

NE REGIONAL OPENER

Binghamton University

9/21 - 9/23/2012

AFFIRMATIVE

| POS | Cornell AB | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|-----------------|--------|-------|
| | Junsuk Ahn | 28.2 | 2 |
| | John Burchfeild | 28 | 3 |

NEGATIVE

| POS | Binghamton SR | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|----------------|--------|-------|
| | Brian Sigl | 28.3 | 1 |
| | Chirag Raparia | 27.9 | 4 |

The better debating was done by the Neg from Bing SR
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: Maybe... I refuse to do the math

Signed: [Signature] Army

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- CX: Lots of these questions are better served as arguments in the next speech. Don't use CX to make args, use them to trick them into giving you links. For example, instead of saying, "You didn't address the damage to the land of building these PV cells," ask "how much land is needed to solve for your advantage?" Their answer one way or the other builds your argument.
- INC: See, none of the args in your CX are in the speech making it kind of a wasted CX. Your "why you should reject" args aren't carded. That's pretty weak for an alt arg.
- ZAC: You need more answers to this DA. Consider the parts of the DA + make answers to each. For example, why might it not link. It's a good impact N/U takeout but more will help. You don't need to extend case b/c it was dropped. Just extend "we still (S)" and describe your impacts and move on. Some generic "Critiques bad" stuff would help Heidegger too.
- CX: Again CX is like a scouting report... you don't score points here.
- ZNC: The story is good, but you never answer ZAC's specific args.
- CX: "What is your inferency?" I don't know what this means. I think you're asking about the Kritik but remember Negs don't need "inferency."
- INR: There is no reason for the ZNC + INR to talk about the same thing. You should divvy up the args between you. That said, good job arguing directly against the ZAC answer. Also you can end the speech early if you're just repeating yourself. Sometimes less is more.
- IAR: You need to stick to the ZAC order. Extend his args rather than make new ones. On the DA spend time comparing the evidence weights. Not just the quality of a news report vs. a science, but they say any risk = extinction and you say, "look nothing's happened yet!" Argue that 1% risk logic.
- ZNR: All these case args are new. CX doesn't matter for this purpose. Good arg though. Oh no, don't go for Heidegger! Why? There's a more or less conceded nuclear war scenario w/only a self-determination advantage. Why introduce another framework?
- ZAR: The impact analysis on the DA is good but entirely new. There's not much explanation why I'd value extinction less than morality.

