# Novice LD Debate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>McAlpine (30)</th>
<th>Armada Matutes (24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25-30)</td>
<td>(25-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Affirmative

- Pranav Tangalpalli

## Negative

- Kináed Jaxon Sabine

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

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

## Judge's Signature

Derek Uisle

School / Affiliation / Occupation

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Your FUs are basically the same thing, just sparer time on it.
- This is not a CP, don't treat it as one.
- Yes, show so AC = NC.
- My last how the harder to be topical
- The IA is all over the place, pick a flow and go down it.
- Sign post!
- 1st to no victory?

- You need to do more on how CD actually challenges structural violence. Is it great ethics on not enough.

**EXTEND!**

- Don't read the same RW. It is the same at all. The CP
- You need to run a CP.
- The NR was really messy
- If you are running a CP, run it correctly (CP text, solutions, etc)
- They should be specific advocacy, not general wording.
- There was little to no weighing.
- Carry out the rebuttal.

**It's not a CP!!**

- You focus on the every argument. Don't focus on this card argument.

---

**RE: I fucked up. While the idea is a CP is very material, the CP is conflict.**

Focus through our proofs that CD can feel structured that America Reid today. Neg at last attempts to "prove how it solves structurally. We still need a new clause is needed.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Ted Braun (*'34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Room 520</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (25-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pranav Tangallpalli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School / Affiliation / Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexie Vanderveen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aff**

- Strong attack on proof for C1 on Neg side
- I found the "abusive" attack/critique unnecessary, and was unconvinced that the Neg was off topic
- Public support convincing

**Neg**

- If violent actions have truer solvency and impact than civil disobedience, why do the violent protesters get wiped over by the peaceful ones by the power?
- Good argument about amiability of C.D. I would have liked to see more discussion on it

**RFD**: Aff's proof for minorities being given a voice through civil disobedience well-supported his Value of Justice and how he defined it. I found the extended card to be better than the need for evidence on the Neg side.
**NLD**

Jim Fountain Classic

FLIP: 29 Pranav Tangalpalli v. 11 Kinâed Jaxon Sabine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice LD Debate</th>
<th>Sathe Dipali (*4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Pranav Tangalpalli</td>
<td>Kinâed Jaxon Sabine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Affirmative Negative
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? 

Judge's Signature

School / Affiliation / Occupation

**MVP**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Aff**

1. Argue our framework, a minute on structural violence causes are redundant
2. Core offense should be more than just cross-arguments on the counter-plan
3. Answer core debate as you are expecting offense at the contention level.
4. Plan out core by obscure individual args that you are ahead on rather than arguing args if you can cross them.
5. More time spent writing why civil disobedience doesn't change anything instead of applying it.
6. Plan should be impact calculus to center the co-optation args and show our deficits. Why does co-optation outweigh the risks of piece meal return to the affirmative?

**RFO:**

I vote affirmative on the risk or offense that civil disobedience is a better method of political resistance to resolve structural vio.

The ARO is decent heavy but lacks terminal impacts that outweigh the ARO.