Novice LD:

TLDR: Do whatever you want, I'll probably be able to evaluate it. Please weigh in the 1ar and 1nc, new weighing in the 2nr and the 2ar will be given far less weight. Also please call me your honor for extra speaks. But do not call me judge, im just a random person.

Side Note: If you're interested in getting into progressive debate, like intros to LARP, Ks, phil, theory, etc. check out this great circuitdebater resource:
https://ld.circuitdebater.org/w/index.php/Library

At the end of the day, a win or a loss doesn't actually mean anything. Don't over-invest into the ballot - it doesn't mean anything about you as a person or a debater - it just determines who won a particular round, so relax and try to enjoy yourself. Given this, I also expect that debaters are respectful to each other and everyone in the round.

If you're aware of circuit debate: please make your more progressive positions accessible to novices, so not like 5 frivolous shells or unexplained process CPs. u can read anything just make sure to explain it well. If i can tell you don't understand your position that well your speaks will not be very high.

_____

Novice debate is a place for young debaters to begin learning the fundamentals of debate. Because of that, please do not be rude or too assertive in CX. I've been on the giving and receiving side of a rude cx (oops im sorry), and overall it's just unproductive. However, if your opponent deserves some attitude please give it, especially if it's funny.

I'll probably be better than average for phil cases that aren't consequentialist, just make sure to answer extinction.

Here are a few strategic guidelines to doing very well in front of me:

1. Collapsing is mandatory - a good rebuttal speech should not go for everything on the flow, only the strongest arguments, or arguments that are conceded. This is also true for the 1ar - maybe only go for 2 out of the 3 contentions in the 1ar, then the 2ar can collapse to one and weigh. When I was in novice, I rarely saw any collapses if at all, and heard a lot of RFDs that did too much intervention, embedded clash, and weighing that was never in the debate.

This also means that you should give me clear voters. The better your 2nr/2ar matches my RFD, the better the speech is.

2. EXTEND YOUR ARGUMENTS PROPERLY!!! Way too often I see an extension that just summarizes a claim and a name of a card. THIS IS NOT ENOUGH! A good extension should be in the same form as an argument. Say "Extend [this arg] - It says that [impact] will happen because [warrant]. That outweighs because [weighing mechanism]"

3. Weigh in your speeches. Use things like magnitude, scope, probability, but also less known ones like cyclicality/fecundity, time frame, time duration, reversibility, etc. Also, if you're ready, do metaweighing. e.g. "Probability matters the most because it's a sequencing question to high magnitude impacts - if it isn't even going to happen its severity is irrelevant"

4. Point out new arguments, or limit your opponent's ability to make them. Things like no new 2nr weighing should be pointed out by debaters, not by judges. In a similar vein, you might want to say yes new 2nr weighing - these things are to be debated over.

5. Have a novel strategy. Be creative! If you read a funnier impact that you can actually win, that's amazing. In fact, my novice year I read a contention about using lethal autonomous weapons to kill jellyfish and lionfish in order to save the environment, which nobody really responded to at all. May have stolen it off the wiki ... oops (thanks strake prep team)!!

6. Please do not cheat. read all your cards and if i notice one is miscut egregiously i'll call you out after round but i won't vote on it unless pointed out. you will suffer ! :)

7. Be aware of burdens - what exactly does the aff have to prove, and what does the neg have to prove? Very often the resolution can allow for more flexible burdens so you should shift them to make your side easier. For example, on the topic "In a democracy, civil disobedience is morally justified", you might want to say that you only have to prove disobedience is a just tool in the toolbox, and proving that other methods exist doesn't disprove disobedience's legitimacy. Obviously, these can be responded to quite easily.

8. Framing debates are good - utilize structural violence, rawls, util, or another deontology-based framework to exclude the other side's offense. That means your value criterion should be something that is specific and clear. A value criterion of consequentialism or even a value of consequentialism is NOT OK!! Consequentialism is a way of analyzing an action, it is not a criterion. I do not like value criterions of "deontology" unless you explain what that means in specific. Also, for criterions/standards like maximizing societal welfare, you definitely need to explain what societal welfare means. Lastly, explain how offense links back to the standard/criterion.

9. SIGNPOST plzplz - tell me where you are on the flow. That means saying what argument you're addressing. For example, "Off my opponents first contention: it's toally nonsensical because ..." or "Now on my framework, you say that it's useless but actually you prefer mine because..."

Pet Peeves (very important for me)

Please do not say "my time begins on my first word" or start counting down "3...2...1..." It's not going to drastically affect speaks but please it's sooo annoying. In reality, 2-3 seconds added or cut off from a speech is not going to affect you, i'll let you finish your sentence.

When giving an order, it really shouldn't be prep time. Just say like nc ac or something and start within 5 seconds. Also, always start on your case - prioritize your offense since it is what is going to win debates.

Another thing about orders: PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE DO NOT USE THE PHRASE "OFF TIME ROAD MAP" JUST SAY ORDER IS _____.

"judge" - please no. In my opinion, debates should be centered around the debaters, like interaction between two people which a judge is observing. Still, do talk to me when giving voters - it'd be kinda weird to tell your opponent to vote for you.