2006-2007 in review

*McLaughlin Honored; Best Wins Fulton Prize Debate*

Past winners of the Fulton Medal attending the reunion served as judges for the 2007 debate.

Even allowing for the well known tendency of debaters to exaggerate, 2006-2007 will go down as one of the greatest years in the long and illustrious history of the Fulton Debating Society.

• For the seventh consecutive season, Boston College qualified to attend the National Debate Tournament (NDT). Of course, this was not unexpected as Allen Best ’07 and Mandy Castle ’07, had qualified in 2004, 2005, and 2006.

• The Fultonians finished the season in eighth place in the final NDT standings. This top ten finish reflected the fact that the Society fielded competitive varsity, junior varsity, and novice teams.

• The highlight of the year, however, was the Annual Fulton Prize Debate which was part of a debate reunion. The debate was judged by an all-star panel composed of twelve previous winners of the Fulton Medal.

• Immediately after the debate, the Fultonians retired to a gala banquet in the new Yawkey Athletics Facility on the lower campus. Legendary debater Joseph McLaughlin ’65 was recognized as Fultonian of the Year and he delighted those present with a marvelous after dinner speech that bridged his years as a debater with his experience as an attorney.

This issue reports on the activities of the Society during the 2006-2007 academic year, including a series of articles highlighting the Fulton Reunion held over the weekend of April 20-21.

Thanks to all the Fultonians who returned to the Heights to join in the celebration. It was especially gratifying to meet some of the Fultonians from the 1960s and 1970s.

By all accounts, the reunion was a rousing success. In fact, the loudest voices came from those who wanted alumni gatherings on a more regular basis. If you have any suggestions for future debate events, please e-mail your ideas to katsulas@bc.edu

We hope you enjoy reading *The Fultonian*.

John Katsulas
Director of Debate

Patrick Waldinger
Debate Coach

and Dale Herbeck
Director Emeritus
MCLAUGHLIN HONORED AS FULTONIAN OF THE YEAR

At the alumni reunion banquet held on April 21, Joseph T. McLaughlin '65 received the Fultonian of the Year award for his exemplary career as a Fulton debater from 1961-1965 and for his notable career as a litigator at several prestigious law firms.

McLaughlin's accomplishments as a Boston College debater are unrivaled. He and his debate partner, James Unger, achieved remarkable success at the National Debate Tournament (NDT), which remains the gold standard for measuring debate success. In 1963, the BC duo reached the semi-finals of the NDT, where they lost a 4-1 decision to the University of Minnesota.

McLaughlin and Unger improved upon their performance at the 1964 NDT where they lost the final round to the University of the Pacific on a close 4-3 decision. These two performances at the NDT were hardly a flash in the pan: McLaughlin and Unger were one of the dominant teams, winning national tournaments such as the University of Kentucky in 1963.

After graduating from Boston College with honors, McLaughlin attended Cornell Law School, and then clerked for Chief Justice Joseph Tauro of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court. For the past forty years, McLaughlin has enjoyed a fabulously successful career as a litigator at Shearman & Sterling, Credit Suisse First Boston, and Heller Ehrman, where he currently is the chair of the New York office. McLaughlin has argued several cases before the US Supreme Court and has published a series of influential articles and book chapters on alternative dispute resolution and anti-trust law.

The Society is grateful to Joseph McLaughlin for attending our alumni reunion and for delivering a remarkable speech on the importance of debate in shaping his professional life as well as playing an invaluable role in promoting the search for truth in our democracy. The full text of his speech can be found on pages 5 and 6.

A NEW FORMAT FOR THE FULTONIAN; UPDATED FULTON WEB SITE

We hope alums will enjoy the look and feel of this issue of The Fultonian. The Society may be ageless, but our old black and white newsletter was growing rather tired. Our new format takes advantage of the latest computer software, the wonders of digital photography, and the visual appeal of color printing.

This is not the only change in our outreach efforts, as the Society also has an updated World Wide Web presence. Our new site was designed to have something for everyone from high school debaters considering Boston College, to students and faculty already on the Heights, and to our 500+ debate alums. If you haven't visited the site lately, we invite you to check out Fulton Debate online at <http://www.bc.edu/schools/cas/communication/fulton.html>.

As always, if you have stories or pictures from your days as a Fultonian, please pass them along. The Society has a rich history and our newsletter and web site provide a great way for us to celebrate and preserve the tradition for the next generation of Fultonians.
BEST & CASTLE SHARE THE DUFFY AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN DEBATE

Allen Best ’07 and Mandy Castle ’07, who are the only two debaters in the United States who qualified for the National Debate Tournament (NDT) as a team during all four years of their career, received the Kevin P. Duffy Award for Excellence in Debate. Best and Castle—who competed as BC BC—qualified to attend NDT tournaments hosted in 2004 by Catholic University, in 2005 by Gonzaga University, in 2006 by Northwestern University, and in 2007 by the Westin Hotel in Dallas, Texas.

Both Allen and Mandy came to Boston College from the Midwest: Allen from Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and Mandy from Holland, Michigan. Except for two tournaments, they debated together for their entire college debating careers. In total, they debated together at thirty-seven tournaments, without encountering any fights about who should do which speaker positions or what arguments should have been extended. That may be another record unmatched by any other pair of Fultonians.

MAEROWTIZ EARNS QUINN AWARD AS THE OUTSTANDING FIRST YEAR DEBATER

In recognition of his distinguished service as Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences and his support of the Society, Joseph F. Quinn was honored with a Friend of Fulton Award at the annual prize debate. The Society used the occasion to announce a new award for the outstanding first year debater named in Quinn’s honor.

Dr. Quinn joined the Economics Department in 1974 and served as Chair from 1988 until 1994. He was named Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Boston College in 1999 and he served until 2007, when he was named the McIntyre Professor of Economics. Quinn is also the 2002 recipient of the Fultonian of the Year award.

Matthew Maerowitz ’10, who appropriately is an economics major, is the first recipient of the Quinn Award. Maerowitz came to Boston College after a successful high school debate career at Brophy College Prep in Phoenix, Arizona.

Competing in junior varsity, Maerowitz won speaker awards at tournaments hosted by Richmond (6th place), John Carroll (7th place), West Point (6th place), Navy (5th place), Binghamton (4th place), the CEDA East Regional Championship Tournament at Marist (3rd place), and the American Debate Association national tournament at Liberty (7th place). He and his partner, Ryan Malone ’10, won the John Carroll and Binghamton tournaments.

HONOR BOUND

The Fall 2006 issue of Boston College Magazine featured a photo of Grace Peters, 15 feet above the floor in Gasson 305, adding the name of Allen Best ’07 to the list of winners of the Fulton Prize Debate. The article is available at http://bcm.bc.edu/issues/fall_2006/linden_lane/honor-bound.html
Best wins Fulton Prize Debate (again)

Allen Best ’07, an economics and political science major, won the 115th annual Fulton Prize Debate held on April 21st in the Fulton Debating Room, Gasson 305. The topic for the debate was, “Resolved: That the United States Supreme Court should overrule the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals in Morse v. Frederick.”

Debating on the affirmative side with Best ’07 was Ryan Malone ’10, a political science major from Minneapolis, Minnesota. They were opposed by Mandy Castle ’07, a political science major, who was paired with Matthew Maerowitz ’10, an economics major from Phoenix, Arizona.

Morse v. Frederick is a student free speech case which was before the US Supreme Court this term. At issue is whether a school administrator can enforce a school policy prohibiting students from displaying banners conveying pro-drug messages at school-sponsored events without violating the First Amendment rights of students. Joseph Frederick, an 18-year-old student, displayed a 14-foot banner with the message, “Bong Hits 4 JESUS,” while students from Juneau-Douglas High School were watching the Olympic torch pass through Juneau, Alaska on the way to the 2002 Winter Olympics in Salt Lake City.

This year’s debate was judged by a distinguished panel of critics who themselves were winners of the Fulton Prize. Listed in order by seniority, the twelve judges were Jack McNealy ’60, Kevin Byrne ’61, Joseph McLaughlin ’65, Ronald Jerutis ’67, Jane Osborne McKnight ’75, Mark Milano ’82, John Goodwin ’88, Charles Morris III ’91, Darren Schwiebert ’92, Robert Berry ’93, Dilip Paliath ’93, and Wenyu Ho Blanchard ’95.

In an 8-4 decision (with Byrne, McLaughlin, Morris, and Schwiebert dissenting), the judges voted for the affirmative side. Allen Best was named the top speaker and awarded the Fulton medal making him a two-time winner of the debate. Mandy Castle was named the second place speaker and she received her third Gargan medal.

POSTSCRIPT. Much like the judges for the Fulton Prize Debate, the United States Supreme Court handed down a split decision. On June 25th, the Justices ruled in favor of principal Deborah Morse by a 6-3 vote. In a majority opinion receiving five votes, Chief Justice Roberts argued that a school may, consistent with the First Amendment, restrict student speech at a school event when that speech is reasonably viewed as promoting illegal drug use. Justice Stevens dissented on First Amendment grounds in an opinion that was joined by Justices Ginsberg and Souter. Justice Breyer concurred in the judgment in part and dissented in part as he believed the Court should have avoided the First Amendment question altogether and simply held that the qualified immunity doctrine prevented Frederick from suing Morse.

Good evening and thank you for those kind words. I understand my children who are here this evening have reserved 10 minutes for rebuttal. This is a special occasion for me—to join you as you look ahead to your careers as college debaters and ultimately participants in the marketplace of ideas. I have followed the performance and accomplishments of Boston College debate teams for over 40 years and I congratulate all of you for your successes and your continuation of a time-honored tradition.

As a debater I sometimes wondered about the long hours preparing file cards, reading obscure journals and traveling to yet another college campus for endless rounds of spirited argument and cold pizza. It does, however, prepare you well—at least most of the time—for what may come later. To illustrate that proposition I want to tell you a brief story. As you know, I am a lawyer. Clarence Darrow, one of the greatest lawyers in our history said he was nothing more than a mouthpiece for hire. Today, we refer to ourselves much more pompously, but the essence of that description remains accurate.

A number of years ago I was preparing for my first oral argument in the United States Supreme Court. My debate training at Boston College stood me in good stead. I read all the applicable constitutional law cases and made copious notes on index cards which I put in a file box using the number of the amendments Fifth, Eight, Fourteenth, etc., as the organizing principle and cross referencing my notes to opinions by individual Supreme Court justices. I went through the record of the case below which consisted of a trial transcript over a thousand pages long and dozens of exhibits introduced into evidence. I made additional notes and began to organize my argument—not unlike the First Amendment cases I had put together here. In the months leading up to the argument, I had many moot court sessions where other lawyers and former judges quizzed me on every aspect of the case and the applicable law.

The overriding question was whether or not it would be cruel and unusual punishment to put my client to death in Mississippi for a felony murder in which he had been involved, but where he did not kill or attempt to kill the victim—his accomplice did the deed. About 10 days before the scheduled argument, I went to a house in the woods where no one would bother me and I re-read my notes, the cases, the record, and constructed answers to every conceivable question that could be asked. By the day of the argument in Washington, I believed I was as prepared as any lawyer could be to answer questions from the nine justices of the Supreme Court.

If you’ve ever been to the Supreme Court you know that it is a magnificent federal-style chamber that seats 400 people. Every chair was full that day because death penalty cases attract a great deal of attention in the legal community. The lawyers sit inside a bar facing the nine justices. My opponent was the Attorney General of Mississippi who argued first, then came the moment for which I had been preparing for over six months. I stood up, walked to the podium, put my notes down and looked up at the Chief Justice to begin my argument. Before I had said a word, Justice Rehnquist leaned forward, looked down at me and said, “counselor, the last lawyer at the podium was considerably shorter than you, would you like to raise the podium?” I looked up, and froze and realized this was a question for which I had not prepared and to which I did not know the answer. It was a difficult beginning. For the next 30 minutes, fortunately, I heard mostly questions I had prepared to answer and I left hoping for my client’s sake that I had been persuasive. Four months later, the United States Supreme Court vacated the death penalty which had been imposed on my client who then received a life sentence making him eligible for parole after serving 10 years. The lesson of that experience was an important one—there are some things you cannot prepare for in debate or in life and you must be flexible and adapt.

When I think about the importance of debate in our history and the tradition you all maintain, I think of some of the great debaters and orators of the past. First, Demosthenes, an orator and champion of democracy in Athens who courageously opposed the tyrannical rule

continued on page 6
of Phillip of Macedon, the father of Alexander the Great, in a series of brilliant orations, called the Philippics, in which he urged Athenians to seek independence in ringing words: “The man who deems himself born only to his parents will wait for his natural and destined end; the son of his country is willing to die rather than see her enslaved, and will look upon those outrages and indignities, which a commonwealth in subjection is compelled to endure, as more dreadful than death itself.”

Two hundred years later, the great Roman orator and statesman, Cicero, gave a series of speeches in the Roman Senate to oppose the imperial deigns first of Julius Caesar and then of Mark Antony. He eloquently urged the Senate to preserve the Republic because, in his words, “Some sort of a free state is the necessary condition of a noble and honorable existence; it is the worst calamity for a people to permanently renounce this ideal and to substitute for it the slave’s ideal of a good master.”

And finally, Abraham Lincoln who prevailed in his seven debates with Stephen Douglas on so many issues that affect our country to this day that he must be considered as not only a great President but also a great debater who shaped history through the power of his ideas and his eloquent presentation of those ideas to a troubled Republic. Lincoln repeated in those debates a powerful theme Douglas failed to rebut—that no nation could long endure half slave and half free.

The Fulton Prize debate is part of this great tradition passed down by the Greeks, the Romans, and our own American heroes. The clash of ideas, the evaluation of evidence and an appreciation of the human and emotional aspects of seeking to persuade others of the validity of your position are the roots of western democracy—and you all have an invaluable role in continuing that tradition, as demonstrated by the exciting debate we saw this afternoon.

I return for a moment to Abraham Lincoln the debater, the lawyer, the President and the father who valued human dignity above all else. He was a very proud parent and he saw in his son, Robert, a flair for debate and the skillful persuasion of others. He had hopes that Robert would attend the Harvard Law School after he graduated from Harvard College in 1864. But Robert joined the Army and served with Grant until the war ended in the spring of 1865. At that point, Lincoln had begun to think about returning to Springfield, Illinois after his Presidency and practicing law with his former partner, William Herndon, and with Robert whom he expected to attend law school now that the war was over. Lincoln was very proud of his son as all fathers, myself included, are—and he told Herndon that Robert would be a far better lawyer and debater than he—Lincoln—had ever been. In April 1865, Herndon wrote to Lincoln about his law practice in Springfield and asked about Lincoln’s plans for the future. Lincoln replied—in his plainspoken way: “Billy—if I live, I’m coming back some time and then we’ll go right on practicing law as if nothing had every happened—but with Robert as our partner.”

Later that week, Lincoln went to Ford’s theatre and he never practiced law with the son he loved so much. But part of Lincoln’s dream came true—Robert eventually became a lawyer—and had a distinguished career arguing cases well into the 20th century.

This is a night to reflect on the role of debate and the honest clash of ideas in all our lives and to cherish the historical tradition from which debate springs—a never ending search for truth. Thank you.

Professor Donald Fishman and Joseph McLaughlin at the reception.
The Milano family (Cheryl Milano ’82, Peter Milano ’09, Matthew Milano ’11 and Gregory Milano ’11) enjoy the reception before the banquet. Dad Mark Milano ’82 won the Fulton Prize Debate in 1982.

All Fultonians, friends of the Society, and family members attending the reunion received a Fulton Debate cap as a momento. The maroon caps (pictured in the foreground) have the BC logo and were embroidered with “Fulton Debate.”

HIGHLIGHT FROM THE DEBATE REUNION

Friday, April 20

The Fulton Reunion weekend commenced with an opening reception at the Sheraton Newton Hotel on Friday evening. In addition to a selection of wines, Fultonians feasted on beef tenderloin brochettes, teriyaki chicken skewers, scallops wrapped in bacon, spanikopita, and asparagus tips wrapped in salmon.

This gathering gave returning Fultonians an opportunity to renew acquaintances with old teammates and to meet alums from different generations. Immediately after the formal reception ended, a delegation of the younger Fultonians ventured into Boston proper to continue the festivities at their favorite establishments.

Highlights continue on page 8
Wallace Peck '56, Jack McNealy '60, and Kevin Byrne '61, enjoy lunch with Dorman and Claudette Picklesimer. “Dr. Pick,” a longstanding friend of the Society, was a member of the Communication faculty from 1969 until his retirement in 2002.

Saturday, April 21

Events shifted to campus on Saturday with a lunch in the Communication Department’s Conference Room and tours of the new debate suite in 21 Campanella Way. After lunch, Fultonians were free to walk around the campus, visit the bookstore to purchase BC apparel for family and friends, or view a Belgian art exhibit at the McMullen Art Museum. A few hearty souls even climbed the stairs to the fourth floor of Lyons Hall to experience the feeling of being in the old debate office, now a conference room used by the Music Department.

The Prize Debate began at 3:30 p.m. in the Fulton Debating Room, Gasson Hall 305. Except for the installation of a new video screen, the historic home of the Society remains unchanged. Details about the debate and the awards presentation can be found in the pages of this newsletter.

Once the debate was finished, festivities shifted to the Murray Function Room in the new Yawkey Athletic Center. Fultonians entered to a reception with assorted hors d’oeuvres and appropriate spirits. After the reception, the Fultonians feasted on a dinner of tenderloin of beef and Seafood Newburgh, accompanied by roasted potatoes, green beans, and Caesar salad. Dessert options included chocolate cake and freshly cut fruit.

The highlight of the reunion was the presentation of the Fultonian of the Year award to Joseph McLaughlin ’65, who gave a memorable acceptance speech reprinted on pages 5 and 6 of this newsletter. For the remainder of the evening, Fultonians entertained one another with reminiscences about partners and coaches (especially John Henry Lawton and Dan Rohrer), victories and defeats, and notable debate experiences.
SUPREME COURT CASES: 
THE 2006-2007 DEBATE TOPIC

Overruling landmark Supreme Court decisions was the college debate topic for 2006-2007. The wording of the topic was, “Resolved: That the United States Supreme Court should overrule one or more of the following decisions: Planned Parenthood v. Casey (1992), Ex parte Quirin (1942), United States v. Morrison (2000), and Milliken v. Bradley (1974).”

The four named cases deal with some of the most controversial and important issues of the day. Casey is a seminal abortion case which invalidated a spousal notification requirement contained in a Pennsylvania law yet upheld other restrictions on abortion such as requirements for parental consent, informed consent and 24 hour waiting periods. Quirin is an enemy combatants case from World War II which provides the legal basis for using military commission trials to prosecute enemy combatants captured on the battlefield in Afghanistan and Iraq. Morrison is a federalism case which invalidated the Violence Against Women’s Act because it exceeded Congress’ power under the Commerce Clause. Milliken is a Detroit school desegregation case where the court banned the use of inter-district, city-suburban desegregation plans unless it could be shown that the district substantially contributed to the segregation.

The novice and junior varsity teams advocated overruling Quirin by having the Supreme Court declare that military commissions were illegal under both the Geneva Conventions and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). As an alternative to military commission trials, the Fultonians argued that unlawful enemy combatants should be prosecuted in civilian courts or by courts-martial.

The case claimed three advantages to abandoning the use of military commission trials. First, the Fultonians argued that scrapping military commission trials will improve the ability of the United States to apprehend, prosecute, and prevent future terrorism. Because European and Arab countries oppose the use of military commission trials, they are refusing to extradite terrorists to the United States. Using civil trials or courts-martial will make it more likely that our allies will extradite terrorists and cooperate more fully in the war on terrorism.

Second, the Fultonians argued that abandoning military commission trials will help to restore the global leadership of the United States to promote human rights. For years, the United States has criticized other countries for employing secret trials without due process. If the United States prosecutes enemy combatants using unfair trials, then this appearance of hypocrisy will undercut America’s ability to pursue a positive human rights agenda.

Third, the Fultonians argued that making military commission trials illegal was crucial to preserving and bolstering international legal norms. By having the Supreme Court strike down military commissions on the basis of violating the Geneva Convention and the ICCPR, the affirmative plan established a precedent for incorporating international legal norms into United States Supreme Court jurisprudence. This action would bolster the credibility of the United States to strengthen international law to prevent human rights abuses and genocide.

The varsity teams overruled Morrison, but in a very unique way. Every team but Boston College who overruled Morrison did so by having the Supreme Court uphold congressional power to allow for federal civil remedies for gender-based violence under the Commerce Clause or section 5 of the 14th Amendment. In contrast, the Fultonians had the Supreme Court replace the substantial effects test with the structural necessity test when reviewing federal legislation under the Commerce Clause.

This version of Morrison claimed to strengthen federalism domestically, which would be modeled abroad by Russia, Iraq, and India, leading to greater stability in each of these countries and averting nuclear war. While this version of Morrison did not overrule the main holding of the decision invalidating the Violence Against Women’s Act, it was arguably topical because it did overrule the substantial effects test which was a precedent in Morrison. Much to the chagrin of negative teams, the Fultonians only lost one debate on topicality the entire year.
TOURNAMENT HIGHLIGHTS, 2006-2007

**Championship and Final Rounds:**

- **John Carroll University (Junior Varsity)**
  First place
  Ryan Malone & Matthew Maerowtiz

- **Binghamton University (Junior Varsity)**
  First place
  Ryan Malone & Matthew Maerowtiz

- **University of Richmond (Varsity)**
  Second place
  Allen Best & Mandy Castle

**Semi-Finalists:**

- **University of Richmond (Novice)**
  Second place
  Allen Best & Mandy Castle

- **George Mason University (Junior Varsity)**
  Second place
  Kevin Coughlin & Sean O'Hare

**Semi-Finalists (continued):**

- **United States Naval Academy (Junior Varsity)**
  First place
  Ryan Malone & Matthew Maerowtiz

- **Binghamton (Junior Varsity)**
  Second place
  Kevin Coughlin & Sean O'Hare

- **CEDA East Championship (Junior Varsity)**
  Second place
  Ryan Malone & Matthew Maerowtiz

- **CEDA East Regional Championship (Novice)**
  Third place
  Kevin Coughlin & Sean O'Hare

**Quarter-Finals:**

- **United States Naval Academy (Varsity)**
  Second place
  Allen Best & Mandy Castle

**Octa-Finals:**

- **University of Richmond (Junior Varsity)**
  Second place
  Ryan Malone & Matthew Maerowtiz

**Double-Octa-Finals:**

- **JV/Novice Nationals at West Virginia (Novice)**
  Third place
  Kevin Coughlin & Sean O'Hare
In April, the Fulton Debating Society hosted the Third Championship Tournament of the Boston Debate League. The League includes Prospect Hill Academy, Charlestown High School, Josiah Quincy Upper School, Boston Community Leadership Academy, Academy of Public Service, and Excel High School.

Over the course of the school year, the League sponsors six tournaments culminating in the Championship Tournament held at Boston College. Students competing in the Boston Debate League debate the national high school topic, which in 2006-2007 was, “Resolved: The United States federal government should establish a policy substantially increasing the number of persons serving in one or more of the following national service programs: Americorps, Citizen Corps, Senior Corps, Peace Corps, Learn and Serve America, Armed Forces.”

Congratulations to the Academy of Public Service who closed out the Junior Varsity Division and to Josiah Quincy Upper School for winning the varsity division.

Jack Trieu, from Josiah Quincy Upper School, making his closing arguments during the Varsity City Championship round with his partner Jason Lam nervously listening.

**FINAL NDT RANKINGS**

The Fulton Debating Society finished eighth in the NDT Rankings for 2006-2007. More than two hundred college and universities fielded policy debate teams last year, so a top ten finish ranks the Society among the nation’s elite debate programs. The top twenty-five includes:

1. Liberty University
2. University of Oklahoma
3. Binghamton University
4. United States Military Academy
5. Wake Forest University
6. Whitman College
7. Wayne State University
8. BOSTON COLLEGE
9. University of Kansas
10. Emory University
11. University of Georgia
12. Harvard University
13. Cornell University
14. University of Mary Washington
15. Northwestern University
16. Missouri State University
17. University of Rochester
18. University of California, Berkeley
19. John Carroll University
20. Kansas State University
21. Wichita State University
22. Gonzaga University
23. Dartmouth University
24. California Polytechnic State University
25. University of Southern California
Photo Montage from the 2007 Fulton Debate Reunion (clockwise by and within quadrant)

Upper left: Edward Fogarty '50, the oldest Fultonian attending the reunion, with Mary Saunders, the Communication Department Administrator. The youngest alum in attendance, Joseph Bowden, graduated fifty-five years later in 2005.

Upper right: Charles Morris '91 (now a Communication Professor at Boston College) and Laura Oei Phillips '93; Jennifer Dowd Deakin '90 and Communication Professor Donald Fishman; Chris Strunk '95 and Jack Minnear '95; Nick Brady '95 could not resist the temptation to pose with the Heisman Trophy in the lobby of the Yawkey Athletics Center. All four of the returning Fultonians from 1995 appear on this page.

Lower right: Darren Schwiebert '92 and Wenyu Ho Blanchard '95; Mark Milano '82; Dean Joseph Quinn, Mandy Castle '07, and John Katsulas are all smiles after the Fulton Prize Debate.

Lower left: Communication Professor Lisa Cuklanz, Stefan Bauschard (Debate Coach from 1999 to 2004), and Communication Professor Bonnie Jefferson at the reception.