**VPF**

**2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy**

**FLIP: 10 Mantri - Narotam v. 13 Damir - Decker**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Claire van Doren ('22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Round 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>ED 228</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Points</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>(20-30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Kyra Decker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Sydrah Damir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Krishna Narotam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Pranav Mantri</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. **Pro** convinced me of the value of offensive COs by laying out 3 ways they had disrupted ISIS ($, recruitment & communications).
2. The necessity to reciprocate against Russian OCs.
3. US key deterrent OBO NATO. Both groups used definitions effectively.

**Pro** clearly restated persuasive arguments 3x.
**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Con Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Clements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Flansbaum</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Yin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Con**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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:**

- With the alt. the point made about the studies being with civilians rather than countries was a huge loss in legitimacy.
- Also, the point made that NSP13 is a national law not an international law was compelling, and even though offensive strategies could save lives from nukes, I did think it was a leap to assume that other countries would jump straight to nukes.

---

**Briggs & Flansbaum**

- Wow! You two are very articulate and well spoken.

**Clements**

- You had very good attacks on their points that ultimately won you the debate.

**Yin**

- Debate is definitely an incredible skill, and I think you are so great in giving it a whirl! Perhaps work on a better organizational strategy. At times you lost your place.
OSO - passive/active cyber operations
- neg aut way poss
1. Increase tension across countries
   - Malware in Russia - one and willing to retaliate
   - Israeli attack in Gaza
2. US offensive breaks law
   - UN & NATO
3. Disadvantage in cyber war
   - Advisers have been able to thwart many since 1980
   - 2018 report - cyber attack resulted in guns, missiles to fail

1. Cannot defend against cyber attack
2. Cyber criminals increase sophistication of
   schemes - can't protect against all hackers
3. Protect against democracy
   - Not directly damage lives lost
   Chance for counter attack and at disadvantage

1. Lose allies by breaking international law
2. Cyber attacks have no laws tied to
   - Study done on people not countries
   NSP13 done by president not NATO/UN

China, Russia, Iran haven't signed agreement

1. Protection against hackers
   A- political - numerous countries can engage so we need to defend
2. Defeats - fight back
   A- stealth war
     Decrease threat civilian lives
     Decrease in lost military lives

While use of offensive = save lives
No evidence of UN/NATO not retaliating
   for breaking treaty

LTT war experiments - large crises
   9/11 toward deescalating report
   Offensive cyber operations doesn't always escalate

- Iran - we need things to escalate
- Retaliation is a sign defenses are working
- Iran - could produce more nukes

Cyber command - NSP13
   We have been given legal go to
defend
   if not strong enough in defense, should we attack offensively?

1. Nat. sec. - deterrent aren't necessary
   - Works unable to detonate but
     Iran unable to back up threats

2. Lives - Georgia lives saved
   Military/civilians saved by
   Avoiding conventional military

Cyber war can save lives and deter war
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Danielle Delgado (*'11)</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 06:30PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Varner</td>
<td>Jagdish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Groman</td>
<td>Griffin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Start by refuting, not rebuilding
- Misrepresenting the 32% response
- Need to better understand intricacies of foreign conflicts
- Did you link sanctions to OCOs? 4 like sanctions are cyber retaliations?
- ISIS not a threat > refer to AC notes
- All the Russian attacks are kept going in circles, it's your job to direct the question and instead of Russian attacking is it what is the likelihood of the US attacking Russia? (if we knew this potential)
- Need to link low risk to Russia won't react under their logic
- Need concession that success is relative
- Link to Syria to strengthen terrorism refutation

I vote Pro. From low risk link to Russia not big threat to proven

Judge's Signature: TRA/11

School / Affiliation / Occupation:
## VPF

### Varisty Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Harsha Hakkal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Krishna Desika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Yash Rohilla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Points (20-30)**

- **ED 250**
- **Fri 12/06/19 06:30PM**

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

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

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

A great debate! Both teams were amazing! Both teams worked really well together, I believe that Con won the debate because they had better claims. I thought their content about how nuclear attacks affect small is very relevant. The Aff new role was able to rebut this point.

---

**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

**Round 3**

**Speaker**
- **Pro**
  - 1st: Nirmita Hamsanipally (28)
  - 2nd: Amrit Bal (27)

**Con**
- 1st: Medina Tamor (29)
- 2nd: Orril Sanyel (28)

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**
- Framework unnecessary (implied)
- Look at judge during (X) questioning
- Jester program seems defensive
- Most of your case + rebuttal was a narrative - simplicity/summarize the facts/data and you can cover more
- I need clear impacts in the case (list impacts)
- Cyber security ≠ cyber offense
- Do not leave me with a question, tell me how to vote

**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

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

**RFD**

**Better rebuttal and addressing other arguments.**
### VPF

**FLIP: 10 Sathe - Shih v. 22 Khan - Wong**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varsity Public Forum</th>
<th>Kristen Lukaszak (*'23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>ED 338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Points (20-30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sathe</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Wong</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>shih</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Khan</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:

Con presented persuasive argument of increased risk due to counter hack and thereby placing civilians at risk of harm.

#### 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.
SRIRAM, ANANTH

2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

VPF

FLIP: 9 Pertovsky - Sarfati v. 22 Bakshi - Kelly

Varsity Public Forum

Ananth Sriram (*'12)

Round 3

ED 236

Fri 12/06/19 06:30PM

Speaker

Pro

Points (20-30)

1st
Morgann Kelly

30

2nd
Kay Bakshi

24

Con

Speaker

Points (20-30)

1st
Esiana Sarfati

28

2nd
Shelly Pertovsky

21

The winner of this debate was

Pro

Con

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win?

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff 57s

- Morgan Kelly

- Good delivery
- Good contentions supporting the aff
- A little monotone
- Impacts need to be emphasized

Neg Sarfati

- Good discussion of impacts
- Good way to discuss the domino impacts
- Government programs
- Summary could have been distributed equally

Con Bakshi

- Discusses anti-military budget
- How does budget stay the same
- I thought there was a good tone
- Grand Cross

50 seconds left

Pertovsky

- Somewhat of a rude tone
- Spreading
- Good discussion and analysis
- Good discussion of Social Causes
- Offensive is not as valuable or helpful
- Russia infiltrated
- Hegemony
- Money can be allocated to different areas
- Final focus delivery could have been better
Aff

Det. OCD

- Preventing conflict with Iran
  - Personnel
  - Disruptive economically
  - Killed 650 troops
  - Cyberstrikes are covert

Necessary for terrorists
  - Server was successful
  - Infrastructure does not offer

Neg

- Economy
  - More expensive
  - Good domestic examples
  - Good discussion of impacts
  - More vulnerable to cyber attacks
- Impact is lives
### VPF

#### FLIP: 16 Hays - Nair v. 21 Gould - Berg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Tom Spector (*9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>William Hays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Arjun Nair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Sophie Berg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Autumn Gould</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Pro**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? ___________

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- **Is this take down media - kills its credit or appearance - disrupting truce and cut off funding**
- German tension
- Nuclear impact
- Create *immediacy* and not open on its last words
- Tensions are already imminent

---

### 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.
It has been done for years and it has not done anything

- do not give example of retaliation
- did not attack ISIS and Saudia

- cyber is not anonymous
  It does create tension
  - attacked the websites
  - attacked 33% metabolism

- what does deciding home to do with if there's evidence of retaliation? It's minor
- impacts have been proven retaliation has not

- It is still unclear and it's not clear what does it mean "mostly"?
  - retaliation is real
**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Dhanunjaya Penmatcha (*2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Matharu</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Patel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td><strong>Pyen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td><strong>Sigsworth</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

- Pro team found weak points in Aff. team argument. Both teams were well prepared.

**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 prep time per side

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.

---

1. Good eye contact.
2. Well prepared material and easy flow speaking naturally.
3. Some of the facts are supported with evidence e.g. finger print, Isis effectiveness.
4. Need to identify more weak points in contention.

---

1. Good eye contact on key points.
2. Well prepared material. Speaking naturally.
3. Highlighted key weak points in opponent.
4. Contentions need to be strong. Need more supporting material.
Cook:
1. ISIS
2. Intell. - Pox threat
3. Jobs - lesser evil

S3:
1. Un - incalculable points
2. Other weapons - costly
3. Affair - point 1/2

Cont:
1. Legal issue & costs
2. Risk - 0.05
3. Taking operations difficult to use

Comm:
1. Good eye contact to make point

Prep:
57 sec
1:40 sec

S4:
Unsubstantiated
No - quantity
Finger print - connected
evidence - No care - inference

5:
Quantity - care, provided heritage cared - misinterpreted

Prep:
0.05

S2:
No impact - 0.00
## VPF

**FLIP: 12 Adha - Garba v. 11 Lovelady - Panayotova**

### 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>Stella Lovelady</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Marc Garba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Violeta Panayotova</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Dhruv Adha</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: neither of the last two FF speeches gave me a clear idea of what I'd be voting on, and/or tried to cover too much ground and thereby spread itself out too thin. I ended up defaulting to Pro's "empires" framing.

---

**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 of Prep Time per side

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>ED 304A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Con</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Isabella Sigalove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Pietro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

**AFF**
- summary could be better organized
- consider key voters

**NEG**
- recess had been really no signposting, which made it really hard to figure out where to flow stuff
- also, you don't quite respond specifically to things?
- reading general block
- the summary doesn't necessarily go any new responses + only extends old responses
- maybe you give more examples, but you don't actually respond to new AFF arg 3 from rebuttal or summary

**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 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>2 min</td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>3 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker.
Very clear argument and contentions, easy to follow, and good job keeping track of every argument in every round.

Your opponents dodged a couple of questions, so don't let them!

Solid engagement, but fluency could use a little work.

Information/cites were really good! Good job keeping up with counter arguments, but if your opponent is focusing on one thing (human rights), make sure you have a clear response.

Fluency was good, but engage your judge/opponents more (eye contact, smiling, etc.)
# VPF

**2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy**

**Varsity Public Forum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Nadia Jafar (*10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Swanton 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parker 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Hahne 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justice 30</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
- 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:

- Offensive action against ISIS
- No direct deaths vs. deaths of physical
we have improved ccos, have not reverse engineered since no deaths

reverse engineering
- Saudi attacked
- could cause recession
- China wants parity w/ US ccms
- 900 mil people = poverty
- ISIS & won't be deterred
- more willingly than physical = more deaths w/ less resources
### 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:

- Nat Sec → New Warsaw
- Is US really behind in OCO than Russ/Chi/Ira? Not sure
- Crossfire → Pro unable to convince or answer any of Con's questions
- Con unable to come back to their guns
- Summ Con did provide
  - 4th gen ex: Warrsy + VR grid
- Con's 1st = Agree US is behind in OCO than rest of us could
- Coll damage
  - How US Espionage
  - Good in x-fire, able to defend any layout PRO
  - Pro went 1st, got to say last
  - Good points as in x-fire that left un-answered
  - Only 11% of OCO's have effect
  - Explained alternatives, opers of Caribou, diplomatic, less costly & could be more effective
  - Expanded NATO, etc.
  - US gave OCO capability to other for counter attack
  - Sarchers are all-right, AGREE

---

### Varsity Public Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>ED 230</th>
<th>Fri 12/06/19 08:30:00PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Matthew Corbo</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Areeb Khan</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td>(20-30)</td>
<td>Points (20-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---

### 2019 ASDCA D1 Winter Trophy

**FLIP: 25 Khan - Corbo v. 22 Brown - Gutierrez**

**BREECE, CARLY**

**CHEEMA, DEEPAK**

**VPF**