

14

Yu Zhao - AofHL**FLIGHT: B**

Open Public Forum - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 517

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM**10:30****Affirmative:** Kudos College of Youth Leadership
AC & CL**Negative:** Nova 42 Academy TR & KZ

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
3	Andy Chen ✓	2	74
1	Claire Liu ✓	2	76

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
2	Taara Reddy ✓	1	70
4	Kevin Zhang ✓	1	78

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Claire: good speed, clear w/ good interaction,
give examples to address counter,
clearly defined

Taara: good hand gesture

Andy: clear voice, articulate argument

Kevin: great hand gesture, smooth flow

15

Yu Zhao - AofHL**FLIGHT: A**

Open Public Forum - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 517

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM**10:30****Affirmative:** Kudos College of Youth Leadership
SH & MA**Negative:** Noya 42 Academy FY & ED

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
1	Shirlyn Huang	3	20
3	Madeline Ang	1	27

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
2	Felicia Ye	4	24
4	Elizabeth Dashbold	2	26

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Shirlyn: good use of examples, address to judge
emphasize key words, good hand gestures

Felicia: good eye contact, could slow down a little
clear structure of argument, went 20 sec over

Madeline: hand gesture, clarify terms, good rebuttal.

Elizabeth: good use of stats, good crossfire questions

16

Nova 42 judge 2 - Nova 42

FLIGHT: B

Open Public Forum - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 457

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM

10:30

NEG1:
Affirmative: Wilshire Academy BA & AJ

AFF:
Negative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership SD & MY

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
NEG1	Brandon An	4	92 VC
NEG1	Andrew Jo	3	94 VC

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
AFF	Sophia Dai	1	97 VC
AFF	Melody Yu	2	95 VC

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

Valvin CM
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

NOVA
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

AFF
S1 (MY) - cyber saves lives
- US has lost intellectual property
- cyber-op deters (US needs to keep up)
- oppose friction
- stop bad actors to attack US & allies
↓ terrorism, ↓ attacks, safer elections, ↑ democracy

NEG1 S1 (AJ)
1. cyber-op → war
- cost resources + lives
- losing cyber war
IMPACT - lives, \$, resources ↓
2. COSTLY
- \$, debt 22 trillion
- cyber-op unnecessary
3. cyber Arms Race
- cyber space
- US Air Force computer cyber-attacks
- ex. cold war → repeat

CX1 cyber-op will (AFF) prevent debt
- analogy to why we need to keep up w/ cyber-op
- cyber arms race inevitable

AFF(S2) SD
- cyber war ↓ bc US is ahead
- N1 - US countered military tactic attack IRAN
- US gain strategic value
- N2 - US gain more than lose
- "1 million not that expensive"
- N3 - ↓ retaliation & deter
- other countries won't want to attack US
- military strat & enough

NEG1 (S2) BA
- instability in I.R.
- lives @ risk / country allies
- NK - country hacked
- Microsoft hired hackers
- \$96.4 million - O.C.O.

CF2 - O.C.O - effective in protecting us
AWE are in a cyber arms race
won the brink of cyber warfare
enemies will attack us
if yes, we are vulnerable to attacks

AFF(S1) SUM
- O.C.O.s will save lives / \$
- China's strength therefore cyber-ops needed
- physical war → ↑ \$

NEG1 (S1) SUM
- rebuilt costly war
GIF - ↑ enviro harm w/o O.C.O.
- intellectual property theft
- China will not attack US

AFF (2) FF
- offensive exploits
- dropped - OCO saves life
- impacts - deter enemy
- necessary in today's era

NEG1 (2) today's era
- O.C.O not effective
- environment - addressed in GIF
- China ahead of us in cyber warfare
- OCO ineffective → how?
- pollution - NA.

DECISION

- NEG dropped the AFF's contention
- AFF turned the NEG's environmental harms contention
- NEG brought up a new argument on pollution in their last final focus speech

13

Joey Giancanelli - Kudos Leadership

FLIGHT: A

Open Public Forum - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 508

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM

10:30

Affirmative: Wilshire Academy AL & SL

Pro

Negative: Nova 42 Academy JK & AY

Con

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
2	Andrew Lee	1	43 JG
1	Sean Lee	2	47 JG

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
2	Jayden Kuo	4	83 JG
1	Angela Yuan	3	87 JG

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Strong well formulated arguments that ended with Aff.
having 4 arguments they had to concede on.

12

Nova 42 Judge 3 - Nova 42**FLIGHT: B**

Open Public Forum - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 511

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM**10:30****Affirmative:** Kudos College of Youth Leadership
KH & SG**Negative:** Wilshire Academy ML & MH

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
2	Kaitlyn Huang	2	9.9
1	Susie Gu	1	10.0

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
1	Monica Lee	4	17
2	Matthew Hyun	3	9.8

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Susie - Great exposition, good contentions

Monica - Your contention 2 about Google home is not linked to USFG, Google collects that information, not the USFG, Also contention 3 about the ozone layer seems dubious & hyperbolic, I need stronger links on this point, it's not strong enough.

Kaitlyn - Solid analysis, strengthened your partner's contentions

Matthew - I like your analysis, good speaker, but you need to be more quick on your feet with responses, there were quite a few quite stalls.

I Vote Aff, there was a moment in the second neg speaker's speech where he for 10 seconds could not conjure up a reason why cyber attacks don't work. In terms of the efficiency of deterrence, the neg needs to do more work here. Citizen surveillance is a good point, but you're not using the best arguments here, Google home is not a good example. More impacts on spying on its citizens, & tell me how that outweighs against the rest of the Aff's contentions.

Natalie Yates - AofHL

FLIGHT: A

Open Public Forum - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 455

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM

10:30

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
JW & CL

Negative: Nova 42 Academy SS & JW

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
-----	------	----------	------------

2nd Aff Joleen Wong

4

Chloe Leong

3 99

<u>Pos</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>RK (1-4)</u>	<u>PTS (30-1)</u>
------------	-------------	-----------------	-------------------

1st
Sodongpo Sodtuya

2 209

James Wang

1 8/9

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win?

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Excellent Debate. Both sides were strong w/ solid evidence
I personally feel the both sides attacked all contentions.
and didn't drop a point.

I feel we had a strong argument and brought up a good point re. our country already having other measures but the defense is ~~not~~ not that then we can still be ~~affected~~ hurt in any way.

At you had a solid closing but I feel that
the Neg had stronger points rather in fact
that seem more feasible.

Neither side gave ~~the~~ numbers for their audience
but ~~both~~ sides were strong. I just think there
News audience. Iran and ~~refugees~~ ^{and losses} were in the

10

Joey Giancanelli - Kudos Leadership

FLIGHT: B

Open Public Forum - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 508

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM

10:30

Affirmative: Wilshire Academy RK & JL

Negative: Perfect Score Academy RL & JC

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
1st	Rich Kang	1	27 JG
2nd	Justin Lee	3	25 JG

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
1st	Ryan Lee	2	26 JG
2nd	Jacob Cho	4	23 JG

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Well formulated whole debate, but the main point was privacy vs safety and can end up taking it by having more evidence and backing.

9

Carol Chong - AofHL**FLIGHT: A**

Open Public Forum - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 521

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM**10:30****Affirmative:** Kudos College of Youth Leadership
PH & SR

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
2	Pearl Hsieh	1	87 80
1	Sophia Ren	2	86 80

Negative: Nova 42 Academy DB & WZ

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
2	Daniel Baek	3	85 80
1	William Zhao	4	84 80

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

A of HL

~~1:30~~ 1:00 Neq

1. Cyber opts.

2. escalation in retaliation

A.

B. distrust on nation

- destruction of infrastructure.

- Cyber War

- 4%

~~1:00~~ 4:00 Aff

1. OCO are very effective

- block internet access

2. Protect against cyber attacks

- military conflict

- country's online

- using cyber deterrence.

- economic loss

3. Increase

- hotline agreement

- OCO

- create treaty's.

- stop tensionism

- Cyber warfare is the future

- prepare

- save lives

8

Stephanie Levitt - Emerson

FLIGHT: B

Open Public Forum - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 525

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM

10:30

Affirmative: Nova 42 Academy LW & JQ

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
2	Leslie Wang	2	28.96 HM
1	Jennifer Quach	3	28.94 HM

Negative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership NS & SC

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
2	Nancy Sun	4	28.92 HM
1	Jevon Mao	1	28.98 HM

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? W

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Wilshire

Leslie — Finish your thoughts. You make good points but didn't explain why those points mattered to your argument.

Jennifer — Just talk. You were a bit nervous and didn't explain everything you had. The point about Iran was good but you didn't prove why that was the US's fault. Also try to think of other examples where deterrence fails like Trump's economic sanctions.

All team advice on back —→

Levon - Follow through on your arguments. You had a great summary, but you should be able to extend both points you made in your IAC during the summary and you didn't.

Nancy - Use all of your time to reinforce arguments and provide more evidence to support your position. You left too much time on all of your speeches.

a 42

Nova 42 Judge 1 - Nova 42

FLIGHT: A

Open Public Forum - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round 1

Room: E3 451

9AM

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

10:30

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
AJ & SC 7/7/12

~~Negative:~~ Wilshire Academy HS & BS

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
-----	------	----------	------------

1 Annie Jiang

3

PTS (30-1)

~~Qia~~

2 Sarah Chen

и

20

<u>Pos</u>	<u>Name</u>
------------	-------------

4 Hadveh Saborouh

RK (1-4)

1

PTS (30-1)

~~_____~~

2 Ben Suh

2

8

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win?

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

AFF

- ~~Net Bunking~~ - Saving
- ~~Carbon Arrows~~ incs
- ~~Racer~~ - Physical
- Very effective warfare
- Cyber Space Global - drug
- Cost / Benefit Traffickers
- Analysis - threats
- Technology - Drop Argument #2
- Cyber bomb by NEE
- ~~Nato OSICS~~
- Nato OSICS
- Sex Traffickers

Clash

- Cyber operation
- War
- Attack
- previous
- Cyber obtrus war
- Cyber
- against future
- own citizens done
- technology
- North
- Criteria
- Korea
- Cyber War
- "Arms Race"
- missiles
- Samsung-Incs
- Conflict
- deterrence
- a.c. m.p.l.
- Iran Examples
- Beda
- Space Race
- fund
- "cold war"
- O.C.O.S
- example

- 9:20 Feb
- the round start
- NIG - Boos Sr
- echnon
- Senghans
- preening war
- h-s use cyber system on there on currency
- 5.6 million finger prints
- 21 million govt employee information stolen
- North Korea - Echnon
- War cost thousands
- Evidence speech construct 1222

RFD: AFF case did a better job ^{example} on Magh-Ardel scores & growth of saving lines

6

Carol Chong - AofHL

FLIGHT: B

Open Public Forum - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 521

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM

Negative

10:30

Affirmative~~Affirmative~~: Emerson Community Charter School AE & SG~~Negative~~: Kudos College of Youth Leadership KK & MC

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
<u>2</u>	Aaron Eliassian	<u>3</u>	<u>96</u> 95
<u>1</u>	Sophie Gopen	<u>4</u>	<u>95</u> 94

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
<u>1</u>	Katherine Kligys	<u>1</u>	<u>98</u> 97
<u>2</u>	Melody Chang	<u>2</u>	<u>97</u> 96

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

A of HL

~~0:55~~ ~~1:00~~ Neg

1. Trade-offs
 - defense

2. Cyber weapons

- used OCO to attack the U.S. (China)
- copycat problems

Impact: Lives

- drone strikes
 - does not promote peace
- poverty

~~1:30~~ Aff

~~2:58~~ 3:38

1. increases

A. defense

- cyber conflict

B. UN electronic warfare

C. advance in cyber warfare

- Super power status
- promotes peace → impact

2. effective

A. Russian

- B. prevent escalation → impact

C. Cheap

1. walls & ladders.

defense is not better than offense.

2. Cyber defense

- Cyber attacks are effective
- E.C. against cyber copycat.

3. Protect against future cyber attacks.
4. intellectual property → stolen property

5

Nova 42 Judge 3 - Nova 42

FLIGHT: A

Open Public Forum - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 511

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM Neg

Aff

10:30

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
HX & AL

Negative: Perfect Score Academy AC & AC

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
2	Hanbo Xu	4	96
1	Andy Liu	1	100

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
2	Ariel Choe	3	97
1	Amanda Chu	2	98

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ☒

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Nova

Ariel - The Neg's contention about Russia interfering on social media has no impact? Your Partner's own speech literally gives the impact about its effect on US elections.

Amanda - Solid case structure

Andy - Great analysis & impact calc, You have a great understanding of the res

Hanbo - Your case sounds good, but upon second look at the res, many of the examples like the hospital attacks or Chernobyl don't apply to the US, they are foreign instances.

I vote Aff on staying closer to the resolution. Neg brings up good points about the dangers of cyber attacks, but no link to how it ties to the US. On a topic concerning the US, using non mil/war examples of the UK & Ukraine don't assist your case, give me examples of US electrical grids being shut down, or US hospitals, not the UK. I'm just not convinced by the Neg that these examples prove the negative effect of US cyber operations, perhaps generally, but not the US.

2

Natalie Yates - AofHL**FLIGHT: B**

Open Public Forum - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 455

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM**10:30****Affirmative:** Kudos College of Youth Leadership
KG & JS**Negative:** Nova 42 Academy KI & MI

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
1st	Katelyn Gan	2	99
2nd	Joy Sun	1	98

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
1st	Kanon Iwata	3	97
2nd	Manon Iwata	4	28

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Great debate. well watched debate.
 I decided w/ Neg because I felt they had more
 cards that supported their evidence better.
 I believe it was the (Fisher 07)? card that
 brought the point home. in the end the
 BA impacts were better supported.
 Aff gun's point was solid about
 how state actors but did not carry your case.

1

Nova 42 judge 2 - Nova 42

FLIGHT: A

Open Public Forum - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 9:00-10:30 - Debate Round I

Room: E3 457

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

9AM

10:30

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
SJ & JX**Negative:** Perfect Score Academy EE & TH

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
<u>AFF</u>	Stephanie Jing	<u>4</u>	<u>83</u> ^{VC}
<u>AFF</u>	Jessica Xue	<u>1</u>	<u>95</u> ^{VC}

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (30-1)
<u>NEG</u>	Erdem Enkhbileg	<u>2</u>	<u>90</u> ^{VC}
<u>NEG</u>	Tayten Han	<u>3</u>	<u>85</u> ^{VC}

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

Valeri *[Signature]*
JUDGE'S SIGNATURENOVA
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Tay

NEG (S1)

- TAX ↑ conflict
- cyber attack ↑ tension
- ~~more~~ ineff/costly
- longer lasting effects
- ~~is~~ useful
- Russia + US high tensions
- pre-emptive attacks don't work (historically)
- cyber-op ineffective
- traditional military weapons more effective

NEG1 (S2) =

- malware
- intrusions ↑ cyberwar from Russia
- cyber-ops backfire
- benefit → backfire
- we should not invest millions when cyber weapons may not even work - already conceded in cx

NEG1 (sum)

- hotline argument - & links
- nuclear war risk ↑
- military-op = more effective
- one example - doesn't explain how
- 1 min conceded

Cyber weapon use

AFF (S1)

- 1 International treaties
- speed up com/agreements to ↓ nuclear war (hotline)
- bilateral coop treaty
- ADVAN
- ↓ tensions

2 EFFECTIVENESS

- blackout

AFF (S2) Jessica

"never listed examples"

- drop
- & links
- examples of offensive successful cyber attacks
- cyber attacks lead to less violence / ~~recession~~
- ↓ retaliation
- shows ↓ consequences
- people vote ↑ (hotline)
- dropped argument

AFF (sum) - cheaper - D

- cyber attacks effective
- examples
- ↓ civilian violence
- better than trad. military attacks - NEG1 dropped A3C

(FF)

NEG1 (S2)

- doesn't matter if it's cheap
- tensions w/ Russia ↑
- new argument drop out of picture
- dropped 'globally important'
- cyber-op = easy to organize and achieve, & costly
- blackout - health and safety systems failed

DECISION

The NEG1 dropped the AFF's arguments on the hotline treaty and o.c.o's global importance. When the NEG1 refuted the benefits provided by the AFF more work needed to be done to negate them because the links and the logic were not there. The NEG1 conceded to cyber operations working, therefore being effective in cx. AFF provides multiple examples of cyber-ops being effective and how.