


VLD

FLIP: 11 Finley Dutton Reid v. 20 Gabe Cohon

Varsity L-D Debate		Aeryn Ohlendorf (*40)	
Semi-Finals		Room 306	Sat 02/11/17 03:30PM
Affirmative <i>Gabe Cohon</i> Points (20-30) <u>27</u>		Negative <i>Finley Dutton Reid</i> Points (20-30) <u>28</u>	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>Yes</u>		 Judge's Signature <i>Hamilton</i> School / Affiliation / Occupation	


Comments & Reason for Decision:

Over (RF)

tachowd 1@asu.edu

VLD

FLIP: 11 Finley Dutton Reid v. 20 Gabe Cohon

Varsity L-D Debate		Candra May (#49)	
Semi-Finals		Room 306	Sat 02/11/17 03:30PM
Affirmative	Points (20-30)	Negative	Points (20-30)
Gabe Cohon	23	Finley Dutton	26
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature Bonita Vista School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1st Speech:

- fast rate of speech made it difficult to follow your case

• know your audience - I do not know your case

1st cross (answer):

- sarcasm was rude

2nd cross (ask):

- questions asked seem to stump your opponent

2nd speech:

- use of debate "lingo" that I am not familiar with frustrates me
- fast rate of speech, again hinders my understanding of your arguments
- did not address many of NEG's arguments
- appreciate the passion - but if I can't follow your arguments, passion is irrelevant

Final Speech:

- more able to follow points in this speech because of more calm & clear presentation

1st Cross:

- maintained composure/respectable tone
- questions helped to clarify issues

1st Speech:

- case was laid out clearly, in an organized format
- stats w/ contention #2 were powerful support

2nd cross (answer):

- many questions went unanswered because of need for clarification

2nd speech:

- helped make voter issues clear by pointing out unaddressed arguments
- use of debate "lingo" that I am not familiar with frustrates me
- appreciate calm, respectful demeanor

(OVER)

FAVRE, BRANDON
KOENIG, AMY

Bobcat Bonanza 2017

VLD

FLIP: 11 Finley Dutton Reid v. 20 Gabe Cohon


Varsity L-D Debate		Amy Koenig (#28) Brandon Favre (#35)	
Semi-Finals		Room 306	Sat 02/11/17 03:30PM
Affirmative Gabe Cohon	Points (20-30) 29.5	Negative Finley Dutton Reid	Points (20-30) 30
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <input type="checkbox"/> Negative <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Circle Winner)		_____ Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		Hamilton / Judge / Student School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: Essentially the round comes down to Tessa & Dolgado on the neg & Leukmitt in the aff. I buy that echo chamber effects will happen if silenced, but worse is to have bad roles forced on people by allowing hate speech. If we go to class (via Tessa), perhaps dialogue could actually occur. Neg victory.

VLD

FLIP: 20 Joshua Cohen v. 55 Parker Whitfill


Varsity L-D Debate		Lindsay Bryant (*31)	
Semi-Finals		Room 328	Sat 02/11/17 03:30PM
Affirmative Parker Whitfill		Points (20-30) 29	Negative Joshua Cohen
			Points (20-30) 26
The winner of this debate was <input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>N</u>		1/Volunteer/Program Mgr School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

As more of a traditionalist judge, it was difficult for me to buy into the Neg's strategy of essentially shifting the structure of the debate from the traditional format to one where the aff is forced to essentially abandon their AC content, & instead respond to a new counterplan proposed by the Neg. The Neg's arguments & case were creative & strategic. However, it's borderline abusive, as the Aff is at a considerable disadvantage. Perhaps I'm just not enough of an expert these days on the evolved format of LD, but I prefer a debate of substance on the resolution. That said, I thought that the Aff did do a good job of responding to the Neg's case, ~~there~~ & adapting to the situation. The Neg also did a good job filling through a few concessions & admissions made by Aff. This was a round w/ 2 very skilled & talented debaters, & I enjoyed the clashing of responses. Best of luck to both.

VLD

FLIP: 20 Joshua Cohen v. 55 Parker Whitfill


Varsity L-D Debate		Alexsandra DeReal (*12)	
Semi-Finals		Room 328	Sat 02/11/17 03:30PM
Affirmative Parker Whitfill		Points (20-30)	Negative Joshua Cohen
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature 	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		DV School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This was a very hard decision but I voted on the Perm because the topic doesn't call on the aff to defend against free speeds. Only to reject one instance of gaining free speed. The Perm insur/double bind would apply if the aff defended free speed.

VLD

FLIP: 20 Joshua Cohen v. 55 Parker Whitfill

Varsity L-D Debate		Vijay Ramakrishna (*29)	
Semi-Finals		Room 328	Sat 02/11/17 03:30PM
Affirmative Parker Whitfill		Points (20-30)	Negative Joshua Cohen
The winner of this debate was <input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature 	
Is this a low point win? _____		BASIS MESA School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I'm voting affirmative based on the perm. I think enough work is done defusing the Keightley card on the justification or intrinsic part of arguments for not allow the extension of the perm. The pro or post-riot argument is also used effectively. I end up not evaluating the pro-riot impact coming off of the NC, ultimately voting on the perm.