<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Derek Chisum (*6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2217</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn DeVos</td>
<td>Pranav Tangalpalli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Gilbert Classical Academy</td>
<td>7 BASIS Scottsdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td>Judge's Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>Judge's Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Evelyn: Great job sticking to your points. Your most impactful points were those that were denied their rights. You spoke about egalitarianism in first part & again at the end but it's a good point & you should hit on it more.

Civil disobedience = moral but did not disprove moral does not = life = happiness

Pranav: I like how you upheld both sides to a degree but it would be beneficial to come up with facts as well to go along side that. Great job refuting her points & noticing what she did not refute & bringing that out.

Morals = life = happiness you say we & have civil disobedience b/c it is radical change.
# Desert Ridge Maverick Invitational

## NLD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Brandon Sumner (20)</th>
<th>Jonathan Lifshitz (20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2217</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sat 10/05/19 04:00PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Points (25-30)</td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn DeVos</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>Pranav Tangalpalli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Gilbert Classical Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 BASIS Scottsdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The winner of this debate was</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Sunny Slope - Scientist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td>School / Affiliation / Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Outstanding debate overall by both debaters. Excellent offense and defense of specific argument points. Each case has been presented and reinforced. The aff case was able to tackle the neg case with regard to anarchy and violence. The neg case could not support the individuals and focused on fear of the government. The aff and neg cross ex were excellent - push for clarification.

---

# Notes

- CIV. DIS ≠ CIV. WAR
- Gov. is a check on minority
- Gov. is a check on actions
- Unreasonability test - possible, not instantaneous
Civil Dis is morally justified

* protect civil rights

CIV. DIS - non-violent → A policy of non-violence

Denise -
Equal - All persons equal

CIV. DIS. - more effective the violence

- fancier obstacles? non-violence
- civil DIS = get justice
- 3.5% of pop = change
- sit in's - protest or petition

2) govt. screws the people
- people upset → a govt.
- object to went govt.

is morally justified because gives power
Legal does not work
Civil DIS means people to voice concerns
- non-violent

Cross-ex: value is human right? yes
- Civil DIS is non-violent.
- Everyone in CIV. DIS. → anarchy
- any examples - no
- anarchy examples - no; Backmore
- protest permits; illegal = anarchy
- Free speech anywhere, anytime
- broken democracy?

NR

Cross-ex: anyone perform CIV. DIS? yes
Legal means of action voting?
CIV. DIS. → more power? pretty effective
legitimacy of voting works?
Voting CIV. DIS is last resort? yes
If legal always work, no need for CIV. DIS
CIV. DIS ≠ non-violence – yes

CIV. DIS has neg. impact
Recipe for anarchy since anyone can commit
- Blow open CIV. DIS. is non-violent

CIV. DIS is ⇒ non-violent by def
- excuses are not relevant
- Legal means - blocked in history
  - power unjust; silence moment
  - ms. permits denied
  - less risk - only for those in power
- Utilitarianism is flat - not all people
- example of broken democracy - only temporary
- Anarchy is flawed

Shawed that the arguments were untouched
Flowed through
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Cammie Soderquist (*2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 2217</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn DeVos</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Gilbert Classical Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pranav Tangallpalli</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 BASIS Scottsdale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Negative Constructive:**
- Clarity of communication - good eye contact - good engagement of points - good nonverbal communication - argument weak in terms of content
- regarding Baltimore protest - Police Probability
- Vietnam war public opinion - failed to see that disobedience lead to change - P.O.
- Acknowledges opponents arguments
- Pranav used aggressive tone during Affirmative rebutted then improved
- not sure Pranav truly understands morality when challenged referred to universality - this seemed ineffective
- Content is not as strong as opponents

**Affirmative Constructive:**
- Excellent examples and quotes
- Effective communication: good eye contact did not frustrate during Neg cross off in spite of being interrupted repeatedly
- Excellent job pointing out opponent's failure to prove examples of Anarchy
- Excellent point regarding opponent's failure to prove examples of Anarchy
- Excellent questioning of sources directly acknowledged
- Effective in truly understanding examples like Woolworth Sit-ins
- I would strengthen your case by pointing out minorities like South Africa ruled majority
Egalitarianism - Civil liberties - Not violent resistance - Women's rights - MLK - Selma - Change (political elite - Selfish周恩来 - Sit-ins)

Egalitarian State - Moral obligation to obey government - public forum = Egal. State - Thoreau quote

Extension of our rights - Good Body Language / eye contact - Overt ime - 6.09

Chasten with care - Curtailed well

Definition proper during rebellion - Khan - Pakistan - Clearly states card - Anarchist?? - Universal 1st

Promote justice - Who decides direct questioning - Democracy of the people

Questioning weak - Neg Cross-ex - 2.35 - Interprets

Lifecan mean good utility? - V. libertarianism - promote as much happiness as possible - Nonviolence not disobedience - Violence may be allowed - Persuasive or coercive

Good eye contact / posture - Civil protests have become violent - 50,000 V. At war - Public opinion - not Con