Greetings from the Heights

Although it hardly seems possible, this is the 11th edition of the modest alumni newsletter we started in the Summer of 2001.

This issue reports on some of the activities of the Society during the 2010-2011 academic year. Highlights include the 119th Annual Fulton Prize Debate, continued tournament success, and a vibrant public debate series.

We hope you enjoy reading The Fultonian and welcome your suggestions and feedback.

John Katsulas
Patrick Waldinger
Dale Herbeck

The Maerowitz Brothers: First Siblings to Win the Coveted Fulton Medal

History was made at the 119th annual Fulton Prize Debate when Michael Maerowitz ’14 (above right) from Phoenix, AZ, was awarded the Fulton Medal for top speaker, making him and his brother, Matthew Maerowitz ’10, the only siblings to ever be so honored. Matthew Maerowitz (above left) received his Fulton Medal in 2008; he is now a first year law student at the University of Arizona.

The only possibility for another brother tandem to have won the Fulton Medal goes back to the late 1920s when Thomas A. O’Keefe won in 1927 and Leo P. O’Keefe won in 1929. Confirmation that the two O’Keefe’s were not brothers appeared in a Boston Globe article on April 22, 1973 announcing the wedding of Leo’s niece, Mary Elizabeth. In the article, it also mentions that Leo P. O’Keefe, S.J., who celebrated the wedding mass, had a brother but his name was Charles D., the father of the bride. Further research also revealed that these O’Keefes came from different hometowns—Thomas A. came from Brighton and Leo P. came from South Boston.

Not surprisingly, the most common surname on the wall in 305 Gasson is an Irish Catholic last name, Sullivan. However, the four Sullivan medal winners were spaced too far apart to have been brothers: William L. Sullivan (1894), Edward A. Sullivan (1914), Francis E. Sullivan (1938), and Jeffrey Sullivan (2004). And, indeed, further research confirmed that none were siblings.

Other surnames appearing twice on the wall include Daniel A.B. Foley (1901) and Henry E. Foley (1921); Philip F. Kennedy (1903) and Jennifer Kennedy (1997); Andrew J. O’Brien (1906) and Charles M. O’Brien (1933); Edward J. McLaughlin (1915) and Joseph T. McLaughlin (1964 & 1965); Donald W. White (1951) and David White (1967 & 1968); and Francis X. Quinn (1916) and Peter C. Quinn (1932).
THE 119TH ANNUAL FULTON PRIZE DEBATE

Michael Maerowitz ’14 won the 119th Annual Fulton Prize Debate held on May 3rd in Merkert 100 before a standing room only audience. The debate is traditionally held in the Fulton Debate Room in Gasson Hall, but that was not possible this year as the building is closed for structural renovations.

The topic for this year’s debate was, “Resolved: The United States should abandon the use of military force to support humanitarian intervention in the Middle East.” The judges for the debate were Stefan Bauschard (BC debate coach from 1999 to 2004), Dr. Charles Morris ’91 (BC communication professor), and Kevin Walton ’10 (Charles River Associates).

Debating on the affirmative side was Grant Gendron ’11, a political science major from Hopkinton, Massachusetts, and Daniel Berkowitz ’11, a political science major from Texas. Debating on the negative side with Michael Maerowitz was last year’s Fulton medal winner, Brendan Benedict ’12.

The debate focused primarily on whether the use of U.S. military force in Libya was desirable. The affirmative side argued that military strikes against Libya would fail and result in greater losses of life by escalating the civil war between the rebels and Qaddafi. The negative side argued that absent US military intervention, Qaddafi would have slaughtered thousands of civilians. Eventually, US and NATO military power would be successful in removing Qaddafi from power and empower the democracy movement in Libya, so argued the negative.

In a unanimous decision, the judges awarded the debate to the negative side and named Michael Maerowitz as the top speaker. When Gasson Hall reopens, Maerowitz’s name will be painted on the front wall of Gasson 305, three spaces below his brother’s name. As the second place speaker, Grant Gendron received the silver Gargan Medal.

2011 Fulton Prize Debaters. From left: Michael Maerowitz ’14, Brendan Benedict ’12, Daniel Berkowitz ’11 and Grant Gendron ’11.
BENEDICT WINS THE DUFFY AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN DEBATE

The Kevin F. Duffy Award for Excellence in Debate honors the long and distinguished service of Dr. Kevin F. Duffy, Vice President of Student Affairs at Boston College from 1976 to 2000, and a professor in the Lynch School of Education from 2001 to 2008.

Brendan Benedict ’12, a political science major from Clarksburg, NJ, is the 2011 recipient of the Duffy Award. He is the first repeat winner. Last year, Brendan received the Duffy Award for being the top junior varsity debater; this year, he received the award for being the top varsity debater. The highlights of Brendan's accomplishments debating in varsity include reaching the quarter-finals at three major tournaments: West Point, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the American Debate Association's Championship Tournament.

MAEROWITZ WINS THE QUINN OUTSTANDING FIRST YEAR DEBATER AWARD

The Joseph F. Quinn Award for the Outstanding First Year Debater was created in 2007 to celebrate the service of Dr. Joseph Quinn, who currently holds the James P. McIntyre Chair in Economics. From 1999 to 2007, Dr. Quinn was the much beloved Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and a strong supporter of both the liberal arts and the Fulton Debating Society.

Michael Maerowitz ‘14 from Phoenix, AZ is the 2011 recipient of the Quinn Award, joining his brother Matthew Maerowitz ’10 who was the first winner of the award in 2007. Arriving at BC after a successful career at Brophy College Preparatory School, Michael started competing at the varsity level. Over the course of the year, he reached the elimination rounds at four tournaments, including the quarter-finals at the American Debate Association's Championship Tournament.

GENDRON WINS THE McLAUGHLIN AWARD FOR PUBLIC DEBATING

The Joseph T. McLaughlin Award for Outstanding Public Debater was created in 2010 to celebrate the legendary debate career of Joseph T. McLaughlin who reached the final round of the National Debate Tournament in 1964, along with winning numerous national tournaments and speaker awards. Naming the public debating award after Joseph McLaughlin is a befitting tribute because he excelled in public debating—winning the Fulton Prize Debate twice (1964 & 1965).

Grant Gendron ‘11, a political science major from Hopkinton, MA, is the 2011 recipient of the McLaughlin Award. This year, Grant competed in four public debates, including the Fulton Prize Debate, where he received the Gargan Medal. As the student leader in charge of coordinating the public debate series, he organized meetings, recruited students, and generated ideas for topics.

Prior to joining the public debate program, Grant achieved excellence as a policy debater, reaching the finals at the John Carroll tournament, the semi-finals of the East Regional Championship Tournament, and the quarter finals at the JV Nationals Tournament. Next year, Grant will be attending law school at Boston University.
WE THE STUDENTS: INTERNET DEBATE OVER SOCIAL NETWORKING

On March 29, 2011, the Fultonians debated against the University of Miami on a live internet program called We The Students. This program is produced by the Miami’s Ethics Program and funded by a grant from philanthropist Adrienne Arsht. The topic for the debate was whether social networking sites (e.g., Facebook and Twitter) are having a positive or negative influence on society and privacy? Fulton Debate argued social networking sites were a positive influence.

Boston College was represented by Brendan Benedict ‘12 and Ryan Folio ‘12 and competing for the University of Miami were Chrissoula Mihelakis and Megan Motley. All four students began their debate training as novices in college.

The format for We The Students debates is more akin to a panel discussion than traditional policy debate. A student moderator, Laura Caso, asked both sides for a two minute opening statement. The moderator then asked each side to answer questions about the topic. For instance, in this debate, Caso asked both sides questions about whether social networking sites intrude on the privacy of users and whether they reduce face to face communication.

During the broadcast, another Miami student, Emily Wingrove, monitored a chat room where students from other colleges offered their views on the topic. The program concluded without declaring a winner or loser.

This year, We The Students sponsored debates on the constitutionality of ObamaCare, the rights of college students to carry handguns on campus, the effects of unions on the American economy, and the desirability of humanitarian intervention by the United States. Video archives of these debates are available at: [http://umtv.miami.edu/shows/we-the-students](http://umtv.miami.edu/shows/we-the-students).

EPA DEBATE: CHESAPEAKE BAY RESTORATION

On September 30, 2010, Boston College participated in a public debate held in Portland, ME, before the Working Waterways and Waterfronts National Symposium. The debate was sponsored by Ibrahim Goodwin, program coordinator and scientist at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and coordinated by John W. Davis II of Debate Solutions.com.

The topic for the debate was, “Resolved: The U.S. Congress should enact the Chesapeake Clean Water and Ecosystem Restoration Act of 2009.” Introduced by Senator Ben Cardin of Maryland, this bill would require the six states of the Chesapeake basin to develop and implement detailed plans for reducing nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment pollution. The bill would allocate nearly two billion dollars to support the cleanup efforts and it would also establish a market-based nutrient trading system whereby polluters could buy and sell credits to comply with pollution reduction mandates.

Debating on the affirmative side in support of the Cardin bill were Terrell Taylor of the University of Mary Washington and Noel Harrison of Hampton University. Brendan Benedict of Boston College teamed up with William Rafey of Harvard University to argue against the Cardin bill.

The Working Waterways conference participants—made up of approximately two hundred marine scientists and environmentalists—were designated as the judges for the debate. Given the obvious pro-environmental bias of the judges, Benedict and Rafey employed a clever strategy of opposing the Cardin bill because it did not adopt bold enough steps to reduce water pollution. They criticized the bill for exempting agriculture, the biggest single polluter of the Chesapeake and for relying on a nutrient trading plan which had no proven means of verifying that polluters were actually reducing nutrient loads.

In a lop-sided voted (winning all but five ballots), the conference participants awarded the debate to the team from Boston College and Harvard.
The Fulton Public Debate Series for 2010-2011

September 17, 2010
(vs. People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals)
“Resolved: Is Meat Eating Ethical?”

October 27, 2010
“Resolved: The Supreme Court should uphold California’s law banning the sale of violent video games to minors.”

November 30, 2010
“Resolved: The Bowl Championship Series should be replaced by a sixteen team playoff.”

February 17, 2011
“Resolved: That WikiLeaks promotes the national interest of the United States.”

March 23, 2011
“Resolved: The United States should increase the use of nuclear power.”

The 119th Annual Fulton Prize Debate
May 3, 2011
“Resolved: The United States should abandon the use of military force to support humanitarian intervention in the Middle East.”
Final NDT Rankings for 2010-2011

1. Liberty University
2. Northwestern University
3. Emory University
4. University of Oklahoma
5. Cornell University
6. Binghamton University
7. Harvard University
8. University of Kansas
9. United States Military Academy
10. George Mason University
11. Vanderbilt University
12. University of Mary Washington
13. James Madison University
14. West Virginia University
15. University of Texas, San Antonio
16. Trinity University (TX)
17. University of North Texas
18. University of Texas
19. University of Missouri, Kansas City
20. University of Minnesota Twin Cities
21. Johnson County Community College (KS)
22. Wayne State University
23. Wake Forest University
24. Kansas State University
25. Towson University
26. BOSTON COLLEGE
27. University of Rochester
28. Kansas City Community College
29. University of California, Berkeley
30. University of Michigan

2010-2011 TOURNAMENT HIGHLIGHTS

Championships and Final Rounds:

University of Massachusetts, Amherst (Novice)
First Place: Matthew Bartholomae & Alexander Tingle

Northeast Regional Championships
Hosted by Western Connecticut State University (Novice)
Finals: Matthew Bartholomae & Alexander Tingle

Semi-finalists:

John Carroll University (Junior Varsity)
Daniel Berkowitz & Nora Lopopolo

John Carroll University (Novice)
Matthew Bartholomae & Alexander Tingle

Junior Varsity Nationals
Hosted by the Towson University
Brendan Benedict & Michael Holland

United States Military Academy (Junior Varsity)
Halcyon Apy & Dana Snay

University of Vermont (Junior Varsity)
Ryan Folio & Nora Lopopolo

Quarter-finalists:

American Debate Association Championship
Hosted by James Madison University (Varsity)
Brendan Benedict & Michael Maerowitz

John Carroll University (Junior Varsity)
Ryan Folio & Michael Holland

Junior Varsity Nationals
Hosted by the Towson University (Junior Varsity)
Brendan Benedict & Michael Holland

Northeast Regional Championships
Hosted by Western Connecticut State University (Junior Varsity)
Michael Holland & Dana Snay
2010-2011 TOURNAMENT HIGHLIGHTS

Quarter–finalists continued:

Northeast Regional Championships
Hosted by Western Connecticut State University (Junior Varsity)
Ryan Folio & Matthew Palazzolo

United States Military Academy (Varsity)
Brendan Benedict & Michael Maerowitz

United States Naval Academy (Varsity)
Brendan Benedict & Michael Maerowitz

United States Naval Academy (Junior Varsity)
Michael Holland & Dana Snay

Double Octa–finalists:

Liberty University (Varsity)
Brendan Benedict & Michael Maerowitz

United States Military Academy (Junior Varsity)
Ryan Folio & Michael Holland

United States Military Academy (Novice)
Matthew Bartholomae & Alexander Tingle

Final CEDA Rankings for 2010-2011

1. Liberty University
2. Northwestern University
3. Emory University
4. Cornell University
5. Binghamton University
6. University of Oklahoma
7. University of Mary Washington
8. University of Kansas
9. Harvard University
10. George Mason University
11. West Virginia University
12. United States Military Academy
13. Trinity University (TX)
14. James Madison University
15. University of Texas, San Antonio
16. University of North Texas
17. Vanderbilt University
18. University of Texas
19. Kansas State University
20. Wayne State University
21. University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
22. Johnson County Community College (KS)
23. University of Missouri, Kansas City
24. Wake Forest University
25. BOSTON COLLEGE
26. Towson University
27. New York University
28. University of Rochester
29. University of Southern California
30. Samford University

Good times at the annual dinner for graduating seniors.
From left to right: Daniel Berkowitz ’11, Kelsey Muraoka ’11, and Grant Gendron ’11 celebrate at The Fireplace in Brookline.
THE DEBATE TOPIC: IMMIGRATION VISAS

The intercollegiate debate topic for 2010-2011 was, “Resolved: The United States Federal Government should substantially increase the number of and/or substantially expand beneficiary eligibility for its visas for one or more of the following: employment-based immigrant visas, nonimmigrant temporary worker visas, family-based visas, human-trafficking-based visas.”

The Fultonians advocated a comprehensive plan to increase the supply of high skilled immigrants working in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) fields. Specifically, the affirmative plan granted employment based visas to all foreign students who graduated from an accredited U.S. university with a Master’s or Ph.D. in a (STEM) field and to all H-1B workers having a Master’s or Ph.D. in a STEM field, including their spouses and children.

Under existing immigration law, thousands of highly skilled foreign STEM workers and students are forced to leave the United States every year. H-1B visas for high technology workers are temporary and expire after six years. Upon expiration of their visas, H-1B workers can apply for permanent employment visas but the waiting period for workers from India and China can be as long as ten years. This backlog exists because current immigration rules allocate seven percent of the employment visas to each country regardless of size. As a result, applicants from China and India are granted the same number of employment visas as persons from Togo and Honduras. Since a large percentage of the Master’s and Ph.D. students majoring in STEM fields are from India and China, the seven percent quota prevents the best and brightest from these countries from obtaining permanent employment visas.

The affirmative case increasing visas for STEM workers outlined two advantages: boosting the U.S. economy and preserving U.S. leadership in nanotechnology. The economy advantage argued that having an adequate supply of high-skilled workers is critical to maintaining innovation, job growth and competitiveness. Because U.S. colleges are not producing enough engineers and scientists to meet future demand, the affirmative case argued, the loss of foreign STEM workers would decrease innovation and erode the competitiveness of the U.S. economy.

The nanotechnology advantage argued that the development of nanotechnology was inevitable and that the country who achieved dominance in the commercialization of nanoparticles could solidify their technological, economic and military hegemony over the rest of the world. The critical role that foreign STEM workers play in conducting nanotechnology research in the United States is supported in a March 2010 report authored by Dr. John Holdren, the co-chair of the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology.