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Anton Ford
Twice an L.D. Trophyist, CDE Alumnus

Isaac Potter
2000 National Champion
Twice a CDE Alumnus

Winthrop Hayes
CDE Alumnus
National Champion

Team Debate
World Champions
Twice

Ami Arad
CDE Alumnus

Jennifer Rotman
CDE Alumnus

LINCOLN DOUGLAS
NATIONAL CHAMPIONS

- Since 1994 over thirty percent of the top finishers at Nationals have been CDE alumni.

- CDE is the only camp to ever have its students from the same school close out L.D. final round at Nationals.

Josh Levine
Twice a CDE alumnus, now
National College Extemp Champion

Team Debate Champions

- In 1990 CDE alumni were the first college team to win the world for the U.S.

- In 1994 the U.S. won the world high school championships for the first time.

- 4 National Championship Teams have been CDE alumni

Geof Brodak and Bill Herman
Both CDE alumni, 1999 National Debate Champions

EXTEMP
and
STUDENT CONGRESS

- Since 1983 CDE alumni have won 14 National Championships in Extemp

- 3 Student Congress National Champions have been CDE alumni
27 NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIPS IN EXTEMP, DEBATE, AND CONGRESS

Michael Strumsky
1st Extemp, NFL Nationals 1995 and 1996
CDE Alumnus 1994

Gaof Brodak
2nd in L.D. at College Nationals 1996
CDE Alumnus 1993-94

David Applegate
1997 National Champion
CDE Alumnus 1996

Courtney Meyer
2nd U.S. Extemp
CDE Alumnus

Joseph Jones
NFL National Champion 1996
CDE Alumnus 1994

Jill Van Pelt
1st Impromptu
CDE Alumnus

CDE is now accepting applications to its 2002 Camp
(July 15 - 30 at Northern Arizona University in Flagstaff, Arizona)
Lincoln Douglas, Extemp, Team Debate $1,125. Application fee $85. Send fee or inquiry to:
CDE, P.O. Box Z, Taos, NM 87571.
Phone 505-751-0514, Fax 505-751-9788. MasterCard and Visa accepted.
E-Mail at bennett@laplaza.org

Visit the CDE WEB SITE today. www.cdedebate.com
Free Lincoln Douglas Blocks Free C. X. Case and Blocks
FREE Internet Links for Extemp, CX, and L.D.
FREE Summer Camp Information
CONTEST • CONTEST • CONTEST • CONTEST
Your speech could win $2,000 and qualify you for Nationals

Chances are, you know the three Rs — "readin', writin' and arithmetic." But have you heard about the fourth one, "retirement planning?"

The Lincoln Financial Group® Video Speech Contest gives you an opportunity to learn about the advantages of retirement planning and compete for a scholarship for your future education at the same time.

What are the prizes?
- The grand-prize winner will receive a $2,000 scholarship.
- The second-place winner will receive a $1,000 scholarship.
- Both winners will qualify for expository speaking at the 2002 NFL National tournament in Charlotte, NC.
- Excerpts from the speeches will be published in several Lincoln publications reaching an audience of more than 700,000.
- Video excerpts from the winning speeches will be shown online at LFG.com and at the 2002 NFL National tournament in Charlotte.
- Coaches of each winner will be awarded a $500 honorarium.

What's the topic?
The Fourth R: Retirement Planning — it's never too early to start.

Where do I find information?
You can find information about retirement planning at your school or public library or on the Internet. Search topics could include: "Retirement Planning," "Annuities," "Financial Planning," "Investing."

Who's eligible to enter?
You are — if you are a high school speech student and a member of the National Forensic League.

How does the contest work?
- You must prepare an original expository speech no more than five minutes in length.
- The speech must be videotaped — production quality will not be part of the judging. Lincoln will retape the winning speeches, if necessary, for the excerpts to be shown on LFG.com and at the 2002 NFL National tournament.
- Only one videotaped speech per school may be submitted. If several students in your school wish to participate, a local school elimination should be held.

What's the deadline?
All entries are due to Lincoln Financial Group on or before March 29, 2002.

Entries should be mailed to: Lincoln Financial Group, NFL Video Speech Contest — 2H-09, 1300 S. Clinton St., Fort Wayne, IN 46802. Include with the videotape a typed sheet of paper containing the name, address and phone number of the student, coach and school.

Who's judging?
A panel of judges from Lincoln Financial Group will select one grand-prize winner and one second-place winner. Judges' decisions are final. Winners will be contacted by April 30, 2002. Winners will be congratulated at the 2002 NFL National tournament and announced in the September issue of Rostrum. No entries can be returned. By entering, participants agree to these rules and to the use of their speech, name, photo or likeness without compensation. NFL expository speaking rules (NFL National Manual pages 9-10) will apply.

Who is Lincoln Financial Group?
Lincoln Financial Group is a diverse group of financial services companies, all dedicated to helping make the financial world clear and understandable so you can make informed decisions to help meet your financial objectives. As the NFL's overall corporate sponsor, Lincoln Financial Group funds the national tournament and provides $78,000 in college scholarships and awards.
NFL ONLINE

- Enroll new members
- Record points for members
- View Chapter Roster
- View each student's record
- Receive coaching points
- Add new coaches

NFL EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MINUTES ON PAGES 33 - 34

The Rostrum provides an open forum for the forensic community. The opinions expressed by contributors to the Rostrum are their own and not necessarily the opinions of the National Forensic League, its officers or members. The National Forensic League does not recommend or endorse advertised products and services unless offered directly from the NFL office.
Darling: Where are the kids?

Forensics.

Forensics? Like bodies?

No

Cutting up? "Quincy" I saw "Quincy" reruns.

No, from the Latin - speaking in public - what they did in the Forum

Oh.

In Rome.

Not soccer?

The Coliseum

Ah, right...Not music?

No

Not the extra - credit-study-group-watching-of-a-film kinda event...?

No

Not drama rehearsals?

No - forensics!

Oh.

You remember - getting up in the middle of the night?

Oh Yes!

Buying special food.

Yes!

Waiting in the dark for your children to turn up, Right!

Facing the corridors, waiting for the results,

Talking to walls

Good, now you have it.

Like having a baby.

Precisely!

(together) The Seven Ages of Forensicing

By Tony,

and Joan,

(together) Haigh.

With apologies to Will.

And anyone else that might be offended

All the world's a Forensics tournament,

And all the men and women merely coaches, chaperones, judges...

They have their exits

Do I have to travel on the bus with them again?

and their entrances;

I could drive my own car!

And one man in his time plays many parts - Dec, Duo, Improv, Solo, Broadcasting, Interp, Exterp...

His acts being seven ages.

At first the infant, novice competitor

Mewling and puking on the long bus ride.

Carrying his blanket, pillow and bag of "road food."

And then the whining school-boy, with his folder,

Mom, where's my folder, the little black book? Mr. Meadows will kill me if I can't find my folder.
And shining morning face
Hair too well done, baggy eyes, dressed for bed and for the office.
Creeping like snail
Slug
Unwilling to catch the bus.
I can get up on my own; it's only 4:30.
4:30!
It takes an hour to do my hair, duh!
And then the lover,
What's that happening at the back of the bus?
Adam? I mean Matt!
—and who's that with you? I don't care if she "just fell asleep in your lap" She's a freshman damn it!
Sighing like furnace,
Don't sigh at the end of every line, or gasp at the beginning.
Pronunciation!
You have to think through the thought, and Breathe! If you don't breathe, how can the judges?
Project!
with a woeful ballad
Isn't that piece just a little depressing? How many dramatic interp pieces are there about a retarded, deaf, blind, handicapped, abused individual who kills his mother?
Made to his mistress' eyebrow.
Don't you think that make-up is a little over the top dear?
Than a soldier,
Full of strange oaths, and bearded like the pard,
The stroking the beard gesture looks fine, but don't do it on every line. And the language...? I know they're not supposed to judge for content, but that...it's a little scary, even for me.
Jealous in honour, sudden and quick in quarrel,
I'll decide who does what speech.
I know you did it last year; but that was last year.
She's your duo partner - get along!
You will have to share with him - no you can't pay extra for a private room!
Seeking the bubble reputation
Take the gum out of your mouth before you begin. Good.
Even in the cannon's mouth
Be subtle, don't blast me away! Project - don't shout!
And then the justice,
In fair round belly with good capon fin'd,
Everyone puts on a little weight when they go to college. The Freshman 15! It's normal! You should be grateful I came back to coach.
With eyes severe, and beard of formal cut,
Full of wise saws and modern instances;
When I was in forensics it was really fun. We mooned half the Bluegrass Parkway! Cool! But now I'm a coach and a judge, so there won't be any of that kind of stuff. And everyone in their room by 11.
And so he plays his part.
The sixth age shifts.
Into the lean and slipper'd pantaloon,
Off to college in the fall. A shelf full of trophies. The admiration and unrequited passion of Freshmen following their every step.
What is he wearing? Pantaloons? Slippers? Oh it's a senior English project. That Miz Haigh - always up to something!
With spectacles on nose and pouch on side,
You have to wear your glasses when you give your speech.
His youthful hose well sav'd, a world too wide
Do you know how hard it is to keep that boy in suits? He grows an inch a week! I just thought I'd buy big this time.
For his shrunk shank;
and his big manly voice,
Finally!
Turning again toward childish treble, pipes
(continued on page 61)
Catholic University of America Debate Scholarships are open to high school students who have successfully competed in debate in high school. Eligibility for this award is determined by academic profile, past debate performance and future potential. Scholarship amounts range from $1,000 to $15,000 per academic year.

Recent Honors

- Ranked Number 1 in the Nation by the National Debate Tournament in 2001
- Ranked Number 1 in the Nation by the American Debate Association in 2001
- 2001 Varsity American Debate Association National Champions
- 2001 Novice Cross Examination Debate Association National Champion
- 2001 Top Speaker in All Three Divisions at the American Debate Association National Championships

Coaching Staff

- Ronald Bratt, Director
- Steve Mancuso, Assistant Director
- Andy Paterson, Assistant Coach
- Michael Dutcher, Assistant Coach
- Paul Kerr, Assistant Coach

Travel

- Debate team members travel to eight to 12 tournaments a year – CUA supports the majority of the expenses.
- Tournaments attended include – Georgia State, Harvard, University of Kentucky, Wake Forest University, University of Southern California, West Georgia College, U.S. Naval Academy, University of Richmond, Northwestern University, Cornell, West Virginia University and many more.

Come join one of the fastest growing and most exciting debate programs in the nation!

For more detailed information and an application, please contact:
Ronald Bratt, Director of Debate
Phone – 202-319-5447
E-mail – bratt@cua.edu
Web site – http://debate.cua.edu
CLASSICAL MENTORING IN FORENSICS EDUCATION
The Coach as Mentor and the Contestant as Protege
by Robert C. Carroll

Forensics can best be described as competitive debate, public speaking and the oral interpretation of literature. Forensics is an outgrowth of those societies, which came into existence during the Renaissance, reached its apex in the Enlightenment and were dedicated to the pursuit of better public discourse about politics, science, arts and literature. Although the activity is European in origin and although debating and speaking organizations currently exist in every developed, representative democracy around the globe, forensics has evolved into a truly and uniquely American activity, offered at high schools and colleges across the country at both the secondary and postsecondary level.

As a forensic participant of twenty years; a former contestant for eight years, a coach for seven years and a current judge and writer, I have noticed that the relationship in forensics between a coach and his/her contestants is analogous to what is referred to in the literature of teacher education as the mentor-protege method of individual instruction, and indeed, that forensics itself can be thought of as a delivery system of individual instruction. This paper will examine forensics as a method of mentoring instruction at the secondary level through a two-step process: first, explaining the requirements of mentoring instruction; and second, demonstrating how forensics fulfills these requirements of mentoring instruction.

ELEMENTS OF MENTORING
A heightened awareness of mentoring can be accomplished by first, listing the categories of mentoring instruction, second, inquiring into the psychological principles of mentoring, and third, examining the common characteristics of mentoring.

Categories
The literature on mentoring essentially divides the method of instruction into three categories. The first category is developmental mentoring, with a senior teacher as mentor and a junior teacher as protege (Bova & Phillips, 1984; Chauvin, 1988; Clifford & Green, 1996; Galvez-Horneveck, 1986; Giles & Endsley, 1988; Harris, 1995; Krupp, 1987; McKenna, 1998; Mullin, 1992; Parkay, 1988; Perna, 1995; Rackin, 1996; Reiman & Thies-Springthall, 1996; Scamen et al., 1997; Weeks, 1992).

The second category is classical mentoring, with a second as mentor and a student as protege (Ayvazian, 1997; Berger, 1992; Brown, 1996; Bunda, 1996; Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Chao & O'Leary, 1990; Cesa & Fraser, 1989; Egan, 1996; Gaskill, 1991; Goldberg & Sedlacek, 1996; Grant-Thompson & Atkinson, 1997; Haring-Hidore, 1987; Herbst, 1996; Johnston, 1994; Kelly, 1984; Menicucci, 1996; Mocca, 1989; Muska & Chaires, 1996; Prucey, 1998; Ragins & McFarlin, 1990; Reglin, 1996; Rodgers & Tiffany, 1996; Summers, 1996; Tartter, 1996; Taylor, 1992; Torres et al., 1997; Wilkins, 1996; Wald & Worth, 1996).

The third category is peer mentoring, with one student as mentor and another as protege (Devlin-Scherer, 1996; Ganser, 1998; Torrance et al., 1996; Yates et al., 1997).

Many authors consider this category analogous to tutoring and treat it as such. In this section of the paper, the focus is the second category of mentoring, classical mentoring, the one most associated with the term in the educational setting (Fagan, 1988; Gray, 1996; Paludi, 1988; Playko, 1990; Wright, 1992). In the third section, the focus of the paper is further narrowed to classical mentoring in secondary schools, although evidence obtained from teacher-student relationships on the postsecondary level is introduced for clarification and descriptive purposes.

Principles
The psychological principle behind mentoring is best described by Vygotsky's model of mediated learning in the zone of proximal development. As Gage and Berliner (1998) explain, "Instruction is good only when it proceeds ahead of developmental level. Instruction must awaken and bring to life those functions that are in the process of maturing, that is, those in the zone of proximal development. It is in the way that direct tutelage and other forms of instruction play an important role in the cognitive development of the child" (111). Gage and Berliner (1998) go on to elaborate, "Mediated learning environments occur when a adult or other knowledgeable person intervenes - mediates - between things in the environment and the child" (112). By the mentor providing not only factual information to the protege, but also working through the process of rational problem-solving with the protege, the mentor goes beyond the mere what, where, when and how of learning into the realm of the condition, reason and why.

The mentor-protege relationship commences when the protege approaches a mentor whom the protege considers an expert in a certain field, while the protege is a novice in the same field. At the onset, the zone of proximal development is huge, as the difference between what the protege can accomplish with and without the guidance of the mentor is immense. As the mentor-protege relationship develops, the zone of proximal development diminishes; simultaneously, the mentor continues to increase the level of what the protege can accomplish with his/her guidance, forcing the protege to internalize more of the social knowledge of the mentor. Thus, as the relationship progresses, the potential of the protege continues to develop until, ultimately, the mentor can increase the level of guidance no higher and the zone of proximal development eventually disappears. At that point, the mentor and protege are on the same level of development, and the relationship is one of equals. The relationship between the mentor and protege may continue, but it is no longer a mentoring relationship, as the protege is now also an expert. As Gage and Berliner (1998) summarize, "In the zone of proximal development, social knowledge - knowledge acquired through social interaction - becomes individual knowledge, and individualized knowledge grows and becomes more complex. Ultimately, development leads to a successfully functioning adult in a particular community" (114).

Classical mentoring, both natural, but even structured, has shown to be relatively
effective in increasing the achievement levels of protégés. Its ability to increase achievement is documented for undergraduate college students (Campbell & Campbell, 1997; Wold, 1996), seventh and eighth grade middle school students (Wilkins, 1996) and even second grade elementary school students (Tarter, 1996). Its demonstrated effectiveness has persuaded the Federal Department of Education to increase support for pilot programs under the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) (Rackin, 1996; Tarter, 1996).

Perhaps its greatest importance to the field of education, however, is in its ability to assist traditionally underserved populations of students, including: gifted and talented children (Menicucci 1996; Torrance et al., 1996; Torres et al., 1996); children with physical and mental handicaps (Moccia, 1989); African-American adolescents (Ayvazian, 1997; Summers, 1996); especially males (Grant-Thompson & Atkinson, 1997); Latin-American adolescents (Ayvazian, 1997; Muskai & Chairez, 1996); and especially young women (Chao & O'Leary, 1990; Egart, 1996; PDE, 1996; Gaskill, 1991; Goldberg & Sedlacek, 1996; Haring-Hidoren, 1997; Pasich, 1988; Ragins & McFarlin, 1996; Taylor, 1992).

Interestingly, for African-American and Latin-American adolescents, the race or ethnicity of the mentor makes no difference in the achievement level of the protege (Ayvazian, 1997; Muskai & Chairez, 1996). While the race of the mentor might affect his/her initial credibility with the protege, it has no impact on his or her effectiveness (Grant-Thompson & Atkinson, 1997). The idea of mentor credibility is therefore, not surprisingly, more important in structured mentoring than in natural mentoring (Summers, 1996). The same holds true for young women; the gender of the mentor makes no difference in the achievement level of the protege (Egart, 1996; Gaskill, 1991; Goldberg & Sedlacek, 1996; Haring-Hidoren, 1987; Ragins & McFarlin, 1996). In fact, some authors contend that it is actually better for a young woman to have a male mentor than a female (Chao & O'Leary, 1990; Pasich, 1988).

In both instances, it appears to be a case of the Hawthorne Effect in action. In closing, Taylor (1992) notes that in many instances, proteges have multiple mentors, just as most mentors have multiple proteges. "Findings indicate that 60 percent of proteges had one or more mentors" (Taylor, 1992, 49).

Characteristics

According to the authors surveyed, the elements of classical mentoring vary greatly with each mentor-protégé relationship; however, three elements appear to be common: mutual initiation, open communication, and reciprocity. Mutual initiation stresses that the relationship occurs spontaneously and can be terminated at any time and both understand that the relationship will eventually be terminated upon the completion of a certain task, such as a thesis or dissertation, or by matriculation. But while classical mentoring is not permanent, it is certainly not transient. Cesa and Fraser (1989) and Chauvin (1988) discern that one of the distinguishing characteristics of mentoring, as opposed to teaching, is that the mentor-protégé relationship is marked by a much greater amount of give and take than the standard student-teacher relationship. The protege benefits through acquiring the skills and knowledge of the mentor and through associating with a person of notoriety, while the mentor benefits from a sense of pride in the accomplishments of the protege and a responsibility for his or her future success. In fact, Bunda (1996) discovers that scholarly faculty at the University of California at Berkeley, who see their primary mission as researching over teaching, nonethe-

less place a great deal of emphasis on the development of a new generation of scholars to perpetuate their work. For some, the development of scholars to further their research is equally as important and satisfying as the research itself (Bunda, 1996).

In summary, the five requisite elements for productive mentoring include: (1) initiation by the mentor; (2) acceptance by the mentee; (3) moderate, but finite duration; (4) open communication; and (5) reciprocity or mutual benefit. We will now investigate how successful forensic education is in fulfilling these requirements.

FORENSICS AS CLASSICAL MENTORING

An effective analysis of how forensic fulfills the requirements of classical mentoring can be achieved through first, grouping the first three requirements into one characteristic of initiation, second, examining open communication, and third, describing reciprocity.

Initiation

Unlike classroom activities, which are mandatory, extracurricular activities, such as forensics, are voluntary. The student makes the conscious decision to "try out," or audition for the team and continues to practice and work in order to remain active. This audition serves as an approach by a novice protege (the contestant) to an ex-
expert mentor (the coach); indeed, at most programs, first-year contestants are expressly referred to as novices. Also, unlike classroom activities, which are egalitarian, extracurricular activities, like forensics, are exclusive. The teacher must make the conscious acceptance of the protege by the process of "cutting", or releasing those students whose work ethic does not meet with his or her approval. The voluntary and exclusive nature of the forensic program ensures the relationship develops mutually; the contestant is free to leave at any time should the requirements of the coach become excessive and the coach is free to release the contestant should the contestant fail to meet his or her requirements.

Once the student learns enough about forensics and his or her particular talents to determine on which events he or she wishes to specialize, the real mentoring process begins. With most forensic programs, a staff of several coaches is involved; one who specializes in debate events, another who concentrates on public address, and another who focuses on interpretation. Most nationally recognized programs have a staff of seven coaches, with each coach narrowing his or her expertise to two or three events. Thus, when the contestant makes the choice of specialization for his or her secondary school career, he or she is committing to work with one coach over a period of three to three-and-one-half years (most programs allow contestants to experiment during the first semester or year to make an informed choice). This element fulfills the requirement of adequate, but finite, duration. By practicing with a contestant for a couple of hours each afternoon for several days a week over the course of multiple academic years, the coach and contestant have a much greater exposure to each other. Contrast this to the typical teacher-student relationship, where exposure is limited to one hour per day for one academic year, and it is clear why forensics, as most extracurricular activities, is naturally more fertile ground for mentor-protege relationships.

Open Communication

This greater exposure leads to more open communication. As the relationship develops, coaches and contestants will sit down and discuss both short-term improvements (what aspects the contestant needs to practice to improve for the next contest) and long-term strategies (what goals and objectives the contestant has set for him or herself and how can the coach assist him or her in achieving those objectives). Often, the topics of discussion will expand even further to include career plans, college enrollment and coursework, academic study, summer workshops, hobbies and interests, and professional behavior. In an environment such as forensics, where adolescents are being evaluated on their abilities to present themselves as competent and mature by adults, the "dress for success" discussion and the "appropriate language" discussion are inevitable.

The level of trust the contestant places in the coach furthers open communication. In forensics, a coach can never judge his or her own contestants or even contestants from his or her program, so others always evaluate the protege's performance. Thus, the coach is never viewed as a barrier to overcome, analogous to earning a grade in a classroom, but as an assistant to surmounting an obstacle. The coach never acts as judge or final decision-maker; he or she only serves to elevate the accomplishments of the protege.

Reciprocity

This sense of the mentor sharing in the accomplishments of the protege, while the proteges bask in the notoriety of the mentor is at the center of the mutual benefits forensics bestows upon its coaches and contestants. The experience of the coach is passed along to the contestant, while the enthusiasm of the contestant rubs off on the coach. This exchange ensures both parties benefit from the relationship and as long as the exchange continues, the relationship continues to develop. Even though a coach attends a tournament every year for decades, attending it with another team of new contestants makes each tournament unique. Even though a novice contestant never participated in an advanced level of competition before, working with an expert coach prepares him or her for almost all possible contingencies (and unanticipated contingencies can still be met with confidence).

Perhaps the greatest benefit of forensics is the sense of the repaid debt (Kay, 1992). At some point in time in the career of every forensic coach, he or she learned to recognize the benefits of forensics education; greater self-confidence; improved social skills and increased knowledge. Thus, many coaches feel as though they have an obligation to extend those benefits to others, and by mentoring contestants, they "give back" or return to forensics something comparable to what forensics has given them.

It is also important to note that the two other categories of mentoring are also present in forensics. Developmental mentoring occurs when senior coaches mentor junior coaches, particularly those junior coaches who were never contestants and enter the activity without the requisite background knowledge about forensics content and procedure. As a matter of fact, the Indiana High School Forensic Association (IHSFA) appoints a mentor for each new coach who registers with that organization each year, especially for those coaches who are starting new programs or taking over existing programs without assistants. Peer mentoring occurs when coaches structure tutoring systems whereby varsity contestants work with novice contestants, usually serving as a resource to answer questions that the novice contestant would be too embarrassed to ask a coach. As an example, several recognized programs are so large, with over 100 students, that it is impossible for a coach to work extensively with all students, even if the staff has seven coaches. These programs implement the controversial "star system", whereby the coach works with the top one to three contestants in each event and those varsity contestants, in turn, each practice with two or three novice contestants in that event. And if a contestant chooses to work with two different coaches in two different events, something most programs strongly encourage, he or she will doubly benefit by having multiple mentors.

In conclusion, forensics fulfills the five requisite elements for productive mentoring instruction: (1), initiation by the protege through audition; (2), formal acceptance by the mentor; (3), moderate, but finite duration, usually three or four years; (4), open communication, trusting and non-evaluative; and (5), reciprocity or mutual benefit, through the repaid debt. The coach- contestant relationship, therefore, is definitely a form of the mentor-protege method of individualized instruction.

North Carolina
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
June 16, 2002
National Tournament
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(Robert C. Carroll is a former contestant for and graduate of Homewood-Flossmoor (IL) High School and Bradley University. He has earned masters degrees in both public administration (University of Kentucky) and education (Saint Xavier University) and has coached with Homewood-Flossmoor and Merrillville (IN) high schools.)
The Arizona State University Forensics Team invites teams to the 2002 edition of the Tournament of Excellence and Southwestern Championships in Tempe, Arizona.

The Tournament of Excellence (TOE) showcases Individual Events, Policy & Lincoln-Douglas debate. The TOE Individual Events tournament features three rounds of competition. The Policy and L-D divisions feature a round-robin and double round-robin format, respectively with three preliminary rounds. Competitors in the TOE L-D division may also enter the TOE Individual Events tournament.

Tournament highlights for 2002:
- Policy debate will be a Tournament of Champions (TOC) qualifier for teams in the final round.
- Large tournament with lots of entries—the 2001 TOE and SWC had 58 schools from 10 states.
- Octafinals in debate and quarterfinals in many individual events.
- Discounted hotel and airline rates negotiated with Sheraton Hotels and Southwest Airlines.
- Excellent campus facilities with terrific Arizona winter weather.

Electronic copies of the invitations are available at the Arizona State University Forensics website (http://com.pp.asu.edu/forensics/invitations.htm).

TOE bid applications are due by December 14, 2001. Accepted bids will be announced on December 17, 2001. SWC applications are due by January 8, 2002.

For additional information, please contact:
Kelly McDonald, Ph.D., Director of Forensics
The Hugh Downs School of Human Communication
College of Public Programs
Arizona State University
PO Box 871205
Tempe, AZ 85287-1205

E-mail: kelly.mcdonald@asu.edu
Phone: (480) 965-2027
Fax: (480) 965-4291
Introduce and Improve Debate Skills!

Perfection Learning® is pleased to announce the acquisition of Clark Publishing. Together, our companies have served educators for over 125 years, and we look forward to offering you the great selection of Clark textbooks in forensics, speech, drama, and journalism.

An introduction to contemporary basic debate for beginning and intermediate debaters

Revised and streamlined to include the most useful, current information, this text focuses on policy debate with chapters on Lincoln-Douglas debate. Student Congress, mock trial, and parliamentary debate.

Examples and graphics explain
- debate history, theory, and ethics
- debate formats
- research sources, including electronics
- argumentation
- rebuttal
- defense
- the judging process

A Teacher's Manual includes activities, grading strategies, quizzes and answer keys, and much more!

The basics of Lincoln-Douglas debate for novice and intermediate debaters

The most complete introduction available on preparing for and participating in the Lincoln-Douglas (L-D) debate format, this text features short, well-designed chapters to move students through L-D analysis, case construction, and case defense procedures.

Students will learn about
- L-D theory
- the difference between L-D debate and policy debate
- values and how to choose and research value topics
- preparing cases
- developing rebuttal strategies
- improving delivery skills

A Teacher's Manual features activities, additional Lincoln-Douglas topics, bulletin, quizzes and answer keys, and more.

Additionale debate texts are available!

Clark Publishing

a division of
Perfection Learning®
CORPORATION

Call or visit our Web site today for a FREE catalog!

phone: (800) 831-4190 • fax: (800) 543-2745 • web: perfectionlearning.com
2001 DEBATE TOPIC

DARK WINTER

by

Margaret A. Hamburg, M.D.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, thank you for the invitation to discuss the need to enhance our nation’s capacity to respond to the threat of biological terrorism. Your leadership and commitment in addressing this challenge comes at a critical time.

The tragic attacks last month have been a powerful reminder of our nation’s vulnerability to terrorism, and have increased fears that we could face even more devastating assaults in the future, including the possible use of biological weapons.

Certainly, the events of recent days have underscored how seriously we must take this emerging threat. Whether an unsophisticated delivery system with a limited number of exposures, as we have seen in several American cities, or the potential of a more high-tech, mass casualty attack, the prospects are frightening. Today, no one is complacent about the possibility that a biological agent might be intentionally used to cause widespread panic, disease and death.

In this time of heightened anxiety and concern, our nation has a real opportunity—and obligation—to make sure that we have in place the programs and policies necessary to better protect ourselves against this threat, and perhaps to prevent such an attack from occurring in the first place. While there are many challenges before us, we do know a great deal about what needs to be done and how to do it. I will address these issues in more detail later in my testimony, but I want to emphasize at the outset that improving the national response to bioterrorism must include several broad elements, such as:

1) Prevention

Every effort must be made to reduce the likelihood that dangerous pathogens will be acquired or used by those that want to do harm. This must include improving intelligence, limiting inappropriate access to certain biological agents and efforts to establish standards that will help prevent the development and spread of biological agents as weapons.

2) Strengthening Public Health

Rapid detection and response will depend on a well-trained cadre of trained public health professionals to enhance disease surveillance and outbreak investigation, educate and alert health care providers, upgrade laboratories to support diagnosis, and improved communications across all levels of government, across agencies and across the public and private sector.

3) Enhancing Medical Care Capacity

We must improve treatment for victims of an attack by enhancing local and federal emergency medical response teams, training health professionals to diagnose and treat these diseases, developing strategies to improve the ability of hospitals to rapidly increase emergency capacity, and providing necessary drugs or vaccines where they are needed through a national pharmaceutical stockpile.

4) Research

A comprehensive research agenda will serve as the foundation of future preparedness. Perhaps most urgently, we need improved detectors/diagnostics, along with better vaccines and new medications.

Some of these activities are already underway, but need to be strengthened and extended; other programs and policies still need to be developed and implemented. This hearing represents an important forum to better define the agenda we must pursue to be a nation prepared.

DARK WINTER EXERCISE

I have been asked in my testimony to address “Dark Winter,” a recent bioterrorism exercise which involved the intentional release of smallpox and the lessons learned. Although a simulation of a worst-case scenario, it powerfully conveyed the distinctive—and sobering—features of a potential bioterrorist attack and helped to spotlight many of the vulnerabilities that we must urgently and effectively address.

“Dark Winter” simulated a series of National Security Council (NSC) meetings dealing with a terrorist attack involving the covert release of smallpox in three American cities. The exercise was conducted by the Center for Strategic and International Studies, the Johns Hopkins Center for Civilian Biodefense Studies, and the ANSER Institute for Homeland Defense, under the leadership of John Hamre, Tara O’Toole and Randy Larsen, respectively. Many of the participants in “Dark Winter” had served previous Presidents in cabinet or sub-cabinet positions. Most knew how the NSC worked, and they were all individuals with considerable expertise and perspective in the security, law enforcement and health fields. I served as the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

In the opening minutes of “Dark Winter” we learned that cases of smallpox had just been diagnosed by the Centers for Disease Control. Given the propensity of this disease to spread person-to-person, the 30% fatality rate of the disease, and the limited supply of smallpox vaccine, it was not surprising that we were soon dealing with an epidemic of devastating, if not catastrophic, potential.

In the 20th century, more than 300 million people died from smallpox—more than those killed in all wars of the century combined. Thanks to a massive and highly collaborative international campaign, smallpox as a naturally occurring disease was eradicated, and vaccination against the disease stopped. Consequently, each passing year has seen the birth of new generations of unvaccinated citizens, and a decrease in the potency of previous vaccinations among adults. So although the eradication of smallpox has saved thousands of lives, the end of vaccination against it has paradoxically left the world more vulnerable to the disease.
This fact would be of little consequence if we did not know that smallpox was made into a weapon by the Soviet Union, and that other nations or groups may have successfully acquired stocks of the virus. Today, a single case of smallpox anywhere in the world would constitute a global medical concern. An example of the seriousness of this disease is the wave of smallpox that was touched off in Yugoslavia in 1972 by a single infected individual. The epidemic was stopped in its fourth wave by quarantines, aggressive police and military measures, and 18 million emergency vaccinations, this to protect a population of 21 million that was already highly vaccinated.

By comparison, in America today we have less than 15 million effective doses of vaccine to protect a population of 275 million that is highly vulnerable to the disease. The Yugoslavia crisis mushroomed from one case; the “Dark Winter” exercise began with 20 confirmed cases in Oklahoma City, 30 suspected cases spread out in Oklahoma, Georgia, and Pennsylvania, and many more individuals who were infected but not yet ill. Initially, we did not know the time, place or size of the release, so we had no way to judge the true magnitude of the crisis. We could easily predict, however, that it would get worse before it would get better.

Over a 24-hour period at Andrews Air Force Base, our NSC “war gamers” dealt with three weeks of simulated shock, stress and horror. We learned that on December 9, 2002, some dozens of patients reported to the Oklahoma City Hospital with a strange illness confirmed quickly by the CDC to be smallpox. While we knew only about the Oklahoma cases the first day, we later learned the scope of the initial infections and the sites of three simultaneous attacks in shopping centers in Oklahoma, Georgia and Pennsylvania. The initial infection quickly spread to five states and 3,000 victims, although at this point, most infected individuals had not displayed symptoms or gone to the hospital, so it was impossible to tell who or where they were.

The two primary tools for containing a smallpox epidemic are isolation of cases and vaccination of contacts. In accordance with this, a strategy was devised to include strict isolation of those with disease and a firewall of vaccine protection around those cases, but from the beginning, that strategy was limited by the large numbers of people initially infected, the rapid spread of the disease, and our limited supply of vaccine. Unfortunately, we had only enough vaccine for one out of every 23 Americans. (This remains the case in America today, although a contract is in place and is being accelerated to produce at least 40 million new doses by the end of 2002).

The Secretary of Defense demanded that all 2.3 million of our military personnel be immediately vaccinated wherever they were in the world. In his wisdom, the President decided against this policy. Instead, we administered vaccine to U.S. military, including the National Guard, and security and medical service personnel who were on the front lines locally, and also those who were in areas of the world where a smallpox attack was more likely to occur.

So, on the first night of decision-making, we designed the vaccination strategy, and we ordered accelerated production of new stock. We even asked the Secretary of State to try to find surplus stock from other countries, but we were doubtful that they would comply with our request in the face of a smallpox epidemic that would in all likelihood become global.

On Day Six of the crisis, very little vaccine was left. The situation required that we consider measures considered draconian by modern standards, including enforced isolation, restrictions on travel, and providing food and other essential supplies to affected areas in the face of these restrictions. These problems were exacerbated by the fact that, by this point, we could no longer provide vaccine to essential providers.

On Day Twelve, when the war game ended, we were beginning the next stage of the epidemic - those who caught smallpox from the original 3,000 people who were infected in the initial terrorist attack. Epidemiologic models predicted that without effective intervention, every two to three weeks the number of cases would increase ten-fold.

At the conclusion of the exercise, the epidemic had spread to 25 states and 10 foreign countries. Civil disorder was erupting sporadically around the nation. Interstate commerce had ceased in large areas of the country. Financial markets had suspended trading. We were out of vaccine and were using isolation as the primary means of disease control.

For each of us around the table, the lessons learned were somewhat different depending on our various backgrounds, experience and expectations. It was fascinating to see the differing perspectives that were brought to bear on the same fundamental sets of data and decision-points. At times, the old adage “what you see depends on where you sit” came to mind. Yet I think we all agreed that the exercise was indeed plausible - even conservative - in the framing of the scenario and the assumptions made about disease exposure, transmission and treatment. Certainly, we all left the room humbled by what we did not know and could not do, and convinced of the urgent need to better prepare our nation against this gruesome threat.

In my role as the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the perspective brought to the table was that of someone who served first as a local health officer (New York City Health Commissioner) and then as a federal public health official (Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health and Human Services). I felt first hand the devastation of terrorism as New York City’s Health Commissioner when the World Trade Center was first bombed in 1993. Today, the horror of that event is dwarfed by the attacks of September 11th. Yet despite the incredible scale of these attacks, it is clear that an attack with a biological weapon has the potential to inflict even greater damage upon our country, both in terms of the extent and the time scale of the unfolding disaster and in numbers of people affected.

I should state that my bias is to approach the bioweapons issue in the broad context of infectious disease threats, both naturally occurring and intentionally caused. There is a continuum. A bioterror attack such as that depicted in “Dark Winter” would certainly represent the extreme end of that continuum, both in terms of a potentially catastrophic consequences for health and because of the disruption and panic that it would cause.

ISSUES RAISED BY
DARK WINTER EXERCISE
"Dark Winter" raised many importa
issues and provided an opportunity to enhance awareness about the complexities of a bioterrorist attack. It served as a compelling illustration of just how much an attack caused by biological weapons would differ from conventional terrorism, military strikes or even attacks caused by other weapons of mass destruction.

It demonstrated how such an attack would unfold slowly—over days, weeks, months—as an infectious disease epidemic, with the potential to cause enormous suffering and death, as well as panic, destabilization and quite possibly civil disorder. There was little doubt that this would be a true public health emergency, for which our nation is ill-prepared to respond. Moreover, it showed how a bioterrorist attack would represent a national security crisis of enormous proportions, yet many of the traditional strategies to manage such an event would not apply. For example, identification of the perpetrator, as well as avenues for possible retaliation, might not be feasible. “Dark Winter” also underscored the intertwined legal, ethical, political and logistical difficulties that attend contagious disease containment and control.

“Dark Winter” further demonstrated how poorly current organizational structures and capabilities fit with the management needs and operational requirements of an effective bioterrorism response. Responding to a bioterrorist attack will require new levels of partnership between public health and medicine, law enforcement and intelligence. However, these communities have little past experience working together and vast differences in their professional cultures, missions and needs. The “Dark Winter” scenario also underscored the pivotal role of the media, and how a productive partnership with media will be paramount in communicating important information to the public and reducing the potential for panic.

Another clear lesson that emerged from “Dark Winter” was that effective response will also require stronger working relationships across levels of government. While national leadership, guidance and support will be essential, it must be recognized that much of the initial crisis response and subsequent consequence management will unfold on the local level. “On-the-ground” local providers—public health and medical professionals, emergency response personnel, law enforcement officials and government and community leaders—will provide the foundation of the response and will deal with the problem from the moment the first cases emerge until the crisis is over.

The “Dark Winter” scenario also brought into bold relief the fact that management of such a crisis would almost certainly occur in the context of an already strained health care system and severe limitations on certain critical resources, including shortages of vaccine, hospital beds and isolation capacity.

**CHALLENGES FOR THE FUTURE**

As an exercise, “Dark Winter” was not designed to provide answers, but rather to raise critical questions and issues about our current preparedness to address the bioterrorist threat. Certainly it achieved that goal, but how do we begin to address these critical concerns? Building on lessons learned from “Dark Winter” from the perspective of public health and medicine, let me emphasize several key challenges as we move forward.

1. **Focus on the real threat/strengthen public health.** In previous testimony before Congress, I have emphasized the need to convince policymakers and the public that the threat of bioterrorism is real. However, the recent cases of anthrax in Florida and New York City have made this point more forcefully than I ever could. However, even in the context of current events, I believe that a major challenge remains the need to get policymakers, legislators, and program planners to really comprehend that the threat of bioterrorism is fundamentally different than the other threats we face, such as “conventional” terrorism, or attack with a chemical or nuclear weapon.

   Meaningful progress against this threat depends on understanding it in the context of an infectious and epidemic disease. It requires different investments and different partners. Until bioterrorism’s true nature as an epidemic disease event is fully recognized, our nation’s preparedness programs will continue to be inadequately designed: the wrong first responders will be trained and equipped; we will fail to fully build the critical infrastructure we need to detect and respond; the wrong research agendas will be developed; and we will never effectively grapple with the long-term consequence management needs that such an event would entail.

   Unfortunately, if we look at our current preparedness efforts to date, necessary public health and medical care activities have been underdeveloped and underfunded. Of the roughly $10 billion budget for counterterrorism efforts in FY 2001, only a very small percentage has supported activities that truly can be considered as core elements of a coherent program to address the bioterrorist threat. In the current environment, it is clear that very substantial new monies will be available, and we must ensure that a significant component of those resources are targeted to address these critical concerns.

2. **Build on existing strategies.** Effective strategies must build on existing systems where possible, but build in flexibility. We do not want to develop an entire ancillary system for responding to the bioterrorist threat. Rather, we should strive to integrate our thinking and planning into the continuum of infectious disease threats and potential disasters that public health agencies are already charged to respond to. The last thing we want is to find ourselves trying out a plan for the very first time in the midst of a crisis. Instead, we want to find the systems that work in routine activities and then identify what we need to do to amplify or modify them to be appropriately responsive for these more acute and catastrophic situations.

3. **Support the health care system’s capacity for mass casualty care.** Controlling disease and caring for the sick will require a deep engagement of the public health and medical community. There are currently many pressures on health care providers and the hospital community that limit their ability to prepare in some of the critical ways necessary for effective planning in the face of the bioterrorist threat. The enormous downsizing that has occurred, the competitive pressures to cut costs, the just-in-time pharmaceutical supplies and staffing approaches, and the limited capacity for certain specialty services such as respiratory isolation beds and burn units that may become critical in a biological or chemical terrorist attack, all need to be recognized and addressed.

   We must be realistic about the potential costs that would be incurred by these institutions and individuals, as well as the
enormous up-front investments needed if they are truly to prepare. And in many ways, if you are a health care institution today, making these preparatory investments is a high-risk undertaking. By preparing, you are also almost setting yourself up to incur a series of costs that may not be reimbursed after the crisis is over.

We know that we must find better ways to strategically support our health care institutions, both because of the implications of a bioterrorist attack but also because of the existing demands on the system, as evidenced this past year when a routine flu season overwhelmed hospital capacity in several cities.

There is an urgent need to develop programs that target dollars for health care disaster planning and relief, including training, templates for preparedness, and efforts to develop strategies in collaboration with other critical partners for providing ancillary hospital support in the event of a crisis. This could be done either through the Army field hospital model or what was done in the 1918 pandemic flu, when armories, school gymnasiums and the like were taken over to provide medical care. In doing this, we need to support local and state planning efforts to assess community assets and capabilities, and we need to look at what federal supports can be brought to bear locally in a crisis.

Invest in research. Today's investment in research and development will be the foundation of tomorrow's preparedness. A comprehensive research agenda should be developed and pursued that extends across many important research domains. For example, our capability to detect and respond to a bioterrorist attack depends largely on the state of the relevant medical science and technology. Without rapid techniques for accurate identification of pathogens and assessment of their antibiotic sensitivities, planning for the medical and public health response will be significantly compromised. Without efficacious prophylactic and treatment agents, even the best planned responses are likely to fail. Biomedical research is needed to develop new tools for rapid diagnostics, as well as improved drugs and vaccines. At an even more basic level, we must invest in research to enhance the fundamental study of genomics, disease pathogenesis and the human immune response.

In addition to biomedical research, further research into such diverse concerns as defining appropriate personal protective gear or decontamination procedures under different circumstances will be important to our overall preparedness for a bioterrorist attack.

Research to support deeper understanding of the behavioral issues and psychosocial consequences of a catastrophic event of this kind is currently very limited but should be made a high priority. I believe that the importance of all of these areas has been underscored by our recent experience in responding to the mounting set of anthrax cases and exposures. These events have demonstrated critical gaps in our knowledge as well as deficiencies in our tools for detection, response and consequence management that we can and should swiftly address.

5) Understanding the public response. Sadly, the many fears, anxieties and uncertainties that have surrounded the current anthrax scare reinforce another major gap identified in current preparedness and planning efforts. This involves how to engage the public, and importantly, how to most effectively work with the public in the event of a crisis. The recent small-scale anthrax attacks, although they have sickened only a handful of people, have given new insights into how complex these issues may be. Certainly, the specter of a silent, invisible killer such as an infectious agent evokes a different level of fear and panic than other disaster scenarios. Indeed, response to previous major disease epidemics—such as the outbreak of pneumonic plague in Sarat, India in 1994—suggests a level of panic and civil disruption on a far greater scale.

Anyone who has ever dealt with disaster response knows that how the needs of the public are handled from the very beginning is critical to the overall response. In the context of a biological event, this will no doubt be even more crucial. Managing the worried well may interfere with the ability to manage those truly sick or exposed. In fact, implementation of disease control measures may well depend on the constructive recruitment of the public to behave in certain ways, such as avoiding congregate settings or following isolation orders. In the final analysis, clear communication and appropriate engagement of the public will be the key to preventing mass chaos and enabling disease control as well as critical infrastructure operations to move forward.

Correspondingly, the needs and concerns of response personnel, including health care workers, must also be addressed. Again, prior experience with serious infectious disease outbreaks tells us that when this does not occur, essential frontline responders and key workers are just as likely as the public to panic, if not flee. The mass exodus of health care workers following onset of the Ebola epidemic in Kikwit, Zaire in the mid-1990s serves witness to this point.

7) Engage the media. The media is key to efforts in a crisis to communicate important information to protect health and control disease, as well as to reduce the potential for panic. Over the past days, we have seen both the press and the public receive a crash course on anthrax. They have been fast learners, and for the most part, the media has done a credible and responsible job in communicating this important information. But there must be a clear plan for providing the news media with timely and accurate information. Furthermore, the credible and consistent voice of well-informed health officials is critical to this effort.

Stepping back, it is clear that the ability of the media to mobilize effectively in a crisis is greatly enhanced by a process of ongoing and continuing mutual communication and education in calmer times. We must strive for the development of a set of working relationships grounded in trust—trust that they will be provided with information in a timely and appropriate manner, and in turn, that they will use that information in a responsible, professional way.

No doubt there will always be tensions between the desire to get out a good story and an appreciation of the complexities, sensitivities and uncertainties inherent in such a crisis. But stonewalling the press or viewing them as the enemy is virtually guaranteed to make the situation worse.

8) Clarify legal authorities. In planning for an effective response, an array of legal concerns need to be addressed. Issues include such basic ones as the declaration of emergency—what are the existing authorities? Are they public health, or do they rest in other domains that will be relevant? What are the criteria for such a declaration? What are the authorities that still
need to be established?

Other outstanding legal questions concern the ability to isolate, quarantine, or detain groups or individuals; the ability to mandate treatment or mandate work; restrictions on travel and trade; the authority to seize community or private property such as hospitals, utilities, medicines, or vehicles; or the ability to compel production of certain goods. Also, questions concerning emergency use of pharmaceuticals or diagnostics that are not yet approved or labeled for certain uses need to be answered.

These questions involve many different levels of government, many different laws and authorities, and raise many complex and intertwined ethical, political and economic issues. In a systematic and coherent way, we must address this array of pressing issues and concerns. And not just what laws are in place or could be put in place, but then also what policies and procedures would be necessary to actually implement them.

(9) Plan, prepare and practice. Perhaps most fundamentally, “Dark Winter” signaled the need for more planning and preparation—across all the domains mentioned above and more. Planning can make a difference, but we cannot begin to prepare in the midst of a crisis. As “Dark Winter” unfolded, it was evident that a sense of desperation about what needed to be done arose, at least in part because the system had not produced sufficient vaccine, had not prepared top officials to cope with this new type of security crisis; had not invested adequately in the planning and exercises needed to implement a coordinated response; and had not educated the American people or developed strategies to constructively engage the media to educate people about what was happening and how to protect themselves.

Prior planning and preparation can greatly mitigate the death and suffering that would result from a serious bioweapons attack. As a nation, we need comprehensive, integrated planning for how we will address the threat of bioterrorism, focusing both on prevention and response. We need to define the relative roles and responsibilities of the different agencies involved, and identify the mechanisms by which the varying levels of government will interact and work together. We need true national leadership to address the bioweapons threat to our homeland. Planning efforts must be backed by the necessary resources and authority to translate planning into action. Moreover, we must practice what we plan. Preparations must be exercised, evaluated and understood by decision-makers if they are to prove useful in a time of crisis.

(10) The importance of prevention. The many intrinsic challenges involved in mounting an effective response to a bioterrorism attack and the many casualties that will inevitably occur—should compel us to make a greater commitment to what can be accomplished to reduce the fundamental threat of their use. Clearly, measures that will deter or prevent bioterrorism will be the most cost effective means to counter such threats to public health and social order—both in human and economic terms. Are there strategies to limit or prevent these often frightening microbes from getting into the hands of those who might misuse them, and how do we reduce the likelihood that they would be misused?

On a policy level, such prevention efforts require a global approach, including the need to find ways to meaningfully strengthen and enforce the Biological Weapons Convention, as well as international scientific cooperation to create opportunities for scientists formerly engaged in bioweapons research to redirect their often considerable talents and energy into more constructive and open research areas. For example, a number of scientific collaborations have begun in Russia in an attempt to address this goal.

We must also strengthen and expand efforts to control access to and handling of certain dangerous pathogens, including proactive measures by the scientific community to monitor more closely the facilities and procedures involved in the use of such biological agents.

THE NUCLEAR THREAT INITIATIVE—A New Foundation—

Encouraging and supporting our government to deter, prevent, and defend against biological terrorism is a central part of our mission at the Nuclear Threat Initiative (NTI)—an organization founded by Ted Turner and guided by a distinguished board co-chaired by him and former Senator Sam Nunn. We are dedicated to reducing the global threat from biological, nuclear, and chemical weapons by increasing public awareness, encouraging dialogue, catalyzing action, and promoting new thinking about these dangers in this country and abroad.

We fully recognize that only our government can provide the leadership and resources to achieve our security and health priorities. But within that context, NTI is:

- Seeking ways to reduce the threat from biological weapons and their consequences.
- Exploring ways to increase education, awareness and communication among public health experts, medical professionals, and scientists, as well as among policy makers and elected officials—to make sure more and more people understand the nature and scope of the biological weapons threat.
- Considering ways to improve infectious disease surveillance around the globe—including rapid and effective detection, investigation, and response. This is a fundamental defense against any infectious disease threat, whether it occurs naturally or is released deliberately.
- Stimulating and supporting the scientific community in its efforts to limit inappropriate access to dangerous pathogens and to establish standards that will help prevent the development and spread of biological agents as weapons.
- And finally, NTI is searching for ways to help our government and the Russian government to facilitate the conversion of Russian bioweapons facilities and know-how to peaceful purposes, to secure biomaterials for legitimate use or destruction, and to improve security of dangerous pathogens worldwide.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, let me re-emphasize that a sound strategy for addressing bioterrorism will need to be quite different from those that target other types of terrorist acts. While a large-scale event most likely remains a relatively low probability event, the high consequence implications of bioterrorism place it in a special category that requires immediate and comprehensive action. Yet as we move forward to address this disturbing new threat, it is heartening (Hamburg to page 61).
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Long ago (the fall of 1946) and far away (Henryetta, Oklahoma) there were two eager high school debaters (Bill Sholer and Mike Barcus) who were dead set on qualifying for the NFL Nationals. They were hampered a bit as they didn’t have a coach. It seems that World War II was being fought and their coach had been drafted. Bill and Mike would have liked a coach as they had to debate the teams of the legendary H.B. Mitchell, but they were determined to forge ahead by themselves. Not only were they debating without a coach, they were debating without any help at all as they were the only team on the Henryetta High School debate squad.

Bill and Mike were persistent, and they were successful. They did, indeed, win State and qualify for Nationals. However, they were not to realize their dream as Nationals was cancelled that year due to the war.

Bill went on to become a very successful lawyer and Mike, a very successful psychiatrist. Everyone except the families of the young debaters could have forgotten this part of their lives, but Oklahoma became the 2001 host of the NFL Nationals and all kinds of debate and speech war stories started to emerge. It seems that Bill Sholer’s granddaughter is an NFL member at Edmond Santa Fe High School in Edmond, Oklahoma, and competes in drama events coached by Catherine Johnston. She told her coach about her grandfather. I was contacted; and consequently, I contacted Bill and Mike. I invited them to come to Nationals to participate as observers of the final debate round and to finally get the recognition they had desired for so many years. Both agreed and I was fortunate enough to spend time with them on the Friday of NFL Nationals. This was truly the highlight of the tournament for me.

These interesting gentlemen reminisced about their debate rounds as if they had just happened recalling moments when they had “crushed” their opponents. (yes, “crushed” is a term that has been around for a long time). They recalled arguments that had been particularly successful and laughed about teams that had been particularly fun to beat. After watching the final round, they both told me how and why they would have voted. They quoted particular arguments and evidence in the round. Remember that they were not flowing. They listened. They both said that they would have voted affirmative. I said, “Bill, would you have voted affirmative because it was the last speech?” He replied, “Just how old do you think I am?”

I was especially interested in hearing them compare debate of the 40’s and the one that they had just heard. Both mentioned the speed, of course, but had little trouble following the arguments. They preferred a slower rate of speed, but didn’t seem particularly bothered one way or the other. They did, however, seem perturbed by the amount of evidence and seemed to think that the debate would have been much more interesting if less evidence had been read and more analysis had been given. Both Bill and Mike thought that both teams over claimed evidence and said that both teams seemed a little “paranoid”, or at least the evidence seemed that way. They did comment on how talented the debaters were and realized how much work had gone into the final product.

But, this is the good part. They were very impressed with ALL of the kids. Not just the ones in finals, but the students in general. Bill told me later that some of the contestants were in his hotel and he asked them the outcome of the debate as he had left before the awards assembly. He remarked how pleasant and polite they were.

Bill had wanted to speak to the debaters to make sure that they knew how fortunate they were to actually have the experience of participating at Nationals. When we presented Bill and Mike with their national qualifier plaques right before the final debate, he only said how much he had wanted to compete himself and didn’t elaborate. He has said to me several times that he hoped that our students don’t take the experience for granted.

The team of Sholer and Marcus got a standing ovation from the audience on the day of Finals. I can’t think of anyone who deserved it more. I received a note from Mrs. Barcus telling me how touched Mike had been by the reaction of the audience. Mrs. Barcus wondered if other World War II veterans in other states had received similar honors. I don’t know, of course, but it seems like a good idea to me.

(NFL Councilor Glenda Ferguson coaches at Heritage Hall HS (OK))
# Championship Final Round Audio Tapes

**"A great teaching tool"**

## Current Final Rounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oratory:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/D Debate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Extemp:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Extemp:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sets: $45 per set—Circle years ordered.


---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>描</th>
<th>Tapes @ $10</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>描</td>
<td>Complete Set(s) @ $45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>描</td>
<td>All 4 Sets @ $170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>描</td>
<td>Shipping ($1 per tape or $4 per set or $12 for 4 sets)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$ Total

---

## Great Past Final Rounds

Circle your selections: $7 each; 3/$19; 10/$65

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oratory:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/D Debate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Extemp:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special: 1500 Drama, Poetry, Oratory, Boys Extemp, Girls Extemp on one tape

Archival Set (115 tapes) @ $465

$ Name

Tapes ($7 each; $19/three; $65/ten)

$ School

Shipping ($1 per tape/ $10 per Archival Set)

$ Address

$ City

$ State Zip Code

---

Mail to: NFL—Box 38—125 Watson Street—Ripon, WI 54971—0038

Phone: (920) 748-6206 Fax: (920) 748-9478 Email: nflsales@vbe.com

7/01
# CHAPTER HONOR SOCIETIES

## PINNACLE
(The elite level achieved by NFL's largest chapters)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Chapter Sponsor</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houston-Bellaire HS, TX</td>
<td>Mr. David Johnson/Mr. Jay Stubbs</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leland High School, CA</td>
<td>Ms. Gay Brasher</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PENTAGON
(The classic five sided figure is the elite mark of honor for NFL chapters over 500 degrees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Chapter Sponsor</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Logan HS, CA</td>
<td>Mr. Tommie Lindsey, Jr.</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrielsono HS, CA</td>
<td>Mr. Derek L. Yuih</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hill HS, MO</td>
<td>Mr. Don Crabtree</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx HS of Science, NY</td>
<td>Mr. Richard B. Sodikow</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence-Truman HS, MO</td>
<td>Ms. Christine Adams</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watertown HS, SD</td>
<td>Mr. Donus D. Roberts/Mr. Richard Mittelstadt</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## THE 400
(Formerly the 400 families in New York City society, now this name honors NFL chapters holding 400 plus degrees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Chapter Sponsor</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washburn Rural HS, KS</td>
<td>Ms. Cynthia Burgett &amp; Anise Deters</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Valley North HS, KS</td>
<td>Mr. Max H. Brown</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterton HS, IN</td>
<td>Mr. James Cavallo</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downers Grove-South HS, IL</td>
<td>Ms. Jan Heitene</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Creek HS, CO</td>
<td>Ms. Peggy Benedict</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis HS, NY</td>
<td>Mr. Eric DiMichele</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramonte HS, CA</td>
<td>Ms. Sandra Maquire</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth HS, IN</td>
<td>Mr. Dave McKenzie</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleton East HS, WI</td>
<td>Mrs. Debra L. Weiler-Tras/Mr. Michael Tras</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patonville HS, MO</td>
<td>Mr. Randy Pierce/Mr. Don Schulte</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls-Lincoln HS, SD</td>
<td>Ms. Kim Maass</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evansville-Reitz HS, IN</td>
<td>Mr. Brandon D. Cosby</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastview HS, MN</td>
<td>Ms. Jennifer McCarty</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SOCIETE' DE 300
(An elite recognition for chapters achieving 300 or more degrees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Chapter Sponsor</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue Valley Northwest HS, KS</td>
<td>Mr. Douglas W. Neill</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Valley HS, KS</td>
<td>Mr. Chris Riffert</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millard-North HS, NE</td>
<td>Mr. Terry Peterson</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagan HS, MN</td>
<td>Ms. Joni Anker</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple Valley HS, MN</td>
<td>Mrs. Pam Cady Wycoff/Mr. Joseph Wycoff</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Springs HS, MO</td>
<td>Ms. Sherri L. Shumaker</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenbrook-North HS, IL</td>
<td>Mr. Ted W. Belch/Mr. Charles Dribin</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel HS, CA</td>
<td>Mr. Douglas Campbell</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Trieste TWP HS, IL</td>
<td>Ms. Linda Oddo/Mr. Douglas R. Springer</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellarmine College Prep, CA</td>
<td>Ms. Kim Jones</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neosho HS, MO</td>
<td>Mr. David L. Watkins</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova HS, FL</td>
<td>Ms. Lisa Miller</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topeka HS, KS</td>
<td>Mrs. Pamela K. McComas</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SOCIETE' DE 300 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Chapter Sponsor</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edina HS, MN</td>
<td>Ms. Lynn S. Schmitt</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taravella HS, FL</td>
<td>Mrs. Beth Goldman</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Davis HS, IN</td>
<td>Mr. Harold Max McQueen</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorhead HS, MN</td>
<td>Mr. Harlan M. Shuck</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee Mission East HS, KS</td>
<td>Ms. Paulette M. Manville</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munster HS, IN</td>
<td>Mrs. Helen Engstrom</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lybrook HS, CA</td>
<td>Ms. Michaela Northrop</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside HS, SC</td>
<td>Mrs. Ruth McAllister</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita-East HS, KS</td>
<td>Ms. Vickie Fellers</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto-Beyer HS, CA</td>
<td>Mr. Ron Underwood</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown-Boardman HS, OH</td>
<td>Mr. Eric Simone</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrollton HS, OH</td>
<td>Mr. Todd Casper</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookings HS, SD</td>
<td>Ms. Judy Kroll</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Springs-South HS, MO</td>
<td>Ms. Georgia Brady</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat Ridge HS, CO</td>
<td>Ms. Donna Riff</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville-Monte Vista HS, CA</td>
<td>Mr. David J. Matley</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raytown HS, MO</td>
<td>Mr. Mark Harris</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver-East HS, CO</td>
<td>Mr. Marc Mullette</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyenne-Central HS, WY</td>
<td>Mr. Nick Panopoulos</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls-Roosevelt HS, SD</td>
<td>Ms. Janet Haar/ Ms. Laura Raeder</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Valley HS, NV</td>
<td>Mr. Scott Ginger</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman HS North, OK</td>
<td>Mr. Jim Ryan</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenbrook-South HS, IL</td>
<td>Mr. Matthew W. Whipple</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyenne-East HS, WY</td>
<td>Mr. Michael F. Starks</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester HS, MA</td>
<td>Mr. Timothy C. Averill</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raytown-South HS, MO</td>
<td>Mr. Matt Good &amp; Ms. Kelli Morrill</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hill South HS, MO</td>
<td>Ms. Jennifer Holden</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benilde-St. Margaret's School, MN</td>
<td>Ms. Connie Leyendecker</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado HS, KS</td>
<td>Mr. Robert A. Chalender</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lauderdale HS, FL</td>
<td>Mr. Jim Wakefield</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Teaching and Coaching Position Beginning August 2002**

**Lakewood High School**

*Lakewood, Colorado*

- **International School**
- **International Baccalaureate Program**
- Co-curricular Honors Debate and Forensics program with a forty-three year history of National and State recognition in Debate, Public Speaking, and Interpretation.
- Excellent administrative and community support.
- Begin as an Assistant Coach.
- Teaching assignment may include English, Honors Debate and Forensics, IB Theory of Knowledge and IB English.

*Please direct inquiries with resume and objectives to: gndavis@home.com*
www.debate-central.org

Get information about controlling weapons of mass destruction.

Dr. Hans Mark headed the spy satellite program under President Carter, oversaw the "star wars" program under President Clinton, served as Secretary of the Air Force and deputy Administrator of NASA and is currently a Professor of Aerospace Engineering and Engineering Mechanics at the University of Texas at Austin.

- More than 1,200 organized links to online articles, essays, studies, and other resources.
- A question and answer segment with Hans Mark!
- An "Ask the Expert" bulletin board where debaters can submit their own questions.
- Information and links about other debate topics: Lincoln-Douglas and Home School.

The NCPA is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit public policy organization. We depend entirely on the financial support of individuals, corporations and foundations that believe in private sector solutions to public policy problems.
The most popular category of counterplan on the "weapons of mass destruction" (WMD) topic involves consultation. The negative argues that instead of promptly adopting and implementing the plan, the United States should consult some specified government beforehand, only moving forward if the plan meets the approval of our consultation partner. Many versions were produced over the summer, including counterplans to consult NATO, Japan, Russia, China, Israel, India, and Canada.

On this resolution, the consultation counterplan is often an irresistible strategic option for the negative. Because most plan texts written advocate immediate implementation (if they don’t the affirmative may be in topicality trouble), the counterplan is mutually exclusive, for one can’t act and consult about acting at the same time. Because the resolution locks the affirmative into frequently defending policies the rest of the world would agree to, the counterplan consultation process would usually culminate in the eventual passage of the plan. Thus, the negative is able to argue there is little or no downside to asking for input. Consultation promises to capture the advantages, with the value added benefit of an improvement in America’s relations with NATO, Russia, or China (from here on I’ll use Russia as my example). The view is also prevalent that the consultation counterplan cannot be permitted by the affirmative, since to do so invariably commits the affirmative either to severance or intrinsicness (more on this shortly). Consultation is here to stay.

For the counterplan to work, the negative must include language, which gives the consultation partner a “veto” over the
plan. That is, Russia must be able to say no, and if they do, we must agree to follow. To do anything less is to promote illegitimate or artificial consultation, which the literature typically condemns. The idea is that Russia doesn't want to be dictated to; rather, they want to be taken seriously, with assurances their objections and suggestions will be incorporated, and this is true of NATO, China, and all the rest.

Advice to explicitly include a veto provision may seem counterintuitive, especially to those affirmative debaters willing to defend the standard of "textual competition." The logic of textual competition when advocated by the affirmative goes like this: if language from the counterplan can literally be pulled from the counterplan and affixed to the plan (with the effect of generating a permutation, yielding net benefits), then the counterplan does not compete even if the attached counterplan text radically alters the meaning of the original plan. In the consultation context, to provide an example, textual competition defenders will seize on the "veto" language for the purpose of a permutation. They will say they can permeate the plan by affixing the veto language to the original plan text, even though this transforms the plan into something probabilistically topical, and in effect makes the permutation the equivalent of the counterplan. Because textual competition standards are not widely endorsed on the national circuit, I'll pass up the chance to discuss them in more depth, except to say that apart from this difficulty, including veto language in the counterplan is in every other respect I know a good idea for the negative.

The events of September 11, devastatingly tragic as they were, have changed the strategic landscape in ways favorable to consultation arguments. Before September 11, the Bush Administration was widely criticized for its ungenerous commitment to alliances—in Europe, for instance, Bush and his team were widely dismissed as permanently predisposed against genuine deliberation. Instead, Bush's preferred policy, on everything from Kyoto to missile defense, was to arrive for talks where the main purpose was for Bush to tell Europe and others what he intended to do. All this seems to have changed, if only momentarily, in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington. Now, if only out of the urgent American self-interest in alliance building, the Bush team is consulting everyone in sight. This fact is not without benefits to the affirmative—after all, perhaps consultation truly is now the "normal means" by which the United States does business. But the main effect is to strengthen the negative's hand: the normal means argument is weak for other reasons beyond the fact situation of American diplomacy, and given the current urgency of alliance consultation there is less reason than ever to force a plan into existence without seeking advice and input from our allies or strategic competitors.

I highly recommend an essay on the NATO consultation counterplan written by Dan Salmon, formerly a national championship debater from Glenbrook North High School (IL), now enjoying considerable success on the college circuit as a debater for the University of California at Berkeley. His essay in this year's Hitchhiker's Companion (organized by Stefan Bauschard, published by Paradigm—www.oneparadigm.com) introduces the argument in a sophisticated way. Salmon lays out how to set up the argument in cross-examination so that some affirmative escape paths are foreclosed, includes a very good bibliography, and prepares the negative to answer the most common responses. Although his essay is specifically organized around the NATO literature, Salmon's theoretical advice is applicable and sound for counterplans engaging other consultation partners. My essay is to supplement his thoughts by addressing some of the larger theoretical issues, and by adding another perspective to his discussion of the most often defended permutations.

Two Weak Objections: International Fiat and Plan-Inclusion

Debaters are often tempted to initiate two theoretical objections to consultation, though neither really pertains. Some argue the counterplan should be rejected because it necessarily entails international fiat. As you know, some object to international fiat (which usually takes the form of a plan or counterplan acting through some other actor, such as a counterplan to have Russia dismantle its nuclear forces at its own initiative) as directive of routine policy comparison. In the context of an American debate, which we imagine might be happening among American decision makers, it would simply not be normal or germane for a senator to stand up and say: "Hold on! We should not act in this case. Rather, we should imagine that Russia has acted to solve the problem for us." Others oppose permitting debaters to fiat through the so-called "object" of affirmative scrutiny; thus, if the affirmative is urging us to contain 1930's-era Nazism, they would object to a counterplan saying Hitler will voluntarily suspend his genocide on the grounds the counterplan is just as abusive as a crime topic counterplan which has criminals abandon their racketeering.

International actor counterplans ("have Japan do the plan") have survived these arguments, and with good reason. There is a full and nuanced literature assessing the comparative benefits of American action as opposed to, say, Russian involvement in global affairs. And the Senate example just offered can be dismissed as misrepresenting the nature of fiat: even in the world of "magic wand" fiat debaters are not pretending to be senators when they seek a judge's endorsement for federal government action. And if this is so, the counterplan to fiat through India is fundamentally no different than a plan which has a high school student from Boise the Senate of forty-nine states or Representatives of 434 districts of which she is not a citizen, or a regulator who probably would not consent even to an interview with a high school visitor. Both plan and counterplan advocates implore a judge to endorse the governmental action of agents largely foreign to round participants. And who knows what we would do if we (gasp!) selected another topic with an international actor—one supposes debate would have to end.

But whichever side of the issue one endorses, it doesn't matter in the consultation context since the counterplan does not dictate any action or response from another government. Properly written a consultation counterplan will only specify American governmental action: "The U.S. federal government shall consult with Russia over the implementation of de-alerting proposals. If Russia refuses to consult with the United States, or vetoes de-alerting, it will not occur," and so on. This text imagines no fiatd Russian action, since it only orders the beginning of the process, which occurs wholly on the American side, and specifies only an American response. And, remember, even if this degree of orchestrated state-to-state interaction is illegitimate fiat, then it is unclear how any affirmative plan operating under the topicality requirement to be a "foreign policy" could survive the fiat challenge either.

Others will be tempted to object to consultation counterplans on the grounds that they are "plan inclusive" (hereafter, "plan inclusive counterplans" are "PICs").
I don't know a single judge in America who finds the "PICs good"/"PICs bad" debate intellectually illuminating, but that has not much impeded its success as an affirmative counterplan response. As is the case with international law, most judges I know have no definitive objection to PICs (and many believe they have much improved plan-centered policy comparison), but because each side can be reasonably defended, and since it takes time to initiate the objection, PICs' theory debating is now popular.

Again, the issue is whether consultation really is plan-centric. I don't think it is, although others may disagree. Defenders of the PICs argument will say the counterplan "includes" the plan since it details a scenario by which the plan will be implemented (that is, if Russia says "yes," the plan is enacted). But literally speaking, the mandates of the counterplan do not "include" the plan, for the counterplan explicitely adopts no part of it. The "condition" of Russian acceptance changes everything, in part because what we eventually agree to with our Russian partners after a process of meaningful give-and-take may bear no correspondence whatsoever to the original plan text—that's how genuine consultation works.

Is Consultation Artificially Competitive?

Debate on the question of artificial competition (by which I mean the issue of whether a counterplan is a genuine or rigged objection to the plan) is today controlled by the back and forth over defined permutations. As a result, there is a tendency to accept the legitimacy of the consultation counterplan, since most (and maybe all) imaginable permutations suffer fatal theoretical deficiencies. We'll look at the specific permutations in the next section, but one example suffices to explain the point for now. The so-called "lie" permutation says "we will commit to the plan (secretly if necessary), and we will 'consult' (or pretend to), taking the chance our certain decision to move forward will not be detected." Beyond the debate one might have over the desirability of this ruse is the theoretical intrinsicness problem. The part of the permutation carrying out the deception is neither a part of the plan nor the counterplan; it is simply invented out of thin air and tacked on so as to produce a net benefit. This is normally thought illegitimate because allowing affirmative inventors to add on to the plan and counterplan invites unchecked abusiveness.

But it may be mistaken to so fully confute the issue of permutation legitimacy and artificial competitiveness. The consultation counterplan may pose an instance of an artificially rigged alternative to the plan, whose artificiality cannot be made plain by the thought experiment of a permutation.

To see why consultation might be illegitimate, even if that fact cannot be expressed in a reasonable permutation, it is productive to compare it to another counterplan thought illegitimate by most judges. If a negative team were to defend a counterplan to "steal the plan's funding and divert it to AIDS treatment in southern Africa," most would find it abusive even though it's not topical (in fact it has nothing to do with weapons of mass destruction use), mutually exclusive ("you can't spend the same money twice"), and net beneficial ("AIDS is the biggest threat to humanity"). The problem is that, in the absence of evidence that WMD and AIDS funding naturally trade off, the counterplan offers a choice only in the falsest, most rigged sense. Reduced funding for AIDS treatment is not regularly an opportunity cost of WMD action, and only becomes one thanks to the counterplan's fiat. Nor, to take a more extreme (and hopefully planner) example, does the following counterplan pose a genuine choice: "any adoption of de-alerting will be mandatorily interpreted as a repeal of AIDS programs worldwide." To tolerate these counterplans as genuinely competitive is to utterly destroy the ability of affirmatives to win, for as Dallas argued many years ago, no affirmative can prove its plan desirable in every possible world (as created by counterplans), and the capacity of the negative to "re-define" the world in which the plan is tested, so as to make the plan either unnecessary or undesirable, is unlimited.

The question is whether consultation falls into this category of inextricable or artificial competitive counterplans despite our apparent collective inability to produce a legitimate permutation illustrating the point. Does a consultation mandate create a contrived comparison in the same way the "any law that says 'de-alert' will trigger repeal of AIDS treatment" or the "steal their money" counterplans do? In my opinion, the affirmative argument ("consultation is artificial! the only reason 'consultation good' evidence counts against us is because they rigged fiat to consult on our plan") can be compellingly made, although deciding the issue requires us to take account of matters both factual and theoretical.

It matters, for example, whether consultation normally happens or not. If the United States normally consults (e.g., the NATO Charter requires it), then the counterplan mandate is not so rigged. On the other hand, if we regularly consult as an aspect of treaty compliance then wouldn't we automatically do so on the plan too?

A side note: In the context of an otherwise very smart essay, Shalmon's answer to this question seems unusually weak, and in my view deeply flawed. Shalmon recommends the negative concede the "normal means" argument, all to say, "this means the plan is abnormal means; since we consult on everything else, the absence of consultation is unique to this plan." But the whole point of the affirmative "normal means" response is that consultation always happens as a matter of routine; for the negative to concede the point is to admit the link connects to no policy, including the plan. Shalmon's other arguments on this point are equally suspect, although I agree with him that the entire issue can often be headed off given a skilled cross-examination.

This discussion of "artificial competitiveness" leads to this practical advice: you might want to consider adding an argument to your affirmative consultation answers which says, "Reject the counterplan because it artificially competes. It's no more legitimate than a counterplan that steals our funding. They've invented a net benefit purely out of their use of fiat, which is not a valid reason to reject our plan." Run the normal permutations elsewhere, but connect none with this claim. Doing so will give you another place on the flow to make the "non-germaneness" objection to consultation without being held hostage to potentially flawed permutations.

Can Any of the Obvious Permutations Survive Scrutiny?

A brief review of the major permutations against consultation confirms the suspicion that most, maybe all, cannot find theoretical legitimacy. Simply saying we should "do both" doesn't help, since it is literally speaking impossible to both act and not act while we hear out our allies' concerns, and hard to defend pragmatically given evidence that NATO, Russia, and the rest can't stand it when we say we're listening even while we charge ahead, giving the lie to our claims to care what they think.

Several of the other possibilities are
vulnerable to the objections against "intrinsenchness permutations." In addition to the "lie" permutation already discussed, the intrinsenchness problem also affixes to the "do the plan and consult on something else" permutation (the consulting on something else part is neither in the plan nor the counterplan, which is incidentally a reason the counterplan should only flat consultation on the plan and no more).

The permutation which essentially endorses the counterplan ("do the plan but give them a veto") is arguably an act of pure severance, which is to say illegitimate since the affirmative is abdicating its advocacy of the entire, guaranteed adoption plan they originally proposed. And the permutation to "consult but then do the plan anyway" only risks adding insult to injury as alliance partners realize we never meant it when we said we wanted their input.

There is one permutation which, in my opinion, survives these theoretical difficulties, and potentially achieves a unique net benefit for the affirmative. Consider a permutation where the affirmative says we should "adopt the plan and then meaningfully consult, including a veto, on mechanisms for implementation." This permutation does not constitute severance, since it includes the mandated adoption of the plan. More importantly, the permutation is not an intrinsenchness argument, a point that can be, in my view, convincingly demonstrated in cross-examination.

After the counterplan is read, presumably in the first negative, the first affirmative might ask these questions (I've put likely negative responses in brackets): "Is the counterplan just one-time, yes or no, up or down vote on the total plan?" ["Yes" — if the IN says anything different s/he is conceding away their "genuine consultation" benefit]. "If Russia says yes to adopting the plan, but then we implement the plan in a way totally offensive to them, let's say running roughshod over their concerns or violating their sovereignty, does the counterplan provide Russia with an ongoing role in the plan’s implementation?" ["Yes" — if the IN says different then there is no solvency to the counterplan, since the genuineness of the original consultation is immediately suspended the first time they express any problems with the policy in action].

If you can elicit a "yes" answer to the second question, then the permutation is not an intrinsenchness perm. In fact, the permutation is the same sort of "logical permutation" universally accepted by debate theorists. Here's why: by responding "no" and then "yes," the negative concedes the counterplan logically takes this form: ((a) Consult over the plan's adoption, with a veto. (b) Consult over ongoing implementation, with a veto.) Understood as such, the permutation simple affixes part (b) to the plan.

Accepting the theoretical legitimacy of the permutation still leaves open the question of whether it constitutes a net benefit for the affirmative, and this is a closer call, for Russia would undoubtedly be even happier to have the opportunity to consult at every point along the way. The affirmative answer to this claim would go something as follows: "While it is true that we do not capture the benefits of consultation in their entirety, we capture almost all of them. And the very slight good will deficit between the counterplan and the permutation is more than justified by the major benefit to be derived by locking in the plan’s adoption." In responding to such a claim, the negative will obviously want to revert to their evidence insisting that consultation has to be "genuine, from the start," and they'll want to emphasize that in these "critical times" (Putin instability, Japanese economic vulnerability, NATO cohesion fragility) we must do "everything possible" not to offend Russia or derail NATO or subvert Japan's sense of mission in the world. But these claims are considerably weakened when the affirmative is also defending a version of consultation with a veto, and it cannot be so hard to read uniqueness answers to minimize the marginal risk of giving offense (such as "not unique, since we aren't genuinely consulting on NMD").

By defending one permutation, I am not advising you to abandon the others. You may find more success in defending the legitimacy of severance or intrinsenschness than others on your circuit, and if so I wish you luck (if only as someone more inclined than most to accept intrinsenschness as theoretically valid). Or you may simply want to laundry list multiple permutations as a way to bog down the second negative. Or you may debate in an area more sympathetic to them than appears the case nationally. My point is that a redeemable permutation may in fact exist, despite the possibly fatal shortcomings which plague the others.

Concluding Advice

By way of closing, I'd like to offer some practical advice, some of which reiterates essential ideas stressed in Dan Salmon's essay.

First, on the affirmative you should never argue that Russia or NATO supports the plan. Doing so is a virtual suicide tactic, for the negative will immediately respond by saying, "there is no risk to voting negative. Doing the counterplan will certainly attain the benefits claimed on the case, and only we capture the additional benefit of improving relations." To the contrary, affirmatives should do everything in their power to prove why the plan is likely to be opposed or subverted, so they can beef up the net benefit claim able to outweigh the benefits of genuine dialogue. While this can be difficult — NATO supports many of these plans (although they would oppose policies like "no first use"), and Russia and China would probably support virtually every plan being defended this year — it is not impossible, despite negative evidence that Country X will do whatever we want. Consider the possibility that Russia or China might well torpedo even a plan they support in principle as a way of asserting their own autonomy; since the counterplan gives them the veto power, they'll be more inclined than normal to use it since the very offer of a veto conveys how relatively low a priority the plan is for American decision makers.

Second, think about adding some version of consultation to the plan text. Or at least you might consider adding language which makes it explicit that as worded the plan does not foreclose consultation. Negatives will object this means you’re not topocal — "there’s no guaranteed action in the plan," and all the rest. But I think the affirmative can reasonably argue that the limit they implement is made specifically stronger by bringing others on board, and that consultation is necessarily part and parcel of what it means to make "foreign policy."

Finally, a point that simply reiterates the main theme of this essay: Especially given the careful scrutiny which permutations will receive in the competition context, it is particularly important that you devise your permutations (and responses) with care. Script them out, lest you create confusion on the questions of severance or intrinsenschness. And on the negative, make sure you pin the affirmative down, so they will not easily evade your responses.

(© David M. Chesler, Director of Debate at Georgia State University)
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By this time it is becoming quite evident why in America public/government employment generally is not considered as prestigious as it is in other Western society countries—which is the topic being explored in Part II of this series of articles. (Part I, Articles 1-5, was devoted to our federal form of government, the nature of public employment, and reasons why there has always been a somewhat anti-government feeling in the United States.)

Three of the four main reasons for this difference in public perception of government employment in relation to prestige have been dealt with in Articles 6-8, i.e.:

- The geographic breadth of our country fostered a sense of individual independence and self-reliance—rather than dependence on any government actions.
- The political development of our country was characterized by a reaction against hierarchic, bureaucratic, and morally intrusive type of government in the Old World countries from which the settlers came—which was not conducive to making government employment viewed as prestigious.
- The economic aspect of American society grew similarly in counter-reaction to the restrictive, overly government-regulated, and class-ridden economic environment of the Old World—so that here government’s role in the economic sphere was subordinate and an aid to the free-wheeling private sector.

And now we take up the fourth and last major factor for the comparatively low prestige of government employment in the United States, that of the role of social class/rank. It seems quite evident and natural given the geographic opportunities to continually “move upwards”—the political tenet-put-into-practice of “the lesser government is the best,” and an economic atmosphere of personal and organizational freedom from governmental restrictions and regulations—that the American people from the beginning developed a society considerably less class-and-rank conscious than those found in the Old World countries. Here a person was expected to use his or her talents and abilities to the fullest, to be equal in the right to earn and prosper, and to improve on his/her economic and social situation.

There were indeed such institutions as slavery, indentured servants, and even early on landed and mercantile classes—but (except for the African slaves) America was the place where people could aspire to and did move upwards in society. The point is not that there were no classes, but that movements between and among them were not only possible but encouraged by the total fabric of the American scene.

This is exactly what was not possible in the Old World, where such aspirations were not only uncommon but also severely punished if practiced. The social structure there was more elaborate and quite rigid, starting with royalty, then nobility (in various grades), ecclesiastics, merchants, and onwards through “commoner” ranks. It was expected that a man “knew his place” in the order and kept it.

And what institution saw to it that this social order was regulated and enforced? The government, which mainly consisted of and was controlled by the upper economic and social classes. Young men from these families were prepared in special schools and academies to enter the major government positions. Thus government employment enjoyed popular prestige, and its members were honored and respected.

Of course in America royalty and nobility did not come to power, and early in the 19th century the work of government started to be considered such that any man could perform the tasks. No special training was considered needed, and any person who could aspire to and become a Congressman, Senator, Governor or even President. Far more important and remunerative work and challenges were seen to exist in the private sector, where the Industrial Revolution was taking place. Government’s role was simply not to obstruct.

And now in contemporary times, while government service has become far more important to the nation’s welfare than it was in the 19th and early 20th century, there is still a lingering feeling that public sector work is less interesting, less important, and certainly less remunerative than that performed in the private sector. The knowledge the average citizen has of what public employees actually do is minimal—as is that citizen’s interest in the subject. Prestige is generally given to those jobs and careers they know about, namely in the private sector such as entertainment, commerce, finance, and sports.

We are now ready to explore a final topic in Article 10: What, if anything, can be done to change this situation.

(Professor Paul Lorentzen, Committee Chair of the Public Employees Roundtable Youth Programs)
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Lanny Naegelin Dedication

Winston Churchill High School

On October 6, 2001, the Lanny Naegelin Theatre was dedicated in Lanny’s memory. Harold Keller, NFL Executive Council member was privileged to speak. The following is Harold’s tribute:

Honorable School Board Members, Superintendent Dr. Middleton, Principal Mr. Reasons, Honored Guests, and especially Mrs. B. J. Naegelin,

It is with humility that I attend this dedication. To stand in the shadow of its namesake causes sentiment, a recalling of the death of my friend and mentor, but also marvelous memories of his life and his dedication to students.

Lanny D. Naegelin built a monument in his contribution to forensics, drama, and communication. The National Forensic League continues to build and grow on the very foundation that Lanny laid. Lanny Naegelin had a vision, a dream, and a plan. Lanny challenged, inspired, and encouraged those around him. He wanted that which was best for the students, with whom he worked and for whom he worked. Lanny Naegelin touched the hearts of students and speech teachers and the total educational community across the nation. Lanny Naegelin impacted everyone that came in contact with him. He impacted the tomorrows.

It is only fitting and proper that a monument such as this magnificent theatre be dedicated to preserve the name and memory of Lanny D. Naegelin. It is also fitting and proper that everyone here work and dedicate themselves to the preservation and fulfillment of the dream that Lanny Naegelin inculcated in the minds and hearts of those that knew him, and in the hearts of those that enter the gateways of this magnificent theatre.

As a representative of the National Forensic League, let the word go forth that we have accepted the Lanny D. Naegelin challenges. We are dedicated to the development of programs that will challenge the gifts and the talents of the youth of today. We recognize that the youth of today are the leaders of tomorrow. These very students involved today in communication activities are the Nation's Future Leaders.

I can still see Lanny Naegelin in the eye of my memory. I can still see his smile. I can still feel his warm brotherly embrace. I can still hear his words of wisdom, his words of counsel, and his words of leadership and encouragement. He was an awesome person and an incredible friend.

It is with honor that I participate in this dedication. May this brick and mortar reverberate with the voices and talent in the shadow of its namesake. May the dreams of Lanny D. Naegelin be personified in the talent that is demonstrated here.

I miss you Lanny. May God bless all of you. May God bless America and continue to protect one of our greatest freedoms that Lanny D. Naegelin was dedicated to—the freedom of speech.

Harold C. Keller

SPECIAL GUESTS ATTEND DEDICATION

Missy Miller-Berlet, (left) former student of Lanny and B. J. Naegelin pictured with Mrs. Naegelin. Missy is Director of Josephine Theatre.

Executive Council
Fall Meeting
September 30 - October 1, 2001
Charlotte, North Carolina

Meeting was called to order by President Billy Tate. All councilors and alternate Mike Barton were present.

The NFL Internet Site
Moved by Roberts, seconded by Sferra: NFL points will be credited to coaches whenever graduated student points are filed on-line. Passed: 8-0. (Sferra abstains)

Under previous NFL rules student points filed after October 15 for graduated students did not earn coaching points. Under the new rule coaches will earn points for graduated students filed after October 15 if such points are filed on-line. This change will avoid programming charges.

Moved by Sferra, seconded by King: Chapter strength will be figured by active student degrees plus coach point totals which equal degrees. Passed: 8-1 (No: Belch)

In figuring chapter strength, coaches will receive degree credit for their current point totals even if they do not have enough years to receive the next diamond. This is necessary because of programming difficulty and expense. The software is based upon points earned.

The Council unanimously approved: On-line recording of Mock Trial will be in the Debate Category. On-line recording of Discussion will be in the Speech Category.

Moved by Keller, seconded by Sferra: Congress coaches may assign Congress points to their students where there is no Official Scorer only by recording the number of speeches and assigning points for each speech: 6,5,4,3,2,1. Passed: 7-2 (No: Roberts, Sferra)

By unanimous consent the above motion was rescinded. The Council felt that each Congress should have an Official Scorer.

Moved by Sferra, seconded by Roberts: At practice Congresses, NFL points may only be awarded by an Official Scorer. Passed: 8-0-1 (Keller abstains)

This rule repeals the existing rule which allows a coach who is not the Official Scorer to assign Congress points to their students and that no more than 2 of their students may be assigned the same total.

Moved by Sferra, seconded by Keller: Post student point records on the internet (NFL has in the past posted these records on the computer modem) but coaches will have the option of recording points on paper, which will not reveal student tournament records on-line. Passed: Unanimous.

Some Councilors were concerned about privacy of student records. On-line posting will allow viewers to access student tournament records as well as category totals. Paper recording will allow viewers to only access student totals and no specific tournament results.

Moved by Sferra, seconded by Roberts: Service points will be assigned according to the NFL degree on record on the date of recording. Passed: 7-2. (Aye: Sferra, Roberts, Ferguson, Crabtree, Keller, Sterner, Tate. No: King, Belch)

By recording service points on the date of recording rather than the date of service will save programming costs on the new internet site.

Moved by Ferguson, seconded by Crabtree: The NFL on-line site will record all points coaches wish to enter. Passed: 8-1 (No: Sferra)

This allows coaches to create complete records for each student by recording all legitimately earned points.
NOTE: This does not change NFL point limits of 500 (speech), 500 (debate), 500 (group/service) and 1,000 (overall - exclusive of district and national contests). The only Official NFL points are within these limits. Additional points recorded do not yield extra coaching points.

Moved by Keller, seconded by Sterner: Release the Sept/Oct LD Topic on-line on August 1, each year. Defeated 1-7-1. (Aye, Keller. King abstains)

National Tournament
Moved by Sferra, seconded by Belch: Abolish double entry at the National Tournament. Passed: 7-2. (No: Roberts, Crabtree)

This rule takes effect in 2003 and is not applicable to the 2002 Charlotte Nationals. Double Entry may continue at district where district committees allow it. Students who qualify in two events may choose one event for nationals unless one of the events is a team event (Duo, Debate) in which case they must enter in the team event. Alternates will be allowed to move up to fill vacant places.

Moved by Roberts, seconded by Keller: The top 14 contestants (teams) in order of finish in each event at the NFL district tournament shall be designated as qualifiers and/or alternates. Passed: Unanimous.

This rule establishes an order for alternates to move into vacant slots and establishes that districts may designate alternates as low as 14th place.
Moved by Sferra, seconded by King: The NFL Council reaffirms existing tie breaking procedures as delineated in NFL manuals. Passed: Unanimous.

Coaches and district chairs need to carefully review these procedures. In order to select 14 contestants (teams) in order, many ties will need to be broken.

Moved by Ferguson: A contestant which wins two events at the district tournament and/or Congress must declare their national entry within 24 hours by notifying the District Chair. Dies: Lack of a second.

Moved by Crabtree, seconded by Sferra: It shall be the affirmative duty of each coach and each student entered in NFL Interpretation contests to determine absolutely that the cutting being performed meets NFL rules. Passed: 8-1 (No: Belch)

Moved by Crabtree, seconded by Sferra: In order to be eligible for subsequent rounds, each interpreter who has qualified for round 11 must present the original source of their cutting to the Ombudsman prior to round 11. Passed: 8-1 (No: Belch)

By passing the above 2 motions the Council hopes to avoid unpermitted or other rule breaking materials from reaching the final round.

Moved by Sferra, seconded by Keller. Adopt National Finals time schedule as presented by Secretary Copeland. Passed: Unanimous.

This schedule will be printed in the April and/or May Roskrun.

Moved by Keller, seconded by Sferra: Raise the entry fee for each main event contestant at the National Tournament to $50. Passed: Unanimous.

Moved by Roberts, seconded by Sferra: Students eliminated in all events prior to round 7 are the only contestants allowed to enter supplemental events. Passed: Unanimous.

Supplementals have become so large that it is no longer possible to allow students to enter after round 8. These students have already won an Octa-finalist cup in their main event. They may, if preregistered, enter consolation events—Improvisation or Storytelling.

Moved by Sferra, seconded by Keller: To uphold the decision of the Executive Secretary to disqualify the first place Duo Interpretation team for using unpublished material and providing false information on the National entry form. Passed: Unanimous.

Districts

Moved by Sferra, seconded by Keller: To adopt the District Report presented by Secretary Copeland. Passed: Unanimous.

Moved by Sferra, seconded by Keller: That the standard for a district to remain a district shall require either 16 active Chapter schools or 500 (or more) contestants entered in the district tournament over a three year period. Passed: Unanimous.

Moved by Sferra, seconded by Roberts: To split a district shall require either a minimum of 32 active Chapters or 950 entrants at the district tournament over a three year period. Passed: Unanimous.

A number of NFL districts will be granted one year to reach these minimum numbers. If they fail to reach the minimum numbers they will be merged with other districts.

Financial

Moved by Belch, seconded by Crabtree: Adopt the Budget as presented. Passed: Unanimous.

Moved by Roberts, second by King: Grant a 3% cost of living adjustment to National Office employees. Passed. Unanimous.

Commendations

Moved by Sferra, seconded by Crabtree: To commend Mr. Copeland for his excellent district report. Passed. Unanimous.

The Council also commended Mr. Copeland for his budget preparation and explanation.

Spring Meeting

The Spring Council meeting will be Sunday, April 14 and Monday April 15, 2002. Place to be announced. Postponed to the Spring meeting were the Coach Diamond Key Committee Report and a discussion of an NFL Legal Defense Fund.
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February 20, 2001
4,610 points

**Suzanne E. Theisen**
Stow-Munroe Falls HS, OH
February 28, 2001
5,362 points

**Robert Speirs**
Spearfish HS, SD
March 6, 2001
3,025 points

**Suzanne S. Munsell**
Esperanza HS, CA
March 15, 2001
5,449 points

**Lee E. Beach**
Rossvale HS, TN
March 19, 2001
3,005 points

**Rita Prichard**
Granite Bay HS, CA
March 22, 2001
3,290 points
DOUBLE DIAMOND COACHES

**Mary Sherman**  
West Fargo HS, ND  
March 27, 2001  
3,039 points

**Anthony E. Myers**  
Durango HS, CO  
March 28, 2001  
4,609 points

**Glen Cook**  
Greeley-Central HS, CO  
April 9, 2001  
4,411 points

**Katherine C. Ligon**  
Cookeville HS, TN  
April 9, 2001  
3,782 points

**Martha L. Carr**  
W.T. Woodson HS, VA  
April 20, 2001  
3,040 points

**Terri Fields**  
Sunnyslope HS, AZ  
April 23, 2001  
3,253 points

**Mickey D. Hutson**  
Collierville HS, TN  
April 24, 2001  
4,732 points

**Eloise Weisinger**  
Aldine Sr. HS, TX  
April 26, 2001  
3,034 points

**Idolene Mazza**  
Warrensburg HS, MO  
April 27, 2001  
3,107 points
TRIPLE DIAMOND COACHES

***Thomas K. Biddle
Bear Creek HS, CO

January 15, 2001
6,417 points

***C. Frederick Snook
Crestwood HS, OH

January 26, 2001
6,111 points

***Michael W. Burton
Eastside Catholic HS, WA

January 29, 2001
13,419 points

***Joseph Gains
Wadsworth HS, OH

February 6, 2001
6,068 points
TRIPLE DIAMOND COACHES

***Sharen B. Althoff  
Wooster HS, OH  
6,197 points

February 7, 2001

***Judith McMasters  
Bishop Kelley HS, OK  
6,004 points

February 8, 2001

***Pauline J. Carochi  
Canon City HS, CO  
6,056 points

February 14, 2001

***Michael Gonzalez  
St. Vincent HS, CA  
6,003 points

February 16, 2001
TRIPLE DIAMOND COACHES

***Gail Sarff
Wayzata HS, MN
March 21, 2001
6,054 points

***Michael Patterson
Guymon HS, OK
April 9, 2001
7,284 points

***Barbara Muhlbach
Massillon-Washington HS, OH
April 18, 2001
6,170 points

***Kathy Mulay
Portage-Central HS, MI
April 18, 2001
6,817 points
TRIPLE DIAMOND COACHES

April 23, 2001
Daniel H. Durbin
Logansport HS, IN
11,715 points

May 3, 2001
Gloria Robinson
Ronald Reagan HS, TX
6,012 points

September 4, 2001
Frankie Reynolds
Mountain View HS, UT
7,106 points
FOURTH DIAMOND COACHES

November 10, 2000

Robert D. Nordyke
Wichita-Campus HS, KS
10,007 points

December 28, 2000

Tom Montgomery
Lodi HS, CA
10,152 points

December 28, 2000

Timothy C. Averill
Manchester HS, MA
10,022 points

March 5, 2001

Marilee Dukes
Vestavia Hills HS, AL
10,837 points
FOURTH DIAMOND COACHES

***Leora K. Hansen
Blackfoot HS, ID
March 12, 2001
13,274 points

***Mark Harris
Raytown HS, MO
March 22, 2001
12,315 points

***Skip Allig
North Platte Sr. HS, NE
April 10, 2001
11,450 points

***John S. Turner
Auburn-Riverside HS, WA
April 24, 2001
10,093 points
FIFTH DIAMOND COACHES

*****Carl F. Grecco
Truman HS, PA
December 29, 2000
14,503 points

A man dedicated to educating many students and having a large speech squad, Carl F. Grecco taught from 1962-1998 at Woodrow Wilson and Harry S. Truman High School in Pennsylvania and has been a Forensic Coach from 1964 to present.

His service to high school speech education in Pennsylvania is exemplary: A member of the Pennsylvania High School Speech League Executive Board from 1964 to present; President of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Debate League (1972-1978, 1998 - present); Treasurer of the Philadelphia Catholic Forensic League (1978 to present), and a member of the Valley Forge NFL District Committee (1978 to present).

Carl has qualified 28 students to 19 NFL Nationals, with students participating in Original Oratory, Humorous Interp, Boys and Girls Extemp, LD, Dramatic Interp, as well as five Senators and ten Representatives in Congress. In 1983 Carl's student won third place in impromptu speaking. Several of Carl's students have been elected National Congress Presiding Officers. Truman has received four Leading Chapter Awards; a membership in the 200 Club the last five years; and has won three District Trophies. Carl has coached the largest chapter in the Valley Forge District for consistently. And, the past eleven years, Carl's school has been first in district enrollment.

Carl Grecco: providing speech opportunities for students for over 35 years!

*****Randy Pierce
Pattonville HS, MO
January 5, 2001
17,338 points

Randy has been teaching since 1974 at Pattonville and coaching since 1976. Qualifying team members to nationals is gratifying, but his greatest satisfaction in NFL comes from hearing students, formerly full of self-doubt, return from their first tournament bubbling with enthusiasm after "winning a debate against other kids who actually knew what they were doing!" His greatest enjoyment in NFL is the many wonderful friends he has made in the coaching ranks. The closest of these is his wife, Rebecca, who coaches a rival school, and who has helped him to raise two beautiful daughters.

Randy's coaching credentials speak for themselves. Randy has served as District Chair in 1982 and 1983. His school has consistently maintained first place in membership enrollment and since 1980 Pattonville has been the largest chapter in the Eastern Missouri District. Pattonville also ranked in the top ten largest Chapters in the U.S. 12 times. Randy has attended twenty-three National Tournaments and qualified 83. His students have qualified in all events including 28 students in Student Congress. Randy's chapter has earned four Leading Chapter Awards and the Karl E. Mundt National Student Congress Trophy. Randy has coached two NFL All Americans.

Mr. Pierce has served on the National Tournament Committee in various capacities; the last several years assisting in the Tournament Room Scheduling.

Randy has been awarded the Distinguished Service and the Distinguished Service Plaque - 4th honors. In 1998 Randy co-chaired one of NFL's very best national tournaments at Pattonville.
Georgia Brady has been coaching for twenty-five years but her commitment to debate and forensics began when she was a student of NFL Hall of Fame Coach Margaret Meredith. By the time Georgia attended the 1968 National Tournament in extemp, she already knew that she would remain involved in this activity. And what a record of competition and service she has compiled. Seventeen of her years teaching debate/forensics have been in Blue Springs, Missouri; ten years at Blue Springs High School and the past seven at Blue Springs-South High School. She established the NFL Chapter at South and during its seven years has been instrumental in helping the chapter grow to over 300 members and degrees. The Blue Springs South Chapter has received the District Sweepstakes Award twice and the Leading Chapter Award for 2000. Georgia has coached two NFL All Americans.

Ms. Brady has qualified over fifty students to Nationals including a semi-finalist in U. S. Extemp and a finalist in Congress. She has been chosen as the Suburban Conference Speech Coach of the Year five times by her peers. Georgia served as NFL District Chairperson for three years and has been a member of the Show Me District Committee since 1988. She chaired the local judges committee for the 1983 Nationals in Kansas City and is a recipient of the NFL Distinguished Service Key. However the real reward to Georgia has been "the opportunity to work daily with bright, entertaining, articulate and hard working young people. What greater reward could there be?"

Gary Addington has been coaching forensics since 1972, lately at Cherry Creek High School in Englewood, Colorado. Gary has coached 158 NFL and State Champions and 7 National Finalists. Sixteen times the Largest Chapter since 1981 has been Cherry Creek High School and first in District Enrollment in the Colorado District since 1973. Chapter awards include 21 NFL Sweepstakes Awards and four Leading Chapter Awards (1982, 1987, 1992 and 1997). Gary has coached 171 National qualifiers including second in HI an unbelievable three times as well as another third in HI, 5th in USX, and 5th in DI. In 1991 Cherry Creek was awarded the Pi Kappa Delta/Bruno E. Jacob Trophy. Seventeen times Cherry Creek ranked in the top ten schools at the NFL National Tournament.

Working with Peggy Benedict, Gary was able to create one of the largest and most successful chapters in National Forensic League history: Cherry Creek High School Chapter 2447!

In 1982 Gary Addington was runnerup for Teacher of the Year honors in Colorado.
FIFTH DIAMOND COACHES

*****Donald N. Belanger
Bossier Parish, Louisiana

April 19, 2001

15,013 points

Don began coaching since 1976. Total tournaments attended, 817; total national tournaments attended, 22. Total trophies won, 2,828; total debates won, 15,924; lost 10,187, pct. 610. Don's chapter at Caddo Magnet has been the Louisiana district's largest chapter the past eleven years; in addition, seven times, first in District Enrollment. Caddo has earned two Leading Chapter Awards.

Don believes winning the Berkeley Forum in 1997 was a very proud time, especially after losing in finals a few years earlier. Also, Don's team has won almost every major "national circuit" tournament in America at least once. This year, NDT's college final featured two Caddo debaters opposing each other...Andy Ryan of Iowa defeated Kamal Ghali of Emory.

Don has qualified ten debate teams for NFL nationals. Events Don's students participated in include: United States Extemp, Dramatic Interpret, Humorous Interpret and Foreign Extemp. Don's key to success: "I've always emphasized thinking over speaking style. We adopted Texas as our home state early on to get better competition and better judging. Most programs in the 1970s were either "comprehensive" with a bunch of kids in many events or they were "policy debate specialists."

A great influence upon Don Belanger was Cliff Aucoin, Don's coach at New Iberia High School and one of NFL's greats.

Don has left Caddo and left national circuit debate. He will be missed.

*****Gary G. Harmon
Salina-Central HS, KS

April 27, 2001

14,991 points

One of NFL's national leaders is Gary Harmon. As Director of the John C. Stennis National Student Congress, Gary, working with Clerk of Congress Harold Keller, established Congress as a vital and important national contest.

In 1967, Gary G. Harmon became an active NFL coach. Through Gary's leadership Salina-Central has qualified 31 students to nineteen national tournaments.

Throughout the years, several of Gary's students ranked among the top ten in Student Congress and several main events including Original Oratory, Boys and Girls Extemporaneous Speaking, L/D, Dramatic Interpretation and Humorous Interpretation.


Currently Gary serves as a member of the West Kansas District Committee. He runs one of the nation's largest high school invitational debate tournaments.

Gary also coached a District Point Leading Student, Kevin Tague, who later became an NFL coach in Kansas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diamond Coaches</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Photos not available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katherine H. Griffin</td>
<td>Hillborough HS, FL</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Carlson</td>
<td>Goddard HS, KS</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter R. Willis</td>
<td>Cypress Falls HS, TX</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis Hirth</td>
<td>Bronx HS of Science, NY</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley J. Hartje</td>
<td>Davenport-Central HS, IA</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Ray</td>
<td>Hays HS, TX</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Carr</td>
<td>LaSalle College HS, PA</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Walker</td>
<td>Watertown HS, SD</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Nelson</td>
<td>Plymouth HS, IN</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad H. Anderson</td>
<td>South St. Paul HS, MN</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk B. McKeen</td>
<td>Norfolk HS, NE</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Huffman</td>
<td>Providence HS, NC</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen A. Prody</td>
<td>Helena HS, MT</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen M. DeBlasio</td>
<td>Bishop Guertin HS, NH</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celeste A. Henderson</td>
<td>Dallas-Jesuit College Prep, TX</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Callis</td>
<td>Yankton HS, SD</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie Velharticky</td>
<td>Kingfisher HS, OK</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy L. Kimura</td>
<td>Kanabahema Schools, HI</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole S. Welch</td>
<td>Taylorville HS, UT</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Holt</td>
<td>Bolivar R-1 HS, MO</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Collignon</td>
<td>Idaho Falls-Skyline HS, ID</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Lunetta</td>
<td>Hanover Park HS, NJ</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry A. Barber</td>
<td>Casper-Kelly Walsh HS, WY</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylee Harris</td>
<td>Pocatello HS, ID</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy T. Taylor</td>
<td>Aiea HS, HI</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellie Lasater</td>
<td>Albu-Valley HS, NM</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Sands</td>
<td>San Antonio-MacArthur, TX</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William W. Boyd</td>
<td>Holy Cross Regional HS, VA</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael L. Kilgore</td>
<td>Eureka Sr. HS, KS</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian White</td>
<td>Bueller HS, KS</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Groven</td>
<td>Rosemount Sr. HS, MN</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth J. Church</td>
<td>Lansing Sr. HS, KS</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy A. Patron</td>
<td>Perry HS, OH</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Noel S. Selegzi     | Hunter College HS, NY         | October   | 2000   | 4,325      |
| Patricia Cannon     | Highland Park HS, IL          | December  | 2000   | 3,040      |
| Calvin J. Vande Hoef| Cannon Falls HS, MN           | December  | 2000   | 3,684      |
| Jon Kachelmacher    | Rosemount HS, MN              | January   | 2001   | 3,832      |
| Michael C. Grove    | LaCosta Canyon HS, CA         | January   | 2001   | 5,513      |
| David Dutton        | Penn HS, IN                   | January   | 2001   | 4,488      |
| Lori Mastrud-Babcock| Duluth-East HS, MN            | February  | 2001   | 3,134      |
| Mary A. Briancourt  | Moorcrestown HS, NJ           | February  | 2001   | 3,690      |
| Paula Partain       | Central Kitsap HS, WA         | February  | 2001   | 3,441      |
| James R. Morrill    | Raytown HS, MO                | February  | 2001   | 6,683      |
| Pamela Schultz-Tacona| Glenbrook-South HS, IL        | February  | 2001   | 3,000      |
| Thomas J. Downs     | Bishop Kearney HS, NY         | February  | 2001   | 3,346      |
| Edward Davis        | Centennial HS, CA             | February  | 2001   | 4,091      |
| Steven M. Helman    | Kamiak HS, WA                 | February  | 2001   | 4,123      |
| Mary A. Schick      | Michael Krop HS, FL           | March     | 2001   | 3,883      |
| D'Arcy F. Patey-Robinson | Poland Regional HS, ME  | March     | 2001   | 4,663      |
| Gregory R. Stevens  | Okafoji Community Schl, IA    | March     | 2001   | 3,435      |
| Paula Mittelmann    | Bridgewater-Raritan Reg, NJ   | March     | 2001   | 3,038      |
| Sandra D. Schneider | Dripping Springs HS, TX       | March     | 2001   | 3,206      |
| Sue Norris          | Flagstaff HS, AZ              | March     | 2001   | 3,342      |
| Michael Nalor       | Danville HS, PA               | April     | 2001   | 3,014      |
| Robert S. Deutsch   | West Lafayette HS, IN         | April     | 2001   | 3,022      |
| James Coleman       | Rapid City-Central HS, SD     | April     | 2001   | 3,510      |
| Michael Bacon       | Newburgh Free Academy, NY     | May       | 2001    | 3,014      |

| David M. Monterra  | Pueblo-Centennial HS, CO      | December  | 2000   | 6,010      |
| Anthony Stokes      | Kiski School, PA              | February  | 2001   | 6,203      |
| Don M. Heinsohn     | James Logan HS, CA            | March     | 2001   | 7,260      |
| Alice J. Ursin      | Bethel Park HS, PA            | March     | 2001   | 6,267      |
| Sarah Thomas        | Washburn Rural HS, KS         | March     | 2001   | 6,015      |

* Bill Davis Blue Valley North HS, KS December 5, 2000 10,445 points
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Daniel Tree</td>
<td>Plymouth HS, IN</td>
<td>12,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lydia Eslinger</td>
<td>Brooklyn HS, NY</td>
<td>12,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lois Gorne</td>
<td>Federal Way HS, WA</td>
<td>12,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Cheryl V. Ryne</td>
<td>Friendswood HS, TX</td>
<td>12,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Paul Geringer</td>
<td>Marshall HS, MO</td>
<td>12,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Steven Davis</td>
<td>Zebulon HS, NC</td>
<td>12,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mark Harris</td>
<td>Raytown HS, MO</td>
<td>12,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Randall McCutcheon</td>
<td>Havelock HS, NC</td>
<td>12,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Shirley Keller</td>
<td>Lynbrook HS, CA</td>
<td>12,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ted W. Beloh</td>
<td>Glenbrook-North HS, IL</td>
<td>12,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Terezae Sparkman</td>
<td>Kiski Area HS, PA</td>
<td>12,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Harlan M. Shuck</td>
<td>Teach HS, MO</td>
<td>12,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Douglass Tischetter</td>
<td>North HS, MD</td>
<td>12,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bill Jordan</td>
<td>Springfield-Glen HS, MO</td>
<td>12,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. William W. Tate</td>
<td>Jagged HS, MD</td>
<td>12,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. T. W. Oglesby</td>
<td>Wabash HS, MO</td>
<td>12,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ray Schafer</td>
<td>Ogemaw HS, MI</td>
<td>12,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Skip Altiss</td>
<td>North Platte HS, NE</td>
<td>12,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David F. McQueen</td>
<td>Bellarmine HS, CA</td>
<td>12,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gregory J. Cullen</td>
<td>Alhambra HS, CA</td>
<td>12,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bro. Rene Sternew</td>
<td>Patonville HS, MO</td>
<td>12,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bro. George Zehnlein</td>
<td>Saint Francis HS, PA</td>
<td>12,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Richard L. Riche</td>
<td>Park Hill HS, MO</td>
<td>12,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Georgiadey</td>
<td>Springfield HS, MO</td>
<td>12,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Mary L. Harmon</td>
<td>State HS, MO</td>
<td>12,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Carl G. Grecco</td>
<td>Hinsdale HS, IL</td>
<td>12,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Carl Swanson</td>
<td>Parkview HS, MO</td>
<td>12,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Larry Hightower</td>
<td>Newmarket HS, MO</td>
<td>12,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. James Menchinger</td>
<td>Portage-New HS, MI</td>
<td>12,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Leora K. Hansen</td>
<td>Savannah HS, CA</td>
<td>12,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gary Addington</td>
<td>Carapella HS, CA</td>
<td>12,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lowell Sharp</td>
<td>South HS, CO</td>
<td>12,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Donald B. Eibler</td>
<td>Regis HS, LA</td>
<td>12,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Pamela B. McCona</td>
<td>Park HS, OK</td>
<td>12,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John S. Tredway</td>
<td>Ashland HS, OR</td>
<td>12,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Diane Alvarado</td>
<td>Regis HS, LA</td>
<td>12,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lee D. Alto</td>
<td>Grand Rapids HS, WA</td>
<td>12,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sandra Starke</td>
<td>Mamaroneck HS, NY</td>
<td>17,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Steven Woods</td>
<td>Free HS, KS</td>
<td>17,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Mary Patricia Plumb</td>
<td>State HS, KS</td>
<td>16,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Martha Land Nedy</td>
<td>Redlands HS, CA</td>
<td>15,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Gary Brasher</td>
<td>Leland HS, CA</td>
<td>15,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Leslee Phillips</td>
<td>Lexington HS, MA</td>
<td>15,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Pam Cadwycoff</td>
<td>Apple Valley HS, MI</td>
<td>13,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Michael B. Burton</td>
<td>Eastside Catholic HS, WA</td>
<td>13,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Deana Butcher</td>
<td>Springfield Hills HS, MO</td>
<td>12,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Ruth B. McAllister</td>
<td>Riverside HS, SC</td>
<td>12,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Charleen Bradt</td>
<td>Wellington HS, FL</td>
<td>12,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Daniel H. Durbin</td>
<td>Logan HS, IN</td>
<td>11,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ron Jackson</td>
<td>North HS, MI</td>
<td>11,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Michael E. Starks</td>
<td>Cheyenne HS, WY</td>
<td>11,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mike Jeffers</td>
<td>Montgomery Bell HS, MO</td>
<td>10,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Julie Sheiman</td>
<td>Stuyvesant HS, NY</td>
<td>10,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Terry Peterson</td>
<td>Lamar HS, NE</td>
<td>9,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Donald Ramsev</td>
<td>Kansas City-HS, MO</td>
<td>9,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bob J. Siepert</td>
<td>Logan HS, IN</td>
<td>9,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. W. E. Schuete</td>
<td>Gregory-Portland HS, TX</td>
<td>9,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Samuel F. Park</td>
<td>Parkway-HS, MO</td>
<td>9,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Allen Janovec</td>
<td>Norfolk HS, NE</td>
<td>9,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bill R. Bland</td>
<td>Tulsa-HS, OK</td>
<td>9,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Harry B. Davis</td>
<td>Huntersville HS, OK</td>
<td>8,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Chuck Balling</td>
<td>Chicago City HS, IN</td>
<td>8,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dr. Elizabeth B.</td>
<td>Ballard HS, MO</td>
<td>8,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Nelson M. Nelson</td>
<td>Newberry HS, SC</td>
<td>6,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gregory Varley</td>
<td>Langley HS, NY</td>
<td>6,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Noel Trullolo</td>
<td>Los Alamitos HS, NM</td>
<td>6,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bro. Anthony K. Cavin</td>
<td>Cape HS, IN</td>
<td>6,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kandi King</td>
<td>San Antionio-Churchill HS, TX</td>
<td>6,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert Brittain</td>
<td>Columbia City HS, IN</td>
<td>6,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jack D. Tuckness</td>
<td>Springfield-Central HS, MO</td>
<td>6,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. M. Gailor</td>
<td>Fort Worth HS, KS</td>
<td>6,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Eric Brannen</td>
<td>Westminster HS, GA</td>
<td>6,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Douglas R. Spring</td>
<td>New Trier Twp HS, IL</td>
<td>6,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. James R. Carlson</td>
<td>Bishop HS, IA</td>
<td>6,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ed Tinnell</td>
<td>Wichita Falls HS, KS</td>
<td>6,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dickie Fellers</td>
<td>Wichita-East HS, KS</td>
<td>6,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Larry B. Stobert</td>
<td>Valparaiso HS, IN</td>
<td>6,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. James Robbins</td>
<td>Chryssler HS, NY</td>
<td>6,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. GREG MAYO</td>
<td>1,719</td>
<td>MR. STEVE SEXTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYDEE CREEKS, TX</td>
<td></td>
<td>WEST BEND-EASTHS, WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. CHARLOTTE JOYNER</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>MR. EPHRAM F. BLUESTEIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN ANTONIO-CHELSEA, TX</td>
<td></td>
<td>GERMAN TOWNS, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. TOM BACKEN</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>MR. JIM D. RYNDERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENDLE ST MARGARET'S SCHOOL, MN</td>
<td></td>
<td>BENDLE ST MARGARET'S SCHOOL, MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. LAURIE Z. COOPER</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>MR. MICHAEL HURLEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODBURY HS, OR</td>
<td></td>
<td>WHEELING HS, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. BARBARA BRIESEY</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>MR. BRIAN KNOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORTHINGTON HS, MN</td>
<td></td>
<td>CASPER-NATRONA COUNTY HS, WY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. JOSEPH LUNETTA</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>MRS. JANET NOBLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER PARK HS, NJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>BIXBY HS, OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. JEFFREY D. RUBISKY</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>MR. ROBERT G. BURGOYNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAYDEN HS, KS</td>
<td></td>
<td>EAGLE POINT HS, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. COLLEEN M. RICHARDSON</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>MS. MARY A. HAMBERGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMAHA-HEALTH HS, NE</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHEYENNE CENTRAL HS, WY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. BARBARA COLLIGNON</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>MR. LYNDALL WESTMORELAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO FALLS-SKYLINE HS, ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. MIKE FREELAND</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>MRS. KRISTEN GONSOIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKSON HS, OH</td>
<td></td>
<td>GROTON HS, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. STAN SMITH</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td>MS. TAMMY SHEDROFF-WALLER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WICHITA-SOUTHEAST HS, KS</td>
<td></td>
<td>MOUNTAIN RIDGE HS, AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. JOHN FISHER</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>MRS. BOBBIE M. BRISTOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOUNDS VIEW HS, MN</td>
<td></td>
<td>MACKWOODS, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. RALPH J. KARN</td>
<td>1,683</td>
<td>MS. CAROL DUFFEE-LUNSFORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEYSTONE OAKS HS, PA</td>
<td></td>
<td>MANNIS, OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. BRAD SAMS</td>
<td>1,683</td>
<td>MS. SUSAN H. SAXON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSEVILLE ACADEMY HS, MN</td>
<td></td>
<td>EVANS HS, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. KAREN S. GRIESENGER</td>
<td>1,683</td>
<td>MR. CONRAD H. ANDERSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLETOWN HS, OH</td>
<td></td>
<td>SOUTH ST PAUL HS, MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. HEATHER SANDS</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>MR. DENNIS HENRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN ANTONIO-MACARTHUR HS, TX</td>
<td></td>
<td>MOUNT MICHAEL HS, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. TAMMY PEETERS</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>MISS JUDITH RAWLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOLDEN HS, CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>AIR ACADEMY HS, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. VERA VERSA</td>
<td>1,673</td>
<td>MS. DIANNE NICKERSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROVE HS, OK</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPIRIT LAKE HS, IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. LARRY WOOD</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>MR. KEVIN E. ONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE WOODLANDS HS, TX</td>
<td></td>
<td>ELKHART CENTRAL HS, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. STEVE THOMPSON</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>MR. RICHARD B. CALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHROBDY SOUTH HS, WI</td>
<td></td>
<td>BURLEY HS, ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. KIM FALCO</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>MS. ALICIA M. SLAVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FURNESS HS, TX</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHRISTIAN BROTHERS ACADEMY, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. VIVIAN L. MARINAS</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>MRS. DONNA CARLIN STRANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEYSTONE OAKS HS, PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. GREGORY W. BOWEN</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>MS. JOANNE CUNNINGHAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARDSTOWN HS, KY</td>
<td></td>
<td>CLINTON HS, MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. RICHARD C. DELANCEY</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>MS. CATHERINE C. STAMPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALLASTOWN AREA HS, PA</td>
<td></td>
<td>ST CECILIA ACADEMY, TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. ROSEMARY MARTINEZ</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>MS. JULIE JOHNSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUTTAMOTH WORTH HS, OK</td>
<td></td>
<td>JACOBS HS, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. KIM HEATH</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>MS. VINCENZA RUSSO-HABER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELLINGTON SRHS, KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. DANNY BARAK</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>MR. MICHAEL STREETER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANVILLE CENTRAL HS, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>GLOUCESTER HS, OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. MARY L. WILLOUGHBY</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>MR. WILLIAM W. CLOYD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADYHS, GA</td>
<td></td>
<td>HOLY CROSS REGIONAL SCHOOL, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. JAY L. JOHNSON</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>MR. MICHAEL L. KIGORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHROBDY SOUTH HS, WI</td>
<td></td>
<td>EUREKA HS, KS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. NANCY WEST</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>MRS. ELAINE M. DALLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIG HARBORHS, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td>CENTERVILLE HS, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. SARA COMPTON</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>MS. AMY L. KIMURA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRENDEN JESUS HS, IN</td>
<td></td>
<td>KANEHAMEA SCHOOLS, HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. LARRY W. MCCARTY</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>MR. LEON KALLIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM MOORE HS, TX</td>
<td></td>
<td>YANKTON HS, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. AL SANDERS</td>
<td>1,627</td>
<td>MR. CHARLES HOLVOET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRINGTON HS, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td>BALDWIN HS, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. PEEF VIGIL</td>
<td>1,627</td>
<td>MR. BILL B. TAYLOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUEBLO-SOUTHHS, CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>AIA HS, HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. THOMAS M. FONES</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>MS. BEA SHEPARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST PAUL ACADEMY SUMMIT SCH, MN</td>
<td></td>
<td>DENVER-WEST HS, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. ALEX J. SCHMID</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>MR. KIP B. NICKEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARVEYS, MT</td>
<td></td>
<td>NORFOLK HS, NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. JUDITH DONATSPUR</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>MR. RANDY PATTERSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENVER-EAST HS, CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>ST ANDREW'S EPISCOPAL SCHOOL, MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. KYLIE HOVE</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>MS. SHAUNA S. LAMABEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK HILLS HS, MD</td>
<td></td>
<td>STEAMBOAT SPRINGS HS, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. KATHY A. PAYTON</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>MS. JERRY A. BARBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERRYHS, OH</td>
<td></td>
<td>CASPER-KELLY WATLING HS, WY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. BRENT MCCLENDON</td>
<td>1,618</td>
<td>MR. MICEAL CARR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHBURN-MARSH HS, KS</td>
<td></td>
<td>LA SALLE COLLEGE HS, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. COLLEEN GATZIMOS-REED</td>
<td>1,618</td>
<td>MR. ROB GROVEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHFIELD HS, IN</td>
<td></td>
<td>ROSEMOUNT HS, MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. KATHLEEN MILLER</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>MRS. STACEY BONDERER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAWNEE MISSION WEST HS, KS</td>
<td></td>
<td>ROCKBRIDGE HS, MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. ELLIE RASATI</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>MRS. MAUREEN M. DEBLASIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBQ-VALLEY HS, NM</td>
<td></td>
<td>BISHOP GUTHIA HS, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. BECKI SHARP</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>GOLDEN HS, CO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOURTH DIAMOND COACH

***Sandra E. Bird
San Fran-Lowell HS, CA
June 6, 2001
10,697 points

(Recipe continued from page 5)

And whistles in his sound.

No, it just broke; it can't go all squeaky again. Please!

Last scene of all,

That ends this strange eventful history,

Is second childishness and mere oblivion,

Sans teeth,

Sans eyes,

Sans taste,

(together) sans everything.

But poise,

...and confidence...

...and the ability to stand up and speak in public without blushing
doing and stammering.

Skills that will last a lifetime and will never be lost.

That reminds me, what does happen to those huge bags of stuff
that we bring home after every tournament and put in lost
property?

I don't know.

(Tony is Professor of Drama at Centre College (KY) and Joan is
Assistant Speech Coach and Teacher at Danville HS (KY). Haigh
wrote and performed this duet at the annual Danville Forensic
Banquet.)

(Haigh from page 17)

to recognize that the investments we make
to strengthen the public health infrastruc-
ture, to improve medical consequence man-
gagement and to support fundamental
and applied research, will also benefit our
efforts to protect the health and safety of the
public from naturally occurring disease.

To be effective, we will need to define
new priorities, forge new partnerships, make
new investments to build capacity and ex-
pertise, and support planning. We may never
be truly prepared for some of the most cata-
strophic scenarios, but there is a great deal
that can and should be done.

(Testimony of Margaret A. Hamburg, M.D.,
Vice President of Biological Programs,
Nuclear Threat Initiative, before the Sen-
ate Committee on Governmental Affairs,
Subcommittee of International Security,
Proliferation and Federal Services, Octo-
ber 17, 2001)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Ave. No. Degrees</th>
<th>District Coach w/Largest No. of Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>172.50</td>
<td>Mr. Eric Di Michele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Heart of America</td>
<td>162.27</td>
<td>Mr. Donald Crabtree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Northwest Indiana</td>
<td>157.93</td>
<td>Mr. Daniel Tyree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Three Trails</td>
<td>148.60</td>
<td>Mr. Bill Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>East Kansas</td>
<td>144.33</td>
<td>Mr. A. C. Eley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>East Los Angeles</td>
<td>125.14</td>
<td>Mr. Gregory J. Cullen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>Florida Manatee</td>
<td>123.40</td>
<td>Ms. Lisa Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>+34</td>
<td>Central Minnesota</td>
<td>121.55</td>
<td>Mrs. Pam Cady Wycoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>California Coast</td>
<td>119.62</td>
<td>Mrs. Gay Brasher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>+33</td>
<td>Northern South Dakota</td>
<td>119.44</td>
<td>Mr. Donus D. Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>Northern Illinois</td>
<td>116.80</td>
<td>Mr. Ted W. Belch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>Kansas Flint-Hills</td>
<td>114.46</td>
<td>Mrs. Pamela K. McComas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Sunflower</td>
<td>114.30</td>
<td>Mr. Robert D. Nordyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>+35</td>
<td>Illini</td>
<td>113.77</td>
<td>Ms. Jan Heitken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>Rushmore</td>
<td>110.55</td>
<td>Mr. Carl Swanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Show Me</td>
<td>108.41</td>
<td>Ms. Georgia Brady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Northern Ohio</td>
<td>107.00</td>
<td>Mr. Kenneth A. Garano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>San Fran Bay</td>
<td>106.55</td>
<td>Mrs. Sandra Maguire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Southern Minnesota</td>
<td>106.46</td>
<td>Mr. Robert H. Ihrig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Florida Sunshine</td>
<td>102.83</td>
<td>Mr. Ron Carr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>West Kansas</td>
<td>101.00</td>
<td>Mr. Richard Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>South Kansas</td>
<td>100.09</td>
<td>Mr. Darrel Harbaugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Eastern Ohio</td>
<td>98.30</td>
<td>Mr. Todd Casper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>Hole in the Wall</td>
<td>96.50</td>
<td>Mr. Skip Altig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>North East Indiana</td>
<td>92.50</td>
<td>Mr. Lincoln Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>South Texas</td>
<td>91.42</td>
<td>Mr. David Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>New England</td>
<td>90.50</td>
<td>Mr. Leslie Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>90.50</td>
<td>Mrs. Ruth B. McAllister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>87.66</td>
<td>Mr. James Menchinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Northern Wisconsin</td>
<td>87.58</td>
<td>Mr. Ronald Steinhorst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>+41</td>
<td>South Florida</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>Bro. Anthony K. Cavet CFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>Mr. Brent A. Farrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>West Oklahoma</td>
<td>83.41</td>
<td>Ms. Charlene Bradt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>83.22</td>
<td>Mr. Don Oberti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>81.40</td>
<td>Mrs. Martha L. Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Greater Illinois</td>
<td>81.40</td>
<td>Mr. Douglas R. Springer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>Mr. Ray Schaefer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Valley Forge</td>
<td>80.70</td>
<td>Bro. Rene Sterner, FSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>Florida Panther</td>
<td>80.57</td>
<td>Mrs. Dale McCal!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>+21</td>
<td>Northern Lights</td>
<td>79.83</td>
<td>Mr. Lee D. Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>Carver-Truman</td>
<td>79.64</td>
<td>Mr. David L. Watkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>Golden Desert</td>
<td>79.00</td>
<td>Mr. Scott Ginger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>77.57</td>
<td>Ms. Anne M. Sullivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>76.57</td>
<td>Mr. Terry Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>North Coast</td>
<td>74.38</td>
<td>Mr. C. Frederick Snook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>Mrs. Leora K. Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>Carolina West</td>
<td>73.42</td>
<td>Mr. Steven Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>Western Washington</td>
<td>72.66</td>
<td>Ms. Lois Gorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>+21</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain-South</td>
<td>72.40</td>
<td>Mr. Lowell Sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>Sagebrush</td>
<td>72.40</td>
<td>Miss Judith Vasconcelos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Ave. No. Degrees</td>
<td>District Coach w/Largest No. of Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>Eastern Missouri</td>
<td>71.53</td>
<td>Mr. Randy Pierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>Ozark</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>Ms. Deana Butcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>+33</td>
<td>Big Valley</td>
<td>70.57</td>
<td>Mr. Ron Underwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>Hoosier Mama</td>
<td>69.63</td>
<td>Mr. Harold M. McQueen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>New York State</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>Mr. Gregory Varley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Southern Wisconsin</td>
<td>68.60</td>
<td>Ms. Doris J. Sexton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>Great Salt Lake</td>
<td>67.66</td>
<td>Mr. Harry B. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>Nebraska South</td>
<td>67.16</td>
<td>Mr. G. D. Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>Colorado Grande</td>
<td>66.84</td>
<td>Mr. David M. Montera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>Central Texas</td>
<td>66.77</td>
<td>Ms. Kandi King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>66.41</td>
<td>Dr. Jane Eldridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>Eastern Washington</td>
<td>66.12</td>
<td>Mr. N. A. Cossette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>Chesapeake</td>
<td>63.60</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas P. Durkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>+16</td>
<td>Gulf Coast</td>
<td>63.42</td>
<td>Mr. W. E. Schuetz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>East Texas</td>
<td>63.35</td>
<td>Mr. Stan Magee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>Kentuckky</td>
<td>63.12</td>
<td>Ms. Virginia Landreth-Etherton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>West Iowa</td>
<td>62.23</td>
<td>Mr. James M. Denekas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>Hoosier Daddy</td>
<td>62.21</td>
<td>Mr. William S. Hicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>+18</td>
<td>Deep South</td>
<td>60.30</td>
<td>Ms. Marilee Dukes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>South Oregon</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>Mr. John S. Tredway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>North Dakota Roughrider</td>
<td>59.83</td>
<td>Mrs. Gayle Hyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>59.81</td>
<td>Ms. Janet Robb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Heart of Texas</td>
<td>59.71</td>
<td>Ms. Jane Terrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>58.69</td>
<td>Rev. Raymond Hahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain-North</td>
<td>56.63</td>
<td>Ms. Dianne B. Moeller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>55.33</td>
<td>Mr. Mel Olson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>North Oregon</td>
<td>54.83</td>
<td>Ms. Susan B. McLain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>Georgia Northern Mountain</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>Mr. Eric Brannen, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Utah-Wasatch</td>
<td>51.66</td>
<td>Mr. David S. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Western Ohio</td>
<td>50.60</td>
<td>Mr. Ralph E. Bender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>Lone Star</td>
<td>48.85</td>
<td>Ms. Barbara Garner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>47.72</td>
<td>Mr. Frank Sierra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>46.75</td>
<td>Ms. Anita Boyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>Sundance</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>Mr. Dennis R. Edmunds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>Wind River</td>
<td>45.80</td>
<td>Mrs. Kitty Peck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>East Oklahoma</td>
<td>45.46</td>
<td>Mr. Bill R. Bland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>North Texas Longhorns</td>
<td>44.30</td>
<td>Mrs. Cynthia Timmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>Georgia Southern Peach</td>
<td>43.80</td>
<td>Mr. Richard Bracknell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>43.18</td>
<td>Mr. Donald N. Belanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>41.40</td>
<td>Mr. Richard Mullen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>West Texas</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>Ms. Carol W. Molloy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>36.16</td>
<td>Ms. Karen S. Finch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Tall Cotton</td>
<td>35.37</td>
<td>Ms. Ann Shofner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>Patrick Henry</td>
<td>34.66</td>
<td>Mrs. Mary Sue Crommelin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>Miss Frances Schoolcraft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>31.60</td>
<td>Mr. Randall McCutcheon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>31.40</td>
<td>Mrs. Karen Miyakado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>Capitol Valley</td>
<td>30.20</td>
<td>Ms. Rita Prichard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Iroquois</td>
<td>29.85</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas J. Downs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Tarheel East</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>Dr. John R. Woollen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>UIL</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>Mr. Jimmy L. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Puget Sound</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>Mrs. Terry Peters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>East Iowa</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>Mr. Robert Beisch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MIKE BURTON

The National Federation Officials Association (NFOA) honored NFL's Mike Burton at the National Federation of State High School Associations (NFHS) Coaches and Officials Conference Awards Banquet held April 28 at the Indianapolis Downtown Marriott in Indianapolis (IN). The NFHS Citation Award, which is the highest award an official can receive, was presented to our very own Mike Burton of Puyallup (WA). During an exemplary officiating career that began in the 1960s, Burton has been a standout official at both the prep and collegiate levels.

Burton, who is the debate coach at Bellevue (WA) East Catholic High School, officiated high school football for 35 years, basketball for five years, and baseball/softball for 10 years. Since 1976, Burton has been officiating high school football playoff games, including six state finals. He has been a Washington Officials Association board member since 1993, and a multiple-term board member and president of the Western Washington Football Officials Association (WWFOA). At the national level, Burton served as president of the National Federation Officials Association (then known as the National Federation Interscholastic Officials Association) during 1997-1998, was a member of the board of directors from 1994 to 1999, and has been the Washington NFOA state director since 1992. He also has served on the NFHS Officials Education Committee since 1998. At the collegiate level, Burton has officiated football for 20 years and has been an observer since 1995. He also has officiated three NAIA college football playoff games, including a national semifinal contest.

CONGRATULATIONS MIKE!!
FROM YOUR NFL FRIENDS

- Teacher
- Triple Diamond Coach
- Executive Council Alternate
- Nationals Awards Assembly Director

Burton has utilized his officiating skills abroad as well, as he conducted a rules clinic presentation in Sydney, Australia, in 1992, and he was selected to officiate a high school all-star series in Auckland, New Zealand, in 1994.

Throughout his officiating career, Burton has received many honors and awards for his efforts in officiating and education. Among these recognitions, Burton was chosen league coach of the year both in 1973 and in 1983, was named Pacific Lutheran's Forensic Educator of the Year in 1992, was awarded the Meritorious Service Award to Students by the Washington Interscholastic Activities Association in 1993, and received the NFHS Section 8 Outstanding Speech/Debate Instructor Award in 1998.
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There's no debate about it. Nurturing a young mind is one of the most important things you'll ever do. Teaching a child to think. To ask questions. To delight in learning. That's why Lincoln Financial Group is a proud sponsor of the National Forensic League, A&E's BIOGRAPHY® Project for Schools, and other educational programs for kids. After all, if there's one thing we've learned as a leading financial services company, there are no smarter investments than the ones you make in young people. For more information, call the National Forensic League at 920-748-6206.

Never underestimate the power of a great mind.

"I love to dig up the question by the roots and bold it up and dry it before the fires of the mind."

— Abraham Lincoln