**2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy**

**FLIP: 2 Kanyal - Ramisetty v 21 Shenoy - Christopherson**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>SDH 148</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kanyal</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ramisetty</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Christopherson</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shenoy</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**.

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **Pro** established **OCO has net positive consequences in terms of deterrence with GDP increase**; weakness of **Islamic State + Boko Haram in Nigeria**.
- **Pro** rebuttal made several unpersuasive arguments re: low probability of war/escalation.
- **Con** rebuttal capitalized on mistakes effectively.

**Overall: Pro's constructive arguments outweighed other factors.**
**Novice Public Forum**

**Round 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Yang</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Hsu</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>Moreno</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Venkatachalam</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Is this a low point win? 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

'Con' team identified and highlighted the weak argument in 'Pro' team. By inviting attacks using 'OCO' may cause bigger economic harm is really good point.

- While doing rebuttal the defense points are highlighted.
- Very good preparation and eye contact in presentation.
- Better use of time.

1. Correctly focused on weak point in opponent rebuttal.
2. Using the time wisely.
3. Need to ask questions in Crossfire. Give short answers so you can ask questions.
4. Good presentation & flow.
C1 ISIS offensive b. political
   2. cyber power: Sony -> N. Korea -> progressive power.

C2 What is it
   What is the impact
   deten = outlook/som.

C3 OCO -> hurting citizen
   Is an outlook attack.
   2. Not remembering C2:
      Forget to affirm/one-time defence.

SL Disposable is what needed for S3
   N. Korea relation to OCO
   Provoke opponents. Weak defence

C4 How defence is related to offensive.

5 Economy/quality of life.
   OCO if. affirm: backwards

6 OCO joining

52 Best defence is good offensive
   Less life impacted.
   Less military/civilian people die.
**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>WHALL 267</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Ajay Taduri</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Haris Kurupahic</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**  (Circle Winner)  
Is this a low point win? Yes

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Fang**
- Negation
- Retaliation
- Good delivery
- No spreading
- Well below topic
- Monotone

**Taduri**
- Warning off threats
- Offense is the best defense
- Monotone
- Terrorist aspect

**Balabhdra**
- Good delivery
- Good analysis of the technology
- 10,000 Ukrainians
- Rebuttal was a little short

**Kurupahic**
- Good job in rebuttal the rebuttal
- Good delivery
- Good offline roadmap
- A little monotonous

**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.
Novice Public Forum: FLIP: 10 Chirravuri - Wickett v. 12 Coates - Keegan

Round 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Keegan Erica</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Coates Michael</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>Robert Wickett</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Richa Chirravuri</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

Pro Con

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**PRO**

Speaker 1
- good eye contact!
- you could be louder
- very poised

Speaker 2
- good volume
- good eye contact

**CON**

Speaker 1
- you are rocking
- good volume
- avoid "firstly" - use "first"

Speaker 2
- good eye contact
- good volume

Richa, more debating, less preaching. Passion is fine, but there's a line.

Richa/Robert - more attack of your opponent's contentions

**PRO** side wins for these reasons:
- excellent answers in crossfire
- revealing logical fallacies
- revealing flaws in opponents' arguments, specifically not addressing 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Setia</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Weissman</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Lange</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Kacir</td>
<td>38</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 speeches, but I think you should explain your impacts more earlier in the debate. Tell me why your deterrence advantages are more important than their impacts when you do get to those points in the summary. I think it's better to focus on data and your cards, especially in your deterrence contention. Your points are good, but I want more specifics—explain it more as it comes up in cross-ex, but explain more on your economy impact.

**Con:** Don't have to be scared in cross-ex—you shouldn't be afraid of saying something wrong. Just defend your arguments. Start it impact of analysis earlier in the debate also—Don't wait until summary or cross to show why their impacts don't matter or why yours are important.

**RFD:** I vote neg on a chance of miracle through OCOs.
## 2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

**NPF**

**FLIP: 16 Chambers - Gomez v. 17 Desai - Esposito**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Arnav-Bawa (+10)</th>
<th>Jackson Wakefield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 4</td>
<td>SS 229</td>
<td>Fri 12/06/19 07:30PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>Yulianna Gomez</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Desai/Tej</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Carmen Chambers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Esposito, Vincent</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- **AFF:** focus on structure in summary & final focus
- **EXTEND YOUR IMPACTS ALL OF THEM**
- ALSO EXTEND REBUTTAL CARDS

---

**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.
KALKSTEIN, AMANDA

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

FLIP: 10 Sinha - Zhang v. 15 Coronado - Featherstone

Novice Public Forum

Amanda Kalkstein (*'12)

Round 4

SHESC 340

Fri 12/06/19 07:30PM

Speaker

Pro

Charles Zhang

Savan Sinha

Points (20-30)

29

24

Con

Rodrick F Goodman

Nathan Coronado

Points (20-30)

26

27

The winner of this debate was

Pro

Con

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

Comments & Reason for Decision:

APE: RESOLVE HARM
1300% INCREASE OCCAS AS DETERRENCE
US PROTECT OCCAS OIL PRICES WILL RISE
US; 100 $ BARREL

ENUCIATES WELL
UPSTAND GDP

EMPHASIZES: DEFENSIVE
THEIR CONTENTION LEADS TO ESCALATION TO NUCLEAR COUNTRIES

MUTUALLY SHARED DESTRUCTION

AWESOME BY GOING POINT BY POINT RETATION IS LESS IMPACTFUL
NEVER SHOW EXAMPLE MONT DEF CAN BE OFFENSIVE

X NICE ATTACK

CROSS

CROSS

HUGE RISK

36% FOR RETALIATION

INITAL ATTACK

NOT

STATISTICAL NOT REALTED

LOGIC MISCONVEV EVID. IF WE DO NOTHING...

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: 5 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.
Q: SHOW CARD → PREP TIME?
*FINISH POINT

SUM (3)
1. IF OCOS... CONT... NO NEC WAR
   NO CORRELATION
2. NEVER GIVE EXAM
3. NO LINK — WHOLE CASE IS HYPER

Q? HOW WOULD NEEDED WAR HAPPENED?
MUTUALLY

KEY
1/3%
0% RETALIATION
→ HYPOTHE - DO WE WAIT

CROSS

HOW CAN OCOS STOP WAR

WARFARE
MISCONTRIBUG CA
2 MIN
HYPOTHEICAL

ON THEIR PHONE
MUTUAL
DNEST ATTACK THEIR POINTS
KFD: Voting AFF today because the NEG did very little in terms of responding to new responses and actually interacting with the AFF speeches. The terrorism arg flows to AFF be the AFF warranting this out pretty well with specific examples, but I don't see a response from the NEG other than the retaliation arg. I buy that cyber attacks are better than conventional warfare in terms of casualties, but I don't see a NEG response to AFF arg about collateral damage being in place.
GRANILLO - WALKER ERIN

GOULD, RUSSELL

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

NPF
FLIP: 25 Khanna - Fink v. 10 Jayaganesh - Chekanov

Novice Public Forum
Russell Gould ('21)

Round 4

COWDN 218
Fri 12/06/19 07:30PM

<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>Khanna</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Chekanov</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Fink</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Jayaganesh</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Delivery could have been in your first speech.
- Look forward during cross.
- There is no need to read the resolution again.
- Flow in columns on your paper.
- Final focus good in some respects but could have explained some arguments better.
- Likewise.
- Look forward during cross.
- Try not to pace back and forth so much in the second speech.
- Make sure you are taking prep time whenever.
- Keep Qs efficient in cross.
- Try not to use rhetorical Qs.

RFD: While several of the arguments ended up being a wash, I ultimately buy that CO2 pose less risk than assumed affirm.
Novice Public Forum

Round 4

Speaker: Pro

Dylan Marks

2nd: Karl Streu

Points:

Speaker: Con

Charlie Bisson

2nd: Sofia Piraino

Points:

The winner of this debate was: Pro

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro: Win: Made a few compelling arguments

1) Only 32% of extra retaliation to OCOs

But 100% retaliation to physical attacks

2) Shown water treatment plant as not result of OCO direct

Touched on possibility that OCOs could be

Removable but physical attacks are not

Both teams did an outstanding job debating!

used data and logic to back up contentions
Offensive cyber security benefits outweigh costs/domino effect

1. Escalate conflict
   - Risk of escalation
   - Ex. Iran w/ nuclear
   - US needed another battle
   - China could target US
   - Escalation to war

2. Effective strategy is to loss of life
   - Iran's destruction domino effect
   - Nuke attacks disrupt services
   - 32% of life due to retaliation

3. Substitute for live military
   - Strategic targets, bombs
   - Cheaper, quicker alternative
   - Only 32% of losses

4. Conclusion:
   - Iran has stopped human programs
   - Rebuttal: Continued to physics
   - Cyber espionage
   - Deterrent: Fear of counterstrike may stop war
   - Economic sanctions, physical threats
   - Nuke attacks can be reversed, reduced
   - Cyber attacks can't be reversed
   - Cato Institute growing conflict in cyberspace
   - Loss when blow out of arms race

- Physical attacks, arms race
### 2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

**NPF**

**FLIP: 16 Carter - Braun v. 10 Chaudhary - Ancheril**

**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Dana Corbo (*'25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Ancheril</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Chaudhary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (20-30)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Speaker**   | **Con**           |
| 1st           | Braun             |
| 2nd           | Carter            |
| **Points** (20-30) | 28               |

The winner of this debate was

- **Pro**: Ancheril
- **Con**: Chaudhary

(Circle Winner)

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

**Judge's Signature**

Chapa

School / Affiliation / Occupation:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Good opening
- Good job trying to discredit their first claim didn't work, but good try
- Good point about re-engineering
- You didn't mention impact until the last 10 seconds
- A little more organization of your facts and you'll be in great shape!

<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>
</tbody>
</table>

3 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
## Novice Public Forum

### Round 4

<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>Chun</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Katikaneni</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Kumar</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Penmatcha</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:

Rather than saying "I have a card that states" use the name of the author. Example: "Rogers states 7 million people are affected by OCO"

---

### Grand CX - Question Statements

Allow your opponents to ask question.

---

### Katikaneni

When giving your speech, it is customary to stand. Also, confirm with your partner, your competitors, and your judge before starting. Use your entire time in the future.

---

### Chun

Kumar

When delivering a speech, look at your judge rather than your opponent. Like mentioned earlier, stand to present your speech. It asserts your position as the speaker and helps the judge to focus on you.

---

### RFD:

**Con/Neg presented Stronger arguments with evidence.** Aff conceded point regarding Kinetic Warfare. Con/Neg was able to turn this point. Aff did not respond to Neg’s position effective. Do not delay economy until Final Focus.
1915 - Caliphate
Wooden '19
Rogers '18 98% territory OCO role

Terrorist financing
US Today
ISIS - Revenue - crippled more

Stop reading card
Rogers '18 7mil. people impact
Keeping ISIS destroyed
Market Business Review
Containing Iran
Rasedra '19 2oper @ IRAN

OCO achieve same affect
grow '18 military airstrike can't
Wanger '19 Stopping military

Hypothetical evidence
OCO escalation - retaliation
OCO do not see a retaliatory strike

1916 as a resource strike team
proves effectiveness - Syria - OCO contain IRAN save lives

Kinetic warfare

5000 unlike the neg. stated GDP

2nd to Singapore - new evidence?
Adding to the warfare not replacing it.
OCO other countries doing it; IRAN/US tensions.

SOE contentions Russian
NATO - Crisis on the US
US takes the lead
Tucker '19
NATO/US runs
Aggression - NATO actors
A risk; TIC for tac inadvertent escalation
Kato '19 Undermine Russia

Beck '19 Policy A OCO - Russia
Energy, Infrastructure - PF
targets foreign economies
Small business affected
Vox - 1/5 falls victim

hermos does out of business after victimized

IMF $200M saved from poverty doesn't flow until PF

A nuclear war
Beed '19 Espionage/OCO conv./cyber

Prior contentions
1915 - Small terrorist
Thatesus - Recruitment 

Ike - 19 kinetic warfare
Restoring peace 98% - DOD kinetic warfare

Donnelly 19 - OCO open invitation disaster conflict not only OCO, but kinetic

Shin '19 large majority

Kinetic not alternate, miscalculation conflict 100% OCO > more lives lost
not just OCO lives lost; 100% 4%

Eining '19 more OCO lead to potential new

Low-level response:

OCO time road map tensions rise
OCO magnified

Faran - huge effect

ISIS
Dahler/ Brookings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Shani Anthony (*'15)</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 07:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>WHALL 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Maya Leis</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Bella Agarwal</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Andrew Miller</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Krishna Ramani</td>
<td>29</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.*

**Pro**

- Good use of sources
- Know your research
- Be prepared for questioning
- Give examples why or how did OCO's stop so many attacks and by whom?
- Good job during questioning but be careful not to lose focus

**Con**

- Clear and concise arguments
- Speak clearly even during questioning
- Deutate on deterrence was smart great source
- Examples you gave were beneficial for your argument

**RFD**

Pointing out how they could not try to refute several of your arguments which was very true was smart. You were more prepared and your sources were more convincing. Great job!