VPF
2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

FLIP: 25 Walters - Lepore v. 10 Mantri - Narotam

Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Eden Gustin (*22)</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Alex Walter</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sophie Lepore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Krish Narotam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pranav Mantri</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was
Pro
(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ___

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Att
- Know your times, use all of it
- Follow normal PF cases (contentions, cause, links, impacts)
- Rebuttal needs to go down the entire case (refute each party's evidence)
- Nuclear war is not likely
- Also they can talk globally not just the United States
- Summary - have key voters with sign (ex. save lives, cheaper)
- Use off time road map
- Final focus has needs key voters with signpost
- Neg did quantity...
- You need a global lens.

Neg
- Minus
- In rebuttal
  1) you proved escalation in Iran but please just state it (you could have made a bigger argument due to how much time you had)
  2) you shouldn't refute the education point that way (you killed the contention by hurting and aliquoting)
- Summary I need you to list key voters (less reputation more weighing)
- Should have flowed good price costs without spikes
- USE KEY VOTERS IN SUM + FF

Neg had better overall responses to the Aff case

weighing was used by Neg case
#1 Gave a clear layout of contentions with specific examples.
- Provided good definition of CEO effect.
- Effectively pointed out that Pro side did not define difference between CEO & DCEO.
- It was hard to follow your answers on cross.
- Strong framing of weakness in Con side that the only alternative they could rely on was direct military action.

#2 Pro effectively pointed out Con's weakness that did not support contention that democratic institutions would be harmed.
- Effectively pointed out that Con did not address Pro argument that ISIS would be deterred by CEO.
- You speak too fast when looking down at your computer to read your argument.
- You were unable to provide data to show threat of ISIS had been decreased by CEO.
- Excellent use of Con's closing analogy to show why your argument was the better one.

Pro was ultimately more persuasive because of the clarity of their roadmap and effectively pointing out arguments not rebutted by Con side.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Con

#1 Gave articulate opening statement with good imagery that new Cold War could occur.
- Spoke too fast when reading from computer.
- It was clear you listened to questions on cross-exam and quickly gave clear, concise responses.
- Provided solid breakdown of argument on summary.

#2 Strong argument that by ISS's are not easily detected, they cannot be a good deterrent.
- Very good question challenging data to support Pro's contention re: ISS.
- I didn't hear the argument in final focus about being willing to negotiate in poor speeches from you.
The winner of this debate was

Pro [Con]

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? No

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1. The Con have much more evidence.
2. I really like the reasoning & analysis process of the Con team.
3. Both sides ask a lot of good questions, but I think the Con team gave more good answers.
4. However, the Con team look weak in source of some facts.

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 argued OCOs served as deterrent to other nations, citing John Bolton, effectively blurring distinction between offense + defense.

CON argued OCOs have increased overall, resulting in normalization of use; use of OCOs has massive impact in lives + $ lost.

REASON → PRO's case relied on assertion of hawkish Bolton that was not supported by other, more reliable evidence of deterrent effect. CON's argument persuaded me that overall increase in OCOs had substantial negative consequences w/o commensurate national security benefits.
04

In consideration of the sum of $10,000, to be paid by the

Baker to the said John Doe, the said John Doe agrees to
give to the said Baker the following:

A one-family house at 123 Main St.,

The said John Doe shall execute a deed of

deed to the said Baker upon the

payment of the sum of $10,000.

In witness whereof, the said John Doe

has caused his name to be signed

date of this agreement.

John Doe
### VPF

**FLIP: 11 Lovelady - Panayotova v. 9 Pertovsky - Sarfati**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Alek Kemeny (*10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Lovelady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Panayotova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sarfati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Pertovsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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:

1. Neg had no link into QGs
2. Neg impact on power grid highly improbable
3. Extended OCO, cheaper and kill less civilians, so vote Pro.

---

**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.
BONNICHSEN, DANIEL

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

FLIP: 10 Tambe - Sanyal v. 5 Parker - Swanton

Varsity Public Forum

Daniel Bonnichsen (*6)

<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>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>TAMBE</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>SWANTON</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>SANYAL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>PARKER</td>
<td>28</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:

The burden of proof in this case was to prove that the US' use of COs directly leads to escalation and that the advantages of their use. I felt that Pro was able to a) assuage the 1.3 billion poverty impact and b) prove that minimal escalation in the face of increasing other attacks in the SOW is outweighed by the benefits of the use of COs for security and economic reasons.

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>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Pranav, Iyer</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Carolyn Clements</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Max Sigsworth</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Jia Tian Yin</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was Pro

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.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Good answer to con x-fire.
- 000 - defensive (Gather Intel) + offensive
- Good solvency options, sig aware.
- Counter attack is defense in offense fashion => by defense is ok.
- Good summary, solvency is benefit.
- 000 source traced good.
- It will act as deter.
- OCO attack goin on 6/24 by China.
- If US drop, OCO, it gain more arm to China to continue.
- UN or G8 was creditor in x-fire.

Reason: Agree with Pro, solvency is a benefit of using OCO. US indirect deep set protection by OCO by contin threat by China / Russia.
**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Sandi Torres (*21)</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 04:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sigalove</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Ori</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was

Pro ☐ Con ☑

(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.

Comment: Verbal Comments

Signature: Sandi Torres

School / Affiliation / Occupation: Perry

Note: Broken hand
## VPF

**FLIP: 10 Griffin - Jagdish v. 22 Burns - Sudhakar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Shani Anthony (*15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Speaker | Pro
| 1st     | Sydney Burns       |
| 2nd     | Sita Sudhakar       |
| Points  | 22                  |

| Speaker | Con
| 1st     | Jagdish             |
| 2nd     | Griffin             |
| Points  | 27                  |

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
- 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
- 3 minutes Prep Time per side

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Pro -**
- Great conclusions
- Your sources were convincing
- But what worked previously worked using CO's
- Try to answer the questions your asked without diverting
- Argument against their retaliation point didn't make sense to me
- Nice job during grand crossfire
- What's happening in the present (effects and what not) is a strong argument and a great way to conclude

**Con -**
- Great start
- Really good points
- Impressive responses to questioning
- Great points about retaliation and how fast they occur
- Your rebuttals in summary were impressive
- Way to be prepared!

- Your arguments about how fixing the problem with what caused the problem in the first place is what ultimately swayed me in your favor

**Great Job**
## 2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

**VPF**

**FLIP: 17 Groman - Warrier v. 16 Hays - Nair**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Sarah Ely (*113)</th>
<th>Johanna Crowl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td>ED 320</td>
<td>Fri 12/06/19 04:30PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Warrier 29</td>
<td>Hays 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Groman 30</td>
<td>Nair 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? NO

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Cyber warfare is effective & can be used in conjunction & impact -> saving lives

- NEG does not do enough to prove their impacts will materialize / are materializing

**Judge's Signature:** Johanna Crowl

**School / Affiliation / Occupation:** Desert Vista

### 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.
Varsity Public Forum

Round 2

Speaker | Pro Points (20-30)
-------|----------------------
1st    | Sengupta 26.5
2nd    | Hepworth 28

The winner of this debate was

Pro Con
(Circle Winner)

Dipak Narotam (*10)
ED 336 Fri 12/06/19 04:30PM

Speaker | Con Points (20-30)
-------|----------------------
1st    | Kelly 29
2nd    | Bakshi 28

The winner of this debate was

Pro Con
(Circle Winner)

Judge's Signature

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Enunciate especially on your taglines/contention names when reading your case to make it more clear
- Be confident during your rebuttal! You show it in CX so I know it's there
- You guys need more evidence bc your logic is strong, but you don't have anything to back it up
- Make sure you can answer what most important voter is from very beginning - don't be dodgy during CX
- Never use speed in rebuttal, you have to make sure you're still speaking clearly. I got it all, but I definitely missed words
- Second rebuttal should be frontlining
- "that's a lie" comment was unnecessarily rude

RFD: I end up voting negative because of the clean extensions made throughout the round. Despite buying the logic of the affirmative position more, this only came out at the end and all links/impact were flowed through unk. Great job overall!
Both teams were polite, organized, and effectively argued.

Gutierrez was too fast with initial delivery but was able to slow it down as she progressed throughout the rounds. All other speakers kept a slower more understandable pace throughout. Each team clearly listened to the other's points and methodically responded.

Crossfires were well handled. Ultimately "Pro" - affirmative had a slight edge with their data and challenging the others points.
### VPF

**FLIP: 12 Adha - Garba v. 13 Damir - Decker**

**2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Satya Taduri (*2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>ED 330</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</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner) **No**

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**Pros:**
- Benefits of OCO outweigh harms
- Cons argue the winners based on specific examples, clear arguments, and winning 2/3 citations
- Cons had good closing arguments

**Cons:**
- 2nd Special Ops gives opportunity to weigh in need for support
- Countercase necessary
- Counter to attack necessary
- 1st Special Ops can protect
- Global issue, instability
- Global war breaks
tension across UN
- Counter reconnaissance
- Early said US was weak in cyber attacks
- 2nd summary tried to counter opponents arguments but was specific
- Unspecific
- Hesitated during summary
- Prepped notes from partner
- Run out of time to ask questions
- Loss of 2/3 arguments
- Failed to ask questions
- Con's did not provide evidence

**Crossfire:**
- Cited source for rebuttal
- Proof of counter-attacks
- Counters argument, response to them
- Clear and concise arguments

**3rd finish focus...**

**Final Focus...**

**Order/Time Limits of Speeches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker 1</th>
<th>Speaker 2</th>
<th>Crossfire (1 &amp; 2)</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>2 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.*
I know I said I was fine w/ speed & I could understand you, however you didn't need to. If you cut down you can still get all your points across w/o having to just because you refute it. It doesn't mean it shouldn't be flown through if the US isn't ready for others are other countries? Hope this is a response in the NR she states this is to your benefit if successful & good resp. make clear that you win & thus they concede w/ the nuclear war issue (you should've said nuclear weapon creation hasn't even cause nuke war).

You opp conceded retaliation in AR, why didn't you link it too?