

*The 2005 Final Round Transcript*  
*Government: Lewis and Clark*  
*College Opposition: Whitman College*

**Shame on Harvard University**

**First Constructive Speech (7 Minutes)**

**Prime Minister, PAUL BINGHAM**

**Lewis and Clark College**

Wow. A minute, that's tough. To all freshmen, first years, first time here, sorry you have to listen to me ramble on. What I hope you realize is to get to this place, it takes the support of so many people. I want to impress that upon everybody.

Second, of course, to my parents who are here and flew out from Ashland, Oregon to be here. If you could hold your applause till the end, I have a lot to get through. Secondly, of course my older brother, who unfortunately could not be here, additionally the wonderful lady friend who bought me this tie.

Uh, so again, I want to thank my school officials. First and foremost, president Hochstettler and vice-provost Dean Atkins. They have been so supportive of our program, it's incredible.

Next, I want to thank my team, uh, they are just incredible. All the students involved, uh, this is my family.

Additionally, my coaches. I have to go real quick here, Steve Hunt, Shelby Jo Long, Kyle, ML, Travis, Dave, Nicky, Steve Pointer, Jarred, Nick and Owen. I have had...I am blessed with wonderful coaches. Shout outs: Karen, Konrad, Texas Tech, uh, Bonnie Stapleton, Bob Trapp, Wyoming team, Lane, both Rob and Gina, uh, I gotta go, that's my minute. I have a bunch more, so later you're gonna hear more.

Alright. Who's official timer? Resolved, er, not resolved, rather, shame on Harvard University. Some definitions.

Shame, we would argue, connotes a feeling of guilt, and there's another level of analysis on this. With shame, we are called to act. Additionally there needs to be an actor to feel shame. We will be proposing a policy in today's debate round. We feel that's best for the debate and actually provides some clash. Harvard University: the University of Harvard, Massachusetts. Big surprise.

Criterion: net-beneficiality.

The overview: Lawrence Summers, president of Harvard University at (...), February last month declared that one of the reasons that women were not as successful as men in the hard sciences and math is because of, uh, maybe because of inherent differences in biology. This has created a huge international and internal debate at Harvard as to whether or not they should punish him. Last week the faculty at the liberal arts

colleges at Harvard took a vote of no confidence in him for this issue and because of his leadership style, which was not conducive to faculty discussions. The vote was approximately 60-40, uh, for shaming him. Yes?

QUESTION, BRIDGET TESKIN:

Uh, how are we sh-, uh, why are we shaming Harvard University when the faculty are obviously taking proactive measures to condemn what he stated?

PM, PAUL BINGHAM:

The fact is proactive measures are not binding, they have no power at all, he is still president of Harvard and will continue to be so. Additionally, we will argue that he's apologized because his comments were mis-interpreted but he has not recanted these statements. WE would argue that they are inherently sexist comments and should be recanted and the fact that he has yet to do so means he is ignorant of this issue and is not remorseful, which we would argue is absolutely critical on this.

Plan: the Harvard Corporation will fire Lawrence Summers as president of Harvard University, citing his inappropriate sexist comments as disrespectful and shameful. Harvard will conduct a search for a new president through normal means.

The solvency points. First, Harvard Corporation has the power to do this; contracts stipulate that the president must represent the college at all times. Secondly, normal means clarification, the committee, most likely, would be selected in order to find an interim president, another search committee would be selected to find a long-term president for Harvard. This is how all universities work when there is an issue of fa-, uh, presidency and that sort of thing.

We isolate two advantages from this. The first is at Harvard. The A point is Harvard has one single faculty member in the hard math and sciences who is female. That is ridiculous. That shows, I think, inherently an atmosphere of sexism at Harvard that needs to be dealt with.

The B point on this is there are no women chairs at all at Harvard, from my understanding. That also shows inherent discrimination and sexism being employed at Harvard University.

The C point on this is that this scandal has been hurt Harvard overall. It has continued the legacy that Harvard is an elitist institution that does not listen to the real world, it is absent and off in its own ivory tower and that it's okay for sexist comments to continue.

The D point on this, our case involves action against this. I'll argue that it improves the relationship of women within Harvard University. We would argue that people are turned off from attending Harvard because they feel there is inherent bias in the faculty selection process. They feel they cannot have a fair and equal representative representation when they get there and they do not feel comfortable in this academic environment.

28 *Parliamentary Debate*

Yes?

QUESTION, BRIDGET TESKIN:

Thanks Paul. I'm a little concerned as to how the appointment of a new president is automatically going to add women chairs and women faculty members. Those seem like pretty big structural burdens and a little big for you to claim as an outright advantage.

PM, PAUL BINGHAM

We'll go with the E point on this, the solvency of the advantage, which is the symbolic action of Harvard doing so. Specifically citing the reasons they dismissed him proves there will be some change at Harvard at least perceptually. We would also argue that the national attention as has been received by this will force Harvard to change. Additionally, we would argue the fact that they have to change and have to find a new government and also the specific reason, the old president was dismissed. It gives an inherent, reasonable opportunity to start looking at ways to change the inherent gender biases that is with Harvard. I think there is a, uh, really good reason we can win this position.

Advantage two: women in society. The first is that the Harvard presidency, uh, his comments really show, uh, and inherent feeling within our society on some level. We would argue that there is an assumption that women are inferior when it comes to quantitative reasoning, that they are not capable of compute properly, er, uh, compute properly.

The B point on this is that his speech created a huge internal, international and also domestic debate over this issue. We would argue that there is important discourse going on all over the place about this and that discourse is leading to one conclusion. That is the firing of Lawrence Summers.

The third argument, I think, is that our case would increase the legitimacy of that discourse and feed that, uh, discourse which, uh, does two things. First, it, the discourse talks about the problems at Harvard, but secondarily, the discourse talks about the problems that are involved in our all over society. Our argument is that this is a very important symbolic schtappe-, state, statement and step to take in order to try and correct some of the massive imbalances in our society.

The fourth point is that this feeds the perception that it is no longer okay to get away with sexist comments, eh, eh, in any position or any place in life. We would argue that that is extraordinarily important.

IT sets the standard that people are held to their own language. They can't just say, "Oh, I'm sorry, everybody just misunderstood what I said." That's unacceptable. They should have to recant what they are saying if it is inherently sexist.

Yeah?

QUESTION, BRIDGET TESKIN:

In debate, if people run language kritiks, a lot of people think it is okay for a debater to apologize and state, "I made a mistake," and in the New York Times, Lawrence Summers has said just that and made extensive apologies. Why should that be unacceptable?

PM, PAUL BINGHAM:

He.. uh, let me stop. Uh, sorry. He has not recanted his statement. He hasn't said he was actually wrong. He has not made the necessary apologetic steps in order to switch back (...). Additionally, the president of Harvard is very different from me. I am not yet president of Harvard, soon, maybe I will be.

And finally, we will argue that sexism is a huge problem within our society. This symbolic step is extraordinarily important in reaffirming the notion that we are all people and that we are all blessed with different abilities. That has nothing to do with our gender. That has nothing to do with that. We would argue that that step is absolutely critical. As our society progresses forward, we feel and know that we must take progressive stances in society. We must continue to reevaluate the problems in our society and look for ways of solving those problems.

We would argue that firing Lawrence Summers is an important symbolic step that will have real, positive implications, not only for the University of Harvard and their inherent gender imbalance, but also for the rest of society because this is such a prominent university. Harvard is the pinnacle or the epitome of American education. It is pointed to across the globe as representative of US culture and education. We would argue this symbolic stance affects us here, in this room, it affects the world around us and also affects our basic understanding of who we are and of humans and the way we are.

I urge you, side government.

**Second Constructive Speech (8 Minutes)**

**Leader of the Opposition, SCOTT THOMPSON**

**Whitman College**

Got a minute, thank you's. Obviously my parents, my parents are one of the most supportive parents on the debate circuit. They come to pretty much every debate tournament. They flew to Minnesota last year; they are so amazing in so many ways aside from just debate. My brother, Brett, my sister-in-law, Alicia,

Fundamentally Jim Hanson is an amazing director of forensics and an amazing friend. I talked about this last year, but he is one of the fundamental reasons that I am attending Whitman College. The other reason being that I was denied from Harvard, shame on them.

I'd be remiss if I didn't thank the entire Whitman squad, who has been instrumental in our preparation, not only for this tournament, but also for clothing us. Thank you Steven for the tie. Dave Dierdry is an amazing friend and amazing debate coach. His influential capacities surpass, uh, well, even Bridget's. Also to Brian Daminson who was also our coach for several years. He's been helping us out here. Uh, Damison's a radical guy. We, uh, love you a lot.

With that, uh, I have three seconds, Ty Cronin, president of Whitman College, thank you; you're the man, thank you for all your continued support.

With that, we will get to the debate at hand. On the top of the debate, no one bears greater animosity towards myself for being rejected, but that is not a war-, of course that's not a warrant for their resolution, but that is not the warrant.... for their.... that their proposal is car-...I'm going to start at the top of case, do some resolution analysis and some burdens debate.

In order to win this round, they must prove that in the status quo Harvard needs to be shamed. In order for us to win, we need to prove that we should be neutral towards Harvard or that Harvard should be praised. Bridget and I rise to a strong opposition to their, to their advocacy because their plan doesn't even meet their own fundamental burden or their own definitions.

They define Harvard as the University at Cambridge and they say that Harvard should be shamed. But what does their plan actually do? Does it shame Harvard? Far from it. It shames an individual, it shames president Summers. It doesn't shame (...) and turn this into a giant topicality debate because that's not what I want to debate about in the final round of the NPDA, but I do think it is important for resolution analysis and it can be framed as a burdens analysis. They're not meeting their fundamental burden of proving the resolution true. Even if you use their own definitions, they said Harvard University should be shamed, their plan has Harvard University shame president Summers and they're not affirming the resolution. I don't understand what this has to do with the debate.

We'll contend that Harvard needs to be praised for a couple of reasons and we think that these arguments have particular saliency when you, especially when you consider their initial argumentation that the faculty of, of Harvard University took a vote of no confidence against president Summers. They said, "We don't like what you said. We think that's irresponsible." Additionally, the students have come up in outrage, showing that the institution itself is being responsible and doesn't deserve the shame.

Additionally, look to the way he prefaced his comments when he was at this economic forum. He said, "I am not speaking now as the president of Harvard University. I am speaking as an individual," and Bridget and I believe that he should have the right to utter that speech.

What other points the points for those claims? And this is some offensive argumentation why their plan is bad. They destroy the freedom of speech. They say, "You're going to utter a comment? There are going to be repercussions. Even when you utter a comment and disassociate yourself from your, from your job, you don't deserve to have that speech. Your speech needs to be limited."

We think that freedom of speech has a valuable impact and is valuable in and of itself and that man should have the right to speak his mind even though Bridget and I vehemently disagree with what he said. He should be able to say that.

Additionally, his comments led to action. They have sparked a movement and a discussion within the United States of America about, it has sparked this resolution, and led to us saying, "No, we're not going to stand for this," and has led to dialogue. That is an event that, to his action, criticizing him, not criticizing, but firing him at this point has serious deleterious affects.

The first of which, it ends the discourse. Rather than getting at the heart of the problem, the fact that, yes, women within Harvard University are discriminated against, yes, women within debate rounds are discriminated against, yes, women within society are discriminated against, we don't talk about those things. Instead, we placate the women; we placate the people who might agree with Summers because we just fired him. We don't get to the heart of the problem.

Not at this time.

They contend that perception, this is a symbolic action. I think that in order to have symbolism, and in order to have better symbolism, you should allow him to stay in office and to continue to have this discussion and even if he loses the discussion, that's great, but the discussion needs to be had. Nothing gets solved, mindsets aren't changed. There's not symbolism when discourse gets shut off and people are automatically silenced before they have the right to, to, speak their mind.

Your point sir.

QUESTION, PAUL BINGHAM:

Do you think that warrants action that leads to massive front-page stories in every newspaper across the United States and possibly the globe?

LO, SCOTT THOMPSON:

I don't, first of all, I don't think it would necessarily and second, I don't understand what the impetus for that would be. If it does lead to large headlines, it doesn't get to the core of the issue. It says, "Hey, we've solved the problem." No, you haven't solved the problem. Remember, one in three women continue to be (...).

### 32 *Parliamentary Debate*

Additionally...yeah. All, all their argumentation about look at the problems at Harvard College, they don't solve for Jack Taco. All those harms continue post plan and women continue to be subjected to it. We say allow the status quo to continue, we say, we say allow for the discourse to be played out and allow his arguments to be scrutinized for what they are.

Additionally, their plan has absolutely no solvency. They can fire Lawrence Summers but he did not breach his contract and there is no reason for his automatic dismissal. The implication of this is Lawrence Summers will sue Harvard University and then when that happens, two things are likely. A, either he gets put back at his post, which means they have no solvency, or two, it gets mired in a large legal discussion. We're not getting to the heart of the problem. The attention goes on, the attention goes to whether or not it was legal to fire him and the real issue is women's rights and their, uh, and women's rights are obscured and obfuscated by their plan action once it gets put in play.

Additionally, I think if you do their plan you obfuscate a lot of other things as well. Rather than getting to the core of the issue, you make other issues look less tangential. Why wasn't Larry Summers fired or why wasn't he shamed when he decided to cut the black studies program at Whitman College and cut funding for that when Cornel West decided to leave. I think that ignoring that issue and saying, "Yes, we're going to stand up for women's rights," does palpable damage to minorities who go to that school and says that, "You're not as important. You're not worthy. We're not going to stand up for you. We will stand up for women, but not going to stand up for you." It perpetuates their disenfranchisement and says that, "You are, uh, continually not worth standing up for."

Addit-, uh, sort of disorganized, I recognize that, I apologize. Blame Bridget. Uh, okay. On the case debate, specifically they say on the E subpoint that national attention forces him, they contend national attention forces them to change. If that's, this is on, uh, advantage one, the E subpoint. Paul says national attention forces them to change. If that's true, then the status quo will lead to those changes because national attention has already been a factor. We contend that this action does nothing to change the problems within the status quo. Those things are going to be changed by the discourse and by the national attention that's already being focused on the issue, not on the individual. They shift that debate to the individual, obfuscating what is fundamentally most important.

Now, advantage two: women in society. They talk about, uh, the important discourse is going on and the conclusion of that discourse is that he should be fired. I don't think that's the conclusion we should be drawing from this debate. I think the conclusion we should be drawing is that making these statements was problematic and we should have a discussion about them, but not that we should just fire people for expressing their opinions.

As an overview, you're going to be voting for Whitman College for a couple of reasons. The first is they don't prima facie prove the resolution true. They say Harvard University should shame an individual, not that Harvard University should be shamed. Their own case arguments demonstrate how Harvard University has, in fact, been quite responsible in its actions.

On a solvency level you're never going to vote for a plan that obfuscates the issues, pushes them underground, doesn't lead to national attention and if it does lead to national attention, leads it to the wrong point.

Additionally, you're always going to vote to protect freedom of speech and even though somebody might stand up and say something that you heavily disagree with, you agree with their ability to stand there and utter those words. We think that is valued and we think that at the end of the day, you'll be voting for that and finally, their plan doesn't have any solvency. Lawrence Summers will sue; it'll get mired in court. That distracts from the real focus of the debate, which is being discussed in the status quo.

Thank you.

**Third Constructive Speech (8 Minutes)**  
**Member of Government, MEREDITH PRICE**  
**Lewis and Clark College**

I want to echo all of Paul's thanks to the administration and our team. There are a few individuals who have had a huge impact on my development as a debater.

First, um, just personally there is Raymond Utech, I don't know if anybody knows him but he has been more than encouraging to me as an individual. He is one of the most funny, charismatic individuals ever and I adore him.

Um, with that, um, I want to thank a former high school debate partner Terry Hatch. I stopped doing debate because I thought it was pointless for a period of time and I realize that that's really wrong now, but moreover he brought me back into the activity and, um, conned me into doing Ted Turner, which was successful for me, but it was pretty interesting in and of itself.

And, um, I also want to thank my family and my mom and especially, my mom has endured so much in her life, um, got out of an abusive marriage, raised four children on welfare, went to college and got a degree and is now successfully battling ovarian cancer and her strength is inspiring to me and has, has had a huge impact on me. Send good vibes out to my mom, she totally needs it.

I'm gonna start now. Okay, so I want to go over Scott's counter-warrants is kind of how I have them and then I want to go over the specific case in general, but first of all let's go to the first argumentation where Scott

### 34 *Parliamentary Debate*

says, essentially, that, that the students have spoke out and the comments have happened. First of all, pull across Paul's answer in the point of information is really great where he tells you that no change has happened. In fact, I haven't heard anything really after everybody's decided to say there's protests and there's been no action since those protests, which is why we decided to run a policy as something essentially happened.

In addition, I would say that he is in a position of authority. It is important to hold people in positions of authority like that accountable. I, I think that that's the important advocacy here.

Also, on the freedom of speech. I think that's really important and I think we're, we're not really limiting speech at all because I think you have to justify the context of your statement and I don't think that his justification afterwards was sufficient to that was okay. In addition to that I would say that he has a contractual obligation to Harvard to represent the college in and of itself fairly, which he is not abiding by.

Additionally to that, I would argue that words have powers. A, a common author like Charles Born says that creating, creating hate speech has a lot of really negative impacts on people's lives and it's important for us as debaters, and even as case planned, to note that that institutional discrimination and rhetoric is something that you can't have.

In addition to that, Scott gives you no scenario about how there's going to be some sweeping backlash on people's rights to speak out. Like, there's no scenario on how this is going to happen, I don't think it's realistic and I think that the Ward Churchill conflict in Colorado proves that there's not going to be a huge limitation or a Constitutional amendment or something like that. I mean, I don't really think that this does a lot of offense to think that the impacts to case don't matter.

Then he says that the comments have lead to action. No, the comments that were made have lead to discussion. That's the important part. There has been no action afterwards, in fact the action that was taken by the members of the liberal arts, um, college did not have any binding aspect to it, which Paul notes, and has no way of really holding him accountable to his statements. In addition to that, I think that his comments have really been justified. Unless they can prove that the comments he made were good, I don't think we should, as a community, accept it.

With that, I'll take your point.

#### QUESTION: SCOTT THOMPSON

Thanks a lot. I'm a little, can you hear me? Okay, I'm just a little confused because you just argued that words have power and then you said that this controversy lead to discourse but that's not enough because we need action.

#### MG, MEREDITH PRICE:

I'm gonna, I'm gonna turn your argument that says discourse is going to stop because I think that the discourse is going to go much bigger.

So, I mean, I understand what you are trying to say but I don't think you're winning the argumentation there.

So, in addition to that, I would say that, if anything, the spillover for this controversy would lead to more international attention, which turns their argumentation. In addition to that, it would set a precedent for other institutions to look at this in a more, in a greater light. I think that the discourse that would happen from actually penalizing the president for saying something sexist, rather than just passively accepting what was happening would lead to much more change. I think that that's a much more persuasive and rational aspect as to how it would function.

Let's go to the impacts. He says that we're going to end discussion. I think that this is kind of a masking argumentation and I have several responses. First of all, the huge symbolic action of getting him out of power is really important. I think that this motivates women across the country to decide, and even if individual student groups on Harvard who would want to speak out against sexist, sexist, um, individuals. The perceptual link turn to this argument is their main thing that they can't take back. The more the impact, the more, the more the average person sees this issue, the more there is going to be problems. I think that even if you look at the status quo to stay the same, discourse is eventually going to dribble off. And if anything, case spikes the issue back to the forefront and you'll see a front-page article in the New York Times. So if anything, case is going to be better.

No thank you, not at this time.

In addition to that, I would say that there's a winners win scenario. Women's groups across the country are calling for his resignation. Movements will only get better if we continue, if we allow case, case to pass. I think there's a lot of different schools that this could talk about.

He says that the symbolism of his staying in office would be great because they need discussion. But I think that eventually this would trickle off and if anything, this precedent setting policy would be much, much better.

In addition to that, he, he, he says that the president will sue and for some reason he's going to get back in office. Okay, first of all, I think his contract allows lots of ways out for the board to decide he's not fulfilling his responsibility to represent the college fairly. But moreover, I would say turn. More press coverage would mean that, eh, uh, even if he did litigate it, then the issue would come back to the forefront, even if he did stay in office, people would be more careful and hold him better.

No, thank you, not at this time.

Now he says, then he makes an argument about a black student group that, I think, wasn't recognized and that would be damaging to minorities. But first of all, I don't think that this would really be a huge issue. I don't think that we're de-humanizing anybody, I don't think we're neglecting any specific group, but if anything, if you buy the litigation analysis, if anything, the black students that have been discriminated against

36 *Parliamentary Debate*

can present their case and make their case for getting rid of the president even stronger.

So, I don't think, on, on the underflow, their counter-warrants, I don't think that any of these are independent, offensive reasons to vote against case.

So, with that, I want to go to case. I'll take your question.

QUESTION, SCOTT THOMPSON:

Thanks a lot. Just, kind of on the contractual argument, you say there are lots of reasons in his contract why he can be fired. While that's an interesting claim, what's your warrant?

MG, MEREDITH PRICE:

What's your warrant, what's, what's your warrant, no, no, no, Scott. What's your warrant, I understand, I think that there's a warrant within, you can sit down, I'm done.

QUESTION, SCOTT THOMPSON:

I haven't even finished the question.

MG, MEREDITH PRICE:

I know what the question is. You're asking me for the warrant and I'm going to respond by saying I don't think there's a warrant in your analysis and you don't talk about it specifically. Part of the contract that means he has to have litigation. I don't think that's very specific and I don't think that generates enough offense for you to be able to do that.

So, with that, let's go to case and some resolitional analysis. They say that Paul and I have to prove that they need to be shamed and they say that they need to prove that it's neutral or they need to be praised. And then they say we're not meeting our burdens.

But first of all, I would say that the president represents the college. At that point, we're saying you can no longer have your job and shaming him, we're certainly being resolitional. In addition to that, I think that the administration is also under criticism, which is a huge part of that administration in general, and I'll just put an RVI here. This is a ridiculous time skew. I think this is a really poorly developed, like, topicality and this isn't a huge deal, but I think that we need to reasonably be tal-, be reasonably talking about the substantive issues of the debate, rather than a weird topicality situation.

So, with that, let's go to solvency. Okay. They said, they say that they're going to fire Summers, it's going to be a breach on contract and that he's going to sue. I don't think that there's any specific scenario as to how this is a breach of contract and I would say that most times when colleges and college boards are forming contractual obligations, they have a lot of wiggle room in case something really bad happens and if anything, I would put a turn on the black individuals getting more coverage on the issue.

I think that solvency, if anything, is pretty darn solid and I think that the symbolic, the symbolic action they can't really beat. So, with that, let's go to advantage one. I want to extend all of Paul's A, B, C, and D points that talks bout how important it is to be, to make sure that we say that sexist rhetoric cannot stay the same. If you don't pass plan, you're saying that sexist rhetoric can happen and all we need to do is talk about it. I say that we need to end it and that's the delineation.

Unsolved, these pieces of the status quo will lead to change, but I don't think status quo will ever lead to change. I think it will lead to stagnation. I think the symbolic action of not having the president still there would be much, much, much, much better for change alone and for allowing movements to develop.

On advantage two, he says that it's not the conclusion and making statements was problematic. If it was problematic, why should he stay in the position of power that he has? He has the obligation to Harvard to represent the students and the individuals fairly. There's no reason they should just passively sit by and say it's okay.

Um, I want you to extend Paul's implications where he talks bout it's important to increase the legitimacy of discourse, to make sure that words do continue to have power, to make sure that we critique them on that. But aside from that discourse, we have to act on that discourse if we ever want things to change. We can't just sit around and twiddle our thumbs and talk in our ivory tower. I think that's what's going on at Harvard and I think that not enough actual change is the problem.

On the D subpoint, it's not okay to get away with sexist comments and on the E subpoint, sexism, sexism is a huge problem across the world and at the very least, you want to combat it right here. Shame on Harvard.

**Fourth Constructive Speech (8 Minutes)**  
**Member of Opposition, BRIDGET TESKIN**  
**Whitman College**

All right, I'm just going to bask in this moment for a minute; it's pretty incredible. The only reason Scott and I are here right now is because in every prep time, this one included, our team has essentially been telling us what we should say, what will and will not fly. We are here because of you and I cannot thank you enough for that. I've never really competed in a team sport before and so debate's all I've got and if this isn't a team sport, then I don't know what is. Thanks you guys.

Also, thanks to my parents, my sister at home back in San Fernando Valley. Also to Mr. Ray and Judy Schaffer, they were my high school debate coaches at Sherman Oaks Center for Enriched Studies. Danny Shea knows what I'm talking about. If you're ever in Thompson Falls, Montana, say hello. They are perhaps two of the coolest individuals on the planet.

Thanks also to Jim Hanson, our old coaches, Kayla Whitaker, Kyle Danielson and of course David Guidry and Scott Thompson. You're one of my best friends and it's been an honor to have shared this year with you and all the losses that go along with it.

How much time do I have? Okay. That being said, I would encourage all of you, when you run positions regarding gender, class or race in your debate rounds, don't just run them as strategic positions, but look at what you do after the round. If you're going to become a lawyer, just, the action you take plus plan, I've become really conscious of this, so try and see if you can. I mean, this is me on my soapbox. But, just try and see what these critical impacts mean for the post round interaction. Thanks you guys.

That being said, if we're going to focus on discourse, and I believe we should, then the freedoms to publicly question, explore, apologize and then arrive at the best solution is what you're going to vote for in today's round and Lawrence Summers did just that. That's why you're voting for us.

Meredith makes a big mistake when she drops the burdens debate. This isn't a reverse voting issue on a shoddy topicality. By contrast, we're stating if Harvard, like, they have to prove that Harvard in totality needs to be shamed, not just Lawrence Summers. They have failed to do that, especially, especially in light of the fact that they can see Scott's, well, they can't see, but Scott makes the point about how hard the University, in totality, has already shamed Mr. Summers. So why should we shame the students who've had movements against him, the professors who had the vote of no confidence? I'm not comfortable shaming all of them along with the president, whose comments I might find problematic. All we have to do is prove to you that you should regard Harvard University's either as neutral or praise them and I think you should do both...well, either one or the other.

That being said, the only argument we have on the vote of no confidence and on student protests, not at this time, is that there has been no change in the status quo. I argue there has been lots of change. There's a national focus. Lawrence Summers has already paid the price. He's been publicly shamed, humiliated, if you like. A vote of no confidence from the faculty is all but unprecedented at a school like Harvard and that sends a pretty big message. I argue that the change there is Lawrence Summers will think twice before he speaks and is he going to look to what the statistics there are regarding female involvement in math and science? I think yes. I think this man has learned a lesson by virtue of what Harvard University internally has done to him and that solves right there.

Your question?

QUESTION, MEREDITH PRICE

Okay, the president represents the college, right? And only a certain sector in the college has shamed him, so how has the entire institution of Harvard come out against him? It seems like only the liberal arts have done so.

LO, BRIDGET TESKIN

Right, your own analysis disproves that. There's an international commotion about this, he's being shamed on an international level. So not only is Harvard University shaming him, but a lot of the national and international press is too.

Onto Scott's first off case position about how they are destroying the freedom of speech. Now Meredith says that he didn't justify what he said after he said it and I say, yeah, he did. In the New York times, they reported how after all the controversy erupted, he went back and said, "Wow, that was not the most brilliant thing to say. I was pretty ignorant of the information out there. I'm sorry. I apologies. I recognize the concrete harms that my discourse did and I take responsibility for that." Scott and I want to know why someone should be punished for that kind of admission after making a problematic statement.

They also state that he has a contractual obligation to always represent Harvard. I think we could look at him as a person and state that he disassociated himself from the university before making the claim. Why does this keep someone (...) rescind their ability to speak as an individual? I think their plan sets a pretty bad precedent. I sometimes speak for Whitman College or even Scott Thompson, sometimes I just want to speak for myself and they're setting a bad precedent.

They talk about hate speech. Now, what Lawrence Summers said was anything but hate speech. Clearly a difference exists between male and female involvement in science because the levels are so disparate. He's trying to find out why. Did he come to the right conclusion? Probably not. But I think there is merit in exploring the question in the first place and he should be given credit for that. The point is to align with the best solution, which is precisely what Lawrence Summers is trying to do.

They stated that his statements were not good. Well, who decides what's not good? We both agree that there is inherent value in discourse and we want to try and get to the bottom of why there is so little female involvement in math and science and so any contribution, Scott and I believe, is valuable. John Mill supports us on this with the marketplace of ideas. Why was Summers contribution uniquely harmful?

Moreover, they talk about international attention. Why I this bad? All that means is you're having this discussion on an international level, which is uniquely important because not all schools even have the rates of female involvement in education at all. So we gain a net-benefit off of international coverage of this issue and if they claim that our counter-discourse will only increase international coverage, I think that's good. If

#### 40 *Parliamentary Debate*

discourse is the best thing in this round, then newspaper coverage is always going to be preferable.

They talk about symbolic action and the perceptual turn that they try and make. I'm confused about what symbolic action is happening when it's not enough for a university, for professors, for students to shame the person who they say stands as their own figurehead? I think that's pretty symbolic and I think we're taking, uh, a lot of importance away from what the students and the faculty actually did. Going out on a limb, considering not all faculty were tenured, who, uh, participated in that vote of no confidence, which puts them in a pretty precarious position, considering how difficult it is to get tenure.

Moreover, she talks about winners win. Their plan leads to an increase in movements. Well, there's no link between the advantages of the case that they try to claim. If you get a new president in, all that's going to do is placate students. They're going to think, "Well, great. Everything's going to be better. Tomorrow we're going to have chairs of all the departments that are womens, er, women, who are female." And Scott and I want to question that kind of "logic" about what it's really going to mean to remove Lawrence Summers. Ronald Reagan once said, "Keep your friends close, but keep your enemies closer," and all I think Lawrence Summers is doing, is sparking discussion at Harvard which is uniquely beneficial for an institution that is devoted to learning, discussion in the first place.

Now, on to this contractual argumentation. Now, mmkay, one side says that his contract will allow for this, one side doesn't. I'm going to err on the side of not, because contracts are usually binding and loopholes are generally not written in. That's why you have so many contract lawsuits in the first place, because of breach of contract. But she says turn, there's increased press coverage, press coverage is a good thing. You're going to have that if he stays, because the press is going to want to see. Is he going to repeat his mistake? Has he learned from his mistake, so we have increased press coverage everywhere. Okay. Scott also thinks it's the bad kind of coverage. He can talk about that later.

Um, on the plan debate, on the plan debate, uh, so, she states that there is wiggle room worked into the contract. Flow across what Scott stated, he's either going to be back at the post, or they get zero solvency, what's the point of plan? Or there is going to be a legal quagmire, which going to distract resources and time away from what Harvard should be doing, which is focusing on the lack of involvement of women in the math and sciences, like that's the real issue. Anything that distracts resources, money, attention away from that is problematic.

Now, on to solvency. Flow across what Scott stated about the Cornel West analysis. Cornel West, one of the foremost, uh, black theorists and philosophers in America was removed, essentially, by Lawrence Summers and why wasn't there a scandal about that. I think it's a little problematic to focus so much on gender and to not apply the same kind of

analysis to issues of race. Scott and I want to support looking at both issues equally.

Now, on this reverse, I already addressed the reverse voting issue about bad topicality, no, it's a burden. I don't want to shame Harvard, the entire Harvard University, especially when they're taking internal action. Flow across what Scott also stated on their advantage one about how they, how allowing the discussion to keep going can happen once Summers is in there. Meredith says sexist rhetoric is bad, I absolutely agree, as does Scott. But why aren't women in math and sciences, clearly some sort of variance exists and there is zero harm in people trying to find out why, which is exactly Summers did. He learned that his analysis was wrong. He admitted that and now we can go back to the real discussion

They don't prove the resolution true. They're masking the issue and they're certainly not protecting the freedom of speech which, and another voting issue right here, is uniquely important at an educational institution. If the president of Harvard University can't be allowed to think of ideas in public, apologize later and take responsibility without being fired, what kind of precedent does that set?

Thanks so much.

**First Rebuttal Speech**  
**Leader of Opposition, SCOTT THOMPSON**  
**Whitman College**

If I could take 30 seconds, would you mind if I took 30 seconds for some quick thank you's? Awesome. I neglected to thank a couple of people, the first of which is Chris Gorman, who Bridget and I both debated with over the last two years and had a lot of fun with., and, er, Chris and I had a lot of fun together, (...).

Did I neglect to thank Bridget? Oh my God. Bridget is, actually, she's one of my best friends. I fundamentally enjoy spending time with her, debating with her, being shushed by her and, uh, all of the... anyway, yeah. Bridget knows that I love her; you all should know that too. So let's start the debate.

Whitman wins this debate for six independent reasons. The first reason is on the burdens debate, the resolution analysis debate. They don't prove that Harvard needs to be shamed and their plan doesn't even shame Harvard. Their plan shames a single individual which does not uphold the primary burden of the resolution which says shame a Harvard, not shame a Lawrence Harvard and they have Harvard shame somebody else.

Additionally, the president is not the institution. He is an individual. They concede that analysis. That's their own definition. Harvard University equals the school in Cambridge. We're using their own definition, they're not meeting their own resolutorial analysis, they're not

#### 42 *Parliamentary Debate*

meeting their prima facie burden. It's a voting issue. They're not upholding the resolution, you can't vote for them.

Now, the second voting issue. If you vote for their plan, you are saying no to free speech, say that you don't have a right to stand up for what you are going to say, that if you do, we are going to silence you in the most insidious of fashions and fire you, even though you have broken no law and have not violated a single contract. I think that that is a terminal impact in and of itself. They concede our analysis that freedom of speech is important, that it is of value and that Lawrence Summers has the right to express himself in an articulate way, especially when you consider that he prefaced his remarks by saying, "I disassociate myself from my college. This is me as an individual." He should have the right to say this without (...).

Additionally, he's already been shamed enough. They concede the fact; this is their own argumentation. The faculty has condemned him, the students have condemned him, this has led to his reevaluation of his college. Remember, this is not hate speech. He was articulating a reason he believes for gender inequity. This doesn't mean we agree with him, but it means he had a reason for what he said and he should be able to express that, express contrition, express that he shouldn't have articulated those words. Why should we punish him there?

The third voting issue. The plan destroys discourse and destroys the movement in the status quo. Their own observation, er, observation one, under the E subpoint, talks about how national movements are in the status quo and there is discourse. We're talking about this now; the people are grappling with the issue. Their plan kills that and is a distraction from the core issues on a few different levels.

The first is that it focuses the debate on an individual, and whether or not they should be fired, getting away from whether or not women should have these rights, or (...).

Additionally, they conceded the fact that the firing leads to a lawsuit. Whether or not he wins the lawsuit is not important. The likelihood is that he will win the lawsuit and that rolls back their solvency, but the fact that that also occurs distracts from the core issue of the debate. Instead, it distracts resources and attention from the debate. We're debating about whether he should have been fired or not, whether or not it was legal to fire him or not, not about women's rights within Harvard University.

Additionally, the next voting issue, their plan does Jack Taco, gah, I'm re-using my jokes, to, to solve for the inequity at Harvard University. By firing him, none of the core issues are addressed. Instead, they are placated, it says, "We've done what we need to. Harvard's done everything we needed them to do because we fired him." No, the inequity continues without the discourse that exists in the status quo.

They say they take symbolic action. I say symbolic action has already been taken by the faculty and by the students, by the students. How much more symbolism is necessary to get it going? Additionally, we

consider that their symbolic action distracts rather than focuses the debate. That's a disadvantage to the case, rather than an advantage.

Now, the racism, the last voting issue. They obscure the fact that Harvard has done other insidious things but no action has been taken. Cornel West left the university because the black studies program, department, was being cut by Lawrence Summers. They say that they somehow solve for this, no. They say that women's rights are more important than black rights. I don't think that's appropriate hierarchy to place in. We win this debate on the burdens. They don't meet it; they don't prove the resolution true.

### **Second Rebuttal**

**Prime Minister, PAUL BINGHAM**

**Lewis and Clark College**

The one last person on my shout out list was Tim Rutledge, he's a great guy, helped me so much at camp. I also want to thank John Runway, he was my high school debate coach and he would not let me quit debate when I wanted to. I would also like to thank my former partner Keith West. Wow. I can't say much more than that.

Finally, this woman. (...). She's better than I am, I think you saw that. All I have to do is pull some of her great analysis and we'll win this debate. I've really, truly enjoyed this year with Meredith Price.

Cost benefit analysis is the way you weight this debate round, I think that is (...). Part of an apology is recanting the negative things you said and since that is yet to happen from Lawrence Summers, I think Meredith's analysis of discourse value without action is particularly important in today's debate round.

Let's examine some of the issues on the burdens debate. I think they're conceding our analysis about how he represents the Harvard institution as a figurehead and as a person. Also, Meredith's analysis about how the administration represents Harvard and they have been delinquent in taking on shame, conceded to us. Our argument is burdens is a very silly debate, especially one of this quality, I really don't think you're going to be voting there. Particularly because we have, I think, arguments that are important and powerful.

Let's actually talk about the important stuff, free speech. First and foremost, our argument has been consistent throughout this entire round. He is far more than an individual, he is representative of the University of, er, the Institution of Harvard University and the pint in time when he makes those public declarations, despite what he says beforehand, he is still representing that institution. Not only that, he is representing that institution across the vote. Our argument is that that trumps the issue of free speech.

Additionally, we would argue there is no analysis about this spills over in any other areas of our life. I think Meredith provides some really good analysis about how that's really not important and I'm going to tell you that there is no way to weigh this through the cost benefit analysis criteria of today's case.

Next issue, discourse and whether or not this would destroy discourse or further discourse. I think Meredith's example of the New York Times having a front page issue and I'm going to argue that all global newspapers, that he got fired because he was sexist and refused to recant his sexist statement. I see that as really powerful discursive action. That promotes more discourse, especially as Meredith reminds us that this issue's kind of fallen off the press in the last couple of weeks. I would say that's far better.

Additionally, it sends the message that you can't get away with sexist comments when you are in a position of privilege. We can't leave people in place who aren't even willing to recant their message. Who won't say, "No, I was wrong, and factually arrogant." He never said that. He said, "I'm sorry my statements have been misconstrued." That's not the kind of apology necessary for solving some of these issues.

Lawsuit. I think Meredith's response that this would increase discourse if he wound up suing the school is extraordinarily important. Additionally, this would also increase the discourse about his other mistakes in terms of how having a potential racial bias influences his decisions. I don't think that gets responded to and I think that's offense on that.

Additionally, I would argue that there are vague contracts, there are built in clauses that stipulate you have to represent your institution at all times. That's our interpretation; we're sticking with it.

Now, on terms of whether or not this would solve at Harvard. I think my original prime minister constructive analysis and also Meredith's analysis is quite good in that because the stipulated reason he is fired is because of his sexist comments and the way they are shameful. It increases in the future the likelihood that Harvard will make reforms. I think that analysis responds to that all over in today's debate round and I think it's extraordinarily important. I'll be impacting case a little bit more in a bit.

Finally, on racism. I think our argument is this is an unfortunate situation but they are not intrinsically linked. They give no analysis on how we are going to cause more racism in the status quo or how we're devaluing that. I think Meredith's original analysis about how there is a lawsuit, that would potentially bring that issue into consideration and maybe those in power would solve and that our case would potentially be increasing discourse which would be extraordinarily important. Finally, I would argue that I'm not exactly sure how to weigh this in a cost benefit analysis but let's go to the case debate.

First and foremost, we argue that the case fundamentally sends a very clear signal that if there is no inherent difference in men and women when it comes to making decisions about science. I think that analysis is

very strong, specifically the rhetoric that we use in plan text. That is something tangible that case solves for on the international level. Additionally we would argue that it also solves on the Harvard level at the point in time in which the president is being fired for this reason. I think that's extraordinarily important.

The next point on solvency I'd like to point out is the actions that have been taken so far, although beneficial to Harvard, are not enough at all. I think it's extremely important that we remove somebody from the position of power who makes sexist rhetoric and will not apologize for it and say, "I recant that statement." That is extraordinarily important symbolic solvency that is absolutely critical and why you should pass this plan.

Additionally, I think that case feeds the movement all across the United States by trying to cut down on the notion that women are inherently weaker when it comes to math and sciences. I, I think that is an important win for that movement. I think that furthers that movement. I think it allows it to gain more strength and credence and that our case soles for that I think that is extraordinarily important.

Finally, our argument is that case sets the precedent that you just simply can't make a group apology, "I'm sorry, I was misunderstood," and stay in an institution and to continue to be there.

We argue that Summers must be removed. It sets the precedent for universities nation wide. At the final end, what would spread more discourse, him being fired, it being a national issue again or him retaining his post and setting the signal that it's okay to be sexist and just say, "I'm sorry, I was misunderstood."

I think you'll vote government

***Lewis and Clark wins over Whitman 5-4.***