Always bring a flash drive to round!

IAC - This is an interesting case. I’m curious to see how the negative responds to these arguments.

INC - You only spent about 2:30 off case, which I think is a bold choice, but I also appreciated the line by line responses to case.

1AR - I found the questioning of the neg to be a bit patronizing. You interrupt the negative speaker a lot, and at times it looks like you’re laughing at him. Even if unintentional, watch out for stuff like that. I think you mishandle some of the negative responses in the off case as well.

NR - I thought that was a great rebuttal. Good job with impact, calculus, and appeals to the judges.

2AR - I would be more clear about voters. I think you should respond to the negative weighing.

RFD: At best, off has no solvency. At worst, off has risk of dis ad. Thus I vote negative.
Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative - Pace was still within my own standards for hearing & understanding. I'm guessing you've had experience that necessitated the slow explanation of disposition, but as its something I understand it felt very out of place compared to the case. Cont II could benefit from extra time here. CX answers didn't yield ground, well done. The asking, however, felt like a dead horse about cont clog - perhaps that necessity will be apparent in the AR. OK why have II if it doesn't matter? Feels like filler now.
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This was a very exciting debate by two experienced contestants. AHT re: morality with individual rights was a criterion. They had 6 contentions (which I thought was a bit much to present with very uneven support by either). 

My counter to framework was attempting to turn the AHT contentions with 3 contentions incl: #1 AHT. My side had considerable evidence & with the continued framework the contention debate was robust. I was surprised by the counter to framework because the Ny counter possibly was prepared for every AHT but in the end - they hit the by topics - legal accountability, rival disputers, because hit but hit rival to flow thru - inappropriate president, committing injustice to everyone when ESP of effective BI. So what do I think about the claims

1. AHT continued on the Ny counter: evidence didn’t efficiently link to the AHT arguments.
2. AHT continued on that the Ny AHT didn’t seem as an effective alternative.
3. AHT continued on that the counter to AHT: evidence (things by honor of counter) was relevant and constructive.

So I lean for AHT.