### VPF

**Varsity Public Forum**

**Amanda Kalkstein ("12)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Pro - AFF</th>
<th>Con - NEG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Narotam</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Iyer</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></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
- Speaker 3: 4 min
- Speaker 4: 4 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:**

- **TAKING A WHILE TO SET UP +3 MIN**
- **SOFTWARE/SCO - DISTRACTION**
- SAFE/EFFECTIVE -> ATTACKING W/O KNOWING MINIMAL -> CYBER ON US 3:37
- CLEAR EYES DOWN MOST OF TIME
- IRAN USE OF REVERSE ENGINEER A: HAVE OPOS N.C. DEVELOPING WE STOPPED + AVOID
- Q: US... OCOS
- ONLY CONTENTION -> REVERSE ENGINEER
- REVERSE ENGINEER US PRESENTS - WONT DROP BOMB
- MONEY -> OM CRAP -> DETER ATTACKS INFL. THREATEN Q: FORU & ATTACK HELPING?
- CARD/RESEARCH:
- US HAS NOTHING TO LOSE FOR PROTECTION
- WAS POLLED + DIDN'T CUT OFF
- CROSS CUT OFF
- Q: DOWNFALL OF ECONOMY
- GOOD POINT 4 HOLE IN THEIR LAUGHING
- PETER STOP ATTACK LIPS
- STOP ATTACK = ARGUMENT
- POKING HOLE = STRONG 2
- RR
- BETTER EYE CONTACT = DETERRING SOME = BETTER
- CROSS #1
- Q: WAS A SOLE

**FLIP: 10 Mantri - Narotam v. 6 Sigsworth - Iyer**

**2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy**

**ED 228**

**Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM**

**Prep**

**2:29** 24 sq
NEW ARGUMENTS
L NOT SUPPOSED TO DO
L
- SOLENCE ⇒ STOP ALL ATTACKS
- THEY DON'T
- 900 MİL POVERTY SAVING LIVES / POVERTY IF DS
- THEY BRINGING NEW EVIDENCE IF DETERANCE WORKS IT SHOULD HAVE HAPPENED
- YES THEY ARE COUNTER AP HARM

3 MIN GRAND CROSS SOLVANCY?
- THEY SAY NOT

3 COS.
Y RESOLUTION
WE OUTWAY HARM DEBATE
REPUTE THE EVIDENCE SOLVANCY = NON NOT A TREND
STRONG

BOTH SOURCES MORTING LIVES
- RESPONSES ANALYZE TRENDS SOLVANCY THE
ARMISTEAD, SARAH

VF

FLIP: 9 Pertovsky - Sarfati v. 10 Griffin - Jagdish

Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Sarah Armstead (*5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Jagdish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Griffin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

**Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Con**

"Try to control "like" habit during crossfire, makes you appear difficult to understand during first speech. Don't sacrifice clarity for speed. Found you groove halfway through. Made some relatable points (welfare + medicare)."

**Pro**

"Good recall of stockneta (sp.)

Importance of quality of life, very relevant. "Like what?" during crossfire - good. Keep opponent accountable.

The only example provided is stockneta, clarification of power grid "incentivating our adversaries" good.

**Speaker 1**

-Good pace and tone. Good questioning during crossfire, bringing up how 17 billion is a relatively small % of US budget. "We only use ACOs against countries attacking us" defense of stockneta people who will die vs people who will die.

**Speaker 4**

-67% of deterrents temporarily is better than 0%. Less money into kinetic warfare. Try to control your "oh" habit. Steal our "intellectual property" or whatever - find a better way to communicate.

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.*
## VPF

**FLIP: 22 Burns - Sudhakar v. 6 Rohilla - Dasika**

### Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Anthony Hall ('20)</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><em>Krishna Dasika</em></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><em>Vash Rohilla</em></td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

- **Pro** (Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? [ ]

The judge's signature: **Haritha Gande**

**School / Affiliation / Occupation:** Hamilton / Intel / Engineer

## Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Pro** - Very polite and logical. Made very good point that *COCO* can be offensive AND defensive. Tactic, but didn't push back with reasoning when asked. After all, a good offense is always a good defense!

**Con** - Very good logic and overall prep. $2.4M damage vs Presidency manipulation. COCO was not bothered. They don't seem to be able to understand that offensive COCO cannot be defensive. Opponents not bothered.

Opponents can hurt you, but you cannot be defensive.
Pro: - Gave a map to the argument that reverse engineered attacks are OCO's and therefore prove the effectiveness although at some cost.
- Made a great final focus and defended the case with data on which lives and livelihoods depend.

Con: - Casualties vs inconvenience is not a strong mapping. You could have used the impact of utilities going down to critical life saving systems/tools to make the point.
- You have great articulative ability, with a little more focus on legacy and a bit less combative tone, you will go a long way.
# 2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

**VPF**

FLIP: 25 Walters - Lepore v. 17 Groman - Warrior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Kailyn Riggs (*'22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>ED 236</strong></td>
</tr>
<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 R. Warrior</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd J. Groman</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Alex Walter</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Sophia Lepore</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Con: 1. Nuclear attack, cause direct, evident, 2. Exonerate 9 failed cause, 3. Lack of efficiency, harm, 175 cyber attacks.

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.

Signatures:

- Judge's Signature: [Signature]
- School / Affiliation / Occupation: Hamilton High School
1. Detecting away from.
2. ISIS ->
   evidence -
3. Student -> descaled into conflicts.
4. Russia - cyber operation.
   escalation - fear factor.
   what is escalation threshold.

Pro side wins the debate based on:
1. Excellent data points
2. Very methodical presentation
3. Great understanding of the topic.

Some inputs:
  Don't be too aggressive.

Con side:
Need more conviction.
More study of topic,
More evidence.
<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>Medha Tambe</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hollmann</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gili Sanyal</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Vishat Ahmed</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Con

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro: The oil shortage by Iran of the strategy of hermoso high oil prices will have an economic and war

Con: Attacks on critical infrastructure impacting lives causing economic impact

I think examples provided were not linked to cyber operations

Ab: Determine is not code word by OSO, if escalates

Sum: Determine works and there are no examples of harm coming from intrashred being targeted

Sum: Impact is real and we cause diminishes

X: No evidence for retaliation

Sum: Retaliation was happening before OSO
# VPF

**FLIP: 23 Ori - Sigalove v. 22 Bakshi - Kelly**

## Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th><strong>ED 336</strong></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>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Isabella Sigalove</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Pietro Ori</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

The winner of this debate is the **Pro** side. They were more prepared, had complete arguments and presented clearly & concisely. Great job!!

---

**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.
Offensive Cyber Operations

Isabella - Pro
  - Proactive Defense
  - Disruption Strategies (2018)
  - Reversibility (2018)
  - No collateral damage (2019)

Morgann - Con
  - Collateral damage
    - Civilians
    - 10,000,000 $1.5 mill (2017)
    - Relationships

Pietro - Pro
  - Better defense - good
  - Non-lethal - semantics of language
  - Shape of future - 2.4 comp. not people
  - Prevented nuclearization

Kay - Con
  - Copy attacks - reverse engineered attack
    - How do you know it wouldn't prevent nuclearization?
    - 3 months - why worse for us?

Excellent Cross on both sides

Forces you to vote: lol!!
Slowed development
Decreasing ability for war
Livedhhood outweighs on lives??

Summary:
- Defense offense - actively defend
- Very broken summary
- Doesn't flow/not connected

Mueller Report?

Great point?

FF3

Great cross
Pietro obviously knows his subject
Kay seemed to be getting frustrated
## VPF

**FLIP: 12 Yin - Clements v. 5 Parker - Swanton**

**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>ED 304A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Swanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Panay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points** *(20-30)*

| 1st | 28 |
| 2nd | 28.5 |

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

**(Circle Winner)**

**Is this a low point win?**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Pro** - carried contentions & supporting facts throughout. Was easy to follow & understand - good real world examples

**Con** - examples for contentions were not very thorough & difficult to understand - sometimes appeared a little disorganized

Both teams seemed to work really well together & support each other's arguments

Both teams - try to slow down how fast you talk - if I can't understand it because you are talking fast - I cannot judge it.
GREENLEAF, CHRIS
2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

VF
FLIP: 16 Hahne - Justice v. 7 Sengupta - Hepworth

Varisty Public Forum

Chris Greenleaf (*6)

Round 1
ED 338
Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Nick Hahne</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Carl Justice</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>Sachi Sengupta</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Caleb Hepworth</td>
<td>27</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: (GENERAL COMMENTS)**
- Case is very strong.
- Both speakers were passionate and enjoyable to watch.
- You both did an awesome job at defending your case.
- You guy started a bit slower, but more than made up for it on the final speeches.

**Pro: (Hahne - 1st speaker)**
- You are a very talented speaker. You were able to get your points across in a logical and efficient manner; i.e., you were fast enough, but not too fast - which I certainly appreciate! The case is very well-written, with a narrative, which is indicative of numerous credible sources. This helped bolster your case. Overall, very nicely done!

**Con: (Sengupta - 1st speaker)**
- You do a very good job of using tone, and pacing to emphasize your most important points. I like how, several times, you used not only one, but two sources to support your points. The case is unique, in the way that it sounds like a narrative, which is indicative of your case. Overall, you did fantastically, but again, I'd like to see even just a little more computer once or twice.
Thank you for making eye-contact! It makes it more interesting and easier to pay attention too. Don't let your words fall out quicker than you can articulate them. It wasn't a huge issue by any means, but it's something to pay attention to. Overall, you did a great job, especially at defending your own case! Great job on cross-ex! I've seen in a while.

You do something that I don't see very often and again: it mostly works: You are able to make me want to care through your conversational tone. ONLY thing I want to warn you about is please make sure you don't come across as too harsh or too biting. It wasn't bad at all, but it's something to be aware of. Overall, very nicely done! Great job on cross-ex! BEST cross I've seen in a while.

There is something major I noticed while you were doing your summary script directly in front of you. Don't get me wrong, both speeches thus far have been great! Only thing I want you to be aware of is it wasn't bad and I could tell that nerves were not really apart of this, BUT don't rely on it too much overall, a fantastic job! I especially appreciate the defense of your own case. Your partner and you are very complementary.

Right off the bat, I appreciated how you defended the sources/links that they had just, seconds ago attacked. I wish you would've made just a bit more eye-contact. I know nerves are a huge factor with EVERYONE, but a lot of judges really appreciate it. I will say however, when you did make eye-contact, I loved how you leaned in as if you were talking to me (an audience). Overall, a very good defense of your case! Well done.

Both cases had a few holes in them, but what you in meat, you more than made up for in sizzle! This comes down to who I think did better in the non-script sections, which can be improved.

You're very passionate about this case! I personally appreciated it. Just be careful not to come across as a bit too loud.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Brandon Sumner ('16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Lovelady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Panayotova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sathe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Shih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>(20-30)</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:** Focusing on impacts earlier in the debate & help with weighing. Some of the debate gets bogged down with the escalation debate, but I think you should attack their link and make it more instead. Your summary could have been more in detail as well.

**Con:** Good case and arguments, though I would try to do a better job defending your link chain throughout the round and clearly explaining how the economy would be affected. Impact work was started in summary but could have been handled better - why does the swing lives contention matter as much as the econ contention? You should spend more time on your offense.
LUKASZAK, KRISTEN

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

VPF

FLIP: 12 Adha - Garba v. 21 Gould - Berg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Kristen Lukaszak (*'23)</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 03:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>ED 230</strong></td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sophia Berg</td>
<td>Marc Garba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Autumn Gould</td>
<td>Dhruv Adha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>28.5</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:

In the issue of violating international law, Con was unable to rebut Pro’s assertion that cyber attacks are lawful under UBV treaties, etc. But aside that, this was a very tough decision as both sides did great!
### VPF

**FLIP: 15 Anthony - Anthony v. 22 Khan - Wong**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Chris Thiele (*'8)</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 Speaker</td>
<td>Emily Wong</td>
<td>Adele Anthony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Speaker</td>
<td>Sahil Khan</td>
<td>Asha Anthony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points (20-30)</strong></td>
<td>29</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:

Both teams were well prepared and focused on the resolution. Pro wins this round with its presenting evidence and attacking the con position of "colds" without evidence showing the deterrance was not worked. Pro had sound evidence of deterrance and that keeping OCOs would create less harm. Also pro argument of the normalizing of OCOs already was strong attack on escalation presented by con.
### Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Dipak Narotam (*10)</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>Matthew Corbo</td>
<td>Araeb Khan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kaja Decker</td>
<td>Sydrah Damir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</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:**

**AFF**
- Impact case in case needed work
- Summary is kinda disorganized

**NEG**
- Rebuttal needs better supporting & has a lot of stuff that looks substantive warrants or evidence
- Summary really disorganized
- Why did you leave out your prep for CF?

---

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>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>3 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**RES:** Voted AFF due to better warranting & response.

Nuclear arms flows AFF, since NEG never responded to args brought up in summary & extended through round.

AFF also outweighs on econ, NEG response about individual impacts not well warranted...
**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Satya Taduri ('2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>ED 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Frida Gutierrez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Cole Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Aidan Briggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ava Flansbaum</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 cyber operations outweigh harms. Con

Response not convincing. (Used Iran relations as good and partners in current environment)

**Prep Time**

- OCO used for deterrence: Iran, Russia, N. W. Korea, Iran's divide and rule strategy, always have a lower nation to look at, moderate and threatening states.

- Iran is not a state with a nuclear weapon. OCO is not enough deterrent.

**Crossfire**

- Made good argument of how terrorism is a result of deterrence and not an alternative. Could not cite specific example. Made good argument of economic impact of cyber attacks.

**Final Focus**

- OCO deterrence to Iran:
- OCO works but not works.

**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.
Varity Public Forum

Round 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Nirmitha H.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Amrit Bal</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Con

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Komal Matharu</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sayni Patel</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro (Circle Winner)

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro

- Cybersecurity must be employed to ensure safety against attacks.
- Thousands of attacks.
- Investigative offensive - determine what they have.
- N.Korean attack.
- Logic Bomb.

Con

- Escalation inevitable - enforces retaliation.
- What is the true motivation?
- U.S. leading cybersecurity but other countries copying their tactics to needs.
- Financial attacks - retaliatory.
- Cyber property attacks against an effort to retaliate.

Defence

- U.S. attacks have no effect.
- They retaliate by attacking financial institutions.
- Every other one hatch by developing it.

Pro reflections - will not escalate counter attacks.
- Russia and China.

Con reflections - increasing information.
- Attack on American oil industry.
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This was an extremely difficult decision because both teams did an outstanding job and were well-prepared.

Excellent arguments on both sides.

Great arguments on both sides.

Both sides are extremely well-prepared and articulated. Excellent arguments. Well informed. Excellent debate!!

Excellent arguments.

Great answers regarding great questions.
Con

- Nuclear engineering
- Offensive tactics - contributing to 
  others knowledge of 
  me to launch cyber attacks
- Escalation
  - Defense - not offensive
  - Making country more vulnerable
  - Iran repurposed cyber attack into a weapon

Chinese attacks 2003

Impact: Prevent rather than adapting economically

Pro

Investigate cyber aggressive

Looking for missiles targeted @ us.

To cyber operators to find out what they need.

Found missiles

China - destroying military doctrine & infrastructure

We need to create a doctrine to secure safety

U.N. needs rules to develop rules

Con

- Taking away resources to build defense
  ... if we are attacked, then resources will be needed to
  protect selves

- Remaining unaddressed
- 400 million                                                                
  resources
- U.S. studies compromised

- Intellectual property: jobs question. Still not clear how jobs will be lost.
  China thinks
  not clear how jobs will be lost.
  China thinks
  because new innovative strategies
  programs, systems
  will still need development

Losing human resources we create

Initiating attacks causes theft of property

Pro

Escalation

Need to investigate to prepare
Threat not unanimous

Rules; regulations

Conv. - Russia ahead

Con

- Nuclear engineering
  - Give blueprint - intellectual
  - Unsecured
  - Financial shock - property
  - Russian threat

U.N. needs to continue