<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gustin</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pejavar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gill</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Mukherjee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro.

Comments & Reason for Decision:
- Con needs to work on fluency.
- Con uses a lot of outdated and non-topical examples.
- Have all files prepared.
- AFF had everything prepared.
- AFF was organized.
- Con let too much flow through.
- Con lost on F.W.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Ronan McNulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Forum Debate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri 03/09/18 08:00PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Xie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Wakefield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **YES**

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**
- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Crossfire (1 & 2): 3 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crossfire (3 & 4): 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 2 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 2 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- 2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

RFD: The Con won the debate today under 2/3 of the frameworks provided.

1. They won that the US indeed judicial/congressional checks.
2. They showed drone strikes served a negative statutory purpose.

The Aff might have won under their third observation (not real in case) that by then there are no real/important checks to evaluate that it is too much power but you drop your C1 which would be your variant for why it is insufficiency.
War powers not off both bad
Checks overview - prove enforcement WP. both bad non unique not AumF
5b led day checks - prove happening
defund
 - after abuse
   - CBPP
     - only fundalyr
   - Vietnam - overview
Judicial reform - after
LL Al Shabaab

Affrocities - Donwan
 - failed to limit
ULC - @ intervention +
 - allowed authoritarian miscalculation
Congress comes together
Pew - approval means good
# PF

## Public Forum Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Xavier Henes (*'14)</th>
<th>Fri 03/09/18 08:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>LL247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Aberg</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Braun</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gadiyar</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gadiyar</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Neg: in cx you're almost yelling and its kind of grating.

yell are yelling it its not helping.

Aff wins.

Post hoc checks bad.

no proof of use.

ack in name only is not a real ck.