

NOTE THE EMAIL CHANGE

Hi. I did LD at Westwood High School for four years. Put me on the email chain -
trumantle@gmail.com

Affiliations: Westwood, Bishop's AC, Bishop's SR, Oxford VM, Roeper RL, Irvington SS,
Acton-Boxborough AL

I am affiliated with the DebateDrills Club Team.

[Pref Shortcuts]

LARP - 1

Theory/T - 1

K - 2-3 (depends on how dense the lit is)

Phil - 2-3 (depends on how dense the lit is)

Tricks - 4-Strike

[Churchill Update]

I am SICK of tricks debate. I do not know (nor will I ever know) what indexicals is. I will never vote for indexicals, evaluate the debate after X speech, or tacit ballot conditional. You may ask me before round if I think a certain trick is egregious. General rule is stuff like truth-testing, calc indicts, log con, and other simple stuff is fine. If you have a possible thought the arg is ridiculous, I most definitely think it is and will almost never vote for it.

Also I don't know any acronyms for this topic so please explain.

[Pre-2021 Season Update]

Main things:

1] I am **comfortable** judging **policy-style** debates and **T/theory** debates, though the worse the shell gets, the more unhappy I am. I am comfortable judging **phil** and **kritik** debates **if they don't get too advanced** for my brain (pomo, Baudrillard, existentialism, etc.). I am **not comfortable judging tricks debates**, and though I will still evaluate those debates, I have great distaste in that debate and **my threshold for answering those arguments is much lower** than other arguments.

2] I agree with **Rodrigo Paramo** on **evidence ethics** and **trigger warnings**. Detailed specifics for ev ethics is below as well.

3] I think tricks args operate on a sliding scale; I think some tricks are worse than others. For example, calc indicts are fine whereas "evaluate the debate after the 1AC" is horrendous. Likewise I also think indexicals and tacit ballot conditional are horrendous arguments for debate. If you're not sure whether an argument is too tricky to read in front of me, **err on the side of caution**, or just **email me pre-round**.

4] I believe in **open-source disclosure**. I think most disclosure arguments that go beyond this are bad (contact info, round reports, actual tournament name, etc.).

5] I give speaks based on **how far I believe your performance would get you at the tournament** I'm judging at. I tend to average around a 28.5. Yes **I will disclose speaks** if requested.

6] **I require much more explanation for arguments than you think I do**. Many 2AR's that I've judged go for a 3-second argument in the 1AR that I did not catch/have an understanding for, and many 2NR's that I've judged blitz through overviews of the theory of power/philosophical position that I cannot keep up with. Either **slow down** or **be clearer in explanations**.

7] **Slow down** please, especially in online debates. You will not be happy with my RFD if I don't catch something because you're blitzing too fast.

8] I am **extremely visually expressive**. I know it's hard during online debate to see my face when you're reading through a doc, but you should almost always be able to tell if I like something/find something confusing.

[Evidence Ethics]

I perceive the following to be cheating (or check Rodrigo's paradigm):

- Clipping
- Cards starting or ending in the middle of a paragraph, or leaving paragraphs out (yes this includes the "they continue" stuff)
- Miscalculating evidence
- Misrepresenting the date of evidence

I would much prefer debaters stake the round on evidence ethics claims. I will notice clipping without debaters pointing it out, though you should still do so to make it easier for me. If there is an evidence ethics violation, it will result in the offending debater getting an L 25. If there is not a violation, the accusing debater will get an L 25.

[Speaks]

I give speaks based on how far I think you'll get at the tournament. For reference:

30 - you're winning the tourney

29.5-29.9 - you'll be in late elims

29-29.4 - you'll break

28.5-28.9 - on the bubble

28-28.4 - even record

27.5-27.9 - negative record

Anything lower means you ruined my day.

Efficiency and strategy are important.

You shouldn't be too fast for me as long as you're clear.

I'm more impressed by slow and efficient debaters.

I've learned that I award speaks for being nice and dock speaks for being an jerk. I also tend to boost/dock by quite a bit.

My average speaks for 2019-2020 are 28.49.

My average speaks for 2020-2021 are 28.44.

Loyola: 28.63

Grapevine: 28.45

Greenhill: 28.68

Meadows: 28.94

UT: 28.76

Churchill: 28.65

HWL RR: 28.93

HWL: 28.24

Peninsula: 28.38

Palm Classic: 28.45

Berkeley: 28.58

[Disclosure]

I think disclosure is amazing and will heavily lean towards voting on disclosure theory. My tendency to vote on disclosure theory slightly goes down the more planks get added (full-text, open-source, etc.) but I'm still very in favor of open source disclosure.

Don't read disclosure against novices or people who have no idea what the wiki is.

Violations need a screenshot in the doc with a timestamp.

[LARP]

Yes.

Good evidence matters, I'm willing to look at evidence post-round.

Please weigh, please make it comparative.

I am pretty bad at keeping up with politics. Don't assume I know everything.

[K (Neg)]

To clarify the pref shortcut, I should be a fine judge for you if you're reading

- Cap
- Security
- Antiracism
- Settler Colonialism
- Simple Stuff (Biopower, Discourse K's, etc.)

I should be a pretty bad judge for you if you're reading anything more complex than that. That includes, but is not limited to,

- Deleuze
- Baudrillard
- Queer theory
- Anything high theory

I have a very basic understanding of most of the literature, don't assume I know your lit base.

The more dense your kritik is the more likely I am to not understand it and vote you down. That burden is on you to explain to me and I have no problem with my RFD being "I don't understand the 1NC."

I get very confused when debaters read long overviews off a doc and don't contextualize any args to ones on the flow. Reading overviews are fine, just use your brain now and then to interact args.

Specific links are better.

Framing also important.

Floating PIKs should be explained instead of just saying they're floating PIKs, and there should probably be some hint of it before the 2NR.

[K (Aff)]

Go for it.

I probably have a slight tendency towards Framework, but I can see myself voting either way.

[T/Theory]

The worse and more frivolous the shell is, the less willing I am to vote for it, the better of an abuse story you'll have to give me, and the worse speaks you'll get.

Send interps.

I default drop the debater, competing interps, no RVI's, and text of the interp, but all of these are super easy to change. These are also likely to lean more towards drop the arg, reasonability, RVI's, and spirit of the interp the more frivolous your shell is.

The messier, larger, and more complicated theory debate gets, the harder it is for me to resolve and keep up with. Therefore, it would benefit you not to have, for instance, 5 theory shells in your debate, or slow down and not blitz analytics at your top speed.

[Tricks]

I think tricks is a very broad category and hard to define, which means you should **err on the side of caution**. Tricks I believe are **extremely short arguments with high-ballot implications**, and **rely on being dropped** to win **instead of actual clash**. How you interpret this is up to you but tread carefully.

I've become more open to these args but I will only vote on things like a priori's or other shenanigans if I have nothing else to vote on, and I'll still dock speaks quite a bit.

[Phil]

To clarify the pref shortcut, I'm a fine judge for you if you're reading

- Kant

- Hobbes

- Virtue Ethics

- Testimony

If you're reading anything else, chances are I won't understand you and you'll have to spend extra energy explaining to me,

I need explanation on whatever syllogism you plan on giving me

I love util

I don't default epistemic modesty/confidence, you do that for me