebuttals.
- **Theory:** Theory debates are very interesting to me. I find them always to get very muddled, or they are very one sided. But just like I said in Topicality, if you are going to run theory, be able to clearly articulate the abuse or the arguments that you are unable to run because of the opposing teams abuse. Theory without standards and voters, is not likely to win you a round with me. Note that I say not likely, it can happen.

Now for those debaters looking to get high speaker points from me there is a pretty simple formula. I do not care about speed in the rounds however clarity is key. Those debaters that are clear and polite in the constructive and persuasive and organized in the rebuttals are normally the debaters that tend to get the highest speaker points. I am not a huge fan of rude debaters. I was one in High School and I have found that in certain cases it has lost me debate rounds. While I will not drop you for being rude, know that I will hurt speaker points if you are rude in round. This is debate. It is imperative to remember that being a good sport and being competitive are not mutually exclusive.

In the end, if there is something here that I have not covered simply ask me and I will be happy to explain or clarify. Good Luck and Have Fun!

Geenen, Jody

School Affiliation: West Bend High Schools

Experience: I was a policy debater and a forensic orator for New London High School over 30 years ago. I have been a middle school forensic judge and assistant coach for St. Frances Cabrini School, West Bend, since the 2004-2005 school year, and a judge and assistant coach for high school forensics for West Bend West High School in 2008 and 2009. In addition, I have been a high school debate judge for West Bend High Schools since 2007. As a high school debate judge, I have judged all forms of debate: novice and varsity policy; public forum; and LD. I have also helped coach LD debate as my daughter was a successful LD debater during the 2008-2009 school year and a CFL National Qualifier in 2010. Other related experience includes spending about 10 years in the career of legal secretary/legal assistant for trial lawyers in both civil and criminal litigation; and coaching the Supreme Court branch of Youth In Government for the Kettle Moraine YMCA since 2006.

Rate of Communication:

Speed is fine "if" you enunciate and do not run your words together. Please remember that if you speak too quickly, you will likely sacrifice some of your ability to speak persuasively, which is the most important element of debate, in my opinion. If I am unable to understand or flow what you are saying, you will have a difficult time convincing me that you should win.

Persuasive Communication:

Please see "Rate of Communication" above. In addition, this is a values debate where the affirmative debater has the burden of convincing me that the resolution is true while the negative debater has the burden of convincing me that the resolution is false. This can be accomplished through logic, philosophy and some evidence and by explaining to me through voters what makes your position more significant than your opponent's position.

Cross-Examination:

Please be polite and use your time wisely. When it's your turn to ask questions, please take advantage of the opportunity to do so, because I can be very impressed with a cross-examiner who asks the right questions. When it's your turn to respond to questions, your ability to do so with composure and confidence will also impress me.

Value/Criteria:

Because LD is a values debate, I expect you to have both a value and criteria and to support them throughout the round. You should show me: (a) how your value will be obtained through your criterion and relate your case to that criterion; (b) how your opponent's criterion won't achieve his/her value; and, possibly, (c) how your case better achieves your opponent's value. In addition, because this is a values debate, I expect you to persuade me that your value and criterion are more likely than your opponent's to "make the world a better place".

Other Helpful Hints:

I appreciate meaningful eye contact directed at both me and your opponent off-and-on throughout the debate, especially when you are trying to make a point crystal clear.

I appreciate a civil and respectful debate.

I do not give oral critiques or disclosures.

If you have questions, please don't hesitate to contact me at jgeenen@sbcglobal.net.

Goetsch, Steve

I've had 14 years of debate experience (debated 4 years high school, judged 4 years and now am coaching at Waukesha South in year 6).

I am a policy judge who will generally vote on the question do I believe this plan will work, if so why should I put it in place or why should I not put it in place. I am okay with counterplans and anything else you can throw out there as long as you can show real world implications. DA's need to have real links that are not just generic but have actual implications due to the affirmative plan.

I do not generally like topicality unless a case is untopical and then the negative still needs to show how this is poorly affecting the debate.

I like debaters who can analyze evidence and explain why the evidence makes sense and how this affects the round and how maybe their evidence is better than the other teams.

I can handle pretty much any speed, I haven't dealt with one yet that I can't really flow.

I do not allow tag team cross ex unless it is specifically granted in the tournament rules.

Le, Todd

Todd Le Policy Judge Bio

I have affiliation with Homestead High School as I have been a judge for them for the past two years and am an alumni of the school. I debated varsity-4 person for four years, going to state every single year. I have been on and off as a judge for policy in all divisions. Since graduation I've really only been involved debate since that's all I really have time for (I'm a biomedical Engineering major at UW-Madison).

I'm fine with speed as long as I can understand you (make sure tags/dates/authors are VERY clear). If you're unclear I'll stop flowing, plain and simple. Many times I weigh analytics heavily in a round as long as they have a clear logical chain that is well-explained. It shows me that you know your arguments and are confident in defending them. I prefer an Open cross-examination just because it allows for all parties to be on the same level and allows for maximum clarification within a round.

Regarding what I love to see in debate rounds, like any normal person I love direct clash. I also love seeing great analytics backed with evidence. Impact calculus is super important for me as a TABS judge because it gives me a clear cut way to weight and vote in the round. I'm also a sucker for a good speaker. More times than not I find myself voting for the debaters that are more composed and collected in around rather than a debater that is mumbling and stumbling their way through a speech. The tie-breaker in a round for me is whichever team presents their case in the most convincing fashion no matter if they feel like they lost the round or not.

On Topicality, as a negative you better be sure that the affirmative is for certain un-topical. If you run T just to run an argument and end up kicking it in the next speech I will hate you forever. It's a waste of time and shouldn't be run unless you plan to stick with it all the way until the 2NR. Also, if you're running T and on-case in the same round, I'm more inclined to vote affirmative just because that in itself is a logical fallacy. For a negative to win topicality for me, they need to be fully invested in running T and they need to run it well, violation, standards, and voters and everything. Conversely, an affirmative needs to answer T well to win it. If an affirmative answers it poorly, then I have a harder time voting for them on T, which to me is a huge issue in round.

Counterplans. I think they are part of a good neg strategy. For me, counterplans need to be both non-topical and competitive to be fair and given weight in a round. Personally, I find PICs to be somewhat abusive unless there is sound reason that the USFG literally cannot do the plan but the other actor can. Considering myself a TABS judge though, I will listen to anything that is put out in regards to counterplans as long as it is non-topical and competitive. Nothing is too ridiculous for me (unless it's like Aliens or something...that's just silly.)

Kritiks are a really cool thing in debate. I love hearing ones that are well-thought out and are especially run well. If you come to the round a present a K that is very generic and non-specific to the case or does not make me stop and actual think about the implications of the moral imperative in the round (remember I like good speakers) then it's not worth my time. For a K to be competitive I want to see a working alternative that is practical (not just reject the plan) and/or a solid framework argument as to why the K has to voted on. For a K to be worth voting on, you have to convince me why it is so important in the round and why it outweighs whatever the aff is doing (or whatever the neg is arguing because Kritikal Affs are cool too.) Again, I will listen to just about anything as long as it's not too far of stretch from reality and is run well.

Plain and simple. Conditionality is acceptable, but if the Aff reads sufficient evidence stating Condo bad and the Neg says nothing about it, then I'm fine with throwing out the Conditional argument without a question (further defense on the argument always helps, but if I will straight vote on condo bad). I'm fine with negation theory as long as the negatives defend that they can exist in parallel worlds if the aff argues that they contradict themselves (unless it's in the same DA or CP then that makes no sense...)

I'm fine with theory debate as long as I'm given a way to weigh it in the round and not just something I need to "think about." Outline why it's important, why it's a voting issue, and why your opponent doesn't meet, and then I'm fine with using it as a factor in the round. Like I said before, I'm fine with anything being run as long as it's not too far out of the scope of reality and its significance is explained well.

Lepien, Kimm

Judging Constraints:
West Bend

Background Information:

I was a policy debater through all 4 years of high school at West Bend East (1999-2002). I also participated in forensics and student congress, and have been judging all three since graduating in 2003.

Paradigm:
Tabula Rasa

Speed:

I am fine with speed as long as it is clear, concise, and well articulated. If I can not understand what you are saying, it will not be flowed, and therefore not judged on. I feel that when speed is used as a means to confuse your opponent that it does not make for a good debate, and unclear speeches will affect your speaker points.

Topicality:

I will vote on T, but only if it is a reasonable argument. I do not want to hear five different topicality arguments and nothing on the aff plan. At this point in the season, there should not be much that you are not ready to debate. I also do not want to hear topicality on words such as "in", "an", etc. or hear redundant topicalities such as both "increase" and "significantly increase" or "military" and "military presence" in rounds. Such case irrelevant and redundant Ts do nothing to enhance the debate and only serve to annoy me. If you are going to argue abuse, make sure there is real abuse happening.

Counterplans:

I will listen to counterplans, however, I rarely vote on them. If you are running a counterplan, it should be non-topical. Otherwise, what is the point of running a one? You should also be explaining the benefits of your counterplan over the aff plan, not just reading the CP to me.

Kritiks:

Once again, I will listen to Ks, but rarely, if ever, vote on them. If you are running a kritik, it must be well explained with good (credible) evidence to back it up.

Disadvantages:

I will listen to and vote on DAs, but they must link. Those DAs that come out of left field and don't link will not be considered. I also expect to hear more than just DAs. I expect other aspects of the aff plan to be addressed as well.

Etiquette:

A few notes on debate etiquette

- You should at least be civil to your opponent. Blatant rudeness will result in my docking of your speaker points.
- Cross-examination will be closed. I should not hear your partner shouting things out to you or the other team. If your partner needs help, you should do this during prep, or quietly while your opponents are speaking.
- I do not want to see any one standing up behind their opponents, peering over their shoulders while they are speaking to read and take the evidence to their partner. I find this to be very rude. You should be using this time to flow and to prepare your speeches. If I have to flow the round, you should too.

A few other notes:

- I like road maps, and do not time them.
- I like summaries/analysis of evidence. Instead of just reading card after card to me, tell me what the cards are saying and how they apply to the debate.
- Not everything leads to nuclear war and/or mass extinction. Please come up with some more plausible scenarios.
- Try to avoid using words such as "like", "um", "ah", "well", "so", "okay", etc. as fillers when you lose your train of thought. These make you appear unknowledgeable and distract from the point you are trying to make. Excessive use of these will affect your speaker points.
- My post-secondary education is primarily in the field of Psychology, so please don't run psychology heavy DAs, CPs, etc. unless you actually know what they are talking about and can explain them in your own words. I will know most of your sources and their theories, and will know that you have no idea what it is you are trying to run.
- I do not disclose or give oral critiques.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at klepian@hotmail.com

Medved, Cassandra

I am from Muskego and debated for Muskego High School for four years. I was part of the first place 2010-2011 Varsity Policy Debate team. My partner and I were also recipients of the Grace Walsh Award. I currently attend UW-Whitewater and have been judging Policy Debate for two years. I am a Tabs judge. The best way to approach a round that I am judging is by assuming I know nothing about the topics you will be debating. I will make no assumptions or connections for any argument. If something has not been brought up, I will not judge on that argument. I will allow any arguments (i.e. critiques, counterplans, off case, topicality). I merely ask for discretion, because these arguments need to be very well run for a good round. I also allow speed, as long as I can understand what is being said. I love analogies. A debater's best bet in a round that I am judging is to weigh the round for me, provide explanations, and make connections. Paint me a picture of the world with/without the affirmative plan.

Moffitt, Andrew

Constraints: Mukwonago High (2013-2014 Tourney)

When listening to a debate round, I am looking forward to the clash and education that both sides gain, not the mindless reading of cards and disrespectful behavior towards others. I know that this may be a bit nebulous, so let me break down this down into several points:

Background: Assistant Director of Debate- Marquette University (Worlds), 4 years HS exp. (Policy), 4 years of college debate (NPDA & IPDA), 7th year judging policy debate.

Overall Philosophy: Stocks, with a strong desire for quality over quantity. Clear argumentation and analysis needed, especially in the rebuttals. This means Mpx Calc. and Voters are really nice to have. I want to do as little work as possible to untangle a round before making a decision, and it would suit your team well to consider that desire.

Topicality: Very important to me in the round (stock issue #1, after all), so run it if you feel that the case is not prima facie. However, if you don't have a complete T structure/story, I will be most displeased, and it will be easier for me to remove T from my flow with the appropriate Aff. responses.

Ks: Let's just say that, if you run a K in front of me, you need to make it count (if you are unsure how to run a K, then simply don't risk the chance that it will backfire). Solid links to case, and a better alternative than just "Reject Aff" is what I will be looking for. This needs to be an argument that is run under legitimate circumstances, not simply as another argument to spread the flow with.

Performance Debate: Simply put, **NO**.

Critical Affs: Same rules as Ks: make them count, and don't run them if you are unsure how to handle them. I don't like them personally, but I will listen to them if presented. **YOU NEED TO ARTICULATE WHY YOU DECIDED TO GO THIS FAR OFF THE RESERVATION FROM THE ADVOCACY OF THE AFF., and why this argument deserves my ballot.**

DAs/CPs: Run them, and run lots of them. I have no issues with them as a form of Neg. Strategy. Again, structure is key, so don't leave arguments hanging half-finished.

Speed: I dislike speed (not to mention the excess hyperventilation common at tourneys today). If you wish to talk faster, please slow down for taglines and analysis of evidence (including rebuttals), so that my flow is clear. Remember, less work for me does equal an easier and less confusing decision at the end of the round for you. I will sound like a broken record yelling "Clear" at you if you are not intelligible in a round, and that will be reflected on the ballot if necessary.

Tag Team Debate/ Open CX: **Simply put, NO. These portions of the round are meant for only the verbal participation of the speaker and/or the person handling CX, and I will not allow it to be changed simply based on the prevailing culture of debate today, which has not yet been supported by rule changes at the national/state level. If you do this in a round, I will penalize your team on the ballot. If you MUST share information with your partner during his/her speech or CX, do so on paper and/or in a way that does not unduly disturb the round.**

Decorum: Please be nice to the people in your round, if that is not too much to ask. I know this activity can be heated at times, but debate (in my mind) is as much an academic activity as it is a competitive activity. We are expected to gain necessary skills from this event, and I feel that respect for other's opinions and decisions has been thrown under the bus in recent years. If you are personally disrespectful in the round to the other team/partner/judge/audience, I will penalize you on the ballot.

Hope this little bit helps. If you have any other questions, please feel free to ask me before the round begins. Good luck everyone.

Payne, Charles

Charles Payne Policy Debate Judging Paradigm

General: I am a policy maker, but I am also stocks. I view policy and stocks as being more or less the same thing. An affirmative without inherency, solvency, or harms cannot possibly offer a policy advantage over the status quo, can it? Convince me that your side in the round offers me the best policy alternative.

I also find that the side that convinces me that they have a better understanding of the topic and the policy issues it presents tends to get my ballot. Unlike other judges and coaches, I have not spent the past 20 years studying debate theory and tactics, so you **MUST** explain your argument to me. Telling me the “story” of the argument will weigh more with me than the technical line-by-line. I am humble enough to be perfectly willing to write, “I did not understand this argument,” as part of my RFD on your ballot. It should go without saying that if I do not understand the argument, it is not going to weigh much in the round.

Speed: I do not like speed for two reasons: philosophical and practical. Philosophically, as a policy debater you should be trying to persuade me that your policy alternative is superior. Talking as fast as you can is annoying, not persuasive, and I believe is ultimately bad for the activity. From a practical standpoint, see my comments above about not spending the past 20 years studying debate theory. Talking as fast as you are able will probably be counter-productive to ensuring that I understand the reasoning of your argument. I will say “Clear” if I cannot understand the words you are saying, but if I do not understand the meaning of your argument, there is not much I can say without unfairly intervening in the round.

Topicality: I will definitely vote on T, but I get bored of technical T very quickly. Explain to me why the affirmative is abusive and unreasonably non-topical, and I will consider it.

Counter Plans: I like policy alternatives. CPs must be non-topical and mutually exclusive. I am probably not going to buy a PIC. I lean affirmative on conditionality arguments because I think the negative should present a coherent, non-conflicting policy.

Kritiks: You must offer me a policy alternative (more than just “reject the aff”). Most often, when a K loses with me, it is for lack of a decent alt. I also do not like “generic” arguments, so I want to hear a good, specific link to the affirmative. Also, make sure you explain the K to me. I have heard more than one round where I truthfully did not understand the K until sometime around the middle of the 2NR, which is way too late. See my comments above on conditionality under counter plans, and I am probably not going to buy a PIK.

DA's: Most of my comments for K's also apply to DA's.

Burden of Proof: When I am in doubt over who won a particular argument, I will lean away from the team that originated the argument. Effectively, this means that, when in doubt, I am going to lean Negative on case, and Affirmative off case.

Split the Block: OK. Please do.

New in 2: Not OK. Please don't.

Open CX: Preferably not, BUT: Debate is a communication event, and it is a team sport. Members of a team must communicate with each other, even during CX. **DO NOT** turn your partner into a puppet!

Closing Comment: Weigh the round and the competing policies for me (especially 2NR and 2AR)!

Shircel, Anton

Anton Shircel

Coaching:

Assistant coach/judge for Sheboygan South from 2004-2006

Assistant/Head coach Neenah from 2006-2010

Assistant coach Waukesha South 2012-Present

Experience:

Policy debater at Sheboygan South for four years (1998-2002)

Debated Novice, JV, Varsity 4, and VSS

Participated in Forensics, Mock Trial, and Student Congress

Debate Philosophy: Policy Maker

Speed: My preferred rate of speed is about medium to medium-high. I don't mind a faster round, however I ask that tags be slowed down to indicate a change in cards/arguments. Related to that, I tend to prefer fewer/well-constructed arguments to a melee of short/under-developed arguments. As far as open-cross examination, I am not against it. However, both sides must be okay with the situation.

Topicality: I am not the biggest fan of topicality. There must be a clear violation of the affirmative for me to consider voting. I like a structured debate with clear standards, etc. and competing definitions. I see topicality as an a priori issue that I vote on first in the round.

Counterplans: I think counterplans are a great negative strategy. There needs to be a clear Counterplan Text and some sort of competitiveness. I am not the biggest fan of topical counterplans. Perms need to be explicit as well so that there is no vagueness.

Kritiks: I am a fan of kritiks, but the negs need to make sure they understand them. It looks bad if the neg stumbles/contradicts themselves in the cross-examinations. Also, I need a clear alternative/world view from the negatives if they hope to have me vote on it at the end of the round. Again, perms need to be clear and explicit and show that competitiveness does not exist.

Theory: Theory is not the end-all of the rounds for me. I tend to look at rounds as real-world. Some theory would be needed at times such as perms/topicality but should only be used as support to an argument and not as an argument itself.

Walker, Jerrod

Tabula Rosa with Emphasis on Policy

=====THIS IS THE PART YOU NEED TO READ=====

I will listen to any argument, but I need you to weigh the round for me with **real world impacts**. Seriously, if you want to run a peanut butter and jelly plan that leads to the death of superman, I will listen to you as long as you explain what the impact of this fictional character's death has on the world and why it is important. I expect everyone to make full use of logic during debate rounds and do the internal link work for impacts.

Do not just read a card and expect that to be enough. You need to analyze these cards and give me their warrants. I don't believe in the terminology "truth vs. tech"; I believe that you should make sound arguments and that you should acknowledge and respond to bad arguments, even if you have to group them. I do not like speed because most people are not clear when doing it. It's rare that I will call for a card; it's up to the debaters to do the analysis and argumentation. I will only ever call for evidence if there is a dispute about the warrants that both sides contest **and** if the evidence is the crux of a debate.

I will tell you **once** to be clear during the round. From that point forward, I simply will not flow you. I will try to listen, but you are risking me forgetting an argument. **To be explicit:** I do not like speed, but I'm okay if you do it AND YOU ARE CLEAR; do not go at a snail's pace because then I become bored.

What is your ideal Debate Round?

I look for excellent direct line-by-line; tell me what they argued, what your counter-argument is, why I should prefer your argument, and why I should care. I need good analysis of cards presented by both sides; do not just read the cards at me and expect me to make the connection. Speed through the card, sure, but slow down just a bit for your analysis if it's important enough to you. I like to see a variety of arguments run, but tied into a strategy. Give me roadmaps. I believe that you should have an agenda during your CX – don't ask a bunch of questions that are unrelated to your negative strategy. Use that time to establish links or poke holes. Split the negative block. I also believe in testing the affirmative, but once you hit the negative block, you've already tested it. If you force the 1A to respond to every single argument and then kick the argument in the 2NR, I'm going to believe them when they say it's abusive. Affs, USE your case throughout the round or you run the risk of me forgetting about it. In each rebuttal speech, you need to weigh the round for me. I also like it if debaters do not sound as if they're about to die (the gasping thing...don't do it.) Oh, and I won't time flashing.

What are your thoughts on Topicality?

Topicality is about what the plan actually does – what does the plan mandate must happen? Topicality has little to do with advantages that are claimed, the effects of doing the plan, or anything conditional. In other words, your plan text must be topical. Therefore, being effectually topical is a problem because it explodes the topic – a negative simply cannot prepare to debate every single case that is tangentially related to the resolution. However, being effectually topical can be legitimate under some resolutions and it is up to the affirmative to defend their effectual topicality if this is where they fall. By the same token, if negatives argue that the affirmatives are effectually topical, they must tell me why that's a bad thing both for debate AND they should provide examples of topical plans. The same applies for extra topicality – when an affirmative team is extra-topical, they are including mandates within the plan that are not topical with the resolution. Whether that means the advantages attached to that mandate are illegitimate or the entire plan is illegitimate is up to the negatives to prove. Topicality is also a gateway issue – if the affirmative is not topical and we cannot debate the actual resolution, then nothing else in the round matters and the affirmative loses automatically. It's out of my hands.

Negatives can use topicality as a part of their strategy – it's a legitimate argument. Yes, I agree that in most cases it is just a time-suck, but it's also a very predictable strategy (so I don't buy that topicality is an abusive argument). Affirmatives should also understand that I'm a writer and I have a degree in English and Legal Studies; in other words, I believe that debating about words and what they mean can be very educational. Not to mention that if policy debate is meant to simulate a courtroom, definitions of words become incredibly important at the appellate level. So affirmatives should know that standards or voters that say, "no one wants to debate about words" are not convincing. However, if topicality IS part of your negative strategy and you run a topicality argument, you should know that I'm going to look very strangely at my flow if I see lots of on-case turns or takeouts or case-specific DA's. If negatives decide to run topicality, then they should tell me precisely what arguments they are unable to run because of the topicality violation **as well as** plans that are topical under their definition. Even still, the burden is on the affirmative to point this out for me and tell me why this is abusive for the round or harmful for debate. Don't you dare expect me to make arguments or connect the dots for you. That's your job.

What are your thoughts on Solvency, Advantages and Impacts?

It's a very simple concept, right? If you cannot solve for your harms or your advantages, then your plan doesn't matter. Your cards need to actually prove your solvency; if you do not have a card that explicitly says that your plan will solve for the harms/contentions/advantages, you need to do the internal link work to show me how you will solve. Now, because I am a tabs judge with an emphasis on policy, you are probably going to want to run a plan that has advantages that solve real-world problems. Frankly, I don't believe a nuclear war is ever going to happen. Maybe there will be some nuclear strikes that lead to a war, but the war itself won't be nuclear. Now, if you can give me *legitimate* reasoning why nuclear war is likely in a specific scenario (rather than some convoluted systemic postulating that ends with everyone dying), I'll give it to you. But just as I expect teams to prove topicality, I also expect teams to prove to me through logical internal links backed by evidence that the Nuclear War (or Extinction) is going to happen. But if a team tells me in a speech with pure analytics and empirics that extinction and nuclear war are unlikely, I'm going to be very inclined to believe them. And let's be honest here – there are impacts beyond these highly unrealistic end-game scenarios. What about genocide? Economic collapse? Human rights violations? Territorial or civil war? Perpetuation of –isms (sexism, racism, elitism) that lead to oppression and dehumanization? At least all of these have actually happened, right? Come on, be creative!

Additionally, because of my emphasis on policy, I am looking for real-world impacts and impact analysis throughout the round. It's not enough that you simply *have* impacts, however real they may be. What's more important is that the impact calculus is done, especially in rebuttals since I do not consider impact calculus a new argument. Talk to me about **probability** – which is more likely to happen? Just as I was saying above, I'm probably more inclined to believe in a dehumanization/ human rights impact than a mass extinction impact. Why? Because one of those things has happened to the human race before – empirics can be convincing. Tell me about the **timeframe** of the impacts. If someone has a bunch of internal links that leads to this huge impact (i.e. global warming = climate change = melting of polar ice caps = flooding of the world = loss of life, crops, etc. = extinction) and the opponent have the same impact with a timeframe that happens sooner (i.e. biological warfare = outbreak of uncontrollable disease = extinction), I might be inclined to go with the extinction that happens sooner. You know, if you've convinced me that extinction is going to happen in the first place. Talk to me about **magnitude** – if both sides are arguing about people dying, then which impact has more people dying. If we're debating dehumanization and one has an impact that dehumanizes a larger group of people (i.e. racism), then I have to go with the impact that saves the most people.

That's basic impact calculus that I expect to happen, even at a novice level. Now, for advanced Varsity debaters, I'm expecting you guys to be a bit more sophisticated with your arguments. If your opponents are arguing that sexism causes human rights violations but you are arguing an impact of terrorism and national security, sure they might have a larger magnitude, but we can reverse human rights violations eventually. We can't reverse death (of course, you could always argue that human death isn't important). This is called arguing **reversibility** of an impact – if your impact is irreversible and the opponents can be corrected, you could legitimately argue that for the time being, your impact is more important. You could also **take out their internal links** with your impact – urban sprawl and industrial development destroys biodiversity and the environment, so the former outweighs the latter impact/advantage. You could also take out their impact by inserting your impact as an internal link that causes their impact – in other words, dehumanization leads to genocide, so stopping dehumanization is more important. You could also include their impact or advantage along with yours; for example, a third world war is inclusive of a civil war (and has a larger magnitude), so the world war outweighs the civil war. Whatever you decide, just be sure not to be lazy during the speeches and forget to do impact analysis.

What are your thoughts on Disadvantages?

Let's start with the basics. Regardless of how you structure your Disadvantage, there absolutely must be uniqueness, external links, internal links, and impacts. If you want to combine the uniqueness and external link to be a "Unique Link" card, hey, that's your prerogative (and a time-saver).

However you handle it, I need the negative team to explain to me why the impacts you're going to claim have not happened yet and how the plan presented by the opposing side will *uniquely* cause those impacts. For example, if the negative team were going for an economic collapse scenario, then their uniqueness would show that either the economy is doing well now **or** that we are improving/seeking to improve the economy. I expect uniqueness cards to be current, meaning you should keep those updated throughout the debate season. There are a few scenarios where uniqueness may not require the most up-to-date cards, but that is an extreme rarity. Yes, if the affirmative proves your disadvantage is non-unique and your impacts are going to happen anyway, then you're going to lose the DA unless you can convince me of a reason that you shouldn't.

When giving me a link, please avoid generic links. If every single possible case links, then I have to agree that it's an abusive argument. Unless of course you tell me why generic disadvantages are good for debate. In fact, when it comes to generic disadvantages, the only time I really approve of them is when a team is running them along with a topicality argument and I'm told "this is all we can run because of how non-topical their plan is." *That* is called good strategy.

Otherwise, if your DA is important to you, make sure the link is specific to the plan you are debating against (unless you provide me debate theory about why generic disadvantages are not bad). Whatever the case, it is the presenter's burden to prove to me that the plan causes the disadvantage you are claiming. Following your link, you should probably have an internal link if the connection between the external link and the impact is unclear. You could leave it out, but running a DA in the 2NC with no internal link and then trying to provide them in rebuttals is abusive. It's simply good practice to ensure that you have done the work to show me how this change that the plan causes leads directly (or systemically) to the impact you provide. Refer to the above section for my thoughts on impacts.

As far as how I like to see teams defeat Disadvantages, there are a few ways that I think work very well. The easiest is usually going to be demonstrating that you do not link to the disadvantage (No Link arg). You could also argue that your plan doesn't cause the internal link that causes the impact. And then, of course, you can argue that there is no uniqueness – demonstrating that the link has happened in the past (or is currently happening) and the impact has not happened. Then there is the no threshold argument, arguing that the link does not make it clear when the impact will happen, which is mildly convincing. Now, these are all defensive arguments and while easier to make, are not the best for a good debate round. An offensive argument that works very well with me is a **link turn**, which I think should always happen in two ways: 1) Show me that the impact is already going to happen in the status quo (Non-Unique) and 2) Show me that you actually do the *opposite* of what the opponent's link says (turn). This is a great strategy because **now** you can include their impact scenario as an advantage to your plan! Now, if you want to make things really interesting for me, do impact turns where you try to convince me that the impacts of the disadvantage are actually a good thing. Again, I am a tabs judge, so I'll consider any argument fairly. Put the opponent into a position where they **must** respond to your arguments or risk them becoming advantages to your plan. Just be careful not to double turn the disadvantage by doing a link turn and an impact turn (because then, you're telling me that the status quo is doing something that you stop, but that thing you stop is actually a good thing...meaning I shouldn't do your plan). I'll also accept severance permutations if you can convince me they are legitimate.

As far as how I like to see disadvantages run, I only have a few things. First, please clearly say which cards apply to which arguments: Uniqueness/Unique Link, Link, Internal Link, Impact, etc. (same for responding: No uniqueness, No Link, Link Turn, Impact Turn, No Internal Link, etc.) Second, disads are fair during any constructive, even during the 2NC – still, it's sporting to ensure that you do most of your off-case in the 1NC. Oh, and side-note: I'm going to be very impressed by an affirmative team that effectively uses a disadvantage against a counterplan.

What are your thoughts on Counterplans?

While in traditional, old school debate, the negative's job was to negate the resolution (argue against it), today, we realize that sometimes, a resolution is such an obvious societal good that counterplans have become common. And you know what? I love it when negatives run counterplans! I am of the philosophy that once an affirmative gives us a topical plan text, they abandon all other grounds within the resolution to the negative because you are saying that your plan is the *best* method for answering the resolution, or at the very least the only plan you'll be advocating this round. As a tabs judge, I don't care whether the plan is topical or non-topical. A smart affirmative that runs into a non-topical CP would be smart to argue how abusive it is to allow a negative to run non-topical plans. But ensure that you understand the debate theory behind such an argument.

Unless you convince me otherwise (which, again, is more than possible), a negative team must offer a counterplan that is competitive. This means that the CP should be fundamentally better and different to the affirmative plan and any combination of the plan and counterplan; in other words, they should be mutually exclusive, meaning unable to exist simultaneously.

One final thing on counterplans: **You MUST present a counterplan in the 1NC and if you continue to advocate for the counterplan in the negative block, I expect you to continue it throughout the round. If you're going to make us debate a counterplan at all, it had better not be a time-suck.** Hypothesis testing is fine, but you can determine after you've heard the 2AC if you want to continue that route or not. If you do, then stick to it. If you've run a bunch of other arguments along with a CP during the negative block, then kick the CP in the 2NR, I will totally side with the affirmatives if they claim abuse.

What are your thoughts on Framework, Theory & Kritiks?

When dealing with a tabs judge like me, providing a framework is one way to take control of the debate. In most cases, judges will default to "calculative framework," which doesn't necessarily consider which course of action is the best, but which course of action causes the least damage (or saves the most lives/resources/etc.). Now, for many teams, this is perfectly fine. But depending on what type of arguments you run, you might decide that you need me to consider things differently. Perhaps you need me to think about morality over anything else. Perhaps you need me to consider future advantages over immediate disadvantages. Again, when you run a framework, you're telling me how to evaluate the round in the end (and for a tabs judge, that works out really well). Here's the thing – if a team runs a framework argument, you

MUST respond to it or you're telling me that you agree with them, which probably isn't in your best interests. And I get rather excited when I have two competing frameworks – it makes the debate more interesting.

When it comes to debate theory and kritikal arguments, **I absolutely LOVE them**. When it comes down to it, we are debating about ideas. If I vote for your plan, in the real world, nothing actually happens. But a kritik allows us to examine how we are *thinking*, which can have a very real impact in our lives. In my humble opinion, kritiks tend to be some of the most important debates in the round. Indeed, it's important enough that it's considered an a priori argument, meaning that I will consider a kritik *before* I consider any other argument (indeed, I'll place it directly after topicality during evaluation). But as much as I love kritiks, I love coherent debate more. That is, if you do not understand a kritik well enough to make what you're arguments are explicitly clear to your opponents, you shouldn't use it. I don't want to see someone struggling to make an argument they don't understand... or, worse, running arguments that bite (or in ways that bite) into their own kritik.

If you do decide to run a kritik, you must have all 3 parts of the kritik and you should clearly sign-post them (unless, of course, your kritik is against linear thinking...). First, you must provide me with a **link**. Because a kritik is usually a philosophical argument, there's no need to prove that it is not happening in the status quo (in other words, I don't expect a kritik to have uniqueness to the opponent's arguments/plan), but you have to show me how the affirmatives actually bite into the kritik. You must explain to me how the affirmative or negative's entire mindset is wrong. When giving me the link, you should clearly explain what the opponent's mindset is as well as explaining the fundamental ideals behind that mindset. Next, you're going to want to give me an **implication**. Here, you will explain to me what impact that mindset has on the world or society. What is the moral/ethical/real world impact? Finally, a kritik must have **an alternative**; it's all well and good that we understand how harmful a certain mindset is, but what is our alternative? Give me an option that is better than what the opponent is doing.

Defeating kritiks can be done in a number of ways, but there are a few that I'm partial to. Among the easiest ways to defeat them with me is to attack the alternative. I am not a fan of the "reject the affirmative" or "reject the mindset" alternative and, should the opponent be so foolish as to not read this and use that sort of alternative, feel free to point out that they've provided no "real" alternative. They haven't provided us with a different mindset or solution to actually evaluate. You'd also want to point out that the mindset also exists in the status quo while doing so. For me, that's enough. Now if they actually went ahead and provided a real alternative, it becomes a bit stickier for you.

You could also go for more logical refutation. Maybe the opponent doesn't actually end up making an argument for something that is objectionable, so then you shouldn't be required to respond to it. After all, they have an entire speech to make a clear argument and shouldn't be allowed to expand on an a priori topic so late in a debate when they've already had the opportunity. You could concede that what the opponents claim as a bad mindset is bad, but that it doesn't actually link to your case. You could argue that after re-thinking everything through, that the kritik actually still doesn't matter that much (all the easier if you've provided a framework for the debate already). If the negatives have run *any* other arguments that bite into their kritik, you could argue that the kritik should be thrown out for pure reasons of inconsistency. At best, it means they probably don't understand their own kritik. At worst, they're demonstrating that debating or thinking in their proposed mindset is impossible. Sure, I'll buy that (but here, you run into the risk of the negs kicking that argument; you can try to still point out that the kritik is invalid since, regardless of whether they kicked the argument or not, they've already demonstrated the exact same mindset, so they are no better and don't deserve to win the round).

More interesting still, you could decide to argue against the kritik itself! Prove, through reasoning and evidence, that the kritik simply isn't true. Or, you could argue that the assumptions being made are justified because it's the best option we have (again, easier with a framework). For those most comfortable with traditional policy debate, it's probably your best bet.

The **most** interesting of answers involves kritiking the kritik. You could kritik the assumptions that the kritik is making using your own evidence and analysis (so yeah, make blocks against common kritiks). You could argue that kritiks are, by their nature, self-contradictory; if kritiks are saying we must question all assumptions, then you can probably convince me that negatives have the burden of proving that there are no hidden assumptions in their kritik and that before we consider any part of their kritik, they must provide evidence that they are not vulnerable to hidden assumptions (almost like a T argument). Finally, you could lean on the fact that I place emphasis on policy and argue that kritiks are not valid because of their nihilistic nature – if we have to question *everything*, then we are left with never-ending skepticism with no solution, which just isn't acceptable for the world. If we are to get on with life and solve problems, then we have to reject kritiks as a concept because they stop us from living. I may love kritiks, but I concede that this might be a problem with kritikal arguments. You just have to argue it. Effectively.

Wanta, Saantha

Policy Preference Information

I graduated from West Bend West High School in 2012. I have four years of Policy Debate experience, and three years of debating at the state tournament. Last year, my partner and I shared the winning record with two other teams and were placed third. I am currently a linguistics student at UWM. It is your job as a debater to be as clear as possible. I expect a lot of clash. Also, because I do have a background in policy, I would expect you to use some concrete examples to support your claims. When you are arguing talk directly to me as a judge during your speech and tell me why I should vote for you. The same holds true for your other arguments. Good Luck to you all! I hope you have a fun weekend.

LD Preference

Hello State Debaters! My name is Samantha Wanta and I graduated from West Bend West High School in 2012. I have four years of Policy Debate experience, and three years of debating at the state tournament. Last year, my partner and I shared the winning record with two other teams and were placed third. I am currently a linguistics student at UWM.

It seems that I will be judging Lincoln Douglas debate, so here are some things you should know:

First, I have never judged LD before. Sorry, I know that sounds scary. But I have observed many LD rounds in the past, and I am confident that I know what makes a good debate. That being said, it is your job as a debater to be as clear as possible. I expect a lot of clash. Also, because I do have a background in policy, I would expect you to use some concrete examples to support your claims. Finally, when you are arguing that your value should be preferred, talk directly to me as a judge during your speech and tell me why I should vote for you.

Good Luck to you all! I hope you have a fun weekend.

Yep, Andrew

Judge Name: Andrew M Yep

School: Waukesha South High School

Experience

Yep was never a member of debate in high school. He was coerced into coaching debate. But has stuck with it since 2011. He does enjoy it. He usually a policy judge but on occasion does get absorbed into the LD and Public Forum realms. Yep is not up to date on Debate lingo. So be sure to explain things and go slow.

Philosophy

Yep has been called Policy, Stocks and Tabs. Thus he does not know exactly where he fits. Persuasion is important and is enhanced by clarity. He will take into consideration all things he understands in the round that are not dropped. Yep does not like it when a team kicks arguments unless there exist a contradiction a speaker cannot explain away. Personally Yep does not like spread. He prefers quality over quantity. If a speaker feels it is necessary to do a line by line analysis give it the time and do not speed over it.

Topicality - Yep is not against topicality. Words are important in the world. But Yep needs definitions, standards and voters. Also give examples of what plans work under the definition and what does not. This helps Yep figure out if there exist a Topicality violation.

Counterplans - Counterplans need to be clear. If the counterplan is not mutually exclusive then a net benefit must be clearly achieved.

Kritiks - Yep is not a philosophy major. Yep does not vote on these often. A speaker may use one but at the risk of Yep being very confused. Be sure to explain the link thoroughly and provide an alternative.

Disadvantages - If Yep misses the link he will be very confused. Clarity is a must. When a DA is introduced Yep firmly believes that minimally it should be linked and impacts discussed in the 1NC.

Structure of the Round and Speaking

Yep likes signposts and likes very clear and slow tags. Cross examinations are closed so that he can judge your organization and understanding of arguments which will reflect into speaker points. If a speaker turns into a parrot that will reflect poorly in speaker points.

Rebuttals

Speakers should summarize the round pull through their arguments. Weigh the round through magnitude, timeframe and probability. Yep likes probability he is a statistics teacher. Obviously certain percentages cannot always be given but we can use word like "certain" or "uncertain". He enjoys it when speakers question the validity of studies and experiments. Analogies and examples are not only welcomed but encouraged.

Timing & Technology

Yep's timer is final. He is a little slow in starting it. He tries to let a team know when he is starting it. He will on occasion tell you how much you have left. In regards to technology the prep time will only end when the portable storage device is physically removed from the port of entry and is one its way to the other team.