I operate on the assumption that debaters work very hard to prepare for debate and sacrifice a lot to be here and that I owe them the same kind of effort in judging debates. I try my best to evaluate the arguments as presented by the debaters. I will vote for any argument (as long as I understand it) no matter my personal preferences if I think it is won in the debate. That having been said, here are some of my preferences:

I like smart, creative arguments. I reward debaters who get off their blocks and adapt to what is happening in the round. I tend to reward debaters who see interrelationships and have the guts to disco. I love good cross-ex and wish it was used well in most rounds.

I generally believe that dispositional means the aff can choose to stick the negative with the counter plan by straight turning it. I am not a fan of the claim that if it is straight turned it isn’t net beneficial and hence disappears. That conflates dispositionality and conditionality.

I like good topicality arguments. While I love a good topicality debate it is sometimes hard to win in front of me because I do not like poorly done T debates. For me topicality is not simply a ground issue. Meeting the words in the topic is a minimum requirement before ground enters the equation. Saying the neg has ground because they filled their speech time is a laughable argument. The negative can have ground and the aff can be non-topical. There is probably better negative ground on warming then on any topical aff under this resolution but that doesn’t make it topical whether the negative has warming backfiles or not. I believe one can evaluate whether or not performances support the resolution even if a plan is not present.

I enjoy a good discussion of philosophical based arguments but I expect an explicit link to the aff (or neg) advocacy and the impact needs to be developed. I do not generally believe that kritiks are “pre fiat” and the case is “post fiat.” A debate round asks me to form an opinion on the subjects debated in the round. I believe that it is as intellectually bankrupt to ignore values in pursuit of policies as it is to bracket consequences to endorsing particular values. A debater arguing a kritik needs to demonstrate why it is more important than other issues in the debate rather than making that an assumption of the fact that it is different than policy advocacy. I believe that in many instances questions of ontology, epistemology, and axiology are fundamentally more important than a specific policy proposal but that is not an automatic assumption that comes from simply labeling something a kritik.

I am not predisposed against any particular disad. Politics is an argument the same as any other. I expect the negative to win a unique link. The negative does not have to win a disad to win the debate. The aff needs to win an advantage.

I believe strongly in the integrity of disclosure. If you or any member of your squad (or squads if a hybrid) has run a plan, a specific plan wording, or advantages you CANNOT claim “NEW” as your disclosure. I am more than willing to vote on false disclosure.