

102

Henry Marston - ELAC

Open Public Forum - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 4:00 Debate Prelim Elim 1

Room: E3 508

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

ASAP**Flip for Sides:** Nova 42 Academy FY & ED

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
<u>1</u>	Felicia Ye	<u>4</u>	<u>94</u>
<u>2</u>	Elizabeth Dashbold	<u>2</u>	<u>98</u>

Flip for Sides: Kudos College of Youth Leadership SD & MY

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
<u>2</u>	Sophia Dai	<u>1</u>	<u>100</u>
<u>1</u>	Melody Yu	<u>3</u>	<u>96</u>

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.Low Point Win? N

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

98

Ted Kim - Nova 42

Open Public Forum - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 4:00 Debate Prelim Elim 1

Room: E3 517

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

ASAP**Flip for Sides:** Kudos College of Youth Leadership SJ & JX

AFF 2

Flip for Sides: Wilshire Academy BA & AJ

NEG 1

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
1	Stephanie Jing	2	90
2	Jessica Xue	3	85

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
2	Brandon An	1	92
1	Andrew Jo	4	80

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.Low Point Win? ☒

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Majority of feedback provided ^{post} round.

I voted ~~AFF~~ NEG on PW. Neg barely proves that deterrence is a sham and that cyber attacks will only serve to escalate.

The impact out to a loss of a \$1T and increased risk to US national security. AFF debated well, but failed to provide weighable whers. Argumentation was extended and wished, but a lack of clear impact left me unable to weigh on AFF.

100

Richard Hu - ELAC

Open Public Forum - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 4:00 Debate Prelim Elim 1

Room: E3 521

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

ASAP

Flip for Sides: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership AJ & SC

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
1	Annie Jiang	2	99
2	Sarah Chen	1	100

Flip for Sides: Wilshire Academy RK & JL

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
1	Rich Kang	3	98
2	Justin Lee	4	97

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

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Congrats!

A

- * Good cross-examining
- * Solid framework setup
- * What specific examples do you have for your C1?
 - I may have missed it, but for C2 you talked about Iran, but where was it for C1? If I missed it, my apologies (clawing + judging is hard).
 - If I didn't miss it, try looking for specific countries or instances that prove your C1.

* Solid C2 subpoint A

* C2B: please mention a counter or try to give me some kind of empirical example of how it stabilizes a crisis

* Your response (2nd speaker) to their first argument was on point

→ expand a little more on why there is no link (different topics)

N

- * First speaker (make sure to enunciate)
- * I'm not sure about your first argument
 - It's a stretch to assume that all of the money we use would directly go to other industries directly
 - I need a stronger link for this
- * What exactly is the 2nd contention arguing? It sounds more like it's saying that we are at risk of being hacked if our defenses are offensive? I think it would help to clarify the wording here
- * Pretty clear point 3 - good job!
 - one thing I could recommend is to scrap the bathroom impact and replace it w/ an impact maybe on financial security for example.
- * Why did you cite Wikipedia?
- * 2nd speaker: you have good ideas for your rebuttal → I just suggest more

*

Same thing for you!

- Your signposting

When you label and explain your responses need to be clear

* Your response to P2 and P3 could have been a little more in depth

- the link you could have attacked was that alot of the premise for their C2 was if they get hacked or if we lose our weapons → how likely is it? Is it realistic? Why is it different from a defensive?

* Attack their link for their C3

* Solid response to their C4

* Good CX handling

* Look at the judges during CX

* More importantly, don't just say that we would "know" our OCO's better than the opponent; give me an empirical example

* Do not refuse their arguments; summarize it:

Same comments

you started well in the Aff telling me what your first C1 was, and but then you tried to add new responses; explain to me what has already been said to explain what you win

* You are also making the final focus more hard for you; just tell me the voters, and then weigh and compare impacts

- You are great; fix issues regarding specificity and structure and you will be great!

(clear signposting)

- Explicit language, such as saying "My opponent's first argument was _____. They argue that _____, that's not true and we have 2/3/4 (however) many responses

- Clear signposting = easy flows

- Why did you not bring up the 4th argument in the first speech? Streamline it into 3 contentions, as P2 and P3 kind of mesh together

- You need more rebuttals
- essentially your whole time should be rebuttals rather than your cost. Save your case for the last 2 speeches

* Look at the judges during CX

* What was the responses to the IAC? I wasn't sure what the rebuttal response was meant to be.

* Summary speech - I'm not sure it was a good move to defend using wikipedia;

* Either slow down or enunciate stronger in your summary speech

* Your whole summary should be summarizing the debate to prove whether you

→ "My first arg was _____. We argued that _____. Our opp responded with _____. We still win on this issue bc _____."

* Explicit signposting and language helps move making the final focus more difficult than it needs to be; just tell me your voters, and then weigh your impacts

* You are extremely talented; just tidy up the structural and issues regarding specificity

* That definitely had evidence in the world and your good

101

Ryan Ohanessian - ELAC

Open Public Forum - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 4:00 Debate Prelim Elim 1

Room: E3 525

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

ASAP**Flip for Sides:** Kudos College of Youth
Leadership KG & JS *Neg 1st*

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
<u>2</u>	Katelyn Gan	<u>1</u>	<u>97</u>
<u>1</u>	Joy Sun	<u>2</u>	<u>96</u>

Flip for Sides: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership HX & AL *Aff 2nd*

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
<u>1</u>	Hanbo Xu	<u>4</u>	<u>94</u>
<u>2</u>	Andy Liu	<u>3</u>	<u>95</u>

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

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

- Constructive speeches were set up very well. Responsive and topical.
- Aff did a good job minimizing neg's ~~live~~ lives impact.
- 2NR needed to lean in more on deterrence
 - ↳ why and how is it flawed?
- Voted neg on impact for loss of lives.
 - ↳ Aff didn't turn this impact well enough.

ERIC OROZCO

99

David Reyes - ELAC

Open Public Forum - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 4:00 Debate Prelim Elim 1

Room: E3 511

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

ASAP

Aff 1st

Flip for Sides: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership KK & MC

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
X1	Katherine Kligys	1	100
X2	Melody Chang	4	97

Flip for Sides: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership PH & SR

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	PTS (100-70)
2	Pearl Hsieh	3	98
1	Sophia Ren	2	99

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

Low Point Win? _____

Eric Orozco

Wilshire

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

- cyber arms race
- digital cold war
- German rail networks
- keep your clarity
- defence over offence
- deterring attempts create vulnerability
- hard to detect
- secrecy and surprise
- outlined previous cyber attacks on US
- deterrence not the same as effectiveness
- even unreliable
- improve defence to prevent blackout
- US det. not working, one million attacks daily
- cyber cannot be compared to nuclear
- hotline agreement won't work

- cost-benefit analysis
- US blocked foreign attack
- OCO's future of fighting
- cyber warfare cheap
- intellectual property
- wreaks havoc on nations
- probability of tacit bargaining increases
- strengthening OCO leaves us better prepared, will create deterrence
- evidence card on deterrence
- Northeast blackout hurting economy by billions of \$
- will only retaliate if strong enough
- strike-first approach

Neg

- no foundation for cyber deterrence
- using offense creates offense
- aff risking security on chance of deterrence
- treaties unsafe because third party involvement possible
- not sufficient evidence on deterrence's effectiveness
- escalation to war
- countries already attacking
- a little trouble with the time on closing statement

Aff

- a little trouble on second cross
- only need a couple of computers
- deterrence protects LP
- recognition from other countries, supported by hotline agreement
- Chinese social media attack
 - retaliation stated, but no course provided
- had trouble defending deterrence argument on cross
 - escalations may happen, but we'd be prepared
 - ability to unveil attackers
 - cost-effectiveness against other war types

RFD

Neg had stronger deterrence argument, which was the biggest focus for both sides

97

Alonzo Eldridge - ELAC

Open Public Forum - Sat 12/14 Pattern A 4:00 Debate Prelim Elim 1

Room: E3 457

2019 SCJFL 2nd Quarter Debate Tournament

ASAP

AFF

~~NFG~~

Flip for Sides: Kudos College of Youth Leadership KH & SG

Flip for Sides: Kudos College of Youth Leadership SH & MA

<u>Pos</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>RK (1-4)</u>	<u>PTS (100-70)</u>
<u>2</u>	Kaitlyn Huang	<u>2</u>	<u>97</u>
<u>1</u>	Susie Gu	<u>1</u>	<u>98</u>

<u>Pos</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>RK (1-4)</u>	<u>PTS (100-70)</u>
<u>1</u>	Shirlyn Huang	<u>4</u>	<u>95</u>
<u>2</u>	Madeline Ang	<u>3</u>	<u>96</u>

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

Low Point Win? ✓

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

AFF

Global Franchise Clash

NEG

- Intellectual property
- economic advantage
- Cyber War versus military war
- Cyber War cost
- deterrents
- China Intellectual property threat
- Fighting with pure resources
- lives lost to rolling
- Black ops
- IP not being protected
- Loss
- Cyber Arms race
- Cyber Weapons War
- Cyber attacks
- cyber war
- deterrence in ~~start~~ to become counting
- Perfect versus not perfect / both with major
- Cyber Arms Race
- Cyber attack hard to block
- Stronger defense better than stronger offense
- digital cold war
- Ultra-intelligent
- China vs U.S.
- communication for deterrents to work
- PPL will die
- Cold War
- Social Media
- 1 million Cyber attacks

RFD: NEG wins this debate, because how the AFR War did not prove how U.S. would have deterred more important ~~role~~ in how or later. NEG did a great job of arguing social media and stronger defenses better the offense. (over debate)