

The Final Round¹

Everett Rutan

Xavier High School

ejrutan3@ctdebate.org

or

ejrutan3@acm.org

Osterweis 2012

Yale University

April 15, 2012

This House believes that the modern feminist movement does more harm than good.

A Note about the Notes

These are my notes from the final round of Osterweis 2012. They are limited by how quickly I could write and how well I heard what was said. I apologize for any errors, but I hope debaters will appreciate this insight: what a judge hears may not be what they said or wish they had said.

There are two versions of the notes. The one below is chronological, reproducing each speech in the order in which the arguments were made. It shows how the debate was actually presented. The second is formatted to look more like my written flow chart, with each contention “flowed” across the page as the teams argued back and forth. It’s close to the way I actually take notes during the debate.

The Final Round

The final round of Osterweis 2012 was between the Choate team of Nat Warner and Russell Bogue on Government and the Wilbur Cross team of Sophie Dillon and Tarpley Hitt in Opposition. The debate was won by Choate on Government in an 8-7 decision.

1) Prime Minister Constructive

- a) Thank you.
- b) We are not against rights and equality, but only the feminist movement in its current form.
- c) G1²: The modern feminist movement (“MFM”³) does more harm than good
 - i) The MFM’s purpose is to try and change men’s minds
 - ii) Arbitrary work and education quotas don’t do this
 - iii) This takes away from the merit system
- d) G2: The MFM is full of hypocrisy
 - i) Women advocate equality only in certain situations, e.g. work, pay
 - ii) Not in others, like the draft, norms, pay, proposals

¹ Copyright 2012 Everett Rutan. This document may be freely copied for non-profit, educational purposes.

² “G1” indicates the Government first contention, “O2” the Opposition second contention and so forth.

³ Introduces “MFM” as an abbreviation for the modern feminist movement.

- e) G3: The MFM detracts from more important issues
 - i) The movement hasn't been a single event
 - ii) There has been a progressive gain of rights
 - iii) Public can't focus on other issues like Iran, the economy

2) Leader of the Opposition Constructive

- a) MFM needed for gender equality
- b) O1: MFM has enabled women to enter male areas
 - i) Women CEOs and college students
- c) O2: MFM has a good psychological effect on women
 - i) It has reduced sexism in all areas
 - ii) We wouldn't be here now without the MFM
- d) O3: MFM is part of a larger movement
 - i) It is important for future legislation, future gains by and for women
- e) G1: Women's gains have not been tokens
 - i) Why should these gains insult men?
 - ii) Pay equality makes up for a lifetime of neglect and leads to equal opportunity
- f) **POI⁴: Why does equality require a women's movement?**
 - i) **Without the women's movement there would be no examples, like teachers, due to sexism**
- g) G2: The draft is a poor example
 - i) Equality has to take physical differences into account
 - ii) Equal pay and opportunity reflect psychological equality
- h) G3: How does MFM detract from other issues?

3) Member of Government Constructive

- a) I will cover on case then off
- b) G1: MFM has annoyed men
 - i) So it defeats the purpose of changing men's minds
 - ii) Quotas, hypocrisy, etc., all annoy men
 - iii) Quotas do not reflect merit
 - iv) As to past abuses, two wrongs don't make a right
- c) G2: Hypocrisy has alienated men
 - i) Men aren't subject to a draft, just registration, so women could register
 - ii) War today is more technology—smart bombs, drones—not swinging a broadsword
- d) G3: Women's rights are important
 - i) The most important ones—vote, income—have already happened
 - ii) Other social problems—debt, poverty, hunger—are more important
- e) O1: MFM is not the reason for recent gains
 - i) It's due to previous feminist movements
 - ii) They told women to work harder
 - iii) If they are CEOs, what was the cost?
 - (1) It has alienated men, and perpetuated the idea that men need extra help
- f) O2: Changing attitudes due to liberal ideals, not MFM

4) Member of the Opposition Constructive

- a) On case then off

⁴ "POI" in bold indicates a point of information raised by the other team and accepted by the member.

- b) G1: Gov says MFM “makes men annoyed”
 - i) Well, so do a lot of other things
 - (1) Change, which removes men’s advantages over women, is likely to be one of them
 - ii) MFM not only has an impact on men
 - (1) It affects women by reducing the impact of sexism and the sense of psychological inferiority
 - c) G3: How does it detract from other issues?
 - i) Multiple controversial issues are considered simultaneously
 - ii) Most women’s gains have already been achieved
 - iii) The ERA hasn’t passed yet
 - iv) No one is fighting for the right to be drafted, but the ERA implies women could be drafted
 - d) **POI: Why is equality a good thing, categorically?**
 - i) **We aren’t arguing a benefit for women, but for all**
 - e) O1: Gov never defined “modern”
 - i) Only recent history should be included
 - ii) It was 1969 when women first entered Yale
 - iii) So we only care about access to college, the workplace, and as an impetus for future legislation
 - f) O2: We need women in high power positions to break stereotypes
- 5) Leader of Opposition Rebuttal**
- a) Our main contention is MFM has put women in power
 - b) Annoyance issue: some women are qualified
 - i) Putting women in power leads to actual gender equality
 - ii) There have been years of white male dominance
 - c) G3: Saying MFM detracts from other issues is a single minded view of advocacy
 - d) G2: It is to be expected that women won’t advocate for things that make them unhappy
- 6) Prime Minister Rebuttal**
- a) Don’t vote for us because we are guys, but because we have the better arguments
 - b) We didn’t define MFM, but we did show it is no longer working
 - c) Opp never showed gender equality would not have occurred without MFM
 - d) Picking and choosing how to be equal pisses guys off
 - i) E.g., not advocating the draft for women
 - e) How does it benefit women?
 - i) Gov case shows that it does not
 - ii) MFM annoys men so it is self defeating
 - f) How does it benefit equality?
 - i) MFM promotes one sex over the other
 - ii) It makes arbitrary characteristics matter
 - iii) If we judge using Rawls’ veil of ignorance, it fails