

## 2019 NCCFI Judge Philosophies:

Taylor Alandzes, Grand Canyon University  
Amber Benning, Hired Critic  
Ryan Corwin, Sterling College  
Michael Dreher, Bethel University\*  
Jeriah Forbes, Hired Critic  
Robert Fortner, Palm Beach Atlantic University  
Eric Garcia, Biola University  
Andrew Harvey, Grove City College  
Logan Hurley, Boyce College  
Kris Lewis, Kansas Wesleyan University  
Jon Loging, Bethany Lutheran College\*  
Jessica Samens, Bethel University  
James Talley, Hired Critic  
Michael Tate, Hired Critic  
Ken Troyer, Sterling College  
Drayton Wiley, Hired Critic  
Dakota Yates, Hired Critic

\*refers to tournament staff that will only be placed in rounds if absolutely necessary.  
However, we want students to have their judging philosophies should they be placed in rounds.

## **Taylor Alandzes, Grand Canyon University**

TLDR: Run what you want, Ks are fine, speed is fine, be an awful person and I will drop you.

Experience:

I debated with GCU for four years. I am a first year out judge but I've been coaching in some capacity for a year and half. I was fairly successfully as a debater and made it to quarters last year at NPDA so I can handle whatever you want to run.

General:

I ran a lot of traditional arguments and a lot of Ks but I'd leave it all for a good straight case debate or theory debate. I spent a majority of my Junior and Senior year running Debate-space criticisms, so I am very open to any of those arguments as well.

Theory:

Love it. Run it. Run it well. Theory, especially creative theory, is my favorite kind of debate. I can be persuaded that RVIs are legit, convince me.

The K:

I enjoy a good K. By good I mean well-read and with round-specific links. Specific K's I enjoy are fem, cap, and debate-space related Ks but I'm open to whatever your wheelhouse is just explain your lit. Real world alternatives are my preference but if you can tell me why your meta-reality is worth the ballot I'm willing to hear you out.

Non-topical Affirmatives:

Have good answers to T. Give me topic specific links or a good framework that tells me why I should ignore the topic.

Speaker Points:

I will almost always give 30s because speaker points are inherently exclusionary HOWEVER I will break this rule if you are a horrible human being. Debate is a hard enough space to exist in, let's be kind and decent to each other.

## **Amber Benning, Hired Critic**

**Overview:** I spent four years debating in high school before attending Kansas Wesleyan. I competed in Lincoln Douglass, but primarily in Parliamentary Debate in college. Over the last 3 years I have judged on nearly every topic, but I haven't seen much on this topic.

**Paradigm:** I default policymaker. That includes stock issues. A policy that doesn't solve shouldn't be passed. However, I vote with the flow so all arguments have to be there in order

for me to make a decision. If I don't know where something goes on the flow I don't mind putting it wherever I think it should go. You might not like that though.

**Speed:** I'd like to think I can handle speed, but to be honest I don't want to listen to the banshee's screech. So let's keep it to a clipped pace at most.

**The K:** If it makes sense I'll vote for it. I ran a few Kritiks, but they weren't ever my specialty.

**T:** I'll vote for T, but please make it clean. Topicality is a framework argument, so frame it. Definition, Interpretation, Violation, Standards, Voters.

**Misc:** If I set down my pen, I'm not listening.

## **Ryan Corwin, Sterling College**

- 1) Tabula Rasa (provided that you tell me where to evaluate the round)
- 2) Policy maker (provided that you do not tell me how to evaluate the round, I will default to whoever proposes the best policy)

Please do not interpret #1 or #2 to mean I do not want you to engage in kritikal debate. We should question the power structures which "govern" us.

I debated in college in Parli for 4 years (not particularly well, but competitive no less), and in policy debate in high school for 3 years. Since graduating in 2012 I have judged roughly 100 rounds of competitive debate at the high school and collegiate level.

I'm okay with speed.

## **Michael Dreher, Bethel University**

Director of Forensics, Professor and Director, M.A. in Communication, Bethel University

Number of debates judged (2018-2019): 3

Number of parli debates judged (2018-2019): 3

Average speaker points (last 4 years): 26.25, sd=1.69 (we are not on a 0.1 pt. circuit)

No. of years judging parli: 24

First of all, if you are reading this philosophy and I'm your judge – we have big problems that are worse than me judging your round. That means we have a severe shortage of judges, and I had to be pulled from the tab room.

I tend to be in tab room at the parli tournaments we attend. Please don't confuse my lack of rounds as a lack of interest/being around debate. We don't also have a thriving LD circuit,

although I'm familiar with NFA-LD, and have previously judged outrounds at the NFA National tournament.

I've judged quite a number of parli, LD and policy debates, and only 1 IPDA debate, so if I'm somehow in the pool for IPDA, then know that I'm not as familiar with the format. We simply don't do it in our part of the country. I'm not sure how much of what I write below applies to IPDA, but it'll give you a sense of how I process arguments.

Specifically, when it comes to quantity vs. quality of arguments: Yes, I do flow. You'll recognize me - I'm the one who uses the really giant sketch pad. I've used large sketch pads for more than 30 years. I write big - it's Biblical (see Galatians 6:11). I use the flow as a guide to help me remember; that doesn't mean you'll necessarily drop the round if you miss the 8<sup>th</sup> point off the third subpoint on the impact scenario. What it does mean is that I look to the reasonability of both positions before determining whether that matters. "Lump and dump" **done well** is just fine with me. If you can cover everything by grouping, go for it. There is a need to strike logical, structured argument along with persuasive abilities. Many people come into parli with a policy background, which is fine - what separates the top parli (and for that matter, NFA-LD) debaters is their ability to adapt to *whatever* kind of audience they have.

You'll find that I tend to default to a policymaking paradigm unless the debaters argue otherwise. I'll gladly listen to other kinds of debates (fact, value, etc.), but I've heard quite a few teams that have terrible criteria when it comes to weighing value or fact rounds. 10 years ago, there weren't many judges like me who would admit they voted for probability over magnitude. I'm glad that the community has come around to that idea. If you're a big fan of tiny brink, large impact DA's, I'm probably not your type of judge. I'm not likely to buy that a \$10 million increase in the budget deficit will lead to nuke war.

Speed: I tend to prefer moderate speed in large part because I'm a "deep flow" judge. I don't flow only taglines; I flow the underlying warrants and backing underneath the taglines. So, the more I hear, the better I understand your arguments, and that means more that you give me to think about for your side at the end of the round.

Accordingly, I tend to take a long time in terms of rendering the decision. I'm likely not to tell you my decision right away not because I am anti-disclosure, but I find that writing my way through the arguments in the round helps me to clearly articulate why I end up voting a certain way. I'll be happy to chat about the round right away and give you some helpful advice, but it does take me a few minutes to work through your arguments. You can find me later and I can talk about round specifics in more detail. Know, though, that your ballots won't just have "see oral disclosure."

Case side vs. DA's/Kritiks: I think case side debates are underutilized and dissecting a gov case can be a thing of beauty. I still vividly remember a Creighton-Grove City round from

NPDA several years back where Creighton basically tore apart the entire case without a single DA or T argument – because they could. K's need impact, and a clear story of how they apply to the gov case, which includes the alternative and a sense of whether the K is pre or post-fiat.

Topicality: I'll vote on it. My quirk is that you don't need to give me a long abuse block. Tell me the violation(s), and why they're violations, and move on! Either I'll vote on the violation or I won't. I've never seen a round won on "Gov decreases education." If I'm a one-judge panel and I hear a huge abuse block, I'll probably stop flowing and start to get annoyed. If I'm on a 3-judge panel, I'll live with it, but don't be surprised if I stop flowing.

As far as citation of evidence in round is concerned, I'm not the world's biggest fan. However, if someone does ask you where you found some information, I'd hope you would have an answer.

Plan text: I don't need a copy unless you're *really* fast, and in that case, I'm probably having other problems keeping a deep flow. Do make sure that we all understand the plan text though. Give the opp a chance to clarify plan and you won't bite into a spec argument. I have been known to pull the trigger on spec a time or two, but that comes from my policymaking paradigm – if I don't know whose job it is to deal with plan, then I'm not sure why I should accept that policy. I don't have to know *every* specific, but I do need to have a general sense of how the plan functions. Not answering a legitimate question about plan only increases the propensity of a spec argument.

Performance arguments: The reason I tend to have problems with them is that they essentially run as privileged narratives, which makes it really hard for the opp because the ground is so skewed.

New arguments/points of order: I do protect teams from new arguments in the rebuttals. So POO's aren't necessary. Run 'em if you want or if you're afraid I've missed something.

Offense/Defense: Defense is underrated. If a team can mitigate the effect of an argument, that can often be the most time-efficient strategy available. In other words, I'm not persuaded by a "they only have defense and no offense" statement; there are times when defense is all you need.

NFA-LD rules: I follow them. I will say the new 2013 rules confuse me a bit about counterplans because of poor grammar in the counterplan rule – I interpret the rules as meaning that no "study CP's" are allowed.

One last thing – NCCFI is a special tournament. While not all of us share the same Christian commitment, I would hope that we can agree on a few common beliefs: a) civility, b)

respecting other's interpretations of faith, even if we don't necessarily agree with those interpretations ourselves, and c) helping to keep the NCCFI a special place. I've been here since the beginning (when I didn't direct Novice Nats), and I worry that over time, I've seen less and less difference between NCCFI and other tournaments. Debate is one of the best places to show that – while we can use debate to “sharpen iron,” as it were -- we can do it in a way that is ultimately a blessing and an honor to God and each other.

## **Jeriah Forbes, Hired Critic**

**Overview:** I debated in college in Parli and LD. After college I went on the coach at Buhler High School for several years before leaving to pursue my PhD.

**Paradigm:** Comparatively advantageous policymaking works best for me. I'll listen to other arguments, but that's not a guarantee that I'll shift my paradigm. Make sure it's on the flow if you expect me to weigh an argument at the end of the round.

**Speed:** I can listen to speed, but it's been some years. If I can't get it on the flow because you're too fast, then I can't evaluate the argument at the end of the round.

**The K:** Do what you want, but theory arguments get muddled quickly. If you want to run a K you need to make sure the framework is solid and that the reasons I should evaluate the K either fall into my comparatively advantageous paradigm, or that I've been given sufficient reasoning to switch my standard methodology.

**T:** Topicality is an a priori issue. If all the components are there and go unanswered or poorly answered, I will vote on T.

**Misc:** Have fun and be educational. This is an academic pursuit, not a street brawl. As such don't use your CX to try and make arguments. I don't flow CX, so it won't do you any good to try.

## **Bob Fortner, Palm Beach Atlantic University**

1. All debaters should treat their partner and opponents with dignity and grace.
2. All debaters should make their case to the judge, or rebut the opponent's case, to the judge directly and transparently (no rapid fire speech that cannot be reasonably followed, no red herrings, no effort to be "too clever by half" in the effort to "trick" the opponents, on topic with a reasonable interpretation of said topic.
3. Direct responses to the opponent's arguments and/or an alternative approach to case or solution that has a clearly reasonable basis.
4. Clear articulation of any question put to the opponent in crossx, and a good faith effort to respond to any question put by an opponent.
5. Avoidance of logical flaws in making arguments.
6. Keeping to all time constraints.
7. Aiming for communication, engagement with the topic, and careful listening, throughout the debate.

## **Eric Garcia, Biola University**

I did LD value debate in high school. I did NDT debate for Cal State Fullerton for 4 years. I qualified for the NDT in 1992 and 1993. I coached parliamentary debate NPDA/NPTE from 2003 to 2012. My flow sheeting skills have declined with age. I will probably yell "slow" more than I used to.

I most often look to the dropped, impacted arguments first. If no criterion is given, I will default to net benefits, but really, I want you to tell me what criteria to use or how to evaluate arguments in the round.

I am more open to procedurals than most judges. I am open to voting on potential abuse and competing interpretations. I am open to theory debates. I barely tolerate critiques. Critique debaters don't use tag lines. I have no idea what to write because the debaters should be using tags for the audience. I detest projects. Projects largely damage NPDA by ignoring the topic.

For rebuttals, I value weighing likelihood, magnitude, irreversibility, and timeframe. If the debaters do not do the analysis for me, I will default to my non-tabula rasa, real world bias.

My real world bias is Libertarian. Take the 1st right on economics and the 1st left on sex and that's my bias. AOC and Bernie Sanders are economic idiots and endorse statist violence. Also, what you ingest for pleasure or do in the bedroom is none of my business. In the real world, government should follow the Non-Aggression Principle. End the War on Drugs. Consent and voluntarism are beautiful. Coercion is terrible.

Being snippy toward the opponents will affect your speaker points. Constantly feeding your partner answers will affect their speaker points. Once or twice is ok, but don't overdo it.

For parliamentary debate, please call points of order. I'll probably catch the new arguments on my own, but it doesn't hurt to call it.

## **Andrew Harvey, Grove City College**

Andrew J. Harvey, Professor of English, Debate Coach, Grove City College  
Judging Philosophy (NPDA/IPDA)

Debate for me, first and foremost, is a teaching tool. So, teach me something in each round. That may be a lesson in civil discourse more than the topic at hand. Ideally both sides are capable and equally informed: I am looking for genuine clash that extends beyond mere gainsaying—give me something I can vote on. And closing arguments should distill the round qualitatively more than quantitatively—make better points than your opponent not just more points, explain why they are better, and boil them down to clear voting issues in the end.

## **Logan Hurley, Boyce College**

In General:

The round is about the resolution. The Negative side of the debate has a lot of tools to try to cause me to not vote for the resolution on the basis of the Aff/Gov case, but I will rarely if ever be receptive to the Aff/Gov running a case that isn't about the resolution.

Otherwise, I strive hard to be non-interventionist as a judge, which means if an argument is winning on the flow, no matter how asinine or ridiculous I may personally find it, it will probably receive my vote. That is not to say that all drops are lethal, just be smart about what you let get through.

In general, debaters who are very clear and explicit about structure will do better than those who are less. Case components that have known features (like the elements of a linear DA, Topicality press, Value case, etc.) need to have all of these features for me to weigh the argument. If your DA doesn't have a clearly labeled impact or your Value case lacks a value criterion, you've not given me the infrastructure I need to plug that argument into the flow.

Aggression is not desired, nor will it be rewarded, so be chill.

I make no apologies for my non-existent poker face. You will almost always know if something is going wrong for your case. You will almost always know if an argument you've made impressed me. Use that knowledge in whatever way you see fit. Adaptation to audience will be rewarded.



IPDA/NPDA:

Attempting to spread in limited prep debate formats is either an indication that you don't understand the value of spreading in other formats and are simply copying something for no real reason at the expense of the format you are in or are cheating by reading evidence/ pre-prepared cases verbatim. Either one is grounds for a loss and minimal speaker points.

These are public-speaking events every bit as much as they are debate events. How you present yourself matters. I made no effort in these formats to limit the influence of ethos on how I understand and weigh arguments.

In NPDA, T-shells, Counterplans, etc. are all welcome. Be careful if you run K, though. Most successful Ks in other formats rely on robust and complicated philosophical grounding that you probably don't have time for in this format.

In IPDA, be aware that the limited speaking time means you won't have much opportunity to run elaborate, technical arguments well. Insofar as you are able to, though, I'm fine with them.

LD:

The fastest I'm going to be comfortable with you spreading is in the 400-500 wpm range. I'm broadly receptive to any and every argument that you've got good evidence for. I've voted for things as weird as Spark and as routine as an Inherency press. I do prefer to vote on stock issues in LD, but I still enjoy the novelty and diversity of arguments that can occur otherwise.

I don't like reading evidence, so if something in your evidence is sketching enough that your opponent makes an issue out of it, and they're right, you've probably lost enough credibility with me that you've essentially lost the round.

As for the conditionality of counterplans and alternatives, I don't have strong feelings on that and leave it to the flow. Be warned, though, that I don't require the Aff to read "Conditionality is bad," until after you try to kick your cp or k.

## **Kris Lewis, Hired Critic**

**Overview:** I started debating in '08. I've tried, or judged, just about every format of debate in that time. Unfortunately, I haven't had a chance to judge this topic, but I've seen a lot of IE.

**Paradigm:** Policymaker. I love me some clean rounds with everything on the flow, especially if I didn't have to guess where you wanted it on the flow. In short, signpost. While I default policy, that's just the initial framework I walk into round with. If you can convince me, or your opposition, that a different framework is better for the round then that's what we'll go with. I

do have certain thresholds for what I'll accept, however. Stock, Policy, and Critical lenses are the easiest to convince me to adopt. Good luck putting me into games player or anything that isn't intuitively educational, though.

**Speed:** Cool Beans

**K:** I love me a good K debate. I primarily ran K's on the circuit. I still need you to give me a proper framework, link scenario, impacts, and alt. It's easy to pick up my ballot against a K if you've won the framework arguments. After that I'll look to the Alt, Link, and impact calc respectively. Just because you read that I love K's though doesn't mean you should run one unless you know what you're doing.

**T:** Topicality is like a baby's first steps into kritical debate. I'll vote on T as a jurisdictional issue, but I need you to explain why your interpretation is the most reasonable. FXT can win a round if you articulate why a certain threshold is most reasonable for how divorced from immediate interaction with the resolution the plan is or isn't. Extra T can get you a sever, which might put you ahead in a comparatively advantageous round, but it's unlikely to win you the round outright. My least favorite thing is when I'm stuck listening to a bad T round, so if you're just throwing it out there to have time to fill I'd almost rather you just sat down with time on the clock. You do you though.

**Misc:** For the love of God, signpost.

## **Jon Logging - Bethany Lutheran College**

Years of competition in Parliamentary Debate - 4

Number of years coaching/judging Parliamentary Debate - 18

I firmly believe Parliamentary debate is an excellent Communication activity and should be carried out with that intention. I like to observe all the formalities that go along with Parli (knocking on tables, formal titles, and such). Delivery should be clear, well paced, and organized. Debaters should use logic, wit, examples, and style to convince a person that their perspective of a resolution is the correct one.

Overall, I want you to persuade me on the issue presented in the resolution. I don't want you to stand up there and tell me the other team is stupid. Stand up there and tell me why I should vote for you. Persuade me! Don't simply bash the other team.

Technical debating does not impress me. I don't care how many levels you have for your topicality argument if the Government team was topical. If the Government team goes way off base with their case, then a simple explanation of why they are not topical is called for. DON'T tell me that they are decreasing the educational value of the debate. Using the same old, tired arguments is what is decreasing the educational value of debate. Meta-debate is a fun activity, but when we are talking about cutting taxes, I don't want to hear argumentation theory; I want to hear why we should or should not cut taxes.

I dislike "road maps". In normal public speaking, a preview is incorporated into an introduction. When you start speaking, I start timing. When my timer says you are done, I stop listening.

I judge a round based on the quality of debate, not quantity. Some arguments might be dropped by the other team. That is not a reason that they should lose. It might be they spent time on the arguments that mattered and not the 12 disads you sped through in 1 minute. Other idiosyncrasies: I don't flow rebuttals. Anything you bring up in a rebuttal should have been talked about in the constructives. Anything brought up in a constructive is fair game in the rebuttals. I don't care if it wasn't touched by their partner. (Read the rules of debating, I have!) I dislike "conversational" debates when everyone decides to speak. The person at the podium has the floor and should be the only one speaking unless a point of information is raised. (By the way, points of information can be a question or a statement.) I come from a region that does not allow group prep/coaching/research during prep time. Debaters need to be informed. If a debater uses information that should be knowledgeable to someone who reads the news, I don't care if they have a citation or not. Don't simply throw cited information at me. Analyze it. Incorporate it into your case. Simply throwing it into the round does not impress me.

At the end of the round I ask the question: Who did the better debating on the resolution at hand? That is the team that will get the win.

## **Jessica Samens, Bethel University**

### Debate Judging Philosophy

Years judging Debate – 9  
Number of Rounds judged – 100 +  
Tournaments judged – 54  
Average Speaker points - 27

I like a round that is civil, well set up, and easy to understand. While I expect students to stand firm in their arguments, I do not tolerate being rude to the other team. Being disrespectful and bullying will cause you to lose the round regardless of the who does the better debating. I also like a debate that is well presented and follows an organized fashion set out by the Gov. This way I don't have to make the decision if you dropped arguments or not, plus it makes it easier for everyone to follow (especially the judge who will be making the ultimate decision). A messy debate forces all involved to make a lot of assumptions. I also like a round that is easy to follow with strong argumentation and clash. Please explain arguments for the sake of the judge and the other team.

Speaking of Topicality, I am fine with you running this as long as it is justified. However, don't spend precious time arguing it hurts the education system and is abusive. I know what the grounds are and do not want you to waste time you could be spending on the case. I am

accepting of counter plans as long as they are not just the gov plan modified – I also need to see they are justified by the opp. I feel the same about K's, etc – impress me with our debate skills. Any argument is fine in this sense as long as it is warranted.

In order to win my round, I want to see that you have learned something about debate and fought a clean round. When teams are equally paired, I am fine with a little humor and sarcasm to each other (while this may seem to go against my earlier claim, I do appreciate the spirit of debate when done fairly), but not when you are the stronger team – you take away from the other team's ability to learn. Also, be sure to tell me why you win – I appreciate voters in the rebuttals to tell me why you are the winning team. Never leave the debate in the judge's hand, there is a lot of information going back and forth and you don't want me to miss the main arguments you have provided.

Happy Debating!

### **James Talley, Hired Critic**

**Overview:** It's been long enough that the style of debate I did is probably unrecognizable to you. Don't allow that to convince you that I won't be able to keep up.

**Paradigm:** I default policymaker, but intelligent arguments are the best arguments. Keep it on the flow, and you'll be fine.

**Speed:** Make sure I can understand you. The onus is on the participants to make sure your adjudicator can follow you. This is a communication activity, treat it as such.

**The K:** I'll follow your theory, but you're in for a rough time if you think that you can use a cutting to tailor a philosopher's ideas to meet the requirements of your shell.

**T:** Feel free to run topicality, but please make sure all the components are there.

## **Michael Tate, Hired Critic**

**Overview:** I debated IPDA and was mainly an IE'er in college, but I've judged plenty of LD and Parli.

**Paradigm:** Stock Policymaker. You need a solvent case that isn't a squirrel, and it should be comparatively advantageous to the status quo or the counterplan.

**Speed:** Please don't.

**T:** If there's a clear violation of some sort, please do.

**K:** Please don't.

**Misc:** I love this activity, but sometimes competitors can't delineate between the competitive aspects and the educational ones. I'd prefer it seem like a competition and not a fight, if you would.

## **Ken Troyer, Sterling College**

### ***Section 1 – General Information***

Please begin by explaining what you think is the relevant information about your approach to judging that will best assist the debaters. Please be specific and clear. This may include your background, delivery preferences and general thoughts on paradigms (stock issues, policy maker, tabula rasa, etc).

I have been involved with debate since the late 80s, both as a competitor and coach. I participated in policy in high school and did 4 years of CEDA in the early 90s. Since then, I coached high school policy for 13 years and have been coaching parli and LD at Sterling College for the last 13.

I consider myself to be tabula rasa, however the limited time in an LD round often precludes much attention given to such a claim. As a result, I have no problem going policymaker or stock issues as suggested by the nature of the round. If no argumentation is made as to paradigm, I will default to policy maker. However I prefer that the debaters provide a clear framework, limiting my need to intervene (as is typically the case when no framework is provided). In other words give me a framework.

I am an old fashioned coach – meaning I am not a theory & K wonk - I don't mind hearing some harms and solvency mitigation coupled with a DA, maybe even some case turns – I prefer genuine clash.

### ***Section 2 – Specific Inquiries***

Please describe your approach to the following

#### **1. How do you adjudicate speed? What do you feel your responsibilities are regarding speed?**

So long as speed doesn't preclude my ability to flow, I don't generally use presentation/communication as a factor in decision making. Not that I mind anyone waxing poetic, but it probably won't play a critical role in the round. While I may not be a fan of the rules regarding speed, I will do my best to abide by the conversational nature of delivery that is expected. Speed should not be used as a weapon. If you believe speed is excessive, please provide me with some sort of threshold rather than simply screaming about the abuse and expecting me to intervene.

#### **2. Are there any arguments you would prefer not to hear or any arguments that you don't find yourself voting for very often?**

Consult CPs, Rules Violations, any K without an alt

#### **3. Final Thoughts?**

T & Procedurals will be weighed much like a DA – I need in round impacts

## Drayton Willey, Hired Critic

**Overview:** May the best argument win.

**Paradigm:** Post-Ironic Policymaker. Which is to say, put me in my place because if you don't who knows what I'll do. Will he vote on my T? Will he vote on my K? Will he make up his own justification after the fact if I don't do enough work on the flow? Yes. That being said, I'd like a nice clear round if possible. Signposting, parametrization, logic; all of these are important in round. Dropped arguments make for easy outs.

**Speed:** I'll understand you.

**Theory:** Theory underlines every argument. Is your cp conditional? Why? If you can explain why you're doing something, then I'll vote on it.

**T:** Topicality is a theory argument, and as such you need to do it well. I have a high threshold on what a good T looks like, but I'm willing to vote on anything if it goes conceded or under covered. If you're going to keep T into the late game, you should be going all in.

**K:** High theory is the best theory. If I see nothing but well-run K's the entire weekend, I'll go home happy. If I see nothing but bad K debate all weekend, I'll go home sad. Don't make your judge sad: only run a K if you know what you're doing with it.

**Misc:** Fun rounds are fun. I enjoy having fun. Try to keep things fun.

## Dakota Yates, Hired Critic

**Overview:** I've debated in high school and college. Sometimes the best argument is the simplest. While I will listen to just about anything you don't need the flashiest K or CP to win my ballot. All I need is a prima facie case out of the Aff, or answers to stock issues from the Neg in order to decide one way or the other. If that's not your style it's fine, arguments are won on the flow regardless.

**Paradigm:** I'm a policymaker through and through. All the aff needs is a prima facie case that is comparatively advantageous to the squo. All the neg needs is to prove that the case either won't work, isn't comparatively advantageous, or that there are better options available.

**Speed:** If you think the advantage you get from speed outweighs the chance that I can't understand you, feel free to try. If the other team can't keep up, I'm just as likely to buy a speed K as I am to buy the 4<sup>th</sup> advantage you put on your case.

**Topicality:** T is an a priori issue. There should be warranted abuse if you expect me to buy the T, but what constitutes that is up to you to prove in round. Your interpretation should be reasonable, and your violation clear. Standards and Voters need to be provided.

**K:** I'll listen to a K, but not if its links are generic. Show me how the other team has intrinsically degraded a certain space if you want me to believe you. After the link scenario, the next most important part of a K is the alt. Don't expect me to buy that a single mindshift advocacy is going to topple capitalism. It won't or it would have happened already.

**Misc:** If you plan on running a theory argument, don't speed through it. That includes topicality. I detest muddled rounds, so unless your strat was to win by a coin toss I'd advise against trying to tack on as many one off arguments that are aimed at confusing your opponent.