**NPF**

**FLIP: 13 Alfaro - Suthar v. 25 Streu - Marks**

**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Ethan Fiber (*'22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks</td>
<td>Suthar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streu</td>
<td>Alfaro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

RFD: Neg fails to offer examples or extend the case or impacts in the summary, and because of this the very limited impacts and examples I get from the affirmative provide me the only thing I can vote on.
**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Gouri Mantri (*10)</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Suman Kattikaneni</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Pranav Penmatcha</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Andrew Miller</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Krishna Ramani</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Pro (Con)**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?  

Judge's Signature:  

Hamilton,  

School / Affiliation / Occupation:  

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

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

3 minutes of Prep Time per side  

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Pro** offers a** Best Defense.**
- **Israel - China** redtacencies.  
  - Powergrid - squirrel - calmed - more damage.  
  - China - won signed treaty.  
  - Escalation - will not happen.  
  - Consequences - truth.  
- **US - China** - truly  
  - Made less - less capable.  
- No limit - budget - large scale - retaliation is not.  
  - Bacheharam - economic - US will not benefit.  
- At OCO -  

**Con:**  

- **US - China** - truly  
- **US - China** - truly  
- **US - China** - truly  
- **US - China** - truly  
- **US - China** - truly  
- **US - China** - truly  
- **US - China** - truly  

**RFD on back**
GDP - doubled
Repeated arguments:

Co was wise this round.
1. Both speakers were very clear in conveying their data points.
2. Was able to argue the real impact of Acc on B fighting Boko Haram.
3. Quantified the cost of Acc.
4. Effectiveness of Acc.

Boko Haram - relation is unclear
11 cases
US Export - saved lives & increased taxes

End of note
Novice Public Forum - Joseph Schwartz (*'19)

Round 3 - SS 304 - Fri 12/06/19 06:30PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Khanna, Ash</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Fink, Josh</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Desai, Tej</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Esposito, Vincent</td>
<td>28</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**
- good pace
- try to make eye contact

**Con**
- good pace
- hold the laptop so you can make eye contact more
- good poise, good presence
- you are tough, but respectful.

Con won the debate because:
- your opponent failed to complete the contentions.
- you did a much better job at pointing out flaws in opponents' argument.
- you nullified new evidence from the unread the contention from speaker 1 PRO.
- Speaker 1 - When you feel yourself lose steam - take a breath!

To improve your argument:
- shorten contention #1
- emphasize that OCO's will decrease casualties. This should be first contention Lead with it!
- good job at pointing out logical fallacies Call it a NON-SEQUITOR
## NPF

### FLIP: 10 Sinha - Zhang v. 12 Lange - Kacir

**Round 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Charles Zhang</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Savar Sinha</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Julia Lange</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ayva Kacir</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner) **Pro**

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.*

---

**The winner of this debate is Pro because:**

**PRO**

- Great use of resources and data
- 2nd speaker very knowledgeable & great @ cross
- First argument was a bit superficial & included data all over the place - i.e. oil & jobs w/o any connections
- Did not catch self-defense on pro side - sovereignty laws & same arguments

**CONS**

- Speaker 1 - superficial arguments that missed valid points about Iran conflict
- CNN - Not a great valid or reliable source
- Stated it was proven many times but not realistically - choppy
- Mentioned UN laws w/o understanding same argument doesn't matter? of course it does - sources are not better or worse. They just tell a different side of the story.

---

**+ Cons**

- 2nd speaker very well spoken & great @ cross
- 1st speaker started off very well but seemed to have lost her nerves
Pro
- Cyber Operations
  - Charles: 1300% 2018 100,000+ ppl would have died
  - Iran: Drones (Reuters, CNN) 2018
  - China: Hacking 614GB Prevent 107B employment
- Tran: Prevent nuclear attack 4B damages 10,000 ppl or but go to hosp
- Wired 2019
- CNBC 2019
- Israel struck

Julia: Escalate international tensions
- Not useful unless attacking target?
  - Limited effectiveness
    - Islamic
    - UNs sovereignty laws
    - Self defense

Not disproven

Con
- Lavar: 1300% 67.4% Escalation
  - US improved cyber defense operations
  - Nic inference ~ Reuters 2019
  - ISIS defeated shortly afterward ~ UN never know: True

Ayana: Rising trends ~ Reuters 2019
- Great balance ~ push
- Very well spoken ~ knowledgeable about topic

Work on balance of argument

Stated UNs sovereignty laws unless it is for self defense or provocateur
Pro
- Great Structure & Contentions well thought out
- Be careful not to speculate

Con
- Great Sources they helped your contentions be careful with your transitions (speaking fast make you hard to understand)
- Great Rebuttal but remember to explain why they’re wrong
- Great Point about how other countries are and can use OUR own CEO’s against us

War is war whether its conventional or Nuclear (good point), Escalation can and will happen.
### Novice Public Forum

**Round 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>Wickett</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Christopherson</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Chirravuri</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Shenoy</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Neg drops their entire case w/ exception of there being a 90% drop in VC will not exist which honestly just is not believable.

Aff flows through warrants & impacts well so I vote on $1 trillion lost in intel prop thrt & 500K job loss per year.
**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>featherstone</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kanyal</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ramisetty</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

Pro: Speaker 1: You have a good presentation, maybe slow it down a bit especially in the opening constructive.

Speaker 2: You have an excellent debating style - I like the style.

Con: Speaker 1: You have a nice way of laying out the information. Maybe slow it down a bit in the opening constructive.

Speaker 2: Also good presentation. I like how you state what you're going to say. Maybe watch the running overtime.

RFD: I found the point ofoco being cheaper than conventional weapons and the money saved could be used for infrastructure very effective. Also the point about the economy roaring now - which is true.
## NPF

**2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy**

**Novice Public Forum**

**Round 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Gomez</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Moreno</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Venkatachalam</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

Benefits of OCO outweigh the harms.

**Pros** are the winners based on strong arguments, winning crossfires, citing data, and being more forceful and crisp.

#2 Controversy: Count is OCO's. Use OCO's flawed logic to delegitimize arguments made by OCO. OCO's argument was that offense cyberattacks will not create panic and death. If OCO's argument is true, it would show that OCO is not a viable solution.

#4 Cyber attacks are less expensive than real attacks. Research shows that cyberattacks are cheaper than real attacks. OCO stopped funding in 2015. OCO's argument that OCO is a viable solution is not supported by data.

## Crossfire

**Crossfire** question to **Pros** was not clear. **Response was not clear.**

**Pros** used examples of cyber attacks to refute the argument. **Cons** argue that attacks were not serious.

**Pros** counter with how attacks are expected. **Cons** do not provide specific examples. **Cons** are expected.

#1 Summary

Repetitive points in original arguments. Argued cyber attacks cannot be more expensive than conventional war.

#4 Final Focus - counters a crossfire attack

#3 Final Focus - how did OCO stop suicide attacks?
Great job! I think all the bumps and bruises from this round will be a good learning experience for everyone. Make sure to maintain professionalism at all times and keep up the good work.

RED: I ultimately vote for the affirmative team because of the way they extended their offensive arguments through the end of the round clearly. There was a major concession made by the negative in the summary speech about the importance of deterrence. Additionally, the negative confused themselves and made arguments in support of the affirmative side. The negative also became unnecessarily rude during cross, which did not help the case.
# NPF
## Novice Public Forum
### FLIP: 16 Carter - Braun v. 25 Hsu - Yang
#### Round 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>Jessica Yang</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Hamley Braun</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Renee Hsu</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lauren Carter</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

**Judge’s Signature:**

Amanda Kalkstein

DMHS/Sponsor/Teacher

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **AFF** > **CO** > **P**  LOUD/ABOUT FAST
  - **NEG**
- **ST**
- SRID/IRAN > REVERSE ENGINEER (NOTIONS)
- OIL DATA
- AMERICAN
- AWESOME PACE
- CON 2) CHINESE > INVEST IN US JUMPSTART CURRENT TRENDS
- CHINA INVANIS > US CAM
- INVADE
- SUB B > EVEN DIFF
- STRONGER
- **K**

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.

Additional notes:

- **AFF** > **CO** > **P**  LOUD/ABOUT FAST
- **NEG**
- SRID/IRAN > REVERSE ENGINEER (NOTIONS)
- OIL DATA
- AMERICAN
- AWESOME PACE
- CON 2) CHINESE > INVEST IN US JUMPSTART CURRENT TRENDS
- CHINA INVANIS > US CAM
- INVADE
- SUB B > EVEN DIFF
- STRONGER
- **K**

Additional comments:

- **AFF** > **CO** > **P**  LOUD/ABOUT FAST
- **NEG**
- SRID/IRAN > REVERSE ENGINEER (NOTIONS)
- OIL DATA
- AMERICAN
- AWESOME PACE
- CON 2) CHINESE > INVEST IN US JUMPSTART CURRENT TRENDS
- CHINA INVANIS > US CAM
- INVADE
- SUB B > EVEN DIFF
- STRONGER
- **K**

Additional notes:

- **AFF** > **CO** > **P**  LOUD/ABOUT FAST
- **NEG**
- SRID/IRAN > REVERSE ENGINEER (NOTIONS)
- OIL DATA
- AMERICAN
- AWESOME PACE
- CON 2) CHINESE > INVEST IN US JUMPSTART CURRENT TRENDS
- CHINA INVANIS > US CAM
- INVADE
- SUB B > EVEN DIFF
- STRONGER
- **K**

Additional comments:

- **AFF** > **CO** > **P**  LOUD/ABOUT FAST
- **NEG**
- SRID/IRAN > REVERSE ENGINEER (NOTIONS)
- OIL DATA
- AMERICAN
- AWESOME PACE
- CON 2) CHINESE > INVEST IN US JUMPSTART CURRENT TRENDS
- CHINA INVANIS > US CAM
- INVADE
- SUB B > EVEN DIFF
- STRONGER
- **K**

Additional notes:

- **AFF** > **CO** > **P**  LOUD/ABOUT FAST
- **NEG**
- SRID/IRAN > REVERSE ENGINEER (NOTIONS)
- OIL DATA
- AMERICAN
- AWESOME PACE
- CON 2) CHINESE > INVEST IN US JUMPSTART CURRENT TRENDS
- CHINA INVANIS > US CAM
- INVADE
- SUB B > EVEN DIFF
- STRONGER
- **K**

Additional comments:

- **AFF** > **CO** > **P**  LOUD/ABOUT FAST
- **NEG**
- SRID/IRAN > REVERSE ENGINEER (NOTIONS)
- OIL DATA
- AMERICAN
- AWESOME PACE
- CON 2) CHINESE > INVEST IN US JUMPSTART CURRENT TRENDS
- CHINA INVANIS > US CAM
- INVADE
- SUB B > EVEN DIFF
- STRONGER
- **K**
AFF

OCOS → PROTECTION AGAINST HACKERS →
CYBER-ATTACK ISN'T AS SPENDING LESS ON WARFARE → USING
DEMOCRACY STRENGTHENED "ADDITIONALLY WILL BE RUTHLESS STAY W/DIFFERENT
GRAND CROSS

Q → EX OF US

WEAPON

A: RUSSIA INTERFERED W/ VOTING

Q: HUMAN LIVES MORE IMPORTANT THAN QUALITY IF

THE BEST DEFENSIVE OFFENCE PROTECTION SUPERIOR TO US

NEG

DIDNT ADDRESS OF OIL NOT RESPONDED
US CYBER-ATTACK
KNOCKS OUT DESCALATION X STRONG ON → GETTING RID OF THEIR CONTENTIONS 900,000,000 PUSH INTO

FAR GRATER THAN OLD

A: WHEN US CONDUCTS
THEY USE CODE
EXAMPLE
TRANSFERS ESCALATES WHEN ONE MOVE UP WE
WHY IS PROTECTING DEMOCRACY HELP YOUR ARGUMENT?

NOT QUALITY DRAMATIC

→ THEY DIDNT ATTACK OR CONTENTION
# 2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

## NPF

**FLIP: 7 Piraino - Bisson v. 22 Wang - Garcia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Chris Thiele (*8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>WHALL 167</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Deborah Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shirley Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge's Signature**

Arcadia H.S.

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.

---

Both teams were well prepared and informed. **CON** won this round through their impact on both human life and infrastructure.
### Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Anthony Hall ('20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Alexander Chekanov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Arunav Jayaganesh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **Con** makes clear observation that U.S. offensive attacks harm normal civilians, the priority is lives of the people.

- **Pro** makes clear point that the offense would prevent these issues created from U.S. being attacked.

- Speaker One (Con) did good logically attacking opponents and breaking down opponents arguments.

- Speaker Two (Con) did good defusing opponent's momentum with questioning.

- Speaker One (Pro) did good on rebuttal.

- Speaker Two (Pro) created good argument with concrete evidence.