### Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WXLR A102</th>
<th>Sat 12/07/19 05:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>(20-30)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Marks</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Streu</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Miller</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Raman</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</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 proves that cyber attacks can be used for effective deescalations and deterrence of attacks.

Pro wins that cyber attacks can be used to prevent physical warfare and saves lives through this.

The pro case outlines how the money saved through use of cyber attacks can be used for more development of new tech.
NPF

FLIP: 25 Streu - Marks v. 22 Miller - Ramani

Novice Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WXLRA102</th>
<th>Sat 12/07/19 05:15PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1st     | Dylan Marks
         | 25        | Andrew Miller
         | 1st     | 28        |
| 2nd     | Streu
         | 20        | Krishna
         | 2nd     | 29        |

The winner of this debate was (Circle Winner)

Pro Con

Is this a low point win? Yes

Comments & Reason for Decision:

To Pro: Read an article from WashPo about how the US used cyber offense against ISIS.

Both teams tell me the round comes down to:

1. Economy and 2. Lives

Economy: Con tells me cyber costs $578-$1099 per attack but Pro tells me physical costs a lot more. Pro tells me the only way to stop them that is effective, Con tells me it doesn't deter well (less than 4%) but it does do something.

Lives: Con says cyber won't stop physical war and this is true (I agree), but I also says cyber can be an alternative to de-escale in some key places like China, Russia, & Iran. So I'm left slightly Pro on lives too.

Thus a low point, great debate.
# NPF 2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

## FLIP: 25 Streu - Marks v. 22 Miller - Ramani

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Arnav Bawa (*10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>WXLR A102</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(20-30)</strong></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marks</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Make sure you know your evidence well enough to explain it to your opponents who have to read through your case.
- Use cross for clarification + to poke holes in opponents case - every question should be a strategic one.
- Second rebuttal needs to respond to first rebuttal.
- SIGNPOST!!!
- Make sure any hand motions you use are not distracting to what you are actually saying.
- Organization & extensions need work.

---

**RFD:** I voted NEG because this round ultimately came down to lives and econ, and they outweighed on both. AFF dropped a lot of arguments in the latter half of the debate that just didn't allow them a chance to have impacts left in final focus.
**NPF**

**2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy**

**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>WXLRA203</th>
<th>Sat 12/07/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Dylan Marks</td>
<td>Aakansha Kanyal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Karl Streu</td>
<td>Nagasriya Ramisetty</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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech Type</th>
<th>Time Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 1</td>
<td>4 min</td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td>3 minutes of Prep Time per side</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

AT THE END OF TODAY THE US STATES CYBER SECURITY TODAY

While NAYA had a hacked electric grid with no clear impact or that AT&T had a 4% efficiency rate while it was still present along with delays in a nuclear program by 2 years...

Feedback: Extend every thing important. Also for both first speakers calm down for summary, you have 3 whole minutes.
Neg 1: P11: - 1.15...
- offensive
- Future
- Continued

US Russia Conflict
- Cold War
- 2018, Nuclear Grid
- Russia, Iran
- Curlew, Russia
- 5-10%
- 3-5%
- 3-5%
- 3-5%
- Rssia will respond...?
- Green Blob 19
- War will happen...?
- 50 - 120 billion
- Small, 43%
- 43%
- 43% of businesses suffer from
- Israel + Munic

Aff 4: 2018, 15 Iranian Facilities, one US nuclear center
- Nuclear
- Open quotes
- Cyber attacks can be used in lieu of fighting
- Less loss of lives
- Less - it's for the future so we need to support it.
- Lives are saved
- Buenos noches
- Huccho mundo

Nato systems are weak to cyber
- Cyber
- Total offensive
- Stony:
  - God is, Iran to spread
  - Varia: 50% of states have been
  - Sec 15, Iran, Libya, budget increased after attack, nuclear
- MAD theory
- So how can Iran help?
- Less need for conflict
- Look to IS, themselves, less help
- Reduce Nuclear Conflict but how?

Neg 2:
- US Russia NATO
- Increased Russia's reputation
- 2018 Russia retaliated and did it well
- Schwed, Hoon. They have 300 units of OCO's
- OCO's mean more quality
- As you see, more in Afghanistan it doesn't work
- They need International warfare

Aff 3:
- Arms Race will occur
- Never contained by the US
- ISIS...
- Deterrance
- Iran, caused two years of Stalling
- Deterrance doesn't solve the problem
- Dude just breath...
- Response options (more options)
- US Russia
- Because of OCO's
- Hub and electrical grid 2018
- Dispells deterrence
- Might be 50% of GDP
**Novice Public Forum**

<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>Dylan Marks</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>Aakansha Kanval</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Karl Streu</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>Narayani Ramisetty</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Pro**

1. Good presence, use of hand gestures, emphasized points, good articulation & tempo.
2. Clearly laid out three points and supported with data.
3. Good attempt to rebut challenge that Russia attacked power grid by stealthjur(July 2018, not confirmed by the U.S.)

**Con**

1. Clear argument that CCOs can be misinterpreted, can harm infrastructure and financial services.
2. Should try to vary pitch and volume of voice to highlight transitions and summary statements.
3. On summary, gave good rebuttal to Pro's challenge on retaliation, referring to Trump policy.
4. Good hack and more recent source.

**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>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>Scott-Nielsen (22)</th>
<th>Ethan Fiber (22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Marks</td>
<td>Kanyal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Streu</td>
<td>Ramisetty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4000</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.

RFD: I vote AFF b/c Neg fails to give me any impacts or solidly linked arguments. That being said, I barely vote AFF. Iran is completely dropped in second when it provides me literally the cleanest place to vote and is the biggest non-hypothetical impact. B/c of this, I have to vote off AFF argument that it saves money b/c it's the only impact left and Neg agrees they are cheaper and faster.
**Novice Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romani</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

- Speaker 1: 4 min
- Speaker 2: 4 min
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 min
- Crossfire (1 & 2): 3 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Finals</th>
<th>Daniel Bonnichsen (*6)</th>
<th>Sat 12/07/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Minute</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ramani</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

---

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Make sure your arguments are clear and continue through the entire speech.
- Use summary for new points!

---

### 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
- 2 minutes of Prep Time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
## NPF 2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Public Forum</th>
<th>Chris Greenleaf (*6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Finals</td>
<td>WXLR A302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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.*

---

**Aff**

1st Speaker: Didn't mention key votes. Just saying the WJ will be attacked isn't in itself an impact, say the arms of the attack weigh impacts??

2nd: Thank you for properly winning key votes in dropped terrorism.

**Def**

2nd: Weak link within case. Impact/likelihood of retaliation not proven.

4th: 2nd: Away less extend and signatures attack limits.

I didn't buy the argument that retaliation was solely because of OCOs, the first chain was wear and neg's impact depended on it. Deterrence outweighed on infrastructure.
Healthcare impacts: 10%
Cyper of all people

2. Never try

Almost all winners are OCO

Key note R

Recommendation -
There will still be off on healthcare
Not stay on, stop after 2 start

OCO's future lawsuit - current
OCO later in Iran, combat terror

Almost all winners are OCO

2. Never try

Almost all winners are OCO

Key note R