

Hello.

I am a junior and third-year debater for Scarsdale HS in Public Forum (2019-present). I have received 3 career bids and have extensive experience in many forms of argumentation.

TL;DR I am a 100% tech judge. Pretty much do whatever you want. Also, add me to the email chain: skini23@scarsdaleschools.org.

--SECTION 1: PRAGMATICS--

Holistic summary:

1. I am 100% tech > truth. Feel free to run any argument you wish, whether it be a newly discovered kritik or an extremely convoluted disadvantage, but try to exercise proper judgment.
2. I can flow quite fast, but not at an infinite speed. Keep this in mind when reading the requirements and general views sections below.
3. Anything I vote on or evaluate must meet the requirements below and be present in both summary and final focus (except, of course, if you are responding to something said in 2nd summary or 1st final focus).
4. I minimize intervention. This means I will search for the least amount of work needed from my end in order to find a requisite path to the ballot (weighed offense). If there are multiple such paths to the ballot, I will choose the one that requires the least amount of personal intervention.

Requirements:

1. Argugensis (the process of creating arguments): all arguments (that is, ranging from case internal links to backline weighing in 2nd final focus) must be warranted (explain why it is true) and be implicated (explain why it matters in the context of the round). So long as you meet the criteria, then you may proceed with any claim you wish and I will try my absolute hardest to minimize internal biases.

2. All arguments must be responded to in the speech directly after, or else it is conceded (except for 1st constructive). Conceded arguments are true.

3. If an argument gets a new implication in a later speech, you can respond to the implication in the speech after, but not the original warranting.

My general views:

1. All clash (directly opposing claims/arguments between the two sides in the round) must be settled constructively. Instead of just restating your points, take the extra mile to explain why your arguments are comparatively more true or more important than your opponents. Doing so will push your arguments further while also building on your original narratives. This is also what makes debate fun; if you find yourself bored or out of passion, then the "settling clash" aspect is likely what you are lacking.

2. The average speaker in the average debate will receive 28 points of speaking quality. Ways to increase this are to follow the guidelines listed above as well as speak with passion and distinguishment instead of reciting monotone formulae that you have memorized for speech structure.

3. I look to weighing (or framework, which is just formalized weighing) first. If there are competing weighing mechanisms to which the clash is not settled, then I will start looking at link analysis. If both teams are winning an equal risk of link, then there is no offense in the round.

a. If there is no offense in the round, then I presume towards the status quo (CON on most topics).

b. If there is no offense on the procedural layer, then I will default to the defending team.

c. If there is no offense on the critical layer, then I will default to the recipient team.

--SECTION 2: SEMANTICS--

Before the Round:

1. Finish preflowing by the start time of the round. The flip generally ends 10 or more minutes before, so you have plenty of time.

2. Add me to the email chain: skini23@scarsdaleschools.org.

3. Label email chains/evidence documents properly (e.g. "Scarvite '21 Round 2 Bronx Sci AB vs. Regis CD").

4. If you have any questions about my paradigm, feel free to ask me before the round.

During the Round:

1. I am willing to read off speech documents, but use this function judiciously. It becomes difficult for both you and I to understand/reciprocate the above guidelines when you are going 350 wpm or heavily paraphrasing evidence.

2. Stay unmuted when calling for evidence. Verbally clarify when your prep time is starting and stopping.

3. After a certain point (around 1 minute or so), the longer you take to send evidence, the lower your speaker points will be. If we are in outrounds, then I will keep this in mind as a tiebreaker if nothing can settle the clash.

4. I may listen to crossfire, but I will not flow it. Crossfires are the only speech times in which you are directly speaking against your opponent, so it is an important time to showcase your hard work while also standing your ground.

After the Round:

1. Feel free to postround as hard as you want. I believe it is a good practice for judges to defend their decisions against the heat of the "media".

2. Definitely ask questions about my decision as well as what you could have improved upon. Unless barred by the rules of the tournament, I will try to be as extensive as possible in my RFD.

Finally, remember to have fun. Good luck!