**FLIP: 13 Billie Briner v. 20 Sophia Browder**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln Douglas</th>
<th>Sajjad Syed (*2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Octo-Finals</td>
<td>Room 2237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Points (25-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOPHIA BROWDER</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td><strong>BLUE BRINER</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**YOU BRING IN FRESHNESS INTO THE DEBATE ATMOSPHERE.**

**YOU BRING IN PERSONAL INSIGHT WHICH IS GOOD.**

**HOWEVER, DEBATE IS ALSO A FORMAL FORUM WHERE BODY GESTURES, MANNERS & OBJECTIVITY PLAYS A HUGE PART IN QUALITY EVALUATION.**

**YOUR METHODS OF DEBATE WAS NOT WRONG BUT PLEASE PRACTICE ON DELIVER, CAUSE YOU DO HAVE A LOT OF POTENTIALS.**

**GOOD PERFORMANCE.**

**DISAPPOINTING SOMETIMES BECAUSE YOU WERE NOT SUFFICIENTLY FORTHRIGHT & WITH CONVITION ABOUT YOUR CASE.**

**PLEASE PRACTICE MORE ON HOW TO COMEBACK (RETURN) OPPONENTS EXAMPLES.**
FLIP: 7 Pranav Tangalpalli v. 13 Madeleine Joslin

**Affirmative:** Madeleine Joslin

**Negative:** Pranav Tangalpalli

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge's Signature:**

Brophy/Coach/Goose Chaser

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- You're a good speaker, nice job.
- Don't make the argument for the opponent about the violence point. For instance.
- Don't call his RR contradictory in CR, don't make your argument in cross-X.
- Your AF is jumping around a lot, make it more organized.

RFD: I negate on the anarchy impact. Aff does too little too late on the point and just isn't able to outweigh. Thus I negate.

• Some of your examples aren't about civil disobedience in your AC. You gotta prove civil disobedience happened in the Vietnam protest for instance.
• Your neg could pretty easily be tuned by pointing how protests lead to violence like you say in your neg unless you prove it was civil disobedience.
• Your ZNR was fine, good impact discussion.
AFF

- Value criterion of equal representation didn’t flow through regs.
- Your rebuttal of the legal system being able to provide means to challenge laws was lacking.
- Ly Ngo’s main rebuttal centered on violence, but her point of civil disobedience not being inherently violent went unconvincing.
- You said the phrase “legal channels being blocked,” but in the context of civil rights, go further. These laws perpetuate the injustice that led to civil disobedience being a necessity.
- Good examples include poll taxes, literacy tests, and voter registration classes. These are proof that legal channels weren’t sufficient, and that’s something I need to be told for you to win.

NO

- I need the impacts of anarchy. Why is the even the chance of this so dangerous that we have to keep the status quo?
- Need a more direct warrant and limit between civil disobedience and anarchy.
- Also your examples of direct democracy (petitions, letters, etc.) except for the Boy Scouts don’t really challenge systemic issues that civil disobedience tackles. Get examples with more far-reaching impacts.

Both sides

- Less defense, more offense!