Topicality
There are not very many topical cases this year. Unfortunately, there are too few negative teams who can win T. While I am susceptible to voting on topicality, I have only done so 3 times this year. I consider topicality to be a discussion about the best way to interpret the resolution so that we create the fairest debates possible. I think about topicality the same way I think about a plan vs. counterplan debate. Each side needs to explicitly discuss the benefits of their interpretation that can not be co-opted by the counter interpretation.

Counterplans
Solve for the case harms and win a disad. It sounds like a decent strategy to me. Affirmative needs to offensive in this debate. It is more likely that I will vote on a disad to the counterplan than theory. Don't take that to mean that you can't win the counterplan theory debate in front of me. I think this statement stems from the difficulties I some times have flowing quick blippy theory arguments. Not only are grounded claims easier to flow but they make better arguments. I operate under the assumption that the negative must make a choice between advocating the status quo and or the counterplan(s). I think that it is your argumentative responsibility to stabilize your position of inquiry.

Disadvantages
Where are they hiding? Hopefully, in next years topic. I do not believe in the risk of a link. One must first win a link and risk assessments are made when evaluating the probability of the impacts.

Critiques
What is the link and why is it more important than the affirmative? Why does it doom the entire affirmative's project (plan) just because one piece of evidence uses noble savage images? The affirmative should force the negative to articulate how the criticism interacts with the 1AC and why it is wholly cooptive. The negative needs to be explicit about the opportunity costs of not voting for the criticism. At times, I am at a lost for what the impact is to the criticism even after the 2NR.

Affirmative needs to be more offensive at the impact level of these debates. Unlike disads, I think that the negative has an advantage at the link level of this debate. The most persuasive 2Acs have been those who turned the alternative, counter-critiqued, and been generally offensive.

Speaker points
CX should be used for more than gathering cards and talking about tidbits of nothingness. CX is a powerful tool that can be used to setup future arguments and provide the critic with a filter for evaluating the debate.

My average speaker points are between 26-27. 28 is reserved for those performances that "wow" me. These debaters are usually able to make my decision easy even when there are no conceded voting issues. Arguments no longer exist as disparate, isolated blocks on a sheet of paper but live and interact. 28s are able to competently discuss argument relationships and consistently make link and impact comparisons. 29s are performances of brilliance. It is a presentation that allows me to forget that I am judging a debate round. The presenter is on and everyone knows it. I have given one 30 this year. I think that it is a measurement of perfection that I reserve for only the most amazing speeches. A 30 allows me to temporarily forget that another speech in the round was worthy of a 28 or 29.