Noah Valdez ’21, won top speaker honors (for the second consecutive year) and Fulton Debate reached the final round in the open division of the Cross-Examination Debate Association’s (CEDA) Northeast Regional Championship Tournament held at The New School in New York City during 23-24 February 2019.

A partial list of schools competing in the tournament included Binghamton, Columbia, Cornell, Liberty, The New School, New York University, Rutgers, The University of Rochester and the United States Military Academy.

Competing in the CEDA Northeast regional championship with Noah Valdez was Claire Wortsman ’20, who returned this semester to Fulton Debate after spending the fall studying in Geneva, Switzerland.

During the preliminary rounds, Valdez and Wortsman were 4-2 defeating teams from New York University (three different teams) and Rutgers. Both of their losses were versus Cornell teams.

In the quarter finals, BC, who was the fifth seed, met the fourth seed from New York University. BC prevailed on a unanimous decision.

Fulton Debate’s opponent in the semi-finals was Binghamton who upset the top seeded team from Liberty. Instead of defending a plan, Binghamton advanced a critique of how executive authority promoted white, masculinity. BC argued that Binghamton should lose for refusing to defend a policy option. In a 3-0 decision, the judges voted for BC.

In the final round, BC faced Rutgers, won the coin flip and again opted for the negative side. Like Binghamton, Rutgers refused to defend a policy and talked about how marginalized groups were spied on by the government. Unfortunately, this time, the judging panel was not receptive to BC’s topicality argument and Rutgers won the tournament.
2018-2019 DEBATE TOPIC: REDUCING EXECUTIVE POWER

The intercollegiate debate topic for 2018-2019 was “Resolved: The United States Federal Government should substantially increase statutory and/or judicial restrictions on the executive power of the President of the United States in one or more of the following areas: authority to conduct first-use nuclear strikes; congressionally delegated trade power; exit from congressional-executive agreements and Article II treaties; judicial deference to all or nearly all federal administrative agency interpretations of statutes and/or regulations; the bulk incidental collection of all or nearly all foreign intelligence information on United States persons without a warrant.”

Under this very broad debate resolution, Boston College teams developed two affirmative cases: one restricting executive authority in the first use of nuclear weapons and the other one restricting the bulk incidental collection of foreign intelligence on United States persons without a warrant.

The plan restricting nuclear first-strikes advocated by the Fulton was devised by two senior scientists (Lisbeth Gronlund and David Wright) at the Union of Concerned Scientists and a University of Maryland professor (Steve Fetter). Under their proposal, a presidential order authorizing a nuclear first-strike would require the approval from both the Speaker of the House and the Vice-President.

Preventing the outbreak of a nuclear war is the primary advantage claimed by this affirmative case. And the harm is much broader than the fear that President Trump might launch a reckless nuclear attack against North Korea or Iran. In fact, during the Watergate crisis, then Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger feared that a heavily drinking and depressed President Nixon might have ordered an ill-advised nuclear attack.

Requiring the approval from the Speaker of the House and the Vice President before any president could authorize a nuclear-first strike would prevent a single person from making an irrational or impulsive decision. This measure would certainly prevent President Trump from preemptively ordering the use of nuclear weapons, as there is no doubt that Nancy Pelosi would veto the action.

The Fulton’s other affirmative case imposed restrictions on the incidental collection of foreign intelligence about U.S. persons without a warrant. Under the current law, the definition of foreign intelligence is so broad that it includes any information that is relevant to foreign affairs. This allows U.S. intelligence agencies, while they are monitoring legitimate targets, to also gather the e-mails and phone calls of foreign journalists, activists, scientists, doctors, lawyers, and businesspeople whose communication, in all likelihood, deals with foreign affairs.

To prevent foreign intelligence collection about U.S. persons posing no national security risks, the Fulton advocated a plan which narrowed the scope of intelligence collection permitted under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) or by any Executive Orders, to (1) actual or potential attacks, including cyberattacks; (2) sabotage, international terrorism, or the international proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; or (3) clandestine intelligence activities.

General Abrams WWII tank at West Point:
Left to Right: Adam Lee, Nick Wong ’21, Ado Jean-Noel ’21, Ben Dewhurst ’21, Noah Valdez ’21, and Dan Moyer ’20. Front: Sophia Carter ’22
VALDEZ WINS THE DUFFY AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN DEBATE

The Kevin P. Duffy Award for Excellence in Debate honors the long and distinguished service of Dr. Kevin P. Duffy, Vice President of Student Affairs at Boston College from 1976 to 2000.

Noah Valdez ’21, a philosophy major from Nashua, New Hampshire, is the 2019 recipient of the Duffy Award.

Debating in varsity, Noah won numerous speaker awards (1st at the CEDA Northeast regional championship, 7th at West Point, 11th at James Madison) and achieved impressive tournament performances (finals at the Northeast Regional Championship and quarter-finals at West Point and James Madison).

Noah Valdez also won his second consecutive Fulton Medal in the Fulton Prize Debate.

CARTER WINS THE QUINN AWARD FOR THE OUTSTANDING FIRST YEAR DEBATER

The Joseph F. Quinn Award for Outstanding First Year Debater was created in 2007 to celebrate the service of Dr. Joseph F. Quinn, who currently is Professor and 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.

Sophia Carter ’22, a political science major from Rhode Island, is the 2019 recipient of the Quinn award.

Competing in novice, Carter won numerous speaker awards (7th place, ADA Nationals and 10th place, James Madison) and achieved impressive tournament performances (quarter-finals at ADA Nationals and Georgetown and octo-finals at West Point).

Sophia also participated in the University Club debate in New York City.

JEAN-NOEL WINS THE MCLAUGHLIN AWARD FOR PUBLIC DEBATING

The Joseph T. McLaughlin Award for Outstanding Public Debater was created in 2010 to celebrate the legendary career of Joseph T. McLaughlin, a legendary Fultonian who reached the final round of the National Debate Tournament in 1964, along with winning numerous national tournaments and speaker awards.

Van-Ado Jean-Noel ’21, an economics and computer science major from Boston, Massachusetts, is the 2019 recipient of the McLaughlin Award.

Ado participated in both the University Club Debate against Yale and the ACC Debate Tournament, where he won 4th place speaker honors and tied for third place. Competing in Junior Varsity at Georgetown because the novice and JV division were collapsed, Ado won 11th place speaker honors.
Noah Valdez ’21, a philosophy major from Nashua, New Hampshire, won the Fulton Medal at the 127th annual Fulton Prize Debate held on April 30th in Gasson 305.

The topic for the debate was “Resolved: That the United States should adopt compulsory voting in federal elections.”

Serving as the judges were Myles Casey ’17 (BC graduate student in philosophy and Fulton Debate alum), Rita Rosenthal (Communication Department professor of public speaking and persuasion), and Christy Webster Dunn (former BC debate coach).

Debating on the affirmative was Sophia Carter ’22 (first Affirmative speaker) and Ben Dewhurst ’21 (second affirmative speaker). Debating on the negative was Nicholas Wong ’21 (first negative) with Noah Valdez (second negative speaker).

The affirmative side argued that adopting compulsory voting was necessary to solve the problem of low voter turnout in U.S. elections—only 56% of the voting age population voted in the 2016 presidential election and only 49.4% voted in the 2018 mid-term election.

Low voter turnout was harmful, the affirmative claimed, because it contributes to political inequality and unresponsive policies toward the poor, the youth, and minority voters who are habitual non-voters. This results in politicians ignoring the problems of income inequality, poor health care access, and restrictive immigration policies.

The solution to low voter turnout, the affirmative argued, was to adopt compulsory voting modeled after Australia. This would require all U.S. citizens to show up to the polls. They would have the option of voting for “None of the Above” if they didn't support any of the candidates. Violating the law would result in the imposition of a twenty dollar fine. Since Australia adopted compulsory voting, the turnout rate has never fallen below 90%.

In response, the negative side argued that the adoption of compulsory voting was undesirable because it violated the individual liberty of persons who abstain from voting. The negative also argued that public opposition to mandatory voting would cause voters to backlash by leaving ballots blank or spoiling them with improper markings.

Instead of compulsory voting, the negative advocated increasing voter turnout by adopting same day voter registration, automatic voter registration and repealing mandatory voter ID laws.

In a 3-0 decision, the judges voted for the affirmative side but named Noah Valdez as the top speaker and the recipient of the gold Fulton Medal. Ben Dewhurst won second place speaker honors and he will receive the silver Gargan Medal.

As per Fulton tradition going back to 1985, if someone repeats as the Fulton winner, the name of the second place debater is painted on the great wall of Gasson 305. So, this means that Ben Dewhurst’s name will be painted on the wall.
YALE DEFEATS BC IN THE UNIVERSITY CLUB DEBATE

Yale defeated Boston College in the 15th annual Percy S. Douglas Memorial Debate held on November 14th at the University Club in New York City. Fulton Debate was represented by Richard Jove ’21, Sophia Carter ’22, Van-Ado Jean-Noel ’21, and Noah Valdez ’21.

The University Club Debate utilizes a parliamentary style of debating, where speakers are allowed to interrupt during their opponent’s constructive speeches by raising points of information. Each side is represented by four debaters. The first six speeches are seven minutes in length with each side giving a five minute rebuttal.

The motion for the debate was, “This house believes recreational marijuana should be legalized.” A month prior to the debate, a coin flip determined the sides for the debate. Boston College was assigned the role of the Opposition, meaning it opposed legalizing marijuana; Yale University acted as the Government and advocated in favor of the legalization of marijuana.

The debate was moderated by the Hon. Andrew P. Napolitano who is a senior judicial analyst for Fox News and a distinguished visiting professor at Brooklyn’s Law School. Previously Napolitano served on the New Jersey bench and was the state’s youngest then-sitting Superior Court judge.

The judges for the debate were the members of the University Club, who by a vote of 45 to 35, declared Yale as the winner of the debate. The loss to Yale ended Boston College’s historic run of three consecutive wins in the University Club debate.

ACC DEBATE TOURNAMENT

The fifth annual Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC) Debate Tournament was held in Washington, DC during April 5-6. For the first time ever, the debate tournament was part of the ACCelerate Creativity and Innovation Festival.

The preliminary debates were held on the campus of George Washington University and the final round was held at the Smithsonian National Museum of American History.

The topic for the tournament was, “Resolved: Voting should be compulsory in the United States.” Debating for Boston College in the ACC tournament was Ado Jean-Noel ’21 and Claire Wortsman ’20.

Boston College compiled a 3-1 record during the preliminary rounds defeating Clemson, Duke, and the Georgia Institute of Technology. BC’s only loss was to the University of Miami in a very close debate.

In the final round, the two undefeated teams met. Notre Dame, debating on the negative, defeated Wake Forest in a 2-1 decision.
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NEW HALL OF FAME INDUCTEES FOR THE DECADE OF THE 1960s

The decade of the 1960s was in many respects the Golden Age for Fulton Debate, when Boston College not only qualified a team to the National Debate Tournament (NDT) for the first time, but also advanced numerous teams into the late elimination rounds.

With so many worthy candidates from the 1960s, Fulton Debate is going to induct six new members (instead of the traditional five per decade) to its Hall of Fame. Our six new inductees are James J. Unger ’64, Joseph McLaughlin ’65, Robert W. Halli, Jr. ’68, David M. White ’68, Charles C. Brown ’70, and Mark R. Killenbeck ’70.

Our first inductee is James J. Unger, the most successful debater in Fulton history. In 1962, Unger became part of the first Fulton debate team (debating with William Able) to qualify for the NDT. During his junior and senior years (debating with Joseph McLaughlin), Unger reached the semi-finals of the NDT in 1963 and the final round in 1964, where he lost on a 4-3 decision to the University of the Pacific.

During his senior year, Unger was named the top speaker at nine of the fourteen tournaments in which he competed, and he won 5th place speaker honors at the 1964 NDT.

After graduating from Boston College, Unger went on to earn a law degree from Harvard University in 1967 and served as the Fulton debate coach from 1965-1967.

From 1968 to 1982, Unger served as the Director of Debate at Georgetown. His team won the NDT in 1977 and finished second in 1973 and 1976.

Our second inductee is Joseph T. McLaughlin. McLaughlin qualified to the NDT three times (1963, 1964 and 1965) and he won the Fulton Prize Debate twice (1964 and 1965).

McLaughlin’s debating career is under-appreciated because he was over-shadowed by debating with Unger. But, debating with other partners during his senior year, McLaughlin achieved tremendous success.

For example, during the Fall of 1964/Spring of 1965, McLaughlin won the University of Kentucky tournament (with John Raedel), won the American University tournament (with Robert Halli, Jr.) and won the Greater Boston Forensics Tournament (with Raedel). He also reached the semi-finals at Harvard (with Dennis McCarthy) and the quarter-finals at Dartmouth (with McCarthy).

In his senior year, McLaughlin received six top ten speaker awards, including winning top speaker at American University, the University of Kentucky and the Greater Boston Forensic Tournament at Boston University.

After graduating Boston College with honors, McLaughlin attended Cornell Law School. For forty-five years, McLaughlin enjoyed professional success as a litigator at Shearman and Sterling, Credit Suisse First Boston, Heller Ehrman, and at Bingham McCutchen.

Our third inductee is Robert W. Halli, Jr., who twice qualified for the NDT in 1965 (with Joseph McLaughlin) and in 1967 (with David White).

Halli won numerous individual speaker awards, including top speaker at St. Joseph's (Fall 1965), The University of Pennsylvania (Spring 1965), and Boston University (Spring 1965).

In the Spring of 1965, he won first place at the American University Tournament (with McLaughlin) and during his debating career, he reached the elimination rounds at Brandeis, Georgetown, Kentucky, and the U.S. Naval Academy.
HALL OF FAME CONTINUED

After graduating from Boston College, Halli received his Master’s and Ph.D. from the University of Virginia. For thirty years, he taught English at the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa and in 2002, was named director of their Honors Program.

Our fourth inductee is David M. White, who was a two time Fulton medal winner (1967 and 1968) and a two-time qualifier to the NDT in 1967 (with Robert Halli, Jr.) and in 1968 (with Charlie Brown).

David White earned numerous speaker awards, including top speaker honors at St. Anslem (Spring 1965) and Boston University (Spring 1965).

Debating with Charlie Brown during 1967-1968, White achieved second place at Dartmouth and Brandeis, two of the largest and most competitive tournaments of that season.

At the 1967 NDT held at the University of Chicago, Halli and White compiled a strong record of 4-4 with 13 ballots and missed qualifying to the elimination rounds by 1 ballot.

David White earned a J.D. from Harvard Law School. In 1985, he founded a non-profit company called, Testing for the Public, which provides students with instruction for taking the GMAT, LSAT and GRE.

Our fifth inductee is Mark R. Killenbeck, a Fulton Prize winner (1969) and a two-time NDT qualifier (1969 and 1970).

Debating with Charles Brown, Killenbeck reached the quarter-finals of the NDT in both 1969 and 1970. In 1969 at the NDT held at Northern Illinois, Brown and Killenbeck were 5-3 with 16 ballots. In the octo-finals, they defeated Canisius in a 3-2 decision. In the quarter-finals, they lost to Loyola in a 4-1 decision.

In the 1970 NDT held at the University of Houston, Brown and Killenbeck were again 5-3 with 16 ballots. They defeated UCLA in the octo-finals in a 5-0 decision. In the quarter-finals, they lost to the University of Houston (the top seed) in a 5-0 decision.

During his senior year, Killenbeck earned top speaker honors at some of the best tournaments, including Redlands and Georgetown. He was also second speaker at UCLA and the fifth place speaker at the NDT in 1969.

Killenbeck received a J.D. and a Ph.D. at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln. He is currently the Wylie H. Davis Distinguished Professor of Law at the University of Arkansas.

Our sixth inductee is Charles C. Brown, who was a three time qualifier to the NDT in 1968 (with White) and in 1969 and 1970 (with Killenbeck).

Along with being a two-time quarter finalists with Killenbeck at the NDT, Brown and Killenbeck achieved other great tournament performances. Early on, it was evident that their partnership would produce winning results. In the fall of 1966, Brown and Killenbeck won the Tufts tournament and in the Spring of 1967, they reached the semi-finals of the Novice Nationals tournament held at Northwestern.

In their senior year, Brown and Killenbeck were one of the best teams in the United States. They achieved second place finishes at Brandeis, UCLA, and Redlands. That year, Brown also earned many speaker awards including fifth place at Georgetown, fourth place at UCLA, and eighth place at Redlands.

Charles Brown received his Ph.D. in economics from Harvard. Since 1985, Brown has been a Professor of Economics at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
FULTONIANS FINISH 2nd AT NAVY

Nicholas Wong ’20 and Daniel Moyer ’20 reached the final round in junior varsity at the 60th Annual Crowe-Warken Debates held at the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland during 19-21 January 2019.

During the preliminary rounds, Wong and Moyer compiled a 5-3 record defeating teams from the University of Minnesota, West Point, the University of Houston, and Liberty.

In the quarter finals, BC won the coin flip and opted to debate on the negative side against Navy, who advocated a plan to require the United States to adopt a no-first use of nuclear weapons (NFU) declaratory policy. Wong and Moyer argued that NFU would erode our nuclear deterrent that protected Asian allies and Israel from security threats. BC defeated Navy in a 3-0 decision.

In the semi-finals, BC debating on the negative, defeated the top seed from Liberty who also advocated a NFU affirmative plan.

In the final round, Wong and Moyer were locked on the affirmative side versus George Mason. In this debate, Fulton advocated their plan to narrow the definition of foreign intelligence because it expected George Mason to run critical arguments.

However, George Mason put forth both critical arguments and policy arguments. And, in the last negative rebuttal, they extended the terrorism disadvantage which claimed the narrower definition of intelligence would interfere with identifying and apprehending terrorists.

In a 2-1 decision, the judges voted for George Mason on the terrorism disadvantage.