#1 You clearly articulated the retaliation argument that we could expose our own technology to others who would not be able to use it had we not attacked them.
- You need to articulate your words, it was sometimes hard to follow.
- You asked very good clarifying questions in cross.

#2 I easily followed your argument that OOCs are more expensive.
- I liked your use of the phrase "what I'm telling you is important because... in other words...". This helped me follow your argument.
- I found your argument that others could steal our technology more persuasive.
- You did not address your opponent's contentions re: GDP and saving lives.
- You gave good responses during Crossfire that linked to your theme.

Both sides did well, but Con was more persuasive due to the clarity of the argument that OOCs could expose us to attack by giving our technology to others who don't have it. This theme was clearly emphasized during each round.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Daniel Bonnichsen (*6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>COWDN 213</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1st</td>
<td>BISSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2nd</td>
<td>PIRAINO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KURSPAHIK</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

AC: Solid case. Possibly make less clear and make impacts clearer. In CX, you can ask questions that are somewhat leading, but avoid making arguments instead of asking questions in CX.

NL: Very good at identifying the parts that are back and the flaws in the opponents' case. Make sure you are identifying the speaker parts if clear so your opponents can extend.

FF: Make sure to make the impact -> MV links very clear. Front vocals reappearing and linking to link of escalation.

APD: If bringing NEG's foreign relations impacts, PRO's economic impacts, and retaliation, but not escalation entirely, but the foreign relations impacts were the best extended and defended in round.
**Human Lives**

**SEC:** escalation

**FL:**

1. Germany, de-link
2. More lower real-life rate

**MAD, has not-weapon**

In Germany 2006, and
Tempo 19 dropped
in South Asia,
and
North Korea has tested.

Would not happen because of MAD

**Nuclear Security**

- **C5A**
  - **C5A**
  - **C5A**

**OCAs can hurt relations**

- Disruption
  - Political
  - Economic
  - Human lives

**Not outweighed**

- 0.5% of decades

**Human lives + Mlc**

**MAD, has not-weapon**

**OCAs**

- **OCAs**
- **OCAs**
**NPF**

**FLIP: 22 Wang - Garcia v. 25 Hsu - Yang**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Greg Pratt (*7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Deborah Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shirley Wang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Crossfire (1 & 2): 3 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crossfire (3 & 4): 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- 3 minutes of Prep Time per side

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.*

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

AFF in CX introduced direct & case when asking about legitimacy.

Outstanding offense/defense (paranoid the pen) - great case rebuttal. I really appreciate the voters in summary. You were written off during this round. HOWEVER, you only restated your contention with no analysis.

NEG: CX does not ask Aff to elaborate - you need to have a focused question with a purpose. OK: you were on you needed throughout the debate in answering AFF case attacks rather than balancing time to attack AFF position.

Interesting points raised but dropped - distinction between offense/defense as well as who started the warfare. You need to hit the issue of values.

KFD: 2 outstanding novice teams well-prepared and extremely analytic and thoughtful on this very timely important topic. AFF prevailed on point case. CTO -2 prevailed as well as impacts. AFF ballot - great debate.
## NPF

**FLIP: 16 Carter - Braun v. 15 Coronado - Featherstone**

### Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Dhanunjaya Penmatcha (*2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Featherstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Coronado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Is this a low point win? ______

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Pro team is clear on their reference and argument. They asked right questions and forced Con team to agree on few points.

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Speaker 1</th>
<th>Speaker 2</th>
<th>Crossfire (1 &amp; 2)</th>
<th>Speaker 3</th>
<th>Speaker 4</th>
<th>Crossfire (3 &amp; 4)</th>
<th>Speaker 1 Summary</th>
<th>Speaker 2 Summary</th>
<th>Grand Crossfire (all)</th>
<th>Speaker 3 Final Focus</th>
<th>Speaker 4 Final Focus</th>
<th>3 minutes of Prep Time per side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>3 minutes of Prep Time per side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
The benefits of the United States federal government's use of offensive cyber operations outweigh the harms.

Pros:
- East Asia
- Microsoft Azure 2018
- Defence espionage

Cons:
- South China ASEAN

Final crossfire:
- Defensive
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Eden Gustin (*'22)</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dylan Marks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Diya Setia</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mark Streu</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cooper Weissman</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Need to have taglines and distinct contentions (say "Harvard said in 2010" or 1st contention"

Contentions explain cause, what's happening & impacts.

Pretend say what they said, then evidence why they are wrong.

Summary
List 2 or 3 reasons why I should vote for you (saving lives, cheaper, diplomacy) and list your card.

Final Focus
Same as summary but more condensed.

Research more into Iran Nuclear...Debate comments for both.

**Neg:** Neg only provided escalation into cyber investment, which APF was arguing was okay.

Neg should have argued that shutting down energy/water would be more likely than nuclear war/war overall and is bad. (Neg should have used Russia card more)
### NPF

**FLIP: 25 Khanna - Fink v. 13 Alfaro - Suthar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Eric Peterson (*12)</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Arin Khanna</td>
<td>JOHAN SUTHAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Josh Fink</td>
<td>Eric Alfaro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Clearest articulation of argument from con!!

- Less volume / more argument
- Evidence

**REASON for DECISION**

- Con laid out a persuasive argument that 1) OCO invite retaliation
  2) OCO have potential for collateral damage; and
  3) Defensive CO are a better alternative.
- Aff presented strong evidence, but did not as clearly craft a simple, clear argument.

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Crossfire (1 & 2): 3 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crossfire (3 & 4): 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- 3 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>WHALL 260</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Wickett</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Chirravuri</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Agarwal</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Leis</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ____________

**Agarwal** - why would we show up as weak if we are offensive?

**Leis** - Goss-ex [questions not pointed], good answer however.

**Wickett** - Avoided answering questions.

**Chirravuri** - Numbers quoted not consistent

Case - Summary - Rebuttal.

Better case presentation - no strong rebuttal.
Agarwal

1. Cyber tax will cause war.
   - No defensive.

2. Cyber war fee violates Int'l law by USA. (Italian papers)

Rebuttal

3. Speaker 3: Blackett
   - Offensive cyber arms good for us

4:20

Speaker 8: Steal IP by China.

Maritime $60b, $50b jobs -> unemployment vs poverty.

---

Speaker 4: Chiravuri

Case: Rebuttal

Don't focus on defense.

---

No clear articulation on why US is weak.

No offense vs defense outcomes

$Spent \rightarrow \text{What is the result?}
### NPF

**FLIP: 12 Coates - Keegan v. 7 Venkatachalam - Moreno**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Deepak Cheema (*10)</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Edward Keegan</td>
<td>Sophia Moreno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Michael Coates</td>
<td>Akshay Venkatachalam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Pro** should include dates in their reference cards. Also, names of people whose comments were used.
- **Pro** countered all **Con** arguments but I don't agree with 2nd **Pro**
- **Pro** not undermining stalk instance. **Pro** could have used their full time for **Speaker 3**
- **Defends** forward very to attack 1st to present counter-attack in its place.

**Summary:**

- I don't agree that **US** should take other countries' легко же in to **OCO**'s win day
- **OCO** attacks US intercultural print importance
- **FE** key role in **OCO**

Reason: Agree with **Pro** as the **Agg 1** item is a design. **Con** try 2 that US counted well but did not agree with 2nd **Con** that US counted well. Also, did not agree with **Con** try 2 that US counted well. **US** should take into A1C the quality of life & development country. **US** internal & external.
# Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>COWDN 218</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>LANGE</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>KACIR</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>KUMAR</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>CHUN</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **Pro** — Great job on finding the closer in the argument.
  - Avoid saying "self-examatory" on "I don't need to explain."
  - Work on timing and delivery.

- **Con** — Dropped flow in 2 spots and agreed contention in summary.
  - Spats and is very flubby and good delivery.
  - You are well on your way.

---

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

**School / Affiliation / Occupation:**

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Crossfire (1 & 2): 3 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crossfire (3 & 4): 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min
- 3 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
### Order/Time Limits of Speeches

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Crossfire (1 & 2): 3 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crossfire (3 & 4): 3 min
- Speaker 1 Summary: 3 min
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **Con**: It seemed like aff tripped you up in the 2nd crossfire.
- **Aff**: Good catch on the 2017 card. "You mentioned, "Why haven't we seen a recession yet." Also, Sinha you caught them off guard in the 2nd crossfire. Good offense.
- **Con**: Your offense is very good. Excellent questioning in crossfire.

### Round 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Zhang</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Gomez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sinha</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**. (Circle Winner)

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

### Remarks

- **Aff** won because of their point that China was only funding and not using the OCOs. Also, when they mentioned Iran had reverse engineered the code in 2017 but hadn't caused a recession yet, that was a good point.
Chang - Sp 1
- Different
  - 2004-2010: OCOs
  - Iran - targeted specific hardware
  - China

3. Lives
  > 0.14% of GDP
- 137 increase when OCOs on defense
- 64% doesn't show retaliation
  > Anyone could reverse US code - non unique
- Advanced oil from rising because we prevented conflict
  - China wants to gain it
  - 2017 should have caused a recession
  > Magnitude of damage of OCOs.
    - Prevented oil prices from jumping and avoided recession
  - US didn't provoke Iran to attack, they just did
    - 100,000 lives saved
    - Chinese funds OCOs, not used them
    - Create 21 million jobs

Prop
- 1:42
- 1:20

Gomez - S1
1. Sanctions
  - Prevented Iran to attack oil
  - Push economy into turmoil
2. Chinese catastrophe
  - Endorsing China's attacks
    - OCOs - Iran copy US OCOs - makes prices rise
    - China uses OCOs to take over Taiwan
    - Once we attack someone, they can take US code
    - Cyber attacks led to attacks in US

China is directly increasing OCOs and harming other countries

If they use the virus, can be catastrophic
  - Misinterpreted move
All links in Ky doesn't connect, you can have more than 1 Ky, some ends in Cx don't engage in CX.

- As is very messy, need to be more explicit in CX.
- Don't use the wrong word for the finality. Don't make it more irrelevant.
- For the correctness, don't care too much about it. It becomes incorrect (at least shot).
- Be careful with how you generalize arguments. OCOS is in Cx.
- Where are your card extras? Con should define OCOS!
- 4 Con should define OCOS, doesn't need a shunt def.
**NPF**  
**2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy**

**FLIP: 10 Chaudhary - Ancheril v. 21 Shenoy - Christopherson**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Shani Anthony (*'15)</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>WHALL 267</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Albert A.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Savannah C.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Shrey C.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ajiyali Shenoy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **Pro**:  
  - Try not to speak so quickly but your contentions were clear. Watch your time! Both speakers.  
  - Some of your responses to questioning were weak.  
  - When you say something doesn't make sense you need to tell me why.  
  - Be quick in questioning and make your questions clear. Overall good response.  
  - Your arguments were great but too much speculation.

- **Con**:  
  - 1st Speaker: Your speech is the foundation for your side so try to know your information a little better so you won't have to read as much and slow down!  
  - I didn't or couldn't follow all your arguments which were probably really good. Great job in questioning.  
  - Structure - You guys need to prepare a little better in presentation (a bit sloppy) but awesome arguments & research. But try to be clear and concise.  
  - Your arguments were sound and more convincing.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches:

- Speaker 1: 4 min  
- Speaker 2: 4 min  
- Crossfire (1 & 2): 3 min  
- Speaker 3: 4 min  
- Speaker 4: 4 min  
- Crossfire (3 & 4): 3 min  
- Speaker 1 Summary: 3 min  
- Speaker 2 Summary: 3 min  
- Grand Crossfire (all): 3 min  
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min  
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min  

3 minutes of Prep Time per side. The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.