**Debate Roles**

* **Representing Employees:** Kayla and Jordan
* **Representing Google:** Conrad and Gabriel
* **Jury:** David and Anya

**General Dialogue**

*Note: this is paraphrased based off in-class discussion*

* **Kayla:** It’s not illegal to discriminate based on political stance, but it is illegal to prevent employees’ participation in politics.
* **Jordan:** Google is inviting (provoking) people to have political discussions in their internal workplace forums.
* **Gabriel:** That is not the meaning of “politics” in this context. It is not the correct view of the law, [...] and being sexist is worse.
* **Conrad:** In the case that they have to prove they discriminate against white men and the internal discussions were based on what the employees did, were the two employees not discriminating first?
* **Kayla:** People did say things related to politics. There were mentions that managers kept blacklists of conservatives.
* **Conrad:** Google, the company, had to have done it, not the managers. Managers does not mean systematic.
* **Kayla:** Is a manager not a subset of Google, therefore representing Google as a whole?
* **Gabriel:** Then at what level are you representatives of your company?

**Key Points**

* Google:
  + Google isn’t at fault because under the California labor law they didn’t stop any of their employees from engaging in political discourse. They only stepping in when an employee crosses the line by asking offensive questions, or publishing sexist and misogynist documents.
  + Attested that the California law prohibits a company from preventing people from partaking in political actions, but doesn’t prevent Google from taking action if someone is creating a hostile workplace under the guise of politics, i.e. it’s not political to ask your coworker if they are being investigated for terrorism.
  + Article only focuses on the immediate of the people fired, and Google. The person who wrote, “You’re a misogynist and a terrible person…” may have had some kind of punishment, but the article doesn’t go into all the ripples created from the paper spread around Google, only the initial closest actions.
  + Google never prevented anyone from participating in political discourse, as evident by the @conservatives mailing list, what they did do is remove a few individuals who were creating a toxic work environment.
* Employees:
  + Although California labor law prohibits employers from “forbidding or preventing employees from engaging or participating in politics”, Google failed to mediate their online messaging system in order to prevent political discussions that fostered a feeling of discrimination from employees whose views differed from their co-workers.
  + Supposedly managers maintained lists of people with conservative beliefs who are blocked from working on their teams. A message from one manager to another after blacklisting an intern stated “I don’t think he was aware that there were real consequences for his actions. That might have given him the right motivation to change his beliefs or at least to keep his mouth shut.” If this supposed black list of conservatives exists and Google did nothing, they were allowing the discrimination of people with conservative beliefs.
  + Google may have not been the entity that discussed politics that left conservative employees feeling discriminated against, but Google did not act on the political harassment that some employees felt. James Damore and David Gudeman are suing Google, and not specific employees, because by not saying anything, Google allowed people to feel like it was ok to degrade those with dissimilar beliefs.

**Jury Verdict**

Google: The jury decided to take Google’s side in the lawsuit due to the laws in California. Google’s position in the lawsuit appears to be more factual in the sense that they didn’t clearly break any laws. The employees side, or James Damore and David Gudeman, give the impression that they are entering this lawsuit based on emotions and feelings that resulted from the repercussions of their actions. Although the reactions they received may have been hostile, Damore and Gudeman provoked co-workers after publishing a document that expressed gender biased opinions. Google fired Damore and Gudeman for “perpetuating gender stereotypes”, which falls under gender discrimination and is legal to have employment terminated for under California law. Google also allowed political discussions in the workplace, which is also legal in California.

**Conclusions**

Google may be located in the West of the United States, which notably votes liberal in politics, however that does not merit fostering an online community of Google employees that politically divided the workplace. The problem is that Google employees feel that it was okay to discuss controversial topics that are potentially inappropriate for the workplace and result in people feeling discriminated against. Potentially, Damore published his gender-biased document as a vengeful rebuttal to the Googles online company-private community, which appears to frequently degrade dissimilar beliefs. Ultimately, Google might want to consider how they can improve their employees relations in the workplace.