

Watch the video from IntelligenceSquared Debates *LIVE Debate: Policing Is Racially Biased* (2 hours)  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-CQ5\\_qO6YJw](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-CQ5_qO6YJw)

### ***Video Summary***

*Streamed live on Jan 11, 2017*

*Senator Jeff Sessions' controversial attorney general nomination comes amidst increased demand for racial justice in policing, fueled by the highly publicized deaths of black men at the hands of police.*

*But there are some who say that protests following these deaths have fed a narrative of biased policing that the data does not back up. What are the statistics, and how should we interpret them?*

*We're in New York City, home to the largest police force in the nation, debating the motion:*

*Policing Is Racially Biased*

*Joining us are two former police officers on either side of the debate. Arguing in favor of the motion are retired NYPD detective Marq Claxton, now of the Black Law Enforcement Alliance, and Gloria Browne-Marshall, a former civil rights attorney turned professor of constitutional law at John Jay College.*

*Opposing them: Heather Mac Donald, a fellow at The Manhattan Institute and author of *The War On Cops*, joins Harry Stern, a former police officer turned civil and criminal defense attorney.*

## Evaluation of each speaker based on their use of rhetoric, data, and data narrative

### Marq Claxton

Marq began with 'bias' as support which is valid to the topic. He brought some pretty good experience to the debate and ensured he did not dive too deep in his former occupation but stay afloat with the debate topic. I believe Marq was acutely aware with his approach so as not to let his race direct his reasoning, being rational rather than emotional with his points and to the con side. He brought up common day-to-day problems faced by blacks and people in a community to backup his points like the 'wine and cheese drinkers' who were exempted because they do not present a threat. He also spoke on data collected and used by the NYPD where it is selective and should not be used too frequent by the con side to buttress their point. Gave an example how he was stopped by a cop weeks to the academy. In conclusion, Marq used little data, but his rhetoric and data narrative was apt.

### Gloria Browne

When compared to the other presenters, Gloria stood out with facts and data. She backs up her side with valid statements and quotations like:

- 1670 James town colony example, 1865 amendment abolishing slavery but with a catch to it (slavery is abolished except as a punishment for a crime). Movie example 'The shower shank redemption
- Statistically proven close to 700,000 thousand arrests, with black and brown people making most of those arrested, reason for racial profiling
- Facts on the Floyd case, other 'records of white Police officers telling their cop friends to go into minority cities or sections and show them who owns that place'. How racist and sick can it get.
- She counters the opposing team on how they define crimes and why they are being selective on a smaller sample data to justify the whole on 'black crimes

In conclusion, Gloria came prepared with facts backing her data, used history and correct data narrative, and was convincing on the subject matter

### Heather MacDonald

Heather was intelligent and brought in data at every point she used. She used findings and directed it to a source in case of any doubts. Her data narrative and rhetoric were clear and useful.

- 2015 Police shooting, data shows the Police killed 991 people, 50% of these shootings were white cases. 26% of the shooting were black cases, and she said 'how does this make up racism. Given blacks make up just 13% of the total population. Goes to add, these shootings occur where police witness violent cases and not black people.
- Heather said 'blacks commit more homicide than any other race,
- Black to Hispanic shooting makes up 75% crime rate in the city when compared to other races
- Questioned the pro team why 53% of stops are black and just 9% white, says it is due to crimes, not race.

But I cannot say all her data was valid, like the Pro team said, 'her data is disproportionate, she focuses on where there is crime, blacks who commit the crime and not on the general crime rate'.

## Harry Stern

His team against came with valid data points but I will not say he had a data narrative. He was more of the persuasive side with work facts and words rather than total data. I did enjoy 3 of his points:

- Blacks commit more crimes than any other race
- Crime is not created by the internal and bad thoughts of the police
- Police actions on television or the internet, as they always look ugly. But those are extreme cases which do not apply to the Police force.

These points are true and do go in favor for his team's debate. The internet can really make things messy, same as social media however they want to benefit their narrative.

## OBSERVATIONS

I believe Harry and Marq should have spoken more on this topic as compared to Gloria and Heather. Maybe they stayed away from sharing so much information, avoided being biased. They should have shed more light in terms of (experience, data narration, clear cut definitions), as their approach would be from the source and not just data and hearsay. Gloria and Heather brought in more information to support their sides of the debate, they came prepared and touched every question where necessary. Gloria brought in some emotion along the question-and-answer phase (think phase 2) which could be avoided as facts, rationality rather than emotion was needed in the debate.

I noticed the Pro and Con team both answered their questions, but the Pro team did better at answering questions from the crowd than the con team. Harry was one-sided in his answers from the audience and avoided touching sensitive issues.

Now on their closing remarks, the Pro team did well as compared to the Con team. I like what Heather said, 'No one is more concerned about Black Lives Matter like the Police are'. That is a great point that can be debated but to what extent?

## WHO WAS MORE PERSUASIVE?

The Pro team (Marq and Gloria) in their data narrative, rhetoric, voice, and eyes, built credibility to my listening. From Gloria bringing in racist history to add weight when referring to the governing system, to bringing out written facts and verbal quotations which depicts racism and control on the minority. Her data narrative was also accurate as the facts are there and cannot be denied. Marq made a good debate on why the con team uses a biased dataset, he said 'If you search for crime in a certain place, you will find it, not because it is there but because you are bent on finding crime there.'

- Law abiding officers are forced into following the system because they interact with people. They do not follow the law; they follow the system. Now the system is bad which makes them follow the bad lane.

In conclusion, I enjoyed the debate I believe the winning team deserved their accolades.