Is cancel culture preventing social justice?

#CANCELTCULTURE

ROYAL FAMILY

Should the Royal family separate from politics?

2020 ELECTION

Democratic Candidates
The Bromfield Politics Club does not endorse any specific opinions nor policies. It aims to give an objective view of news stories with student opinions from either side. Look to our website for sources of each article and join us on Wednesday mornings at 7:10 in Mrs. Keane’s room.

03 Hong Kong vs the NBA
By Angela Xing

04 Should the Royal Family be separate from politics?
By Fiona Nash and Meenu R

05 Democratic Candidates
By Raiya Suliman

07 Should College Athletes be paid?
By Mackenzie Hoover, Angela Xing, and Meenu R

09 Is Cancel culture preventing social justice?
By Shreya Kumar and Mackenzie Hoover

11 Should the US be involved in the improvement of other countries
By Fiona Nash and Shreya Kumar

12 Democratic Candidate Crossword

Editor: Meenu Ramakrishnan
Writers: Mackenzie Hoover, Shreya Kumar, Angela Xing, Fiona Nash, Raiya Suliman, and Meenu Ramakrishnan

We’d like to extend a huge thanks to Mrs. Keane for her ongoing support in the editing and production of the paper. Thank you to Mr. Hoffman, the PTO, and the Harvard School’s Trust for financially supporting the paper. The PTO does not endorse any political views.
On October 4th, Daryl Morey, the general manager of the Houston Rockets, tweeted a “Fight for Freedom Stand with Hong Kong” image in support of the pro-democracy Hong Kong protests. The Chinese government immediately began criticizing Morey, resulting in the owner of the Rockets, Tilman Fertitta, releasing a statement stating that Daryl Morey "does NOT speak for the Houston Rockets". The NBA has also made efforts to distance themselves from the tweet, stating that they are "deeply disappointed about Morey’s inappropriate comment". The NBA and the Houston Rockets, in particular, have a longstanding history in China. The leader of the Chinese Basketball Association, Yao Ming, played for the Rockets from 2002 to 2011 and was the first Chinese player inducted into the NBA Hall of Fame. When Ming was first drafted into the NBA, Chinese fans became ecstatic and viewership in China quickly increased. The NBA recognized the profits to be made in China and created a subsidiary, NBA-China, now worth $4 billion. A large portion of this profit stems from the hundreds of millions of viewers streaming live games on their TVs and phones. Along with the profit from streaming, the NBA holds numerous licensing and retail deals, including a $500 million deal with Tencent Holdings Ltd. and a 30-year streaming contract with CCTV. Morey promptly deleted the tweet stating that he was "merely voicing one thought, based on one interpretation of one complicated event" and that his tweets "in no way represent the Rockets or the NBA". However, despite the NBA’s efforts to repair relations, China’s sportswear maker Li Ning Co. suspended deals with the Rockets and CCTV halted broadcasts of the Rockets’ games. The cautious approach the NBA and the Rockets have taken reflects the approach of many other major international corporations. This approach, however, has generated criticism from politicians. Rockets fan and Republican Ted Cruz tweeted that "the NBA shouldn’t be assisting Chinese communist censorship" and that the NBA was "shamefully retreating". Democratic presidential candidate Julian Castro tweeted that the U.S. must "not allow American citizens to be bullied by an Authoritarian government". On the other hand, some of the major NBA players, such as LeBron James and James Harden, have voiced their criticism of Morey and his tweet, stating that Morey "wasn’t educated on the situation at hand".
THE ROYAL FAMILY SHOULD STAY INVOLVED IN POLITICS

BY FIONA NASH

Meghan Markle, the newest addition to the royal family is known for breaking royal taboos. One of the more significant rules she’s been known to break is getting involved in politics, especially social issues. Last year, on International Women’s Day, she stood in solidarity with other notable female figures in England. She didn’t see her involvement in the political issue to be taboo at all. “If things are wrong, and there is a lack of justice and inequality, then someone needs to say something. And why not me?” The royal family has been declared politically neutral since the country became a constitutional monarchy in 1688 and the queen was declared to be the impartial head of state. However, Markle is not the only other royal who has shared his or her political views. For example, Prince Harry has worked to de-stigmatize mental illness, Prince Charles is an environmentalist particularly opposed to plastic, and Prince William often speaks in favor of climate change reform. It is, admitted, a fine line, especially for Kate and William, who are in line to inherit the crown. While it’s important to uphold and protect the image of the monarchy, it would be a waste to not use a platform as large as a royal title to advocate for important causes. At the end of the day, it’s a good message to send out to the adolescents of England that they should stand up for what they believe in no matter what.

ROYAL FAMILY SHOULD BE ABOLISHED

BY MEENU RAMAKRISHNAN

The Royal Family should be abolished as it has no place in modern day society. The combination of inordinate wealth and nepotism is irrefutable even if they appear to make humanitarian, although strategic, decisions. The Royal Family cost each British taxpayer 69 pence last year (up 4 pence compared to last year), a 13 percent increase. Will and Kate’s Royal wedding reportedly cost $34 million, paid for by British taxpayer. Public money should go towards solving the housing crisis rather than the Royal Family’s own possessions. Historically, the Royal Family has subjugated many, and continues to refuse to acknowledge it. Meghan Markle, an outspoken feminist who has made many strides in furthering gender equality has failed to mention the royal family’s role in perpetuating it. No matter what humanitarian PR the Royal Family likes to do, they serve no purpose in present day society, forcing British taxpayers to pay for their lavish expenses. The present day Royal Family likes to pretend they are modern, but are still stuck in their racist views. For example, Philip, famous for his many gaffes, once asked an Aboriginal Australian, “Do you still throw spears at each other?” He also told a group of British students in China, “If you stay here much longer you’ll all be slitty-eyed. Moreover, the Royal Family damages Britain’s democracy. The Crown is the centerpiece of Britain’s constitution, giving Britain a head of state who lacks independence or purpose, who can only do what she’s told by the Prime Minister. The costs of the monarchy are considerable; the gains fleeting and mythical.
SENATOR ELIZABETH WARREN

Former Senator turned Presidential Candidate frontrunner Elizabeth Warren has big plans for America’s future. As of now, Warren’s top talking point is corruption. She sees a clear link between the country’s political downfalls and the shady happenings of Washington. For her, large companies and relentless lobbying are tearing public policy apart. As for her political stances - well, they’re pretty status quo for a Democratic progressive candidate: unrestricted reproductive rights, free college tuition, and wealth taxes. So what makes Warren different? Well, for starters, she is an undeniably bright candidate with an extensive background in law and politics. Formerly a law professor at Harvard University, Warren proved to be an invaluable asset in the formation of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Her work with bankruptcy legislation paved the way for many key legislators in Washington. In her time as a Massachusetts Senator, Warren challenged many companies and businesses to crack down on misuses of power. Despite her advances in the world of politics, Warren has faced her fair share of criticism: recent race-related scandals continue to plague her progress in the primaries. Warren continually backs her presidential platform with concrete plans and figures, and many argue that she is clearly qualified - but will that be enough in November of 2020?

FORMER VP JOE BIDEN

Perhaps the key word when comes to Joe Biden is image. Over the past decade, Biden has crafted an undeniably likeable image for himself. The three-time presidential candidate who faced tragedy when his first wife and daughter were killed in an accident is hoping to oust sitting President Donald Trump in 2020. Unlike many of his running-mates, Biden’s political track record is less progressive than many would suspect of a Democratic candidate. In the past, Biden voted in favor of a crime bill that many say resulted in mass incarceration. His previously conservative views on abortion have since changed, but many voters refuse to support the Biden bandwagon. Despite his sometimes unpopular stances, Biden has, indeed, passed praiseworthy legislation: after losing his son to cancer, the now hopeful candidate helped to raise $1 billion for cancer research. As Obama’s vice president, he maintained an amiable character -- maybe even too amiable at times. In spite of Biden’s progressive critics, his base and his image remain strong as ever. He continues to further narratives of climate change policy and low-income schooling initiatives. Many predict that Joe Biden is the only candidate capable of defeating Trump, but as always, only time will tell.
An eminent figure in the 2020 presidential race, Bernie Sanders continues to maintain a frontrunner status among his opponents. Known for leftist policies, the current Vermont Senator has created a paradigm shift in the Democratic party. Sanders pushes his agendas of universal healthcare, free college tuition, and campaign finance reform unapologetically. Perhaps the most progressive candidate in the race, Sanders has normalized many initiatives within his party. The two-time presidential hopeful has also faced his ups and downs in the public arena. Many question Sanders’ ability to assume the role of president given his poor health record and old age. Instances of gender inequality throughout his 2016 campaign have tainted his progressiveness, and as more candidates enter into the race, the future remains unclear for the 78-year-old politician. Still, much of Sanders’ base stands by him. As part of his aspirations as president, Sanders hopes to combat climate change, protect immigrants, abolish private prisons, legalize marijuana, and more. In order to fund these ambitious plans for the future, he continues to propose cuts in military spending and taxes on the wealthy. Bernie Sanders is without question a force within the political arena, and his policies have forever changed the Democratic party. The real challenge is predicting whether or not his monumental impact is enough to secure the 2020 presidential seat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator/Bernie Sanders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualified for the December debate*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph R. Biden Jr. ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Warren ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernie Sanders ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Buttigieg ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamala Harris ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Yang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Klobuchar ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory Booker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsi Gabbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Steyer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The NFL Players Association announced Monday that it will collaborate with the National College Players Association to explore how college athletes could receive compensation for the use of their name, image and likeness. Currently, college athletes do not receive any share of revenue stemming from the sale of licensing and broadcast rights by schools, athletic conferences and the National Collegiate Athletic Association. “These organizations take all revenues and profit derived off the athletes’ work without even acknowledging that athletes deserve a fair share,” the two organizations said in a press release. Under the new collaboration, the NFL players and college group will ensure licensing representation is available to college athletes in states that allow them to sign endorsement deals. In September, California became the first state to pass a law that would allow college athletes to get paid for endorsement deals and hire sports agents. The “Fair Pay to Play Act” takes effect in 2023, and was backed by the collegiate players group. The new collaboration comes as Florida and New York became the latest states to push legislation similar to California’s NCAA “pay to play” law. States with similar pending legislation include Minnesota, Nebraska, Pennsylvania and South Carolina. The NFL and collegiate players also announced plans to design a fund for injured athletes to pay for current and former athletes’ out-of-pocket medical expenses. The fund would also help players suffering with cognitive disabilities associated with contact sports. Though the NCAA currently bars students from earning any compensation related to college sports, the organization is reportedly poised to revise its rules for amateur athletes.

The NCAA’s board of governors will receive a briefing Tuesday on whether paying college athletes is feasible, the Associated Press reported. In September, the NCAA’s board of governors sent a letter to California Gov. Gavin Newsom opposing the state’s pay-to-play bill, arguing it would “upend [a] level playing field for all student-athletes.” The California law, Senate Bill 206, nicknamed Fair Pay to Play, prevents the NCAA from disqualifying collegiate players if they have third-party contracts with vendors that pay them for marketing campaigns, sponsorships and other uses of their name and image. It does not allow college athletes to be paid by their university, which was a strategic move by California legislators to propel the bill further, said Callan Stein, a partner at the law firm Pepper Hamilton who works in white-collar legislation and follows NCAA issues in the courts. “The California law was very smartly drafted — it was more narrow in scope than prior attempts to address the NCAA amateur issue,” Stein said. “The bill doesn’t seek to name athletes employees of the schools; they don’t get salaries from the school. They don’t devalue the NCAA scholarship and room and board … It really just prevents the schools from stripping players of payments.”
OP: COLLEGE ATHLETES SHOULD BE PAID

Before California’s new bill, there was an unfair treatment with college athletes due to the fact that it was illegal for them to be paid. California’s athletes could not be paid for their hard work but their college could. The colleges were receiving money that was rightfully earned by their athletes while the athletes weren’t rewarded a cent. It’s well believed that one should be rewarded for their hard work but in college, athletes legally can’t. A basketball Hall of Famer, Kareem Abdul Jabbar explains that “College athletics is a big business and the people who put the people in the seats, they’re the football and basketball players...They get nothing. What? Room, board and tuition. That’s a joke. The gentleman who runs the NCAA makes several million dollars a year” (Hutchinson, Bill). Proponents for the bill “argue, corporations and colleges have been able to excessively profit off these students, even after they have left college and joined professional sports teams” (Gutierrez, Melody, and Nathan Fenno). An example of this mistreatment involves a former UCLA basketball player, Ed O’Bannon, who “sued the NCAA in 2009 over the use of athlete images, including his own, in video games and other products licensed by the organization” (Gutierrez, Melody, and Nathan Fenno). Later in 2014, a U.S district judge discovered that “the NCAA violated antitrust law by using the athletes’ names, images and likenesses without paying them” (Gutierrez, Melody, and Nathan Fenno). Along with more equality for athletes, the bill will “also create new opportunities for female athletes who have limited professional opportunities to profit off their abilities in college”.

LeBron James had commented on his support for the bill saying, “This is a game-changer for student-athletes and for equity in sports...Athletes at every level deserve to be empowered and to be fairly compensated for their work, especially in a system where so many are profiting off of their talents” (Gutierrez, Melody, and Nathan Fenno). California’s new bill will finally allow athletes fairness due to their hard work. California Governor Newson agrees. “It’s going to change college sports for the better by having now the interests finally of the athletes on par with the interests of the institutions...Now we’re re-balancing that power arrangement” (David). Fortunately, people are taking the first steps in helping college athletes get paid, starting with California’s bill that was passed.
A person’s past comments do affect their ability to be in the public eye, and they should be held accountable for what they have done. An example is with a well-known quote made by President Donald Trump. A tape, leaked during the 2016 presidential election, showed Trump saying, "Grab 'em by the p---. You can do anything." (Transcript: Donald Trump’s Taped Comments about Women). Obviously this is not an appropriate statement to say about anyone which many of the public agreed on. This quote had created a lot of backlash and even started the well-known hat project. For those who don’t know about the pussy hat project it was with “Knitters – mostly women – started crafting handmade pink caps with cat ears, a reference to Trump’s vulgar statements about grabbing women’s genitals, which were revealed in a leaked video shortly before the election” (Mehta, Seema). The pink hats became an iconic symbol during 2017 representing female empowerment and were worn all over the 2017 Women Marches nationwide. The movement is a clear example that U.S. citizens along with other countries had not forgiven Trump for what he said. he nation’s view and support of him had drastically decreased which was directly related to his offensive comment. This was because the public didn’t support Trump as president since they didn’t want a man who would say sexist remarks to run a country. But U.S. citizens had a right not to forgive Trump due to his apology that he had after the tape had leaked. His response to the backlash was to apologize and “quickly pivoted back onto the attack, raising Bill Clinton’s sex scandals and Hillary Clinton’s role in discrediting women who had affairs with her husband” (Diamond, Jeremy). These actions show that the current president was not fully apologetic toward his mistake because he makes excuse about worse actions others took. Trump also “did not apologize for or address the behavior he said in that conversation that he engaged in toward women, including that he could ‘grab them by the p---’ and that he would sometimes ‘just start kissing them’” (Diamond, Jeremy). This displays the idea that sometimes people do not always change or become truly apologetic. It also exhibits that people, like Trump, just say sorry for their public image and not morality. If this is the case then the one should not forgive a person’s past comments since they never know if that person will say something worse in the future. They would not know if that person will change or if they are even truly sorry. If the public accepts them, then they might think it’s ok to say other comments and be forgiven. These people would not learn from their mistakes and just continue they have done before. Therefore, due to past comments a person can make, the public should not forgive them for it.
Everyone makes mistakes and says things that they regret. At the time, such remarks may have seemed comedic. They may have been said just to make a certain impression or evoke a laugh from an audience. This does not make them excusable - what does is the response of the speaker afterwards. If an appropriate amount of remorse is felt for the people the comment may have affected and the potential implications of the comment are addressed, the speaker has done their due diligence and has accounted for the damage they may have caused. One example of comments that have created backlash have been the homophobic comments made by Kevin Hart in the past. He has made references to the fact that he, as a heterosexual male, would make conscious efforts to discourage his son from coming out as homosexual. This included stopping his son from playing with a dollhouse and breaking the toy over the child’s head. He also mentioned a billboard of actor Damien Dante Wayans looked like “a gay billboard for AIDS.” Many people have called out Hart for his insensitivity when addressing the LGBTQ+ community. However, the actor has responded to such controversy with the following statement: “Guys, I’m almost 40 years old. If you don’t believe people change, grow, evolve as they get older, I don’t know what to tell you. If you want to hold people in a position where they always have to justify or explain the past, then do you.” In this statement, Hart explains his belief in evolution of the mind. People change and grow as they get older. They move from the actions of their past and evolve into different people. Nothing anyone says will please everyone. There will always be some people who will speak out against what others say or find faults in their words.

It is up to the speaker to determine whether these faults have substance and how to address them at the proper time. If it is done correctly, the speaker can be assured that they have done what is necessary to move forward. People should not be judged by the comments they have made in the past. People are constantly evolving, changing, and moving forward in our thoughts and principles. We are a malleable species. If one’s past is allowed to haunt them for the rest of their lives, redemption would never be possible. The same way that a criminal can reform their behavior after incarceration, a person can reform their thought and move past their controversial action. They can learn to gain a new appreciation for the people they may not have known much about before. In this way, people can learn from their mistakes and move forward with others while learning more about the people and communities around them. A flexible outlook by all parties in these kinds of situations is most beneficial. People can be assured that they will be received with acceptance, regardless of the insensitivity they may have contributed to earlier. Together, we should encourage an environment that facilitates growth and progress as a community.
NOT AT ALL: FIONA N

President Trump sparked controversy recently with his decision to bring American soldiers home from Syria, effectively abandoning our Kurdish allies. While the U.S. has historically gotten involved in many civil wars across the globe to fight for democracy, it reserves the right to not put its soldiers into every single conflict in the world. It is simply not practical for the U.S. to send troops into every country’s civil war. Often, American troops can exacerbate conflict by heightening tensions or leaving a power vacuum which has sparked the creation of extremist Islamist groups. In the situation of Syria, the Obama administration made a conscious decision to enter the region and fight alongside the Kurds. That decision is irreversible, and while we can’t see any clear consequences of this involvement yet, one thing is clear: pulling out of Syria is an embarrassing inconsistency that likens the U.S. to a fickle toddler. Once a decision is made regarding whether the U.S. is going to get involved in a conflict, that decision should be fully carried out. That being said, the U.S. has had a poor track record in many cases. For instance, in Vietnam, American troops are responsible for the My Lai massacre and the use of harmful technology like napalm and agent orange. Indeed, almost 45 years after the war, the country has still not fully recovered from the use of some harmful chemicals. Additionally, the Americans can be credited with creating the current political and economic conditions in Central America because of anti-communist take-downs in the 1980’s Cold War. Although the U.S. has felt compelled to defeat communists and support democracies abroad, our patterns can change for the better by taking a step back from international conflict, instead of working on social and political issues within our borders.

INTEGRAL TO SAFETY: SHREYA K

As one of the most powerful countries in the world, the United States has an obligation to set an example and lend aid to countries that may need it. It has an immense military presence and capability which can be utilized to contribute to the spread of democracy around the world. Democracy ensures that citizens have the rights and representation they deserve. In a world that is currently plagued by autocracy, it is more important now than ever to make sure that the democratic ideals of the United States are being enforced by the country itself. One of the most prevalent areas that need the aid of the United States is Syria. One very important reason that the United States should remain in Syria is the growing threat of ISIS. As a resistance, great strides have been made to remove the threat of ISIS in the region. However, President Trump’s recent decision to pull American troops out of Syria has led to growing unrest in the region. The Kurds, our longtime allies in war, are now facing severe consequences due to their less protected state. Many ISIS prisoners have escaped from the facilities that were holding them. The US is a controlling force in this region. Its vast supply of resources have been effective in keeping the situation in Syria from becoming too drastic. Slowly but surely, the war on terror was being won. Removing our influence from that area can only have negative consequences for the health and safety of the people and of the progress of our mission there. Another important reason that the US should remain involved in Syria is because of the Syrian civil war that is currently raging there. The US should help create a sustainable solution to the democratic crisis in the area. Our influence could help create a stable environment for the Syrian people by helping to establish secure borders and a defensible territory for the community. To ensure that the future of Syria is not corrupted by the autocratic influences in the region, the United States needs to maintain their seat at the diplomatic table. The United States is a global powerhouse with incredible reach throughout the world using their military and diplomatic influence. It has the power to impact change around the world and establish brighter futures for many global populations. This kind of power comes with a responsibility to preserve and protect the futures of the countries around the world in order to ensure global cooperation and safety.
Across
5. youngest member of President Obama's Cabinet
6. former investigative intern at WMAQ-TV
7. philanthropist who founded OneRoof, Inc.
8. represented Delaware
9. rated by fivethirtyeight.com as the top (male or female) candidate 'who's getting more home-state support than their party" Down
1. former law school professor specializing in bankruptcy law
2. most frequently Googled candidate after the first, second, and fourth 2020 Democratic debates
3. dubbed 'The Internet's Favorite Candidate'
4. chronicled by filmmaker Marshall Curry in his documentary Street Fight
7. attended University of Chicago
10. former deputy district attorney in Alameda County, California
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5. Castro
6. Buttigieg
7. Steyer
8. Biden
9. Klobuchar

DOWN
1. Warren
2. Gabbard
3. Yang
4. Booker
7. Sanders
8. Harris
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Dropped Out
Bullock de Blasio Gillibrand Harris Hickenlooper Inslee Messam Moulton Ojeda
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