Number of YEARS Judging:
  High School: 5
  College: 1

Number of TOURNAMENTS Judged (This Year's Topic):
  High School: 1
  College: 8

Number of ROUNDS Judged (This Year's Topic):
  High School: 15
  College: 35

PHILOSOPHY
To me, a ‘judging philosophy’ is a contradiction in terms, since judging means privileging your arguments over my philosophies. That said, I understand the utility these things hold. So, below is a list of my default thoughts on debate, followed by a list of my default thoughts on certain arguments. Remember that my defaults are easily overridden by warranted argument.

Bio: In high school, I went for the politics DA. In college, I went for kritiks. Most of my reading on this topic has been about Greece and Turkey.

Default thoughts on debate:

1. An argument is a claim and a warrant. A claim without a warrant is worth zero. A one-sentence card is a warrant (“a qualified author says so”), but not a very good one. A strongly warranted analytical argument can beat a card. There is such a thing as zero risk. For example, there is zero risk that the cubs will ever win the world series.

2. The burden of rejoinder does not exist until the burden of proof has been met. In other words, you don’t have to answer an argument until it has a claim and a warrant. Most common application: “They have no answer to our alternative” isn’t persuasive if I have no idea what your alternative is or why it’s good. Second-most common application: the words ”voting issue” are not necessarily a voting issue, even if they’re initially dropped.

3. The Link. The quality of your “political capital is finite” evidence is irrelevant if you can’t explain why the plan would require political capital expenditure in the first place. The quality of your “prolif discourse bad” evidence is irrelevant if you can’t prove the aff has employed the style of prolif discourse your evidence describes.

4. Arguments win easy debates; argument comparisons win tough debates. Explain the warrants in your evidence; tell me why your warrants are better than theirs; tell me why your impacts are more important than theirs. To the greatest extent possible, I will rely on your explanation instead of my own.

Default thoughts on certain arguments:

Theory: Specificity is important. Some PICs may be bad, but your PIC may still be good. Textual PICs and international fiat are probably OK. Consultation CPs and functional PICs (e.g. “exclude X product from the farm bill”) are more difficult. Dispositionality is probably OK. Conditionality is more difficult. Agent counterplans are probably OK. Literature is probably a good litmus test. (I do not mean the existence of literature on a certain argument; I mean the centrality of your argument in the literature.)

Kritiks: Kritiks and kritik alternatives are probably OK. An alternative may need a text, but defending the value of criticism itself is probably OK too. Uniqueness does matter for kritiks, but alternatives usually take care of it. For teams that like to go for “the aff gets to choose the framework for the debate,” I am yet to hear a persuasive answer to “debating the merits of different frameworks is better than letting one side arbitrarily choose one,” but that doesn’t mean that one doesn’t exist.

Topicality: Topicality is probably a debate of competing interpretations of the resolution. A predictable limit is probably more important than ground. Topicality is probably a voting issue.

Spec-ification: I don’t like these arguments much, but I understand their utility. If a team has egregiously unspec-ified (Harvard), or egregiously un-answered your spec-ification argument (Berkeley), they’ll probably lose.