## Novice Public Forum

**FLIP: 2 Kurspahic - Taduri v. 25 Hsu - Yang**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Ajay Taduri</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Jessica Yang</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Haris Kurspahic</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Renee Hsu</td>
<td>2.5</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 offered a stronger presentation in both argument and support for its contentions.

---

**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.
Both Speaker 1 & 2 had good supporting examples for their arguments.

Crossfire 1 & 2 - Didn't use time wisely. Both teams lost momentum & not much was gained.

Richa - good job addressing contentions w/ examples after 1st crossfire

Grand Cross - time was wasted asking for cards rather than proving arguments

Both teams were very passionate about proving their cases.

Con - good final rebuttal
Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Lance Martin (*13)</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setia</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Fang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Weissman</td>
<td>Balabhadra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Good opening statement. Contentions were clear. Make your impact more clear. Good job pinning their facts on their assumption. Good job attacking their assumption very well. Everyone should come prepared and organized notes.

One contention isn't great when you admit you don't have any actual evidence to support it. Need cards to support claims. You're on to a good argument, but you need facts to back it up.

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: 3 min
- Speaker 3 Final Focus: 2 min
- Speaker 4 Final Focus: 2 min

The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>WHALL 220</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Thang</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sinha</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Marks</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Streu</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Is this a low point win? ___________

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**RFD:** Pro side was sticking to the conclusion and over all provided data that supported their **claim**.

Con side had a strong start and added to back up their claim but deviated from the claim as debate progressed. Their need to provide data that they can tie it back with concrete examples.

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

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

FLIP: 25 Khanna - Fink v. 12 Leis - Agarwal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Claire van Doren (*22)</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Maya Leis</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Becca Agarwal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arin Khanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Josh Fink</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Well organized, good amount of research.
- Really good job on cites/evidence, demeanor!
- Flow was better, but try to engage judge more (make eye contact, smile etc.)

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.
**NPF**

**FLIP: 22 Miller - Ramani v. 16 Carter - Braun**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Nadia Jafar (※10)</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>SS 229</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Braun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ramani</td>
<td>Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The winner of this debate was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro ( )</td>
<td>Con ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle Winner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a low point win?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Pro:** Overall good presentation. Speaker One may want to slow down - especially in opening statement. Speaker Two ends a little too abruptly sometime.

**Con:** I liked your use of specific examples (Stuxnet & Kuwait, etc.).

**RFD:** Two particular points made by the Con team I found very persuasive.
1. Easy to reverse engineer the code
2. Better to focus on defense rather than OSA which can be stolen and reverse engineered.
**SUMNER, BRANDON**  

**NPF**  

FLIP: 10 Chaudhary - Ancheril v. 7 Piraino - Bisson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Brandon Sumner (*16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>COWDN 218</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (CQBO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancheril</td>
<td>29.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaudhary</td>
<td>28.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Speaker             | Points (20.30)        |
| **Con**             | 1st                   |
| Bisson              | 28.78                 |
| Piraino             | 27.86                 |
| 2nd                 |                       |

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Pro:** Mostly good, but you can both organize your speeches to spend more time on the arguments that will win you the round and less time repeating yourselves. The grand crossfire round could use more time debating semantics instead of discussing a link chain. Having a better explanation on your economy impact would be helpful.

**Con:** Good for most speeches but it's important to focus on which arguments will win you the round. It's mutually assumed destruction stuff isn't as important as your impact arguments - I think you're spending a lot of time here. Spending more time on your offense can be useful. In the last couple speeches it's better to slow down a little and get more important than the pros?

Good debate all!
**NPF**

**FLIP: 22 Wang - Garcia v. 16 Chambers - Gomez**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>COWDN 213</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Garcia</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**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:**

**Pro:**

- **Great job all around - felt like a varsity debate!**
- **Speaker 1:** Excellent pacing, easy to understand. Focus on ISIS - relevant that button topic.
- **Speaker 2:** Excellent use of OCOS against China - only way to deter attacks. OCOS are a proactive, effective way to protect other countries.
- **Speaker 3:** OCOS are already normalized and accepted.
- **Speaker 4:** OCOS are in the status quo - protection of other countries.

---

**Con:**

- **Speaker 1:** Creation of cyberarms race - China increased OCOS to US. Good job keeping opponent accountable during cross, asking for numbers.
- **Speaker 2:** Good response to deter enemy - "many lives, many people" good point.
- **Speaker 3:** "We never said..." Taking your argument back just be a terrorist group takes credit doesn't mean they did it. Difference between attacks and defense. Good balance of speed + clarity. We don't need OCOS to deter nukes. Build defense vs offense. Conventional arms of ISIS - OCOS will not stop social media recruiting.
- **Speaker 4:** Good work bringing back to offense vs defense. "Undefined amount" versus 9 million.
Neg uses concrete evidence and statistics to create a more viewpoints toward the approach.

1st crossfire was won by Con, due to the concrete evidence provided, well defending and attacking in the crossfire.

Con makes it very clear on the negative affects of offensive cyber attacks have on the U.S.

Pro makes clear point in The United States failed attempts of prior defense.

Makes clear point of discouraging attacks to save lives.

Pro does well in implying that focus given to offense would discourage attacks.

* Con makes clear point throughout round that defense keeps peace while also protecting lives, although the economy and money are key factors to the country if there are no citizens those factors do not matter.
**NPF**

**FLIP: 2 Katikaneni - Penmatcha v. 12 Coates - Keegan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Lisa Reason (*17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fri 12/06/19 04:30PM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? Yes

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both teams did a great job of presenting strong arguments. However, the **Pro** team made stronger arguments for defending their position and made strong arguments to refute the negative.

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.*
Use

1. offensive - admin war
   - Fall behind without offensive capabilities
   - China stole data
   - Titan ease - can win; China in unsecured state

2. offensive measures vs cyber crime
   - U.S. strong against 6 attacks
   - U.S. falling behind in cyber defense

3. Can't stop what offensive measures

4. Defending forward = offensive is different

5. Attack by the attacker

6. Confront threats by such as nuclear

Defense choices:

- Nuclear power: offensive cyber security benefits out weigh risks: harm/deterrence
- Russian aggression
  - Red dots under falling
  - Say this one incident applies to all areas: fallacy

- Nuclear infrastructure: protected - threat is not valid

- T: for IoT = D!
  - Slippage slope = no proof to back up; energy will fail soon

- Need causes for civilian casualties = majority of offensive - cyber security

- No need for mutual destruction

- Good analogies: catching bullet after fired
  - Also good observation of failures
  - E.g. Slipping slope

- China sPAC data: created a weapon
  - F35 flight test

- Surprised us in military

- No proof other countries surprising is proof

- AMC rule: proof it is still an issue, yet not currently

Con

offensive cyber operations (OCO)

- Causes
  - Aggressive retaliation
  - Paralyze
  - Back and forth attacks

- U.S. nuclear war
  - Software malfunctions
  - Don't allow for appropriate responses

- Retaliation
  -extensions

- OCOs taken calculation from wrong of retaliation

- Nuclear cyber bombing

- Kinetic warfare

- OCOs do measure harm

- Countries attacking small from

- Argument that offensive cyber measures antagonizing others

- To retaliate

- Makes own cyber options more vulnerable

- U.S. offensive cyber security

- Causes harm

- Data should accompany assertions

- E.g. How many retaliations

- OCOs

- Offensive cyber warfare

- Operations
# NPF

## 2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

**Novice Public Forum**

**Tom Spector (**9**)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Reesha Kumar</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharmila C.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Christian Chen</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Angali S.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Con: Iran - undercuts terrorism financing and destabilizes  
  - better than war - it saps and saves lives - does not cause escalations
  - reduces power, less dangerous for international relations and distrust
  - risk of war

- Con: - we detect at least against what we attack  
  - defense is strong

---

**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.*

---

**Reason**

Better detecting in both attack and defense counter attacking well and yet times well!
OCO shipped to ISIS and deeper

Central Iran
does not increase escalation

was benefit for

OCO is more expensive because of effects on inter...
FLIP: 10 Jayaganesh - Chekanov v. 15 Coronado - Featherstone

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Sarah Armistead (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro Speaking First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Roderick Featherstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Adnan Coronado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

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: 5th Speaker Featherstone
- Spreading
- Monotone
- Did not see the impacts

Strong contentions
- Needs to appeal

Questioning
- Asked leading question
- Not coherent in questioning
- Offered a lot of hypotheticals

Coronado
- Limited contentions

Jayanaganesha
- Good job in referring to question
  - Good counter to Iran
  - No standing to Nuclear War
  - All theory
  - Hypothetical
  - Did not counter every point
  - Don't speak in first person
  - Should not speak in first/second

Neg: 1st Speaker Chekanov
- Spreading
- Monotone
- Could not see the impacts

Good examples of failing Cyber Security
- Good job in discussing long-term and macro-impacts of the overall argument

Questioning
- Played defensive
- Did not ask any questions

2:10 left of Prep
Terrorists
Act a bit for cyberespionage
No way to prevent cyber attacks
Force multiplicator
Info for enemy

Rising tensions
Trigged responses from other nations
OOC discussed the military impacts

North Korea
Used to prevent wars/missiles
Info used for tracking of missiles would be useful

Art
Loses and

Art
Loses and
GREENLEAF, CHRIS

NPF

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

FLIP: 12 Lange - Kacir v. 2 Kanyal - Ramisetty

Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Chris Greenleaf (*6)</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Julia Lange</td>
<td>Aakansha Kanyal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ayya Kacir</td>
<td>Nagasriya Ramisetty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro  Con

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Lange: You're a very talented speaker. I could tell right off the bat that you knew exactly what you wanted to portray, and the points you ad to get across. It's not a huge issue, but eye contact is very important, and might help grab your audience's attention (esp? on the first sentence. Excuse all spelling issues! Your case is a whole was VERY well-written and it made sense. Your impacts were there, and your sources really

Kacir: You have an interesting way of approaching your speeches! I especially enjoyed how you directly attacked their case, and didn't dance around it like so many debates I could see. The wheels turning in your head shows how knowledgeable you are on this topic! Only, non-major thing is to pay attention to filler words like "um..." It's okay to take a breath without filling the silence. Filler words aren't deadly by any means...

Kanyal: Your attacks were well thought out, like you took the time to really think about what you were saying. You've definitely got me hooked on your case. Keep it up.

Ramisetty: Critical thinking is obviously a huge part of any debate, and while you've done amazingly with this...
Both cases were very strong, and well-written with an abundance of sources and impacts! I'm very impressed with the speaking, and critical thinking prowess of all FOUR of you! Con was very good on defense (a.k.a. defending attacks made against your case). Pro, OTOH was also very good, this time on the offense (a.k.a. attacking the opponent's case). While I liked both cases, and both teams for very different reasons, I think my decision comes down to who's case held up better, after all is said and done. In this instance, I think Con was a bit more "put-together" (for lack of a better word), especially in cross-ex. It doesn't mean I don't like you guys, because I do! Both teams made this a very enjoyable debate! Break a leg in all your future rounds, thanks so much for allowing me to be a part of a great debate! (^_^)(^_^) (one for each of you!)