


Flow Chart¹ of the Quarterfinal Round: Yale Invitational, September 25, 2011

This House would militarily intervene to prevent Iran from getting the bomb.

This quarterfinal round of the Yale Invitational Parliamentary Division was between the New Canaan team of David Luchs and Gita Abhi-Rahman on Government and the Wilton team of Allie Schaefer and Eleanor Clifford on Opposition. The debate was won by the Government team from New Canaan.

Format Key

I take notes on an 11" by 14" artist pad. The two pages below are formatted to print in landscape mode on 8 ½ x 11 paper. The first page covers the four constructive speeches and the second page covers the rebuttal. The pages are intended to be arranged as follows, which is how my actual flow is arranged:



Note that the first page containing the constructive speeches always has arguments related to the Government contentions at the top, and those relating to the Opposition contentions at the bottom. This is not how the speeches may have been presented, in that often a speaker will deal with Opposition arguments prior to the Government. The “transcript” version of this chart presents the arguments in each speech as presented.

The chart uses “A1,” “N2,” etc. to refer to the Affirmative first contention, the Negative second contention and so forth.

¹ Copyright 2011 Everett Rutan. This document may be freely copied for non-profit, educational purposes.

Prime Minister Constructive	Leader of the Opposition Constructive	Member of Government Constructive	Member of Opposition Constructive
1) Introduction 2) Statement of the Resolution 3) Definition: "US Military Intervention" as the use of force on any scale 4) G1 ² : A nuclear Iran is dangerous a) They have a radical Islamic Shiite government b) They oppose Jews, Christians and Sunni Muslims c) Ahmadinejad has threatened Israel d) They could intervene in Israel, India/Pakistan and Iraq e) The popular Green revolution was crushed f) Long-range missiles threaten Europe g) Potential for nuclear terrorism 5) G2: Diplomacy has failed a) Iran deserves civilian nuclear power b) Russia and France offered to enrich uranium for this purpose c) Qom enrichment program is for weapons grade d) Missile program is not peaceful 6) G3: Large scale attack is not necessary a) Locations are known b) Israel has already practiced fly-bys i) Iran can't defend the sites c) Surgical strikes would solve the problem	1) G1: Action would give terrorists and radicals a reason to attack	1) G1: Iran is ruled by Shiites a) Already in conflict with many others 2) G2: Iran has already declined international support a) Offered help on energy if it gives up nukes 3) G3: Locations of nuclear facilities are known a) A direct, effective attack is possible b) US military can target weaknesses	1) G1: Several of Iran's neighbors are already nuclear powers a) Iranian bomb is an invitation to attack b) No benefit to attacking them 2) G2: Diplomacy hasn't failed, we just haven't found the right compromise a) We need to prove US stands for principles b) Military intervention seems easy, but should be a last resort 3) G3: If a "large scale" attack isn't necessary, why did they define military intervention that way? a) If it only requires a pinpoint attack, they could have defined it that way b) Training, transportation, weapons will be exorbitantly expensive c) Economy has no funds for this d) In previous wars, US economy was stronger e)
	1) O1: The motion would stir global conflict a) US is seen as meddling i) Misunderstands Iran and effect on the Middle East ii) Not a global policeman b) We should be a unifier not a divider, use diplomacy 2) O2: More peaceful means are available a) Diplomatic methods save lives, reduce threats b) Military intervention unnecessary, not worth loss of lives c) Need to understand Iran's intentions, cultural differences 3) O3: Intervention is too expensive a) High military cost. i) Gov says "on any scale" so could be expensive b) Could lead to war in the Middle East c) Economic and social pressure are better approaches	1) O1: It is in our interest to defend ourselves and our allies a) Nuclear weapons themselves would cause conflicts b) Allies are already united on this issue 2) O2: Iran's motives and intentions are clear a) Willing to attack Israel b) Diplomacy has failed, by US, UN, others 3) O3: Gov is not suggesting a war a) Intervention can be limited and cheap	1) O1: World is not behind a military intervention a) No one wants to meddle with a government b) Other nations do not see US police role c) Allies are not with the US, there are divisions d) There is likely to be a loss of lives e) Clear possibility of failure f) Can't assume the targets are known g) Too expensive

² "G1" indicates the Affirmative first contention, "N2" the Negative second contention and so forth.
 Quarter-Final Round, Yale Invitational, September 25, 2011

Leader of Opposition Rebuttal	Prime Minister Rebuttal
1) Gov then Opp	1) Opp is based on noble sentiments
2) International Support a) Terrorists will oppose intervention and reach b) A large conflict is likely	2) O1: Other nations have already agreed to act a) E.g., Israel b) It is better if the US leads
3) Definitions Issue a) Broad Gov def of military intervention conflicts with G3	3) Definitions: we want to keep options open a) Intervention will be short and brief b) Preemption is possible as nuclear facilities present a target
4) Economic a) Economy is already strained by Iraq and Afghanistan	4) Tension: terrorists are a small minority
5) Diplomacy a) We should use every means possibility b) We should be a unifier not a divider	5) O2 vs G2 a) We can't negotiate with radicals i) Chamberlin and the Nazis b) Cultural experts understand Iran c) If we don't act, we may let millions die
	6) O2: war isn't necessary, just intervention
	7) G3: This is not Iraq
	8) The world stands behind us