THE FULTONIAN

BC qualifies for 76th NDT

Coach Adam Lee, Director John Katsulas, Christopher Cheek '25, and Sophia Carter '22 (participating online)

Sophia Carter '22 and Christopher Cheek '25 qualified to compete at the 76th NDT held at James Madison University in hybrid form during April 1-4, 2022. They did so by placing third in the District 8 qualifying tournament hosted (online) by the University of Rochester on February 26, 2022.

Boston College first qualified to attend the NDT in 1962. William S. Abell, Jr., and James J. Unger were the first team to qualify. Carter and Cheek became the 42nd Fulton Debate team to qualify for the NDT.

BC is part of District 8, which includes the five New England states and New York. At the district tournament, other teams who qualified for the NDT along with BC were two teams from Binghamton (placed first and second) and the New School (placed fourth).

Prior to the district tournament, two teams from both Harvard from Dartmouth received first-round at-large bids to the NDT. After districts, Tufts received a second-round bid, and teams from Harvard and Dartmouth received third-team bids.

As a prerequisite to attending the NDT, all participants were required to submit a negative COVID test result. Unfortunately, the Monday before the tournament, Carter tested positive, which required her to debate from her home in Rhode Island.

Cheek attended the NDT in person (along with the BC coaches) and communicated with Carter by cell phone before debate rounds.

Given that Carter was ill during the tournament, BC performed admirably, winning 3 debates (defeating the Naval Academy, Indiana, and Emporia State in unanimous 3-0 decisions) with 11 ballots. Two of their losses were in close split decisions to Baylor and Rutgers.

In the NDT final round, Dartmouth College (Arvind Shankar & Tyler Vergho) defeated the University of Michigan (Giorgio Rabbini & Rafael Pierry) in a 4-3 decision to repeat as champions. Last year, Vergho (debating with Raam Tambe) defeated Rabbini & Pierry in a 5-0 decision.

Greetings from the Heights

This issue of *The Fultonian* reports on some of the activities during the 2021-2022 academic year. Highlights include qualifying for the 76th NDT and the novice team winning the Texas Open and placing second at ADA Nationals.

We also inducted five Fultonians from the 1990s into the Fulton Debate Hall of Fame. Finally, we celebrate Fulton history with a story about the first intercollegiate debate in 1895 between BC and Georgetown.

As always, we hope you enjoy reading *The Fultonian*.

John Katsulas, Adam Lee, & Dale Herbeck

130th FULTON PRIZE DEBATE: CHRISTOPHER CHEEK WINS FULTON MEDAL

The topic for the debate was, *"Resolved: The U.S. Supreme Court should overrule the U.S. First Circuit Court of Appeals decision in Shurtleff v. City of Boston by holding that the City of Boston's third flagpole available for raising private flags is not government speech."*

This controversy was a pending case before the United States Supreme Court. The issue in the case was whether the third flagpole on the City Hall Plaza, which usually flies the Boston City flag, was government speech or a designated public forum.

After approving 284 third-party flag raisings, the City of Boston denied the Camp Constitution from flying its "Christian Flag." The group filed a lawsuit alleging religious discrimination. Boston defended its denial by saying the flagpole was government speech and that it was necessary for the City to deny all religious flag raisings to avoid violating the Establishment Clause.

In the debate, Caleb Wachsmuth '24 (first affirmative) and Sophia Carter '22 (second affirmative) advocated for the affirmative side, and Ian McNabb '24 (first negative) and Christopher Cheek '25 (second negative) supported the negative position.

The affirmative argued that, since Boston opened its flagpole to various groups and exerted very little oversight over the approval of the flags (i.e., Boston admitted it did not look at the approved flags), the City flagpole became a designated public forum. It also argued that a ruling in favor of Boston would expand the scope of the government speech doctrine and result in the censorship of viewpoints.

In response, the negative argued that a ruling against Boston would decrease freedom of speech because the City would terminate the flying of any third-party flags. If the flagpole was deemed a public forum, the negative claimed the City would be prohibited from excluding any flags based on viewpoints, including the flags of the KKK and the Nazis.

This year's judges were six distinguished Fulton alumni, including Wenyu Ho Blanchard '95 (Associate General Counsel and Vice President at SP+), Jack Minnear '95 (Assistant General Counsel at Verizon), Nick Brady '95 (U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission attorney), Joshua Marmol '99 (Legal and International Sales Executive at GET Group Passport ID), Dominic Cameratta '01 (CFO at Cameratta Companies), and Brendan Benedict '12 (Benedict Law Group).

In a 6-0 decision, the judges voted for the negative and awarded the Fulton Medal (for top speaker) to Christopher Cheek and the Gargan Medal (for second best speaker) to Ian McNabb.

Only six days after the debate, the United Supreme Court in a 9-0 decision held that the City of Boston violated the First Amendment when it denied Camp Constitution an application to fly a Christian flag in front of city hall.

Fulton Prize Debaters (from left): Christopher Cheek '25, Ian McNabb '24 (speaking), Caleb Wachsmuth '24, and Sophia Carter '22

The 130th annual Fulton Prize Debate was held on April 26, 2022 in Gasson 305 and also available on Zoom

2021-2022 DEBATE TOPIC: INCREASING THE SCOPE OF ANTITRUST LAWS

The intercollegiate debate topic for 2021-2022 was *"Resolved: The United States Federal Government should substantially increase prohibitions on anticompetitive business practices by the private sector by at least expanding the scope of its core antitrust laws."*

Boston College teams advocated a plan to repeal baseball's exemption from antitrust laws. In 1922, in *Federal Baseball Club of Baltimore v. Professional Baseball Clubs*, the U.S. Supreme Court, in an opinion written by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, held that baseball was exempt from antitrust laws because it did not constitute interstate travel.

In two later decisions in 1953 (*Toolson v. New York Yankees*) and in 1972 (*Flood v. Kuhn*), the Supreme Court acknowledged that baseball involved interstate travel, but refused to revoke the exemption based on specious arguments grounded in *stare decisis* and nebulous claims about how baseball was somehow different from other professional sports teams.

Boston College claimed several advantages to revoking the baseball exemption, including forcing Major League Baseball (MLB) to pay minor league players higher wages and preventing MLB from coercing cities to provide subsidies for building new stadiums.

The debate resolution on antitrust was one of the broadest in recent years. Because the topic failed to require the affirmative to choose its plan from a list of sectors, any private sector of the economy became fair game for a plan.

The range of antitrust plans dealing with one sector of the economy was staggering and included these: big container shipping, small farming cooperatives, blockchain, drug companies, defense contractors, meat-packing, agro-chemical firms, oil and gas, hospitals, Facebook, Amazon, Google, export cartels, Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations, airlines, American Express, outer space commercialization, and telecommunications.

Along with these single sector approaches, affirmative teams advocated numerous plans to replace the consumer welfare standard with an alternative that allowed for consideration of other factors, including the public interest, competition, worker welfare, and total welfare.

Despite the expansive affirmative ground, the antitrust topic did not lead to a lop-sided number of wins for the affirmative. In fact, debate teams routinely opted to debate on the negative side if they won the coin flip in the elimination rounds.

In many ways, the topic favored the negative side because most affirmative plans harmed the economy and had difficulty proving that they solved any harms.

The best economic disadvantage on the topic argued that expanding antitrust eroded U.S. business confidence, which decreased innovation and economic growth.

A common geopolitical disadvantage argued that expanding antitrust against U.S. technology companies made them less competitive against China, which ceded U.S. technology leadership in areas such as artificial intelligence, cloud computing, and 5G.

The Fulton Debate Society of 2020-2021

Sophia Carter '22
Christopher Cheek '25
Cross Conrad '23
Owen Engler '23
Louis Gleason IV '23
Fiona Godoy '25
Katherine McCaffrey '25
Ian McNabb '24
Elliott Shin '22
Caleb Wachsmuth,'24
Anderson Zhang '23

Contact Fulton Debate

John Katsulas
Director of Debate
St. Mary's Hall S360A
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467
(617) 552-4298 or katsulas@bc.edu

Adam Lee
Debate Coach
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467
arlee1979@gmail.com

Fulton Debate Web Site
www.bc.edu/fultondebate

CARTER WINS THE DUFFY AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN DEBATE

Sophia Carter '22

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.

Sophia Carter '22, from Warwick, Rhode Island, is the 2022 recipient of the Duffy Award.

After achieving competitive success as a novice and JV debater, Carter debated this year in varsity and became one of the few students to qualify for the NDT who began as a novice.

Carter graduated with a dual degree in political science and philosophy and was inducted into Phi Beta Kappa.

Next year, Carter will be working as a paralegal and research assistant at the law offices of Brann & Isaacson in Portland, Maine.

WACHSMUTH & MCNABB SHARE QUINN AWARD FOR 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, the James P. McIntyre Professor of Economics. From 1999 to 2007, Dr. Quinn was the much-beloved Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and a strong supporter of the liberal arts and the Fulton Debating Society.

Caleb Wachsmuth '24, a sophomore from Portland, Oregon, and Ian McNabb '24, a sophomore from New Hampshire, are the recipients of the Quinn Award.

As debate partners competing in the novice division, Wachsmuth & McNabb achieved outstanding success. They won the University of Texas (Austin) tournament and finished second at two tournaments—the University of Minnesota online tournament and ADA Nationals at Emory University. Wachsmuth & McNabb were also quarter-finalists at the Wyoming online tournament.

Ian McNabb '24 & Caleb Wachsmuth '24

CHEEK WINS THE MCLAUGHLIN AWARD FOR PUBLIC DEBATING

Christopher Cheek '25

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

Christopher Cheek '25, a political science major from Nashville, Tennessee, is the recipient of the McLaughlin award for public debating.

Cheek debated in high school at the University School of Nashville, and he qualified for the NDT as a freshman. He is the recipient of the McLaughlin Award for winning the Fulton Medal in the Fulton Prize Debate.

FULTON DEBATES TAKES SECOND PLACE AT ADA NATIONALS

Caleb Wachsmuth '24 and Ian McNabb '24 reached the final round in the novice division of the American Debate Association's National Tournament hosted online and in person by Emory University during March 5-7, 2022. This was the first tournament where BC debated in person.

During the preliminary debates, Wachsmuth & McNabb were 5-1, defeating teams from Monmouth, University of Miami (Florida), University of Houston, George Mason, and Indiana.

As the 4th seed, Wachsmuth & McNabb debated against the 13th seed from George Mason. The computer awarded George Mason the choice of sides, and they decided to debate on the negative. George Mason argued a Capitalism bad critique. BC argued that replacing Capitalism with Marxism would lead to massive social disruptions leading to the death of three-quarters of the world's population.

With a distinguished judging panel headed by the legendary Dallas Perkins, Jr. (retired Harvard Coach), Boston College prevailed in a 2-1 decision capturing the ballot of Perkins, along with the current Harvard Director of Debate, Tripp Rebrovick.

In the quarter-finals, Boston College met the 5th seed from James Madison. BC again lost the coin flip. James Madison opted to debate on the negative. James Madison argued an Afropessimism critique. BC responded by arguing that applying antitrust to MLB was not inconsistent with Afropessimism. In another 2-1 decision, Boston College emerged victorious.

The semi-finals set up a debate against the undefeated and top seed from the University of Houston. Fortunately, the computer cooperated this time and gave BC the choice of sides. BC immediately declared it was going to debate on the negative.

The University of Houston advocated a plan to apply antitrust against the National Resident Matching Program. This is a non-profit that matches medical students to residency programs. Earlier in the tournament, BC had defeated the other Houston team who ran this same affirmative plan. So, BC was confident in beating Houston.

In the semi-final debate, Wachsmuth & McNabb argued that the Houston plan was non-topical. The debate resolution required expanding antitrust to the private sector. BC argued that the doctor match program was not part of the private sector because it was not a profit-seeking business. BC argued that excluding non-profits was vital to keeping the topic manageable as there are 1.4 million non-profit organizations.

In a 2-1 decision, the judges agreed with BC that the Houston's plan was non-topical.

In the final round, Boston College faced Samford University. The computer awarded BC its choice of sides, and BC opted for the affirmative. Because Samford ran a new affirmative plan in the octo-finals, BC was not prepared to debate on the negative side.

In the finals, BC ran its plan to repeal the antitrust exemption given to MLB. In a very close debate, the judges voted for Samford in a 2-1 decision.

Tournament Schedule for 2021-2022

October 15-17, 2021 – University of Mary Washington (online)

October 10-25-27, 2021 – Wayne State University (online)

November 5-7, 2021 – Liberty University (online)

November 12-15, 2021 – Wake Forest University (online)

November 12-14, 2021 – ADA Fall Championship (online)

December 3-5, 2021 – University of Wyoming (online)

January 28-31, 2022 – University of Minnesota (online)

February 5-7, 2022 – University of Texas (online)

February 26, 2022 – District 8 Tournament (online)

March 5-8, 2022 – ADA Nationals at Emory (in person and online)

April 1-4, 2022 – NDT at James Madison University (in person and online)

April 30, 2022 – ACC Debate Tournament (online)

FULTONIANS WIN TEXAS OPEN

Caleb Wachsmuth '24 and Ian McNabb '24 won the novice division of the Texas Open hosted online and in person by the University of Texas (Austin) during February 5-7, 2022. Approximately half of the teams attended in person. Boston College competed online.

In the preliminary rounds, Wachsmuth & McNabb were 4-2 defeating teams from Liberty, University of Houston, George Mason, and the University of Minnesota.

In the octo-finals, Wachsmuth & McNabb debated against a hybrid team of students from James Madison & Texas Tech. Debating on the negative, BC won in a 3-0 decision.

In the quarter-finals, BC debating on the affirmative, defeated Liberty in a 3-0 decision.

The semi-finals set up a re-match against New York University, who defeated BC in the quarter-finals of Wyoming in December. With NYU debating on the affirmative side again, they advocated the same plan, which was the Competition and Antitrust Law Enforcement Reform Act. This is a policy promoted by Senator Amy Klobuchar, which advocated several measures to block future mergers and acquisitions. In a 2-1 decision, BC defeated NYU.

In the final round, Boston College faced a hybrid team of students from the University of Houston and The New School. BC won the coin flip and opted to debate on the negative. The Houston/New School team advocated a plan to have the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) file an avalanche of lawsuits against Amazon alleging antitrust and National Labor Relations violations. This affirmative case argued that Amazon exploited workers by offering low wages and providing unsafe working conditions.

In response, Wachsmuth & McNabb argued that Amazon paid higher wages than other companies and was adopting measures to improve working conditions in its warehouses. Boston College also argued that, by reducing the profits of Amazon, the plan would decrease investment and innovation to develop artificial intelligence, which would jeopardize the ability of the U.S. military to compete against China.

The decisive argument that won the debate for BC was a solvency turn claiming that the affirmative plan would cause Congress to backlash against the FTC. BC argued that over-aggressive enforcement in the past resulted in Congress retaliating against the FTC by cutting their funding and staff.

In a 2-1 decision, the judges voted for BC. The two judges that were in the majority were former National Debate Tournament Champion debaters from Kentucky (Anthony Trufanov, 2019) and Dartmouth (Raam Tambe, 2021). Therefore, BC felt highly confident that they deserved to win the debate.

Ian McNabb '24 and Caleb Wachsmuth '24 with a cake celebrating their victory at the Texas Open

Christopher Cheek '25, Sophia Carter '22, Ian McNabb '24, and Caleb Wachsmuth '24 celebrate victories at the Capital Grille

NEW HALL OF FAME INDUCTEES FOR THE DECADE OF THE 1990s

The Fulton Debating Society enjoyed tremendous competitive success during the decade of the 1990s. While there were many outstanding debaters, the five most successful that deserve induction into the Fulton Debate Hall of Fame are Darren Schwiebert '92, Craig Cerniello '93, John Frantz '93, Jack Minnear '95, and Wenyu (Ho) Blanchard '95

Our first two inductees are Darren Schwiebert and Craig Cerniello, who debated together from the Fall of 1989 until the Spring of 1992. This partnership produced many triumphs at tournaments and qualified for the NDT three times (1990, 1991, and 1992).

In their first two years as a team, Cerniello & Schwiebert won tournaments at King's (1990) and George Washington (1990). They also placed second at King's (1989) and Navy (1990), reached the quarter-finals at Navy (1991), and advanced to the double-octo finals at Northwestern (1991).

During the 1991-1992 season, Cerniello & Schwiebert reached the elimination rounds at national-level tournaments: octo-finals at North Carolina (1991), octo-finals at Wake Forest (1991), quarter-finals at Pittsburgh (1991), quarter-finals at West Georgia (1992), and the octo-finals at Heart of America (1992).

At the 1992 NDT hosted by Miami (Ohio), Cerniello & Schwiebert concluded their debate career on a high note by reaching the octo-finals. During the preliminary rounds, they won 5 debates with 13 ballots. In the double-octo finals, they defeated Baylor (Rod Phares & Bill Trapani) in a 3-2 decision. They were defeated in the octo-finals by Georgetown (Ahilan Arulanantham & Kevin Kuswa), the eventual NDT champion that year.

On a final note, it should be recognized that Darren Schwiebert was a four-time qualifier for the NDT, having qualified during his freshmen year with Lisa Marie Ameden. Schwiebert also is a two-time winner of the Fulton Medal (1990 and 1991).

After graduating from Boston College with a degree in political science and communication, Schwiebert received his J.D. from the Harvard Law School in 1995.

For the past 27 years, Schwiebert has worked as a prominent trial lawyer for several law firms. He has appeared in over 100 Federal Court cases in 15 different Federal Courts. He has tried cases in the areas of breach of contract, patent infringement, patent ownership, copyright infringement, employment litigation, debt collection, fraud, and civil theft.

Since 2021, Schwiebert has been employed as an attorney by Briol & Benson in Minneapolis.

Cerniello did not debate during his senior year, and he graduated from Boston College in 1993 with a degree in political science. He then received an M.P.M. in International Security and Economic Policy from the University of Maryland.

Charles Morris, Jennifer Dowd, Craig Cerniello, and Darren Schwiebert participated in the 1990 Fulton Prize Debate celebrating the Society's Centennial

Dale Herbeck, Craig Cerniello, Darren Schwiebert, and John Katsulas at the 1991 National Debate Tournament

1990s HALL OF FAME CONTINUED

Back: Dale Herbeck and John Katsulas
Front: John Frantz and Jack Minnear
at the 1993 NDT

Back: John Katsulas and Dale Herbeck
Front: Jack Minnear and Wenyu Ho
at the 1994 NDT

For several years, Cerniello worked for the Arms Control Association and authored numerous articles for *Arms Control Today*. Today he works for the U.S. government as a foreign policy and intelligence analyst.

Our third Hall of Fame inductee is John Frantz. Along with being an elite debater, he was known for wearing all-black attire at debate tournaments. So, like Johnny Cash, he earned the nickname of "The Man in Black."

As a freshman, Frantz debated with Sal Liberto. At Wake Forest in 1990, they qualified for the freshman breakout elimination rounds, where they reached the semi-finals. For the next two years, Frantz debated with Jack Minnear. In their first year debating together, they showed great potential. At the Northwestern tournament, they reached the double-octo finals, and they later qualified for the NDT. At the NDT, they won 4 debates and in round 8, they lost a break round in a split decision.

The next year, Frantz & Minnear emerged as one of the top twenty debate teams in the United States. During the 1992-1993 year, they reached the elimination rounds at virtually every national tournament: octo-finals at Northern Iowa (1992), second place at North Carolina (1992), octo-finals at Harvard (1992), octo-finals at Wake Forest (1992), double-octo finals at Northwestern (1993).

John Frantz earned several individual speaker awards including 7th speaker at North Carolina and 15th speaker at Harvard.

At the 1993 NDT hosted by Northern Iowa, Frantz & Minnear reached the double-octo finals. They won 5 debates with 13 ballots. They were defeated in the first elimination round by George Mason (Gordon Stables & Ryan Galloway).

In 1993, Frantz graduated from Boston College on an accelerated basis (in 3 years) and then received his J.D. degree in 1996 from Harvard Law School.

From 1997-2000, Frantz worked as an Associate at Kirkland & Ellis in Washington, DC. Since 2000, he has worked in a variety of legal roles at Verizon. He is presently the Senior Vice President and General Counsel of the Verizon Business Group. Since 2009, he has also served as the Chair of Verizon's pro bono program.

Our fourth inductee is Norman "Jack" Minnear. Jack Minnear enjoyed a fabulous four-year career—debating for two years with John Frantz and two years with Wenyu Ho. He qualified for the NDT four times (1992, 1993, 1994, 1995). He is also the only debater in Fulton history to advance four times to the double-octo finals at the Northwestern Tournament.

In his junior year debating with Ho, Minnear advanced to the double-octo finals at Northern Iowa and, of course, at Northwestern. They also qualified for the NDT.

1990s HALL OF FAME CONCLUDED

Minnear & Ho achieved considerable tournament success during their senior year. They advanced to the double-octo finals at Northern Iowa (1994), octo-finals at North Carolina (1994), quarter-finals at Navy (1995), double-octo finals at Northwestern (1995), and quarter-finals at ADA Nationals (1995).

In 1995, Minnear also debated at the George Washington tournament with Bill Macey. They reached the semi-finals, with Minnear earning 4th place speaker honors. At the 1995 NDT held at West Georgia, Minnear & Ho came close to making the elimination rounds. Going into round 8, they had 4 wins. But, unfortunately, the round 8 pairing pulled them up to face a first-round at-large team from Northwestern (Sinan Aral & Mason Miller), who had 5 wins. In round 8, Aral & Miller defeated Minnear & Ho and ended their debate career.

After graduating from Boston College with a philosophy degree, Minnear received his J.D. in 1998 from Georgetown Law School. He has practiced law at several firms, including Sutherland Asbill & Brennan (2004-2011) and Kasowitz, Benson, Torres & Friedman (2011-2014). Since 2014, Minnear has served as the Assistant General Counsel at Verizon.

Our final inductee is Wenyu (Ho) Blanchard. Wenyu debated for four years and achieved success at the novice, junior varsity, and varsity levels.

As a novice, Ho debated with Christopher Strunk. They were a formidable novice team. They won Navy and ADA Nationals and placed second at George Mason.

The following year, Ho debated in junior varsity with Dilip Paliath. The Ho & Paliath partnership won three tournaments (James Madison, Liberty, and ADA Nationals) and placed second at two more tournaments (Navy and George Mason). Debating with Nick Brady, she reached the finals of Navy.

As a JV debater, Ho received a top five speaker award at every tournament and she won the top speaker award at both Navy and ADA Nationals.

During her last two years, Ho debated in varsity with Jack Minnear. For someone who began as a true novice, it is remarkable that she qualified twice for the NDT and reached the elimination rounds at numerous national tournaments.

Along with being a champion tournament debater, Wenyu Ho was also a successful competitor in public debates. She won the Fulton Medal in 1994 and the Gargan Medal in 1993. She was selected by the International Discussion and Debate (ICDD) committee to be a member of the U.S. debate team that toured Great Britain for several months in 1996.

After graduating from Boston College with a degree in political science, Ho returned to the Heights and earned a J.D. degree from the Boston College Law School.

She worked as an associate and made partner at a law firm in Chicago (Sonnenschein). Ho Blanchard then pursued a career as an in-house attorney at several firms, including Wrigley (2006-2013), Oscar Mayer (2013-2016), and Alliant Energy (2016-2021). Currently, Ho Blanchard is the Associate General Counsel and Vice President at SP+.

As freshmen, Wenyu Ho '95 and Chris Strunk '95 won the novice division at the 1992 U.S. Naval Academy Tournament

BOSTON COLLEGE VERSUS GEORGETOWN: THE INTERCOLLEGIATE PUBLIC DEBATE SERIES

In December 1894, Georgetown accepted a challenge from Boston College to compete in an intercollegiate debate. This would be the first off-campus debate and would lead to the establishment of an annual debate competition between the Fulton Debating Society and the Philodemic Society of Georgetown that lasted for six years.

The negotiations for establishing the rules for the first debate in 1895 were conducted by the Rev. Timothy Brosnahan S.J., the President of Boston College with the Rev. J. Havens Richards S.J., the President of Georgetown. Georgetown's enthusiasm for agreeing to the debate were certainly helped by the fact that Father Richards completed his undergraduate education at Boston College from 1869 to 1872.

After several months of talks, the colleges consented to a basic framework. They agreed that the debate would occur in Boston, and that Boston College would pick a topic before February 25, and that Georgetown would select the side it wanted to defend within ten days after receiving the topic. They further agreed that each side would have three debaters who would be allowed to each speak for fifteen minutes.

It was agreed that there would be five judges with two of the judges selected by each school. The Presidents of the colleges would select a fifth judge who would chair the panel.

With these parameters agreed to, Boston College sent a telegram to Georgetown on February 24 suggesting the following subject for the debate: *"Resolved: That the granting of citizenship to the negro has been detrimental to his best interests."*

Georgetown objected and Boston College proposed: an alternative: *"Resolved: That the present income tax is equitable."* Georgetown found this topic acceptable and elected to debate on the negative side.

The selection of the five judges followed soon afterward. Georgetown picked Charles E. Gorman, a U.S. District Attorney from Providence, and Richard H. Dana, a prominent Boston attorney and the author of the Massachusetts Ballot Act of 1888 (which ensured the right to a secret ballot).

Boston College selected George F. Babbitt, a Boston Health Commissioner (who donated the Fulton Medals for the 1892 and 1893 Fulton Prize Debates), and John P. Leahy, a Boston lawyer who was the President of the Catholic Union.

The college presidents of BC and Georgetown jointly decided on the Rev. Thomas J. Conaty, the president of the Catholic Summer School, to be the fifth judge.

After two postponements, the debate was finally held on the evening of May 1, 1895, in College Hall before a full house of 1200 spectators. The walls of the room were adorned with the blue and gray colors of Georgetown, the maroon and gold colors of Boston College, and the Stars and Stripes. Beautiful ferns and flowers decorated the stage.

Shortly after 8 pm, James T. Connolly '95, a Holy Cross debater and the master of ceremonies, introduced the debaters and gave a brief speech extolling the virtues of the art of debating.

Michael J. Scanlon, the first affirmative speaker from Boston College, defended the equity of the income tax by arguing that it was a fairer method of generating revenue than the tariff laws. Whereas tariff laws imposed the same tax on all citizens regardless of means, Scanlon argued, the income tax was more equitable by requiring the wealthy to pay a higher share than those having less wealth.

Sketches of the Boston College and Georgetown teams published in the Boston Globe, Monday, April 22, 1895

BC VERSUS GEORGETOWN CONTINUED

The first negative speaker from Georgetown, James W. Burke, argued that his side should win the debate if they proved that any part of the income tax was inequitable. To support his point, he identified several exemptions to the income tax that he argued were inequitable. For example, he claimed there was no basis for excluding state, county, and municipal bonds from taxation. He also claimed that the exemption of the income tax which did not apply to any income below $4000 was not equitable; as those citizens paid nothing to support the government.

Michael J. Splaine, the second affirmative speaker, briefly responded to the points made by the first negative, and then expanded upon the arguments presented in the first affirmative. Splaine reiterated the point that the revenue generated from tariffs came mostly from the pockets of consumers of modest means. He also argued that absent the income tax, the wealthy would contribute nothing to support the funding of the armed forces, the payment of pensions, or the improvement of the nation's infrastructure.

The second negative speaker, Charles E. Roach, devoted much of his speech arguing the exemption of income below $4000 was not equitable. He claimed "all incomes should fall within the scope of the law—the man of moderate means, as the wealthy, must be taxed proportionately without favoritism to individual or class." Roach cited figures from other countries to prove that the $4000 exemption in the U.S. tax code was too high. For instance, he stated that the exemption in Prussia was $225, in Denmark it was $215, and in Germany, $70 to $600. The $4000 figure was not chosen based on any ethical principles or political economy, he said. Rather, it was chosen for political expediency. By excluding 90% of the population from the tax, Roach concluded, it was possible to gain political support for adopting it.

John J. Kirby, the last affirmative speaker, argued that the $4000 exemption was not excessive. He claimed that the amount was justified to offset the costs of the tariffs paid for by those with incomes below this amount. Kirby's closing speech, as well as Boston College's overall argument in the debate, was that the income tax was justified as a countervailing measure to offset the costs of the tariff law.

The last negative speaker from Georgetown, Neal J. Power, repeated many of the same arguments about the income tax having numerous and unreasonable exemptions. These exemptions and favoritism, he warned, would eventually lead to strife among the classes.

Power concluded his speech with a rhetorical appeal for upholding the American ideals of equality: "For America's first principle is equality. Equality of privileges, equality of duties, equality of burdens! And if this be the directing and pervading spirit of our laws, all will be well, and this great nation of ours, conceived in the light and spirit of independent equality and nourished upon the bosom of uncompromising justice, will triumph over her enemies and remove any menace that may or can threaten her permanent welfare and continued prosperity."

After twenty minutes of deliberations by the five judges, Rev. Father Conaty came upon the stage to announce that Georgetown was the winner of the debate.

Despite Georgetown's triumph over BC in the 1895 debate, the Philodemic Debating Society would not participate in another intercollegiate debate until 2006. From 1895 to 1906, the main focus of the Georgetown debate program was confined to holding public debates on campus.

This situation changed in 1906 when the President and Board of Trustees of Georgetown issued a declaration supporting the expansion and promotion of greater debating activities.

When Georgetown resumed its interest in intercollegiate debating, an agreement was reached with the Fulton Debating Society to hold an annual debate. From 1910 to 1915, Boston College competed in six debates against Georgetown, with the Fulton winning four of the six debates.

These six debates utilized the same three-person debate format as the 1895 contest, but the length of the speeches was reduced to twelve minutes with the last two speeches being five minutes.


TWICE WINNER IN TWO WEEKS.

Debating Team of the Fulton Society of Bosion COllege Overcomes Georgetown---Banquet This Evening.

DAVID B. WATERS. JAMES A. COVENEY. LOUIS F. KELLEHER.

FULTON DEBATING SOCIETY TEAM.

Boston Globe, Wednesday, April 13, 1910

The Intercollegiate Debate Series

The First Boston College-Georgetown Debate (1895)

Date: May 1, 1895, in College Hall at Boston College
Topic: *"Resolved: That the present income tax is equitable."*
Debaters: Boston College (Aff.) - Michael J. Scanlon '95, Michael J. Splaine '97, and John J. Kirby, '95
Georgetown (Neg.) - James W. Burke '95, Charles E. Roach '95, and Neal J. Power '95
Judges: Rev. Thomas J. Conaty (President, Catholic Summer School), Richard H. Dana, Esq. (Boston attorney and civil service reformer), Charles E. Gorman (U.S. District Attorney for Providence), George F. Babbitt, Esq. (Health Commissioner), and John P. Leahy, Esq. (President, Catholic Union)
Decision: Georgetown wins

Boston College-Georgetown Annual Public Debate Series (1910-1915)

Date: April 12, 1910, in College Hall at Boston College
Topic: *"Resolved: That legislation be enacted whereby all national banks shall be required to establish a guarantee fund for the full payment of all depositors of any insolvent national bank, such fund and the administration thereof to be under the control of the federal government."*
Debaters: Georgetown (aff.) - John F. Crowley '12, Edward V. Carter '11, and Daniel B. Murray '10
Boston College (neg.) - James A. Coveney '10, Louis F. Keleher '10, and David B. Waters '11
Judges: Melvin O. Adams (Boston lawyer and former U.S. Attorney for Massachusetts), O.W.M. Sprague (finance professor at Harvard University), and John B. Dore (President, Charitable Irish Society)
Decision: Boston College wins

Date: April 23, 1911, in Gatson Hall at Georgetown
Topic: *"Resolved: That Congress should have the power to lay and collect taxes on incomes from whatever source derived without apportionment among the several States and without regard to any census or enumeration."*
Debaters: Boston College (aff.) - Francis A. Harrington '12, Thomas L. Gannon '13, and David B. Waters '11
Georgetown (neg.) - James M. Pierce '11, Edward V. Carter '11, and Vincent Daily '12
Judges: Scott C. Bone (Editor, *Washington Post*), Gen. James F. Smith (Judge, U.S. Court of Customs Appeals), and William F. Murray (U.S. Representative from Massachusetts)
Decision: Boston College wins

Date: May 13, 1912, in College Hall at Boston College
Topic: *"Resolved: Every corporation engaged in interstate commerce should be required to take out a federal charter, constitutionality being granted."*
Debaters: Georgetown (aff.) - Paul W. McQuillen '13, Stephen W. Carroll '12, and John F. Crosby '12
Boston College (neg.) - Thomas L. Gannon '13, James E. Gibbons '12, and Francis A. Harrington '12
Judges: Louis A. Frothingham (former Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts), James J. Storrow, Esq. (former President, Boston Chamber of Commerce, and a bank president), and David T. Walsh (Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts)
Decision: Georgetown wins

Date: April 13, 1913, in Gaston Hall at Georgetown
Topic: *"Resolved: That United States vessels engaged in coastwise trade be free from toll in passing through the Panama Canal."*
Debaters Boston College (aff.) - Francis X. Salloway '13, Edward A. Sullivan '14, and Leo M. Murray '14
Georgetown (neg.) - James P. Needham '13, Bernard S. Brady '14, and David L. Waldron '13
Judges: Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood (Chief of Staff, U.S. Army), F.W. Booth (Judge, U.S. Court of Claims), and Henry Heiskell (Chief of Marine Service, U.S. Weather Bureau)
Decision: Boston College wins

Date: May 13, 1914, in College Hall at Boston College
Topic: *"Resolved: That the law exempting United States coastwise ships from the payment of tolls at the Panama Canal should be repealed."*
Debaters: Georgetown (aff.) - Edward I. Devlin, Jr. '14, J. Francis Ryan '14, and Rufus S. Lusk '17
Boston College (neg.) - Edward A. Sullivan '14, Robert P. Barry '14, and Leo M. Murray '14
Judges: Patrick M. Keating (Judge, Superior Court), John R. Murphy (Boston Finance Commission), and Charles S. Sullivan (Judge, Charlestown Court)
Decision: Boston College wins

Date: May 9, 1915, in Gaston Hall at Georgetown
Topic: *"Resolved: That the federal government should adopt a policy of building up a merchant marine by subscribing for 51 percent of the capital stock of a corporation to be engaged in the foreign trade."*
Debaters: Boston College (aff.) - Edward A. McLaughlin, Jr. '15, Francis J. Mahoney '16, and Edmund J. Brandon '15
Georgetown (neg.) - William J. Cullinan '15, Rufus F. Lusk '17, and W. St. John Garwood '17
Judges: Robert M. Montgomery (Judge, U.S. Court of Customs Appeals), Charles H. Robb (Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia), Dr. Henry J. Harris (Chief of the Documents Division, Library of Congress), Allen C. Clark, Esq., and James Mooney
Decision: Georgetown wins