

Experience: watched musab chummun get disqualified from bear creek 2022, stole 400+ cases from the wiki, went 2-4 at the prestigious kamiak invitational

Tech or truth preference: I vote off grand cross

I agree strongly with [this paradigm](#)

Please in fact just pretend as if i'm musab chummun. I aspire to read his level of excellence in judging.

Okay fr: .

Pf four years, lolml will always be wsd tho. Qualls r cringe to put in paradigm just tab stalk me or smth. I will always disclose results at the end of round and speaks if asked to.

i wanna make the round as chill as possible. If there are any ways I can accommodate you during the round let me know. If you need to contact me before round for anything text 425-553-9885.

PF

.

Tldr: **mostly tech > truth**

Read bold for fast

If both teams agree I'll imitate a lay or a flay or judge however u want.

If you don't know what any part of this paradigm means Please ask me

I flow. I will buy arguments as stupid as "the sky is green" if it's conceded on the flow.

fionayli1004@gmail.com for email chain but I guarantee you I will not look at it unless some ev dispute happens. Please set up email chain b4 round. feel free to send me a doc and just delete it after round so I don't steal ev, I won't care I'm just afraid of missing stuff in round when I'm tired

READ THIS IF U R IN VARSITY PLS:

- **Extend your case that means re-explain what your argument is from uniqueness to impact.** Idc if it's blippy but it needs to BE THERE. Say "extend our case" and then start extending if u have to make sure we r both in the same page. If you're varsity on the nat circuit I'm very picky on extensions. Ask me before round if u r unsure.
- Example of minimum extension I'll take; extend our c1 on Russia invasion. Right now Russia is aggressive because Putin needs popularity. Affirming solves because us military presence means the opportunity cost is too high for putin. Absent deterrence, the war in the Arctic goes global because allies are forced in. The impact is preventing an conventional war which would kill 14 million people through famine. IF YOU R GOING FOR A TURN ON THEIR CASE, same thing. Extend uq- link- the internal links and A TERMINALIZED IMPACT THANK YOU 😭
- **I very kindly beg of all varsity debaters... please PLEASE PLEASE SPEED UP EVIDENCE EXCHANGES.** I won't drop you if it's slow but I'm gonna get bored and start making worse decisions. Fast ev exchanges = higher speaks

Generally:

- **second rebuttal needs to frontline everything you're going for + kick out of offense if needed**
defense is not sticky
- **below 250 wpm I can prob follow, any above send a doc.**
- **New weighing in first ff is okay if second rebuttal didn't collapse, second ff responding to first ff weighing is also okay.**
- There is no grace period.
- **How i make decisions:** Assuming both teams adequately extended at least a link and an impact , I evaluate weighing first, then if the person winning the weighing wins their offense it's over if not I look to the other offense. If neither team is winning case I vote on weighing as a risk of offense UNLESS u give me presumption warrants. If no offense no presumption warrants and no weighing I will flip a coin to presume. (This argument doesn't have a warrant/indicts without interacting with the warranting type of stuff IS NOT terminal defense) .

Evidence:

- I am not too big of a stickler about ev stuff?. I'll accept paraphrased evidence and won't rage if one of your ev is like bad or smth. Pls don't abuse this though try and engage the round in good faith
- Evidence IVIs need to be fully warranted out for me to vote on them. I need to know why the ev ethics violation is enough for me to drop them
- If you stake the round on misconstrued ev tho, I'll prob adhere to nsda rules i.e. no ellipses, no miscutting, cards need to have links and paragraph lol

Non-topical stuff: (bc it deserves its own section)

- I debated mostly before Ks and trix became meta for all of debate. I'm probably a little behind ur average tech judge on those debates but I'll try my best
- Probably a hot take but if u run these on novices/jv I'll be a lil ticked but I won't drop u just be nice and don't be condescending in round pls
- **Theory:** I've ran theory before but I'll probably be lost in high theory rounds, funny friv shells and the usual pf shells should be fine
 - a. You don't need to extend DTD unless it's contested. However, extend standard you are going for, impacts + interp (**you DO NOT NEED TO EXTEND THE SHELL IN REBUTTAL**)
 - b. I'm chill with friv I think it's funny
 - c. I default to reasonability, yes RVIs and spirit > text . Make warrants if you want me to default otherwise, I'll generally vote for anything I can understand, I think content warnings are good, disclo is good only if it's OS, RRs r okay not great, and paraphrasing is somewhat good. I am 100% receptive to voting on disclo bad, rr bad, para bad, OS bad etc stuff that's against usual theory norms. I think those rounds are super interesting if you can come up with unorthodox rzn. If you go for RVIs good, make sure your arg on the theory layer matches the RVI warrant you read (ask me in round if u dk what this means)

- **Ks:** Ran a k at one point but not super confident in my ability to evaluate it. I need clear explanations of wut my ballot does. I'm most familiar with Cap and Securitization as well as with the usual identity Ks with disruption/discourse as solvencies but beyond that I'm a lil lost. Pls slow down and clarify the jargon so I'm not like googling what shit means mid round pls. I think on default neg Ks get fiat but feel free to make arguments on why they shouldn't
- Are trix educational? No. Are trix good for debate? No. Are trix making you a better debater? No. But will you evaluate them? Sure why not. (I should NOT be evaluating Trix bc I'll definitely make the wrong decision unless they r completely conceded but they're funny so if they're clean I mean why not but if they r not uhhhhh lol good luck 🙄)

Speaks:

- Speaks r super arbitrary so I'll give high ones unless tournament breaks depends on speaks. In that case speaks start at 28.5 and go up depending on content not speaking ability. I like efficiency + strong warranting

Fun speaks.

- Email annixchen03@gmail.com a funny meme with zero context for +0.5 in speaks
- +0.2 for using the words "debate chad" in a funny way
- +0.2 for strategically incorporating the word pog into ur speech iykyk
- +0.2 if u start a cross by taking a sip of water and saying "I'll drink some water to let u get ready" to honor the og ray silverman
- If u don't read a single card in rebuttal and make good analytics I will give u a 30 (don't do this just to throw the round though)
- If u sing ur constructive I'll give u a 30
- +.2 if second constructive starts reading responses to first constructive (first rebuttal should frontline if this happens)
- +.5 if u successfully incorporate a musab chummun quote in a strategic way

Post rounding:

- Go for it but you shouldn't be rude to your opponents while doing it. If u start yelling at me imma just awkwardly side eye u until you stop and then say "slay queen"

LD:

General:

- I've watched like three rounds of LD total and it was all trad so I know nothing
- I'm not that equipped to deal with most non-topical arguments in Ld but I will try my best
- Treat me as trad ld judge or smth that's tech>truth and understands offense and defense.
- If someone's doing smth in a speech that they're not supposed to like making new responses in a speech that's not supposed to have new responses call it out/tell me idk the rules that well
- Prefs
 - Larp - 1
 - theory - 3

- Performance - 5
- Dense Phil - 5
- Topical Kritik - 4
- Non-T kritik - 4
- High theory - 5 (strike)
- Trix - 5 (strike)

Congress

- I hate congress.

Policy:

- if I'm ever judging open and I mean like super fast non-trad policy, start praying for both u and me bc it's not going well.
- Stock issues r probably fine but I'm still a dumb pfer
- Refer to the prog section in PF to understand how little of nontopical debate I understand (very little) I'm about a solid 90% chance likely to make the wrong decision if it's super tech so! Option to have me flip a coin for the winner at the beginning if both teams agree
- With that being said totally fine if u don't wanna adapt to me and just do your thing, I will try to follow I just might not be too successful

Worlds:

- refer to PF paradigm I'll judge prob similarly
- Both the twos should have made all the responses u will make in the round to the 1s
- Opp 1 needs to respond to prop
- I love worlds
- I think style points r kinda arbitrary and will tend to give you high ones