

# A Semi-Final Round<sup>1</sup>

Everett Rutan

Xavier High School

[everett.rutan@moodys.com](mailto:everett.rutan@moodys.com)

or

[ejrutan3@acm.org](mailto:ejrutan3@acm.org)

## Yale Invitational, Parliamentary Division

September 25, 2011

**This House would not cheat even if it would not get caught.**

### A Note about the Notes

These are my notes from one of the semi-final rounds of the Yale Invitational. They are limited by how quickly I could write and how well I heard what was said. I apologize for any errors, but I hope debaters will appreciate this insight: what a judge hears may not be what they said or wish they had said.

There are two versions of the notes. The one below is chronological, reproducing each speech in the order in which the arguments were made. It shows how the debate was actually presented. The second is formatted to look more like my written flow chart, with each contention “flowed” across the page as the teams argued back and forth. It’s close to the way I actually take notes during the debate.

### The Final Round

This semi-final round of the Yale Invitational Parliamentary Division was between the Bishop O’Dowd team of Natalie Dierkx and Audrey Carson as Government and the Wilton team of Peter Jensen and Ali Hiestand in Opposition. The debate was won by Bishop O’Dowd on Government.

#### 1) Prime Minister Constructive

- a) Introduction
- b) Statement of the Resolution
- c) We will link the resolution to a substantive interpretation:
  - i) We consider US manufacturing corporations
  - ii) That they not dodge, evade or negate environmental regulations
  - iii) Even if they are not fined or shut down if they do
- d) G1<sup>2</sup>: Moral
  - i) Not looking into the future if spoiling the environment
  - ii) Future generations and country create a moral obligation
- e) G2: Economic Health
  - i) We depend on resources in the long term
  - ii) Need green products to protect us

---

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

<sup>2</sup> “G1” indicates the Government first contention, “O2” the Opposition second contention and so forth.

- iii) No business in the long-term without
  - f) G3: National Security
    - i) Need resources to defend ourselves
- 2) **Leader of the Opposition Constructive**
  - a) We agree with the Gov interpretation to the extent it applies to the real world
    - i) Why just one example?
  - b) Def: Cheating is behavior not according to accepted rules and norms.
  - c) O1: The reason people don't cheat is due to the repercussions
    - i) Cheating is usually more efficient
  - d) O2: Not doing the right thing is expedient
    - i) Cheating is not necessarily harmful
    - ii) If you are not caught, no reason not to do it
    - iii) Can't always play by the rules, e.g. war
  - e) **POI: How is war related to cheating? Warfare isn't conducted by rules, e.g. when we secured independence.**
    - i) In things like espionage and foreign policy, it is often for the long term good
  - f) G1: Rules may cost company existence, jobs.
- 3) **Member of Government Constructive**
  - a) Intro
  - b) I will discuss definitions, Opp then Gov
  - c) Defs: Opp must show definitions abusive and non-topical to change them
  - d) O1: Lying inherently harms other people
    - i) Economy and country based on ideas
    - ii) Cheating stifles innovation in ideas
    - iii) Cheating always involves old ideas, not innovation
  - e) G1: Opp ideas difficult to apply
    - i) They say firms will follow rules due to self-interest
    - ii) They will also see the need for a sustainable future
  - f) G2: Following environmental rules stabilizes the economy
    - i) Unsustainable actions result in price increases, people buy less, depressed economy
  - g) G3: Opp proposes no benefits
    - i) It's unsustainable to use all the resources
    - ii) Wood, water, etc. would not be available for the future
    - iii) Wars for water and food will occur, just like those for oil
- 4) **Member of the Opposition Constructive**
  - a) I will cover Gov then Opp
  - b) Def issue: our intention is to broaden. Gov just presents one example
  - c) G1, G2, G3: Gov argues for morality, long-term economic health, security
    - i) Companies don't operate on these principles
    - ii) Greed drives search for profit
    - iii) If they are seen cheating, they are punished
  - d) **POI: Didn't we define resolution in terms of environmental regulations? That was one example, we are presenting another**
    - i) Fines are small relative to the benefits

- e) **POI: Won't companies be hurt by their actions? They aren't concerned with long-term implications.**
- f) Opp presents a variety of examples
  - i) US searches out foreign policy secrets of others
    - (1) Cheating yields tremendous benefits
  - ii) Ambush in war, e.g. Japanese attack on US in WW II
- g) **POI: How can war tactics be cheating? Some said yes in the case of Japan**
- 5) Leader of Opposition Rebuttal**
  - a) This debate boils down to one example vs another
  - b) Gov says business will sense and obligation
    - i) Opp says profit will drive actions
      - (1) Business won't see long-term issues
  - c) Cheating helps US in foreign policy and war
  - d) Overall, the Opp approach is needed to succeed in the 21<sup>st</sup> century
- 6) Prime Minister Rebuttal**
  - a) Thank you
  - b) I want to crystalize the debate on four issues: drops, definitions, war and cheating, impacts
  - c) Drops: Silence is consent.
    - i) Opp ignores long-term economic security
    - ii) Dropped G1, G2
  - d) Defs: Gov is permitted to narrow the case
    - i) Opp must show defs are unfair
  - e) Wars are not relevant to Cheating
    - i) Gov would have to argue wars can't happen
    - ii) You can't cheat against another country
  - f) Impacts: Opp provided no broad impacts
    - i) We rebutted the repercussions argument (O1)
    - ii) Innovation is linked to growth
    - iii) E.g. Fish in the Atlantic, there aren't enough fish