
Take all the time you have.

Good Job!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Simol Shah (*'16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Double Octos</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> 29 (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Fenn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> 2.8 (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mitbander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative** (Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

(Oral critique)

Both sides agree that we should attempt to preserve autonomy for the greatest number of people, and CR successfully does that by allowing for the more effective repeal of unjust laws, protecting the minority in addition to the already-happy majority.

Great work all around.
**FLIP: 4 Charles Zhang v. 34 Isabella Keesler-Evans**

**Novice LD Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Double Octos</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 203</th>
<th>Sat 10/26/19 12:30AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>Isabella Keesler-Evans 28</td>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
<td>Charles Zhang 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

Affirmative **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Aff

Case is only 4:15. That's enough time. Expand on each contention or further develop framework.

Good ownership of cross answer time.

Use all cross time.

Clean up rebuttals. Sign-post and go straight down the flow. You had great args but I'm not always sure where to flow them.

Make sure the room is ready before beginning speeches.

Very messy 2nd contention.

Give voters in 2AR.

Neg

Good line-by-line attacks.

Missed term "double bind."

Did not handle question on whether civil disobedience is effective well.

Watch definitions that identify CD as nonviolent.

Need to at least address this since it.

Too much time spent on case defense in 2MR, especially on points that didn't really matter.

Rawls was not a new arg.

Impact on 2nd contention in your rebuttals.

Better speaker but missed what became the most important arguments in this round.

CED: Rawls cards went unopposed, so I'm voting for the debater that helps least advantaged.

Aff turned legal means arg by pointing out that CD can speed up legal change, leaving Neg without offense under framework of helping the least advantaged.
**NLD**

**Jim Fountain Classic**

**FLIP: 11 Emma Jane Carns v. 4 Muntaha Islam**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Mike Brady (*)</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 11:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Double Octos</td>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight 1</td>
<td><strong>Emma Carns</strong> 27</td>
<td><strong>Emmy Carns</strong> 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 212</td>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win? <strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments &amp; Reason for Decision:</td>
<td>Emma was extremely convincing and persuasive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Emma**

- Great eye contact!
- Excellent use of references
- Good exchange of information
- Great use of gestures and body language. Very convincing.
- Too fast—thoughts get lost.

**Muntaha**

- Good questions, specific.
- Great use of cards/references.
- Good eye contact & gestures.
- Rate of speech slightly too fast.
- Needed to pause. Gave good presentation and countered opponent’s position. Great references and use of them to advance her position.
- Good confidence in position of the topic.
- Too fast—thoughts get lost. Good job!
### Novice LD Debate

**FLIP: 4 Sasha Sai Guntu v. 22 Maryam Khan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Double Octos</th>
<th>Flight 1</th>
<th>Room 203</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 11:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasha Sai Guntu</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Maryam Khan</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Is Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **No**

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

- I don't really see that your evidence in your 3rd contention supports your tagline.
- Cross should be more than clarification. Questions should be designed to set up future argy or point out contradicts/flaws in opponent's case.
- Solid IAR. Good argy on framework.
- Strong voters.

### Affirmative

- Be better prepared for cross. You lost a lot of time just trying to find the right wording for your questions, leaving cross mostly wasted.
- Attacks in 1st speak very messy. Missed a lot of Aff's argy.
- Case familiarity needs to be much stronger. Should know all examples without spending time referencing case.
- 2NR very messy. I could not follow most of your arguments.
- Sure time in 2NR to give voters. Time management in general could be much improved.

**LFD:** Aff wins on framework and Neg does not impact out to minorities. 2NR was very difficult to follow and had no voters, so I really didn't have anything to weigh on the Neg.
# NLD

**FLIP: 4 Andrew Xie v. 34 Jhaj Baaz**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Jordan Adamo (*'22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Double Octos</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Andrew Xie</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The winner of this debate was</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is this a low point win?</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**
- Aff: Don’t have to repeat your opponent’s arguments; you can be more efficient.
- Neg: Keep track of your time and try to go down each argument one by one and answer them.
- I voted off because he met his criterion better and had offense on a.
- Additional comment: given in round.
Both of you were polished, engaging and quick on your feet with lots of good information!

Aff giving a definition of Civil Disobedience up front that did not include violence= that the civil part of neg’s 2nd contention = esp. since neg only gave one example which aff argued was not intended as civil disobedience in the 1st place. Aff was also able to show that not all people can vote in democracies which threatened neg’s 1st contention that people vote those in power in office. Neg pointing out other countries rather than just using the U.S. as an example further hurt this argument. That said, using intel examples doesn’t help aff w/ their 3rd contention about being effective in the past. Neg should have addressed aff’s argument about the environment.
**NLD**

**FLIP: 11 Ryan Duong v. 7 Sarah Savage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Double Octos</th>
<th>Flight 1 Room 210</th>
<th>Fri 10/25/19 11:45PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Sarah Savage</td>
<td>11 Ryan Duong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- **Affirmative**
- **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?

Judge's Signature: Desert Vista

School / Affiliation / Occupation:

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Do you need any evidence?
  - You need to do a better job linking contentions back to your FLW.
  - Be careful not to blame the constitution as the source of morality.

- You both focus on the same arguments in this round.

- Make sure to use all your prep and speech time.
  - Both of you make the same arguments in your last speech. It's too late at this point.

- You play too much offense and make almost no offensive arguments.

- You need to ask more offensive questions next.
  - The link chain for nuisance is weak... they are inedicable.
  - Do more work on the FLW.
  - Much was after the civil war.
  - You focus too much on the arguments and not the context of the FLW.

- You start to weaken, but about 30 enough.
  - Your notes/notes are all over the place. Signed?

**EMAIL for Questions: camontillo@smu.edu**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Double Octos</th>
<th>Flight 2</th>
<th>Room 207</th>
<th>Sat 10/26/19 12:30AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Joshua Marais</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Connor Clark</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **NO**

---

Conceded definition of democracy means that no civil disobedience would be required.

Conceded 1st rule.

Oral RFD given.

Email me @ tachewol1@asu.edu
Both affirmative and negative had a well defined framework, value criterion and contentions. They both cross examined each others' contentions and also extended on the same. I would have liked the negative to have a very strong concluding summary of the framework, his case and the opponent's case. Same goes for affirmative. They both appeared to be tired and lose the speech towards the end. Negative was asking questions in the rebuttal round, affirmative successfully and effectively responded and extended on his contentions.

It is a hard decision to make however I chose Negative in this case as he provided a better counter model of why civil disobedience shouldn't be tolerated and adhering to law and can lead to better results and better democracy by both relating to the opponent's contentions and extending on his own arguments by giving evidence and facts.
Affirmative (Joey)

Defined Civil obedience
Value: Justice.

Contention 1: Express of basic human rights evidence given. Civil disobedience.

Contention 2: Civil obedience are selected evidence given. Race party civil rights movements.

Contention 3: Civil disobedience is a virtue by possession.

Contention 4: Restores democracy faith.

Great framework:

Negative (Ethan)

Rebutted: Negative asking question how affirmative extended on his arguments.

1st contention: 1996 in Ethiopia, Iran democracy.

See value criterion. Dignity utilitarianism.

Contention 1: Conceding to tool totalitarian state.

Contention 2: Strategic legal institution.

Civil disobedience alienates people.

Framework: Negating the contents of affirmative effectively, each and every contention.

Gross sec by affirm: Negative is providing a counter model.

Do legal protests rather than breaking the laws.

Both affirmative and negative played well in this round. Affirmative Negative responded and even provided a counter model better not following civil disobedience can lead to better results.

Joey: Explained well why his contentions and value criterion justifies civil disobedience and why utilitarianism is not right for democracy always.

(Ethan) (framing my own)

Provides a counter model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Kathleen Clark (*31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Double Octos</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flight 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Room 205</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Zhou</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Zhou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan B Gan</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  _No_

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- In the affirmative rebuttal, Negative asked for evidences in the bible and the justification for trusting bible over other religious books which was successfully managed by the affirmative.

- Cross see by affirmative evidences were asked by the affirmative however in this round affirmative overpowered with his arguments not letting the negative to digress much in his

- Negative presented his case very well, with value criterion in line to the debate topic.

- While presenting his case, affirmative pointed every contention of Negative, provided evidence against those and suggested why Negative shouldn’t be chosen.

- Negative pointed towards the contentions of the affirmative however couldn’t successfully negative than effectively negative them.

Decision the only reason to chose affirmative as he could effectively cross examine the negative, the negative couldn’t extend his arguments in the rebuttal round.

Both affirmative and negative presented their case within the defined framework had value criterion, contentions and evidences supporting the contentions. Overall, a difficult and interesting round to judge.
Ryan: Negative. Predominantly to the moral of God (Value Criterion)

William (Affirm) (3 contentions given)
- Facts given
  M. L. King example given based on Christian principles.
  Socrates
- Hitler
  Serbians/Russia, Robert Mugabe, Pakistan/Iran

3. Duty to Disobey
   Socrates

Ryan: Negative

Why should we trust Bible

Natural Evidence: As asked by Ryan, evidence given by William

Affirm (Rule of Law) (Value Criterion: Social Order)

- Value Criterion
  Contention 1: Legal channel works (1st)
  Contention 2: Legal channel ineffective

Cross See: M. L. King and William is cross see. Very well

Assault examples of civil obedience which resulted in violence
Sudan evidence was given.

William (Affirm)
Bible was given as a tool
Opponent fails to negate the genocide in democracy.
He conceded that we should not tolerate those break the rule

Assault. To the rule.

Ryan (Framework): Bible can still be considered as interpreted as it was 3000 yrs. old.

M. L. King
Nazi did under a non-democratic regime
Serbia

Two or three contentions weren't non topical

Bible didn't provide how civil disobedience can solve the problem.
NLD

Novice LD Debate

Hanna Griffin (*27,9)

Octo-Finals

Room 1123

Sat 10/26/19 02:30PM

Affirmative

William Zhou
11 BASIS Phoenix

Points (25-30)

27

Negative

Ethan Dean Nicoll
16 Mountain View High School

Points (25-30)

28

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature

Brophy

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- you did a good job impacting weighing throughout speeches but make sure to weigh in BOTH worlds
- be sure to respond to the arguments made against the core of your case otherwise the support fails
- you can't perm in 2AK!

RFD: I vote NEG because I buy the arguments that 1). debate ought to be secular since it is most real world and isn't respectful to other beliefs and 2). a person doesn't need to use the Bible to be just and virtuous. I also buy that civil disobedience undermines the legal structure and that we can achieve more legitimate results through legal reforms. Both need to work on voters, extensions, and impact weighing.
**MOHAMMAD, NAVEED**

**Jim Fountain Classic**

**NLD**

**FLIP: 22 Daynah Andrews v. 11 Kináed Jaxon Sabine**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Naveed Mohammad (*'36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octo-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 1133</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daynah Andrews</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
<td>Kináed Jaxon Sabine</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- **Affirmative**
- **Negative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **No**

Judge's Signature: **Brophy**

School / Affiliation / Occupation:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I voted neg because their impacts weren't responded to by the affirmative side.

Additional comments were given in round.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Micah Sandys (*37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octo-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 1134</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emma Jane Carns</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The winner of this debate was</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is this a low point win?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I vote neg because:

- They won FW, and that
  AFF Framework collapses
  into them

- AFF did not address
  neg FW entire debate

- AFF loses voters if
  they don't win
  a FW for us to
  weigh them with

There needed to be WAY more clash in this
debate. I had to do impact calc on my own
because the debaters were not comparing
their arguments in speeches. It was almost like a
missing ships in the middle of the night.
**Jim Fountain Classic**

**FLIP: 11 Ryan Duong v. 32 Avi Agarwal**

**Novice LD Debate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octo-Finals</th>
<th>Luke Calhoun (*1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 1126</td>
<td>Sat 10/26/19 02:30PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avi Agarwal</td>
<td>Ryan Duong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **No**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Avi- Watch how fast you talk, it was clear, but barely.**

I like that you say "end" at the end of the quote; that made it quite clear. You left 30 seconds in your construction, you could have slowed down, give an off-time road map before rebuttal.

**Ryan- Great use of your first cross, getting AFF to confirm their case 3. Contentions; great construction speech. Stand when speaking, it's more powerful; great job defining "structural violence"; great pace of speech during construction; very clear; great examples and denying AFF's contentions (NOT democracies; no examples for C2B).**

**N26's argument of co-opting was a very powerful argument and knocked out AFF's C1 ½ C2. N26 pointing out that India & South Africa will not democracies knocked out AFF's C3.**
BRADY, MIKE

NLD

Jim Fountain Classic

FLIP: 4 Sasha Sai Guntu v. 34 Isabella Keesler-Evans

Novice LD Debate

Mike Brady (*2)

Octo-Finals

Room 1122

Sat 10/26/19 02:30PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasha</td>
<td>Isabella</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was: Affirmative

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Judge's Signature: Lyndsey Long

School / Affiliation / Occupation: Mequon High

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff - Strong case. Just the tone to touch on more of your case w/ each round. Strong points would have flowed through that Neg didn't talk refute on.

Neg - Need to be a little more organized in your rebuttle. You jumped around a lot & made it challenging to know which area you were attacking. Great job on the economy card(s). You won that point!

Neg - You contradicted yourself quite a few times throughout this debate which made it difficult to vote for the Neg side ex: when talking about the media, you stated w/ out it civil disobedience would not erupt into violence but then oppose about the gay rights movement that strongly needed the public media to make Chang peacefully?

Aff - You stated the equality was needed just before justice & the Neg didn't refute that.

Aff - Great job on your cross-ex. on bringing that home by asking if opponent thought everyone deserves the same human rights. She said no.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Khoa Nguyen (*'16)</th>
<th>Sat 10/26/19 02:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octo-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 1125</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Hunter Travis Fenn</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (25-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Philimon Yosafat</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **no**

Comments & Reason for Decision:

A: Your argument made more sense when you attacked your opponent's points and refuted them each time you wanted to attack. Be sure to not add in additional points in your final speech. It's just a waste of your time. Use it for some other purpose to further highlight your argument.

N: Your speech was relatively good. You attacked each of your opponent's arguments and defended your own. The speech that you made had too many "um"s and "never mind"s that made it more difficult to follow along with your argument while you were spreading and speaking quickly. These interjection words were also points where your argument went onto a different point. This breaks the flow of your argument. Please reduce the number of times that you say them, so that your argument goes smoothly.

RFD: The neg made numerous breaks in his speech that hindered them from clearly following along with his argument. Though both made strong arguments within their debate, the aff better defended and supported their value and criteria with his content contents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>John Doller (*4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octo-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 1124</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Connor Mack</td>
<td>29 Pranav Tangalpalli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **No**

**Judge's Signature**

**Hamilton**

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The negative provided more evidence to support the contentions. The Affirmative had good contentions, just not as well supported (in my opinion) - summary segment was the deciding factor. This was a tough decision! Both did an excellent job! Thanks.
### NLD

**FLP: 11 Gagan Ram Vaidyanathan v. 4 Andrew Xie**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Brittany Stanchik (*34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Octo-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 1121</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Affirmative</strong></th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th><strong>Negative</strong></th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Andrew Xie</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td><strong>Gagan R. Vaidyanathan</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Negative**

Affirmative (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? **No**

**Judge's Signature:** [Signature]

**School / Affiliation / Occupation:** Tempe Prep.

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Aff** - Clearly countered points brought up in Neg.
- Strong about cyber-activity counters
- Contention 1 - needed to expand & link to examples
- At the last statement your statement about attacking without political focus (cyber) was strong
- Continued to make a link back to non-violence in C.B.
- Include more examples of C.B. in democracy, paint the picture of their jury-mandating, and C.B. Dis are tied & support your case
- Legal channel/argument strongest.
- Spoke very well, clear and listenable.

**Neg** - Framework clear.
- Spoke clearly, exactable, easy to follow.
- Value of life repeated & threaded throughout and used to refute Aff case.
- Cyber activity - came back to correct & strengthen point about political focus, connect to history of what came up last to counter Aff’s card.
- Utilitarianism - referred to only twice could have strengthened the links.

**RFD:** Strength in gross and clarity in 2nd round, refute framework to articulation & flow through.