CDE Debate and Extemp Camps?!  

Anton Ford  
Twice a National Champion,  
Twice an L.D. Trophyist, CDE Alumnus

Isaac Potter  
2000 National Champion  
Two a CDE Alumnus

Winthrop Hayes  
CDE Alumnus  
National Champion

Team Debate  
World Champions  
Twice

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.

Ami Arad  
CDE Alumnus

Jennifer Rotman  
CDE Alumnus

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 1993 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 Shumsky
1st Extemp, NFL Nationals 1995 and 1996
CDE Alumnus 1994

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

David Applegate
1997 National Champion
CDE Alumnus 1996

Courtney Mayer
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 2003 Camp
(July 14 - 30 at Northern Arizona University in Flagstaff, Arizona)
Lincoln Douglas, Extemp, Team Debate $1,325. Application fee $95. 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
Your speech could win $2,000 and qualify you for Nationals.

In turbulent times, it is easy to be stampeded into making unwise financial decisions... and follow the crowd in a panic. That's why it's important to have a sound financial strategy now more than ever.

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

What are the prizes?
- The first-place 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 2003 NFL National Tournament in Atlanta, GA.
- Video excerpts from the winning speeches will be online at LFG.com and at the 2003 NFL National Tournament in Atlanta.
- Coaches of each winner will be awarded a $500 honorarium.

What's the topic?
Taming the Bull and the Bear... the importance of a sound financial strategy

Who's eligible?
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 on LFG.com and at the 2003 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 24, 2003. Entries should be mailed to:
Lincoln Financial Group
NFL Video Speech Contest
1300 S. Clinton St. - 7H00
Fort Wayne, IN 46802

Include with the videotape a typed transcript of your speech and include 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 the winners. Judges' decisions are final. Winners will be contacted by April 30, 2003 and will receive their awards at the 2003 NFL National Tournament.

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 funds the national tournament and provides $78,000 in college scholarships and awards.
2003-2004 Policy Debate Topic

Please vote for one topic.

The area that receives the most votes will be the 2003-2004 debate topic and resolution.

---

**OCEAN POLICY**

Resolved: That the United States federal government should establish an ocean policy substantially increasing protection of marine natural resources.

---

**RIGHTS OF CHILDREN**

Resolved: That the United States federal government should establish a policy substantially increasing the civil rights of children in the United States.

Name: ____________________________

School/State: ______________________

Ballots must be received by No Later than January 6, 2003
NFL, P.O. Box 38, Ripon, WI 54971-0038
Fax (920) 748-9478
(The deadline date for voting is established by the National Federation Debate Topic Committee)

---

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MINUTES ON PAGES 58 AND 59

---

**Lincoln Financial Group/NFL JANUARY/FEBRUARY L/D Topic**

*R*: When in conflict, globalization ought to be valued above national sovereignty.

---

**NAMI Policy Debate Topic 2002-2003**

*R*: That the United States federal government should substantially increase public health services for mental health care in the United States.

---

The Rostrum now online at www.nflonline.org
NFL Website: debate.uwm.edu/nfl.html
The burden of suffering experienced by children with mental health needs and their families has created a health crisis in this country...


The National Alliance for the Mentally Ill (NAMI) is the leading family member and consumer grassroots membership organization in the nation dedicated to improving the lives of children and adults with severe mental illnesses and their family members. NAMI supports education, outreach, advocacy and research on behalf of persons with serious mental illnesses such as schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, major depression, severe anxiety disorders and major mental illnesses affecting children and adolescents. The group that NAMI represents, those with severe and persistent mental illnesses, constitutes more than 5% of all adults, and nearly 10% of all children.

Our nation has abandoned people with mental illnesses — especially children...

The prevalence rates of youth with mental illnesses are staggering. Approximately 7-9% of all children have a diagnosable serious mental disorder, which translates into millions of youth and one or two of the children in every classroom.

—New Freedom Commission’s Interim Report, October 2002

NAMI is deeply concerned with the information recently reported to the President in the New Freedom Commission’s Interim Report. It is consistent with the research and information in the Surgeon General’s 2001 report on children’s mental health. According to the Surgeon General’s report, 1 in 10 children and adolescents in the United States suffers from a mental illness severe enough to cause impairment while fewer than 1 in 5 of these children receives needed treatment. The World Health Organization Global Burden of Disease Study indicates that by the year 2020, childhood neuropsychiatric disorders will rise proportionally by over 50% to become one of the five most common causes of morbidity, mortality, and disability among children. (WHO, 2001)

The WHO report shows that when compared with all other diseases, including cancer and heart disease, mental illness ranks first in causing disability in the U.S., Canada and Western Europe.

On October 28, 2002, the President’s New Freedom Commission on Mental Health issued an Interim Report to the President that describes the critical problems in our nation’s fragmented and broken mental healthcare system. All reference in this article to the “Commission’s Interim Report, October 2002” apply to that report which is available online at www.mindhealth.gov/insideprint.
One thing is patently clear — too many children with mental illnesses are not receiving any services. The circumstances are even worse for African-American, Latino and other youth from ethnically and culturally diverse communities. Tragically, they often bear a significantly greater burden from unmet mental health needs and thus suffer a greater loss in overall health and productivity. (Surgeon General 2001 Report on Mental Health: Culture, Race, and Ethnicity)

What are the consequences for the roughly 80% of youth with mental illnesses who fail to receive services? The long-term consequences are staggering in both human and fiscal terms. Suicide is the third leading cause of death in adolescents aged 15 to 24. (Centers for Disease Control, 1999) Over 30,000 lives are lost each year to suicide. (Commission’s Interim Report, October 2002) The evidence is strong that as many as 90% of children and adolescents who commit suicide have a mental disorder (Institute of Medicine Report, 2002 and Surgeon General, 1999).

**Consequences of Untreated Mental Ilnesses in Children and Adolescents—**

- Suicide - 3rd leading cause of death in youth;
- 30,000 people lose their lives to suicide each year;
- 90% of those who commit suicide have untreated mental illness;
- Youth get locked up – 80% of youth entering the juvenile justice system have a diagnosable mental disorder;
- Children end up in foster care where it is estimated that 85% of children have an emotional disorder or substance use disorder;
- Dramatically high rates of school failure and drop-out;
- 20% of families surveyed by NAMI gave up custody of their child to the state to secure services;
- Youth frequently turn to substance use to self-medicate;
- Youth are socially isolated from their peers;

Youth with untreated mental illnesses also tragically end up in the criminal justice system. An astounding 80% of children entering the juvenile justice system have a diagnosable mental disorder. (Commission’s Interim Report—citing Cocozza and Sowyr article entitled Youth with mental disorders: Issues and emerging responses, Juvenile Justice Journal, April, 2000) The prevalence rates of children and adolescents with mental illnesses in the juvenile justice system is a moral outrage and speaks to our nation’s failure to build a mental health treatment system.

Often, children end up in foster care — where it is estimated that up to 85% of children have significant mental health problems. (Values and Principles for Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services and Supports for Children in Foster Care, American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatrists and Child Welfare League for America, June 5, 2002). For children, the failure to diagnose and treat a mental illness early often results in the loss of critical developmental years. Many children fail in school, fail to develop friendships and social skills. They also become isolated from their peers. Their inability to participate in school results in their failure to earn a diploma and ultimately in the chance to lead an independent and productive life. The devastating reality is that youth with untreated mental illnesses have a greatly diminished future as citizen and worker.

What is the impact of untreated and poorly treated mental illnesses in children on families? Simply put — devastating. Stigma and shame drives many families away from the treatment system. Suicide severely impacts the families left behind — who often wrongly live with extreme shame and guilt over not having prevented the death of their loved one.

NAMI is frequently contacted by families across the country who have struggled to get treatment for their child, and in the process attempted to navigate a fragmented, broken and underfunded system. Often these families have long since exhausted their private insurance benefits for mental health coverage (nearly all health insurance plans place restrictive and discriminatory caps on mental health benefits) and paying for intensive service is simply not financially feasible. Most of these families do not qualify for Medicaid benefits. Many families are told by state agencies and others that they can access critically needed treatment by relinquishing custody of their child to the state. This causes unthinkable stress for families, hit at their most vulnerable moment.

NAMI’s 1999 report — Families on the Brink, The Impact of Ignoring Children with Serious Mental Illness — documents the prevalence of the custody relinquishment problem. In Families on the Brink, 23% of respondents to NAMI’s national survey of parents and caregivers, reported being told that they would have to relinquish custody of their child to access services. 20% of the respondents reported they ultimately relinquished custody of their child to the state. Understandably, families are devastated to learn that their family must be torn apart and they must hand custody of their child over to the state to get care. Children who are turned over to the state often feel abandoned and unwanted. Imagine a family with a child with cancer or diabetes or any other major illness being told that they must give up custody of their child to get health care treatment.

Some families also report being told that to access treatment or services for their child, they should either call the police and have their child arrested or leave the child at a hospital or treatment center. An arrest means that the child may receive services through the juvenile justice system and parental abandonment means that the child will be referred to the child welfare system for possible treatment.

It is now well recognized that mental or emotional disorders are not “just a stage” or simply a function of poor parenting or crowded classrooms, but are real brain illnesses. We know with certainty that children do experience serious mental illnesses as well as a range of emotional and behavioral disorders that require and respond to treatment in the same way as other illnesses do. If properly treated, these children can experience a fairly typical childhood. They can establish friendships, learn in school, and improve their life chances dramatically.

**The Federal Government must take a leadership role to overcome this national crisis**

*Our Nation’s failure to prioritize mental health is a national tragedy.*

- New Freedom Commission’s Interim Report, October 2002
The federal government must make the same commitment to childhood mental illnesses that it has made to childhood immunizations and screening for vision, hearing, lead and other health-related issues. The federal government— including the U.S. Congress and federal agencies charged with research, oversight and the delivery of mental health services to youth with mental illnesses (HEHS, DOE, DOJ, NIMH)—must take the lead to overcome this health care crisis by addressing the following, which are described more completely below:

- Invest in redesigning the fragmented and broken service system and develop a national campaign to combat stigma;
- Work with state and local governments and families and mental health consumers to build an effective and accountable mental health service system to serve the needs of children and adolescents;
- Enforce and implement the federal laws that were enacted to remedy the civil injustices that have historically existed for those with mental illnesses (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and Medicaid);
- Increase funding for research on early-onset mental illnesses and effective treatments; and
- Enact federal legislation to address discriminatory health insurance coverage for mental illness treatment (Mental Health Parity); health care coverage for families when children require intensive treatment (Family Opportunity Act); legislation to address the profound shortage of mental health treatment providers for children and the juvenile justice crisis.

States lack the resources and scope of understanding to do it alone. When the states cannot solve such problems, the federal government has a responsibility to act—as a partner in our federal system.

The various levels of government and different agencies must stop the finger pointing of responsibility that so often interferes with children receiving services. Families suffer greatly from the lack of treatment options—while one community may have an innovative mental health system for children and adolescents, another state or community may have no available services. The system for delivering mental health services to children and their families is complex; the patchwork of providers, interventions and funding streams contributes to the lack of treatment. There is a desperate need for appropriately trained child psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers.

In addition to the need for an effective treatment system, we must stop the stigma surrounding mental illnesses. A national campaign should be established that includes partnerships with youth, families, media, the health care system (mental health and other treatment providers), schools (educators, counselors and other school personnel), community leaders and advocacy groups. We must reach children early. Education is the key to understanding and combating stigma and giving children with mental illnesses an equal chance in life.

Federal special education law—a good “IDEA” but not well implemented

Children with mental disorders who are identified for special education services have higher levels of absenteeism, higher drop-out rates, and lower levels of academic achievement than students with other disabilities.

—New Freedom Commission’s Interim Report, October 2002

The United States Congress enacted the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) as a civil rights statute in response to the neglect and failure of school systems to meet the most basic education needs of children with disabilities, including students with mental and emotional disorders. Students were routinely denied equal opportunity to fully participate in the educational system. The statutory provisions included in IDEA are strong and could be effective. Unfortunately, the federal government has failed to adequately implement and enforce the provisions of this critically important legislation, thereby denying students with mental illnesses their fundamental right to a free and appropriate public education. (National Council on Disabilities, Back to School on Civil Rights, January, 2000). The federal government should set the standard for state and local education agencies by enforcing implementation of IDEA. (See also, A New Era: Revitalizing Special Education for Children and Their Families, a report of President Bush’s Commission on Excellence in Special Education—available at www.ed.gov/iff/ctc/commissionsboards/whspecialeducat/index.html) Enforcement and implementation of the federal law would improve the outcomes of students with mental illnesses.

The U.S. Congress also promised to fund IDEA up to 49% of the average per pupil expenditure for each special education student, but has never lived up to that promise. Congress has never funded more than 15% for special education. The new Congress just elected in 2002 should live up to the promise of full funding. Most schools fail to provide school personnel with basic training and education to understand the early warning signs and symptoms of mental illnesses, despite the high prevalence rates of the disorders. Without an adequate investment in education for students with disabilities, especially those with mental illnesses, and an investment in the appropriate training of school personnel, we will continue to see unacceptably poor outcomes for these students.

We know that for many children, their mental illnesses go undetected and thus, untreated. The federal government should ensure that states and local school districts have the resources for early identification and appropriate intervention to maximize the ability of students with mental illnesses to benefit from their education. They should also increase and encourage collaboration between state and local government agencies that serve children and adolescents (like community mental health centers, child welfare, juvenile justice and others) and schools. These systems must accept the financial and service responsibility for meeting the needs of children and adolescents with mental illnesses and their families.

Federal Medicaid law requires broad healthcare coverage for children who qualify—but kids still do not get the care that they need.

Medicaid is a joint federal and state program that finances
health care coverage for 21 million, or more than 1 in 4 of our nation's children. Medicaid has been an effective health care program for millions of lower-income families who need basic healthcare. Despite the assistance that it has provided to many families, there are important components of the Medicaid program that require reform. One of the central services that federal Medicaid law requires states to provide is the screening of children to detect various conditions early and to treat them before the conditions worsen. The Medicaid early screening requirement is commonly referred to as "EPSDT" — which stands for Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment.

Unfortunately, all too often, states fail to meet the EPSDT federal mandate and children in the program fail to be screened for early detection of illnesses — including mental illnesses. Research shows that the percentage of children receiving preventive care and screening of any kind through the Medicaid EPSDT requirement is low. (National Health Law Program, 2001 – National Review of EPSDT — information available at www.healthlaw.org; see also; U.S. General Accounting Office, 2001 – Report on Medicaid: Stronger Efforts Needed to Ensure Children's Access to Health Screening Services — information available at www.gao.gov; and Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law — Report on Where to Turn: Confusion in Medicaid Policies on Screening Children for Mental Health Needs — information available at www.bazelon.org.)

States also routinely fail to inform families that they are eligible for Medicaid. Moreover, for those families who are fortunate enough to be identified and enrolled, unduly complicated federal and state rules, procedures and other administrative barriers often exist in the Medicaid program. This prevents families from accessing the critically needed screening and follow-up services that are required by the EPSDT mandate. The failure of states to identify children with mental illnesses through the Medicaid EPSDT mandate is consistent with the deeply troubling research and information in the Surgeon General's 2001 report that showed that less than 20% of children who need treatment receive it.

What can be done at the federal and state levels of government to ensure that Medicaid eligible families receive the treatment and services that children with mental illnesses often require and are entitled to receive under the federal law —

- The federal government holds the purse strings and must take action to hold states accountable for providing mandated services for children with mental illnesses;
- The federal government, through the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) — the federal agency with oversight responsibility for the Medicaid program — must work with states to conduct outreach to Medicaid eligible families to make them Aware of the EPSDT mandate;
- CMS must also maintain closer oversight of state Medicaid agencies to hold them more accountable for providing EPSDT services and to promote state EPSDT compliance — this includes requiring states to provide data on mental health referrals for children — something that is not currently required;
- CMS should identify states that are performing well in providing EPSDT services and other innovative service programs and share information with other states on what policies and procedures have been adopted to meet the EPSDT requirement to address the needs of youth with mental illnesses;
- Both CMS and states should encourage state-sponsored physician and provider education programs to ensure that mental health treatment providers under the scope of the EPSDT requirements;
- Both the federal and state governments must provide adequate reimbursement to mental health treatment and service providers to increase the profound shortage of child and adolescent treatment providers participating in the Medicaid Program;
- CMS and state government should ensure family inclusion at every point of outreach, screening, diagnosis, treatment planning and implementation phases to ensure the best chance for the recovery of children with mental illnesses.

The Medicaid program should offer real hope for families with children with mental illnesses. Unfortunately, like so many other well meaning programs, it has not been well enforced or implemented at the federal or state levels and thus has failed in its purpose to identify children with illnesses early and to get them treatment. The program is simply not meeting the needs of many families across the country with children with mental illnesses. This contributes greatly to the crisis.

Scientific advances offer hope — our nation must continue to invest in research on early-onset mental illnesses

Research confirms that recovery from mental illness is real: there are a range of effective treatments, services, and supports to facilitate recovery. Medical science has devised treatments and services that work...

- New Freedom Commission's Interim Report, October 2002

Research is our best hope for the future. Science is giving us new and effective treatments every year. Years of hard work and investments in research have begun to pay off. Scientists have made breakthrough discoveries on how the brain works and that has resulted in new medications that help the brain work better at regulating emotions and thoughts. These medicines — when combined with cognitive behavioral therapy, home and community-based services, family education, wrap-around services, respite care — give children and adolescents with mental illnesses the chance to recover from their illnesses and enjoy a full and normal childhood. We must continue to invest in and support research on early-onset mental illnesses. This includes research on the use of psychopharmacology for children and adolescents with mental illnesses.

It is critical that Congress appropriates significant increases in federal funding of research at the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) — especially research focused on mental illnesses in children. The research funding for these illnesses should directly correlate to the disease burden and the high prevalence rates of mental illnesses in children and adolescents.

At the same time, special consideration and attention must be paid to the complex ethical issues associated with research on children and the complexities raised by child development. Psychotropic medications for young children with mental illnesses
should be used only when the benefits outweigh the risks. Children and adolescents who are taking psychotropic medications must be closely monitored and frequently re-evaluated by qualified mental health providers. The side effects common to some medications can be particularly difficult for children. At the same time, psychotropic medications can be lifesaving for some children with mental illnesses. Many families report that medication and therapy has allowed their child to participate in school like other children, to live at home and to develop friendships with peers. We also know that lack of treatment will adversely affect a child's overall physical and mental development, including the ability to learn, socialize and function in the community.

Efforts must be undertaken at the federal level to bridge the gap between research and practice by disseminating information and promoting effective communication and appropriate sensitivity between and among healthcare and mental health providers, researchers, youth and families. We know that too often children and adolescents are not getting the best evidence-based treatment available because of the information gap.

NAMI is well aware of those who suggest that children and adolescents are being over diagnosed with mental illnesses and over treated with medications. These arguments largely recycle bad science and trivialize the need for early identification and treatment of mental illnesses in children and adolescents. Public policy involving treatment of mental illnesses in children and adolescents must be founded on science and shaped by research and scientific evidence, not science fiction or religious ideology. Recent research and science have disproved the baseless arguments of those who claim that we are over diagnosing and over medicating children.

There is emerging scientific evidence that early treatment interventions significantly improve the long-term outcomes for children and adolescents with mental illnesses. Early assessment and identification should exist across all of the systems designed to serve children and their families, including but not limited to primary health care, schools, community centers, child welfare, juvenile justice, substance use treatment systems and others. There must be a coordinated effort to break down the barriers to appropriate identification and recognition of children with mental health needs and the factors that interfere with access to appropriate treatments and services. Research increasingly is showing that the failure to intervene and provide early treatment for many mental illnesses accelerates the course of the illnesses and may actually result in increased damage to the functioning of the brain.

Rather than focus on scientifically unfounded assertions, attention must be paid to the legacy of failure in this country to treat childhood mental illnesses and efforts must be made to fix the fragmented and broken system.

The U.S. Congress must show leadership by enacting federal legislation that will help to alleviate the mental health crisis in this country.

Mental Health Parity

The health insurance policies of most Americans include adequate coverage for what have typically been called "medical or physical illnesses." That is not so for mental health coverage. Most policies include extremely restricted and discriminatory mental health coverage. There is simply no scientific or medical justification for insurance coverage of mental illnesses to be so unfairly restricted in comparison to the terms and conditions for other diseases. Discriminatory insurance coverage of mental illness bankrupts families and places a tremendous burden on taxpayers through suicide, homelessness and the inappropriate "criminalization" of children and adolescents, as well as adults, with mental illnesses. The enactment of a federal mental health parity bill would change that by requiring insurance plans to provide coverage for mental illnesses at the same level or amount as coverage for other illnesses.

The good news is that parity is affordable! The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that the current Senate-passed parity bill (Senate Bill 543) would only increase insurance premiums by 0.9% (a finding that is consistent with numerous previous studies that demonstrate how non-discriminatory coverage is affordable). (To review the text of S 543 and the Senate Committee reports — visit — thomas.loc.gov)

Mental illnesses are real illnesses of the brain — treatment works, if you can get it — in fact, the treatment efficacy rates for most severe mental illnesses exceed those for heart disease and diabetes. There is simply no scientific or medical justification for requiring employers and insurers to continue to arbitrarily restrict and limit insurance coverage of mental illness treatment. The United States Congress simply should do the right thing and enact a federal parity law. To do otherwise will only serve to prolong the crisis.

Family Opportunity Act

This landmark federal legislation (Senate Bill 321) is intended to end the financial devastation that families too often encounter in attempting to access quality treatment for their children with mental illnesses. As many NAMI members know firsthand, families are often illegally forced to give up custody of their children to obtain the most appropriate treatment and services for them. This legislation offers the chance for stability and recovery for children with severe and chronic disabling disorders, including early-onset mental illnesses. It is a measure that will help put an end to the horrible choice — of forcing families to give up custody of their child to secure services — that loving and caring families must make in cases where there has been no abuse or neglect.

Under the bill, states would be able to offer Medicaid coverage to children with severe disabilities living in middle income families through a buy-in program. Cost sharing on a sliding scale up to the full premium cost will be required within certain guidelines that protect lower income families. Currently, families must stay impoverished, place their child in an out of home placement or simply give up custody in order to secure the health care services their child needs under Medicaid.

Federal Action is needed to address the profound shortage of mental health providers and for juvenile justice reform.
A crisis exists in the shortage of qualified child and adolescent mental health providers in virtually every region of this country. This shortage is pronounced in rural and poor communities and disproportionately exists in our public mental health systems. Families are often told that they must travel tremendous distances to get mental health treatment for their ill child. This presents an incredible hardship for families who are already suffering from the burden of having a loved one with a mental illness.

According to a report of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatrists, there are currently approximately 6,300 child and adolescent psychiatrists in this country and, given the existing prevalence rates of childhood mental illnesses, the need is currently at 30,000. (For more information, visit the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatrists web site at www.aacap.org). The disparity between the number of psychiatrists and the need is projected to substantially increase in the years ahead. The shortage of children's mental health providers is not limited to psychiatrists it includes psychologists, social workers and other professionals.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics in the Department of Education, there are approximately 513 students for each school counselor in United States schools, a ratio that is double the recommended ratio of 250 students for each school counselor. (For more information visit the National Center for Education Statistics web site at nces.ed.gov)

Congress must develop incentives, through legislation or programs, to attract more qualified professionals to child and adolescent mental health services and treatment. Legislation might include loan forgiveness and scholarship programs for new children’s mental health professionals, grants for graduate programs to create or expand children’s specialties and grants for community providers to train paraprofessionals, among other things.

On the juvenile justice front, the federal government, either through the U.S. Congress or the Department of Justice must take a leadership role in developing effective approaches to divert youth with mental illnesses out of the criminal justice system and into treatment systems. It is simply a moral outrage that our jails and prisons have become our nation’s de facto mental health treatment system. This issue is intentionally included last to make the point that if we work to reform our mental health treatment system for children and adolescents — then we should not have to focus our reform efforts on the juvenile justice system. We would not tolerate treating children and adolescents with other serious illnesses — such as cancer or diabetes — like this and we should refuse to tolerate treating children with mental illnesses with this deliberate neglect and abandon.

Conclusion

Children and teenagers represent our nation’s hope for the future. Those with mental illnesses deserve to experience accomplishments in childhood and to thrive in nurturing environments. Mental illnesses, like all childhood illnesses, should be detected early and children should receive appropriate treatment and services targeted to their specific needs. Without proper attention and a real commitment to change at the federal, state and local levels — the tragedies that result from unidentified and untreated mental illnesses in children and adolescents will continue.

(Darcy E. Gruttadauro, is Director of the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill Child & Adolescent Action Center)

NFL Executive Secretary

The NFL seeks applicants for the position of Executive Secretary, to begin effective August 1, 2003.

Among the Executive Secretary’s responsibilities are to:
- provide administrative leadership for the NFL,
- oversee the Annual National Tournament,
- administer the League's educational, online and international initiatives, and
- implement plans to better secure NFL's advancement and financial development.

Interested applicants should contact: Bro. Reue Siebert, PSC, Search Committee Coordinator, LaSalle College High School, 8005 Cheltenham Avenue, Wyndmoor, PA, 19038 (215-233-2911; rsmurcer@bachs.org).


The NFL is an AA/EO employer, and especially encourages applications from women and minorities.
Wake Forest Summer Debate Workshops

Fifty Years of Workshop Experience
Year-Long Debate Instruction for the 21st Century

This summer, Wake Forest University will be celebrating a fifty year commitment to the instruction of debaters from across the United States through our Summer Debate Workshop programs. Four different programs are available to for students to choose from:

The Summer Debate Workshop. Team-taught laboratories, divided by experience level, allow each student to receive intensive individualized instruction as students are taught each phase of the debate process. Each lab of no more than eighteen students is led by two of the listed faculty members and is assisted by our Wake Forest debater.

The Policy Project. Other institutes have been playing catch-up in curricular design ever since we began the Policy Project. Now, while others are advertising shared evidence, early frequent practice, and other features we have long since refined, we are finding new ways to tailor the debater's experience to their specific needs. You and/or your coach can choose the specific lab you want. Lab choice is a function of the affinities you want to work on and/or the coaches you want to spend the most time working with. Regardless of your lab choice, your practice rounds, theory discussions and other activities for which tracking is important will be with people at your level. We never track by age, only ability. We aim to simply have the best overall group of debaters of any age and provide appropriate experiences for each of the ability levels.

The Fast-Track. What would it be like to be coached by those who have coached national champions at both the high school and college level? By coaches who contribute to the cutting edge of debate theory and argument construction at both the high school and college level? If you are selected for the Fast-Track you can experience the answer. John Heidt and Ross Smith will get you, and a small, select, group of your peers off to the fastest start possible with practice drills and debates, discussions, seminars, and focused research. We will argue together about strategy, tactics, and key issues on the coming topic. You can apply individually or with a partner. The program is limited to the most talented and experienced debaters applying, but is not restricted by year in school.

Policy Analysis and Strategy Seminar. Debaters who want to start off with a unique intellectual opportunity are invited to attend a special seminar week before the beginning of the Policy Project. The Policy Analysis and Strategy Seminar provides directed readings and discussions on core topic issues; analyzes the arguments produced by early workshops and handbooks; and discusses high-level strategy, theory, and tactics of special interest.

*Please visit our web site for updates on the most recent dates and prices.

Tentative Dates*
Summer Workshop: June 15-July 3
Policy Project: July 5-August 1
Fast-Track: June 20-August 1
PASS, June 27-July 4

Last Year's Prices*
Summer Debate Workshop $1575
Policy Project $2875
Fast-Track $3475

Why Attend Wake Forest?
50 years of workshop experience
Year-round learning
Affordable opportunities for all
Cutting edge strategy and curriculum
Professional, experienced staff
Safe and comfortable environment

Wake Forest Summer Debate Workshops

In partnership with PlanetDebate.com, the Wake Forest Summer Debate Workshop programs are happy to announce that we will be providing the first ever year-round workshop experience, with a summer stop in Winston-Salem.

Instruction for students who attend any of the summer workshops will begin in mid-May with an introductory audio lecture on the topic, access to over 1000 to topic-specific articles on the web, at least 25 essays on the topic, comprehensive bibliographies to support research at home and in Winston-Salem, and a practice debate affirmative. When students leave Winston-Salem, they will have continued access to a special collection of Planet Debate resources, which include:

- Over ten thousand cards on from leading debate handbooks and college debate coaches. The evidence is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week in a searchable database;
- Special chats for Wake workshop students only;
- Special message boards and forums for Wake students where questions will be answered by lab leaders throughout the year;
- The delivery of audio lectures throughout the year on important topic-related arguments.

An extensive link directory to topic and instructional resources that will support your debating all year long.

2003 Faculty Includes*

Ross Smith, Director, Debate Coach, Wake Forest
Jarrod Aitchison, Asst. Coach, Wake Forest
Stefan Bauschard, Debate Coach, Boston College
Amy Collinge, Senior Debater, Lewis & Clark
Becca Eaton, Senior Debater, Wake Forest
Justin Green, Debate Coach, North Texas
Jenny Heidt, Director of Debate, Westminster School
Casey Kelly, Asst. Coach, Wake Forest
Jim Lyle, Director of Debate, Clarion University
Kristen McCauliff, Asst. Coach, Wake Forest
Tim O’Donnell, Director of Debate, Mary Washington
Kim Shanahan, Director of Debate, Fort Hays H.S.
Patrick Speice, Senior Debater, Wake Forest
Ed Williams, Director of Debate, Marist School

*See website for updates and bios of the faculty
CONTROVERSY:
NOT YOUR FATHER'S DEBATE
Q and A about NFL's new event

The Coin Flip
Q How does a Controversy round begin?
A With a flip of a coin between the competing teams.

Q Why a coin flip?
A The coin toss adds an element of uncertainty and teaches strategy, since depending on the toss a team may choose to be affirmative or negative or may choose to speak first or last.

Q How is the flip conducted?
A A coin is tossed by one team and called by the other team. The team which wins the flip may choose one of two options: EITHER the side of the topic they wish to defend (affirmative or negative) OR the speaking position they wish to have (begin the debate or end the debate). Once the coin toss winners select their favorite option (i.e., they choose to have the last speech) then the other team makes a choice within the other option (i.e., affirmative or negative). The analogy here is to football: Toss the coin and the winner chooses to kick or receive OR the side of the field they wish to defend.

Q Does this mean the negative might begin the debate?
A Indeed. There is no presumption or burden of proof in Controversy as in policy debate. The Affirmative side wishes to convince the audience that the topic should be adopted; the negative side wishes to convince the audience that the topic should not be adopted. Hence the negative, knowing the topic, can argue against adoption as first speaker.

Q Why not just alternate sides?
A Tournament directors may choose to do this at invitatonals but NFL suggests the flipping. By alternating sides the affirmative is locked as first speaker and the negative as last speaker. It is much fairer for students to have a choice of side or speaker position.

Crossfire
Q What is crossfire?
A Both debaters “hold the floor.” But the first question must be asked to the speaker who just spoke by an opponent. After that question, either debater may question and/or answer at will.

Q Won’t this create confusion?
A Perhaps, initially. But soon, as students practice the format, they will learn valuable lessons: one may be more effective with good answers than asking questions; good questions must be brief; filibuster answers will be exposed; rudeness will be penalized by judges.

Q Controversy sounds like TV debate shows?
A Right! Capital Gang, Crossfire, McLaughlin Group et al do this each week. Crossfire adds excitement to the debate process which attracts audiences and the media. Your principal will love to see a Controversy debate! (Would you let your principal see a policy debate?).

Q Won’t kids abuse this format?
A Not if they want to be successful! Adult judges from the community will be using a ballot which calls for questions to be “brief” and answers to be “on point”. Contestants will be penalized for rudeness and poor communication.

Q What is the Grand Crossfire?
A All four debaters have the floor to interact with questions and answers. This is a real test of team work. The first question is asked by the team that had the first summary to the team which had the last summary. After that, any debater may question or answer.

Q Does the judge ever ask questions?
A No. But this is an option that may be explored at a later NFL conference which will evaluate Controversy.

Q I’m still worried that the crossfire periods will be “Towers of Babel”
A The judge is chairperson of the round and may halt any crossfire out of control. After an initial trial period most debaters will learn that interrupting, shouting, filibustering (all of which may also occur in Policy and LD cross examination periods) are counter productive.

Q How can students be taught cross examination skills?
A Read James Copeland’s book Cross Examination in Debate, National Textbook Co. (shameless plug); read pages TA7 and TA8 of the NFL Manual; read John Munkman, The Technique of Advocacy, Butterworth (U.K.); read the Art of Cross Examination by J. W. Ehrlich, Dorset Press; read the Art of Cross Examination by Francis L. Wellman. (check for used copies at abebooks.com. The Munkman is British so Amazon.com (U.K.) might be best. Most libraries will have at least one of these books.

Last Shot
Q What is the “Last Shot”?
A It is a very clever adaptation of the old “point of order” by Hall of Fame Coach Donus Roberts. Too often debaters are muddled by racing rebuttals trying to cover every point and failing to crystalize the key issues.
The "Last Shot" allows one speaker on each team to argue only one point — the point that the debater believes will win the debate. This one minute speech might even begin "Judge this is why you should vote (aff or neg)" and then present one's single best argument. This "Last Shot" trains students to choose what is vital to decision-making. If more than one argument is presented in the last shot period; it is an automatic loss.

Summary Speeches
Q Are the summary speeches the same as rebuttals?
A Yes. Each team should summarize arguments it is winning and refute the arguments it is losing.

Q Can new information be presented in summary and last shot speeches?
A Yes. Facts, opinions, statistics -- evidence of all kinds are legal and welcome to advance the debate. New arguments in summary and last shot speeches are forbidden. An answer in response to an argument originally presented by the opposition is not a new argument.

Topics and Research
Q When are topics announced?
A A new topic will be announced the first day of each month at www.nflonline.org.

Q Who chooses the topics?
A This trial yearDonna Roberts (c), Robert Jones (NFL Extimp Topic Chair), and James Copeland (NFL Secretary). If the NFL Council establishes Controversy as a permanent event, a topic committee will be set up as in L/D debate.

Q How should topics be researched?
A Newspapers, news magazines, online news sites, books.

Q Is evidence necessary?
A Yes. This is a debate event. Arguments must be supported by evidence.

Q How much evidence should be presented?
A Controversy is public debate. A speak or spew of evidence will be punished by a loss. Present evidence to prove your points but not so much as to destroy good communication with the lay judge or audience.

Q Are kritiks and counterplans banned?
A Yes. There is no plan required so a counterplan would be irrelevant. Kritiks, which are off-topic arguments, are not allowed. Public forum debate (Controversy) should stick to issues within the proposition -- not outside issues.

Judges
Q Who judges?
A Almost anyone in the community; salesmen, housewives, retired teachers, business people — a typical American jury. College debaters and debate coaches who are not classroom teachers in a high school may not judge.

Q How should a judge evaluate a Last Shot argument?
A The debaters will select what they believe are the voting issues; the judge may vote on one of these or select another issue(s) he feels is more important.

Q Why are judges required to identify their voting issues?
A In order to make sure arguments play a part in the decision. Although superior communication must be rewarded, Controversy is a debate contest not just a public speaking event.

Ballot
Q Why are there no speaker points?
A Speaker points have no real analogy in the real world. Community judges using a school grade based system (A, B, C, D) will provide more accurate feedback for debaters.

Q How can speaker awards be determined?
A Perhaps awards can be based upon the greatest number of A grades scored by each speaker.

Q With no speaker points, how are ties to be broken?
A Suggestions: If the teams have met, the winner proceeds; or strength of opposition, where each team's score is based upon the total number of wins achieved by the teams it debated or the team with greater number of A's (if still tied the greatest number of B's).

NFL Rules
Q How many NFL points does Controversy earn?
A 6 for a Win 3 for a loss; Maximum of 500 points (exclusive of district and nationals) in the debate category.

Q May students double enter in Controversy and another event at the NFL district tournament?
A No. But may enter both Controversy and district Congress.

Q Why can't students in Controversy Double enter and Double Qualify?
A Controversy is in its trial stage. Trial events in the past (Duo) have not allowed double entry. And, the purpose of Controversy is to attract new schools and new students to NFL, not create another contest for existing students to win more trophies!

Q How many Controversy teams may a school enter at the district tournaments?
A One team which is above quota; up to 3 more which are part of a schools entry quota based upon degrees.

Preparation
Q What can a student do to be successful in Controversy?
A Mainly learn to speak well. This is public debate to lay audiences. Jargon, spread, spew, acronyms and the arcane nuances of policy and L/D debating will be counterproductive.

Q What can a student study to be successful?
A You may wish to read Public Argument by Robert O. Weiss, University Press of America, or the long essay by Bill Davis in the November Rostrum, The A-Ha Experience.
last year, students across the nation converged on los angeles, california why? find out this summer

vbi@ucla July 6 to 19, 2003

"VBI helped me debate better, smarter, and slower. Take the best of all the camps, throw it into one great blender, and there you have VBI. In other words, VBI was great on every level a debate camp could be, it was laid back, yet intense; progressive, yet conservative; slow yet fast. VBI was the way debate camp ought to be." "The social life at VBI was great. I know this is hard to believe but the camp actually allowed you to have fun." "The staff was stellar. The environment could not have been better." "VBI was a great learning experience for me as a novice." "If you think you know about debate, wait till you get to the VBI." "This camp was phenomenal. I've met life long friends. I loved the emphasis on standards, ethics, and personalized attention." "This was one of the greatest times of my life! I am planning on coming back next year." "I loved this camp! It helped so much!" "VBI is much more advanced and appeals to today's type of I.D." "I was impressed that all of the lab leaders were so personable. I talked to them every night about arguments, strategies, and other issues." "The food. The staff. Enough said!"
lincoln-douglas

It is our goal to provide every student with a curriculum that builds on their strengths while motivating them to develop new ones. Our philosophy? To teach students how to argue intelligently, how to adapt to every possible judging environment, and how to make rounds clear. The Victory Briefs debater knows how to establish a standard, how to make offensive arguments meet standard, what arguments to go for, and how to think strategically, rhetorically, and persuasively. The Institute is designed for both beginning and elite debaters. The curriculum emphasizes student choice, practice rounds, interaction with staff, and hard work. Join us!

policy

The policy program offers a refreshing alternative to the existing debate institutes. Our intention is not to produce as much evidence as possible, rather we hope to provide debaters with the necessary tools and strategies for researching and compiling files, while focusing the majority of our time on interactive teaching sessions stressing the essentials of debate. With this in mind, we are resolved to produce well-rounded debaters and to teach fundamental, yet necessary, research habits. Emphasis will be placed on more classic negative strategies, such as disadvantages, engaged solvency attacks, counterplans, and topicality; whereas, kritiks and theoretical issues will be addressed from the standpoint of “how do we never lose to these arguments?” Style will be a major focus of this institute. Incomprehensible topicality shells, “eight off-case” roadmaps, and generic kritiks will be discouraged in favor of the more specific, above mentioned strategies. What does this mean? The emergence of a debater who is a master of winning both lay and upper-echelon judge’s ballots.

extemp

The Victory Briefs' Extemp Institute has several key facets to helping extempers grow in multiple areas. Throughout the week we will focus on skills lectures, topic seminars, filing instruction and many, many critiqued practice rounds. We will systematically analyze each of your speeches to provide you with a foothold for improving not just during the week, but throughout the entire year, with this camp as a foundation. Our extemp camp is committed to an in depth skills focus—-with lectures and practice in the areas of speaking, analyzing, researching, summarizing and more. Each day there will be several skills lectures and with each practice speech these skills will be applied and exercised. These skills seminars will go hand in hand with extemp topic focuses on pertinent and common question areas. These will include readings and research on topics such as the US Economy, American Politics, Europe, Russia, China and International Trade and much more. In addition, each day will include both material for filing as well as instructions on how to improve one's file.

For more information, email vb@victorybriefs.com. Or contact us at 310-453-1681 or Victory Briefs, 1144 Yale St. #3, Santa Monica, CA 90403. For application and the latest news, visit the Victory Briefs website.

www.victorybriefs.com


The staff for this year's policy institute will be drawn from Victory Briefs' stable of policy writers. Check the website for the latest updates.
NO!
by
Chad Henson

No disrespect to the venerable traditionalist Mr. Mathers, but I think there is more to worry about, at least among the intellectual elite, than the hip-shaking antics of Mr. Presley. The National Forensic League, the eminent national organization for competitive high school public speech and debate, has announced the christening of a new event. This event, aptly named “Controversy”, is likely to spark just that along with the interest and resentment of every existing clique in the forensics community.

Such realignment would leave orators out of the loop. The interpers are so far removed from this new event that the possibility of them being seriously affected by this event is almost laughable.

So we look at the possibility of an alliance with the debaters. The two existing types of debate, Lincoln-Douglas (LD) and Policy, are struggling to keep participants beyond the novice year. The champions of each existing debate event will be highly resistant to Controversy because there is a risk that Controversy will steal participants from each. Like Policy, Controversy is a team event. Controversy also focuses on issues of time-based importance, also like Policy. LDers, are not immune from the theft, however. The switch of topics on a regular basis and the affirmation of an entire resolution is most consistent with LD. Furthermore, the inability to advocate counterplans or kritiks, combined with the slow rate of speed required, will appeal to the traditionalist judges that didn’t like such nonsense anyway. An additional appeal of LD that controversy might negate is the shorter time of each round. LD rounds last 37 minutes, while Controversy rounds last only 33 minutes. This will allow debaters to cross-enter.

Perhaps the greatest worry of the debate purists is the appeal Controversy will have to novice debaters. The novi will not be intimidated by having to go up and debate alone (a fear of novice LDers) and will not be scared to confront advanced theory and rapid rates of delivery (major fears of novice Policy debaters, or Cxers). Controversy offers an easy format where you have the support of a teammate. This “safety event” will appeal to many novice debaters looking for the easy way out or taking debate as a required class.

This worry is well-founded. Controversy will teach poor argumentation skills that will be hard to overcome, regardless of coaching. First, there are rules prohibiting certain types of legitimate argumentation, mostly notably counterplans and kritiks. The inability to run counterplans will harm debaters who go into Policy. They will be unable to defend their plans (another device prohibited by Controversy against opposing plans, rendering them completely incapable of 2NR and 2AR analysis in half their rounds. The prohibition against kritiks will harm debaters of all types. Kritiks are gaining popularity in LD, and have been around since the ’70s in Policy. The reason for such an absurd rule is either far beyond (Henson continued to page 18).
Mr. Chad Henson has written in opposition to the new Controversy event. As a former debater and national circuit debate coach I am delighted to debate Mr. Henson about Controversy either as the affirmative on the policy proposition. Resolved: Controversy will significantly increase speech participation and education in U.S. high schools or the negative on the L/D topic. Resolved: That Controversy is unnecessary and harmful.

The initial argument made by Mr. Henson is "Controversy, if it gains a large participatory base, will break up the current cliques and cause chaos in the [forensic] community."

Arthur Kruger in his book Modern Debate: Its Logic and Strategy, notes six ways an argument may be refuted -- three indirect and three direct. The indirect: An argument may be insignificant, inconsistent or irrelevant. The direct: An argument may be doubted (not enough evidence), denied (proven false) or retorted (turned; the opposite proven).

Mr. Henson's first argument may be dismissed by every method -- let me count the ways:

- Insignificance: Mr. Henson shows no impact if such cliques are disturbed or broken up.
- Inconsistency: The "cliques" were not thrown into chaos by earlier introductions of L/D debate and Duo Interp.
- Irrelevancy: The comfort of established cliques must be irrelevant to establishing educational change, else there would be no educational progress.
- Doubt: Mr. Henson asserts the existence of such cliques a priori; if his convenient taxonomy is true, little proof is provided.
- Denial: In many programs many students participate in two or three different "cliques": Extemp (the Speech clique) and Debate and L/D (the debate clique) are the largest cross entry at nationals. Number two? Oratory and the Interps.
- Retort: The existence of these cliques (if indeed they exist) is not a positive force and the cliques should be disturbed! To consign a kid to one clique, "You are a debater" is the intellectual equivalent to consigning a kid to one high school, social subset: "You are a grease" or "You are a jock!"

Mr. Henson's second argument is that "Controversy should be rejected because "The two existing types of debate, Lincoln-Douglas (L/D) and Policy are struggling to keep participants beyond the novice year."

Please note my turn: Mr. Henson admits the reason why the Council thought Controversy was needed: too many kids are rejecting debate now! And such struggling began long before Donus Roberts invented Controversy and is not the fault of Controversy.

What Mr. Henson defines as his "greatest worry" is Controversy's greatest strength. In the words of Mr. Henson:

"Perhaps the greatest worry of the debate purist is the appeal Controversy will have to novice debaters. The novices will not be intimidated by having to go up and debate alone (in fear of novice LDers) and will not be scared to confront advanced theory and rapid rates of delivery (major fears of novice Policy debaters). Controversy offers an easy format where you have the support of a teammate. This "safety net" will appeal to many novice debaters looking for the easy way out or taking debate as a required class." (Emphasis mine)

Mr. Henson proves the Council's point: Beginning kids will be attracted to try Controversy but perhaps be fearful and not try other debate events.

"Controversy will teach poor argumentation skills," argues Mr. Henson. Let me three point that: First, no evidence; second the event has barely started, how can be predict; third, a turn won't kids truly learn argument once they are freed from tabs of briefs they did not write, cases given to them at camp, and "canned" critiques which have little relationship to the specific proposition being debated? Perhaps with a new topic each month and no camp evidence and briefs available -- kids will, using ar-

(Copeland continued on page 19)
my level of comprehension or a result of too much liquor consumed by the NFL’s Executive Council. We must be able to debate premises and mindsets if we are going to avoid rearguarding issues and create a new path for argumentation – either in debate or in an activist role.

But forget forging a new path. The requirements for judging mandate the exclusion of judges who could find the old one without a GPS and a tour guide. From the only paper on this event released for publication, “A New Debate Event”:

Controversy wants to promote audience debate and media debate ( cable access, etc.,) The speaking must be very communicative. All judges must be ordinary citizens — no debate coaches, no college debaters, no ex-debaters. (Emphasis mine)

In other words, anybody qualified to judge debate is unqualified to judge Controversy. The prohibition against debate coaches judging will veil the atrociousness of this event. After all, coaches don’t have time to see rounds outside their judging requirement. Prohibiting college debaters will prevent the participants from getting meaningful feedback from those who debate on a higher level. This is especially ironic, as the only existing activity remotely resembling Controversy is college Parliamentary debate. Finally, even ex-debaters are kept out of the judging pool. I suppose the rationale is that those who have participated in legitimate debate will be incapable of listening to this nonsense without vomiting — or that such judges will require argumentation.

These rules seem to have been designed to ensure that Controversy will never improve. At least in LD and Policy, you get graduates capable of coming back and judging the event they used to compete in. This is prohibited in Controversy because the former competitors will be excluded as "ex-debaters", even if many of us maintain that Controversy is not really debate. I would go so far as to say that former Controversy competitors will be incapable of judging any forensic event. Unlike the current set-up, Controversy is not close enough to any single event to allow the former competitors to judge those. Every student that competes in Controversy is one less potential qualified judge our community can make use of. But then again, we apparently don’t value qualified judges anymore. I, and many other like me, are personally insulted that while we set new trends in Policy and LD debate for four years, we are not considered to be key to initiating a new event; instead, we explicitly excluded. I am a former LD debater, a college Policy debater at Towson University, and the Lincoln-Douglas Debate coach at the nearest high school. It appears I am excluded in all three ways. It’s insulting, and most of my college teammates who debated in high school feel the same way.

How ironic: One of the central complaints about modern debate is the elitism and exclusion. Does anyone else find it highly humorous that the group that is excluded now is the same group that will be relied on for support? Maybe the idea that those who will be needed to coach the next generation of debaters are prohibited from viewing what is intended to be the debate of the next generation will bring a chuckle to the lips of even the most hardened purists? I can assure you that we really are laughing. I daresay that most of the forensics community will join us shortly after witnessing their first Controversy round.

But we can even ignore, for a minute, the debate implications of Controversy. Instead, we should temporarily look to the effects Controversy will have on the other potentially impacted part of our community – the original speakers. Currently, the NFL recognizes Foreign and Domestic Extemporaneous Speaking (Extemp) and Original Oratory as events. There are a few competitors who focus on one of these two events, and many more who will enter into competition in multiple events, including one or both of these. For example, in my senior year of high school, I competed in LD, Oratory, and Foreign Extemp.

The divide between extemp and oratory is simple and already stated. The focus on current events, combined with the possibility of cross-entering, would encourage extempers to do Controversy as a secondary event (or possibly the other way around). Those who did this would rack up NFL points faster than a hard spread, getting debate points for Controversy and speech points for extemp. This goes a long way to remove the 500 point maximums on both speech and debate; those who cross-entered could quickly rack up points in two events where you talk about the same subjects.

These subjects change every month in Controversy, as opposed to every round in extemp. But this gives Controversy the worst of the debate and extemp worlds. Unlike debate, where topics last 2 months (LD) or the whole year (Policy), a single month will be insufficient to truly develop advanced argumentation on a topic. In oratory you at least get to talk about the same subject the whole year. In extemp, you get the sheer breadth of topics, speaking on up to 4 current-event topics in a standard local tournament. Controversy lacks the true breadth of extemp, and the true depth of debate and oratory.

But you may be left wondering how oratory will be affected. Our unusually-dressed speaking friends might well be left out entirely. If Controversy and extemp ally, as the sheer similarity of subjects and time allowance seem to make inevitable, extempers will no longer need orators. Oratory is too original to be lumped in with the interpretation events, and not analytical or adversarial enough to be considered debate. Oratory will probably be relegated to the same role of Student Congress—a curiosity among forensic connoisseurs (and an NFL qualifying event), but nothing more in many areas of the country.

In addition to the obvious problems with Controversy, there are so many semantics to be worked out. For example, how will the Controversy participants dress? Will they observe the elegant attire of the LD debaters? Will they manage the respectable speechfulness of the Policy debaters? Might they wear the suit and power ties of the extempers or the short dresses or tight shirts of the orators? Perhaps it would be most appropriate if they were to show up in multi-colored hats and pointed shoes. For while this new event may disrupt the balance of the Debate Masters, Speech Queens, and Extemp Kings, the participants in Controversy will never be anything more than Jesters.

(Chad Henson, the LD Coach at Loyola-Blakefield HS (MD), teaches at the Towson International Debate Institute and is an active college policy debater at Towson University. He moderates the lddebate.com forums, under the “Dagii” moniker.)
gumentation texts, coaching, and their own brains, learn to write their own arguments!

Mr. Henson takes umbrage in particular to rules prohibiting counterplans and critiques. One could certainly argue that the above mentioned are two of the culprits which caused the rapid decline in policy debate participation.

Mr. Henson, who by his own admission is a college debater, believes the ban on the kritik in Controversy is "...a result of too much liquor consumed by the NFL's Executive Council." This ad hominem fallacy is unworthy of any true debater. I'm sure the Council would never claim that most kritiks are composed by college debaters in a haze of pot smoke.

And if students wish to use kritiks and counterplans they are free to do so in policy debate. The fact that controversy bans these items is no more egregious than the ban on prose material in Poetry. Policy and Controversy are different events (policy is information processing, Controversy is public forum) and have different goals. Students may choose which they wish to pursue.

When one wishes to debate before the public (i.e. the Presidential Debates, the original Lincoln-Douglas debates) one's focus must be on real world issues—not arcane argumentation theory. In a debate about reform of social security on the floor of Congress, will a legislator present an anarchy counterplan or a language critique? I rather doubt it.

The new Controversy event does not eliminate Policy Debate any more than the adoption of L/D in 1980 eliminated Policy Debate. Policy is available (with spread, spew, kritiks, counterplans, Foreign and TOC legs) for all who wish to participate, and many do. But if people vote with their feet and leave an activity (scores of schools have dropped Policy Debate) that activity needs to look to its internal problems (i.e. year long topics, expense, travel, speed, off topic, argument, lack of coaches) and not blame other events for its decline.

Mr. Henson is very concerned that college debaters and college coaches are not permitted to judge Controversy rounds. Indeed they are not. Controversy is public debate and hopes to teach students to speak to the ordinary citizen. Just as lawyers are barred from jury service so college debaters will not judge Controversy. The NFL believes an event which teaches students to speak to the public will be of great educational value in a student's later life when they will be addressing juries, sales meetings, campaign audiences, city councils, church congregations and other real life communication situations.

Mr. Henson claims that "Prohibiting college debaters will prevent participants from getting meaningful feedback from debate on a higher level." I contend that prohibition of college debaters judges will keep Controversy from turning into a "show, not a shine" event.

Mr. Henson next argues "These rules seem to have been written to ensure that Controversy will never improve." Wrong! They have been designed to make sure Controversy is not Policy by the demands of college debate judges. Improvement must be measured not by the standard used for debate but by the standard of Public Forum debate: have debaters effectively argued to citizen voters.

From the above comments, it is clear that Mr. Henson, you and your college teammates must use your wisdom to Policy and L/D. Too allow you to judge Controversy is about as sensible as letting you judge Duo. You don't wish to judge the event according to its own goals; you wish to impose your goals upon it.

The reason why most high school debate coaches won't let their principal see a Policy Debate and most college debate coaches won't let their college president see a Policy Debate is that Policy is "inside baseball." Only a few elite judges are allowed to judge the elite teams and no outside thinking is allowed into the inner sanctum. Judge strikes and mutual preference judge assignments guarantee this inbreeding.

But I agree with my worthy opponent that Policy Debate may be elitist. Just as the elite in Boston said "the Cabots speak only to the Lowells, and the Lowells speak only to God," in National Circuit Policy Debate the debaters speak only to mutually acceptable "A" rated judges after their coaches have struck judges considered unacceptable. Many would argue that there is nothing wrong with this. In fact, Arthur Kruger makes a strong case that policy debate should be elite:

"If there is any analogy between academic debate and other kinds, it is between academic debate and that carried on in expert administrative and legislative government committees, before those "whose training and specialized experience give them superiority in the technical aspects of the problem."

But not every NFL event should be so specialized. Just because Humorous Interp is funny does not mean that all NFL events must also be funny. Each event has its own mission.

"My Father's house has many mansions" saith the Bible and Mr. Henson will discover that a "single pair of shoes does not fit all feet" (Confucius?). NFL offers to students a smorgasbord of opportunity by sponsoring 16 different events: Policy debate, Lincoln Douglas, Barbara Jordan Debate, Controversy, Legislative Debate, Oratory, Extempore Speaking, Duo Interp, Humorous Interp, Dramatic Interp, Prose, Poetry, Commentary, Expository, Storytelling and Impromptu. Each event designed to teach different skills. Students may specialize in a single event or experience a variety of contests. In short, each student may exercise free will. Mr. Henson's heroine, Ayn Rand would be pleased. Ms. Rand's hero Nathaniel Branden would be very pleased! And Foucault himself wrote "...nothing is more arrogant than trying to dictate to others."

NFL needed an event which trained students to debate current issues before lay audiences, school administrators, and on local access TV. Controversy is the right start in that direction. Controversy has no function if it becomes Policy: Part Deux.

Mr. Henson took his inspiration from Eminent, I take my inspiration from Lennon and McCartney.

Controversy? "Let It Be!"

(James M. Copeland coached National Circuit Policy Debate for 25 years. His team closed out TOC, NCFL, Emory's Barkley Forum and reached the finals once and semi four times at NFL nationals. He has been NFL Secretary since 1986. He is the author of Cross Examination in Debate.)
Mental Health Handbooks

1st Affirmative Casebook
- Over 10 fully scripted winning and useable affirmative cases
- All evidence exceeds NFL documentation requirements
- Evidence printed on one side of page for easy rebriefing
- Extension evidence on each argument
- Answers to generic and case specific Disads
- On-point coaching advice (a Dale exclusive)

1st Negative Casebook
- Well developed T positions with explanations and extensions
- Generic and case specific harm and inherency positions in block form
- Extension evidence for rebuttals on each argument
- Counterplans directly relevant to topic with explanations and warnings about use

2nd Negative Casebook
- Generic Disads with shells and extension blocks
- Case-specific link cards
- Case-specific and generic solvency blocks
- Strategy tips

PRICES
- 1st Affirmative: $25.00
- 1st Negative: $25.00
- 2nd Negative: $25.00
- Dale Complete set: $65.00

BEST VALUE!
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Dale Publishing and Tape Distribution Center have moved. We will still be providing you with the same quality products, only from a different location.

Our new address is:
Dale Publishing Co./Tape Distribution Center
PO Box 347
Independence, MO 64050

Phone (816) 350-9277
Fax (816) 350-9377
2002 NATIONALS VIDEOS

Final Round Videos from Charlotte, NC
(and every year since 1983)

Video allows you to truly expand your travel and instruction budget. Give every student the visual advantage of seeing the NFL National Tournament final rounds! The National Forensic League will receive a significant royalty from every tape sold.

PRICES

Cross Examination $74.95
Lincoln Douglas $74.95
International Extemp $74.95
United States Extemp $74.95
Original Oratory $74.95
Complete Set (of 5) BEST VALUE! $310.00
Awards Assembly $74.95
Supp. Events (Impromptu, Ex. Comm., Expos.) $74.95

We DO NOT accept credit cards.
Please add 12% shipping for P.O.s
Please specify years desired.
Selection errors are purchaser's responsibility.
Due to copyright law, we are unable to sell interpretation events.
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Whitman National Debate Institute

July 27 - August 7, 2003 (2 week session)
July 27 - August 13, 2003 (3 week session)

hosted by Whitman College, Quarters, 2002 NDT, Tenth, 2002 NPTE

Why Whitman's camp?

1. Individual attention: 4 to 1 staff to student ratio and the vast majority of your time will be spent in small labs with four to six people and a staff member, not in a lecture room with 100 people; not in a lab with 12 to 16 people with two staff members.

2. Practice and drills. You won't just do debates at the end of camp. You will do drills with clear feedback throughout the camp.

3. Research. We put out hundreds and hundreds of pages of cases and briefs with strategies that win debates.

4. Instruction diversity. You won't get stuck in one lab with one or two lab leaders you might not work with best. We rotate labs so you work with all of our staff members.

5. Family feel. People at our camp feel connected, not isolated. Whether you are shy, into sports, critical, outgoing, whatever, you'll find your niche. We make an effort to reach out to students, to build up community, and to give people space to be who they are.

Policy Debate

You experience top-notch instruction in the arguments, theory, and strategies you need to win on the 2003-2004 high school topic.

- Ideas for cases, disadvantages, counterplans, etc.
- Intense analysis of the wording of the 2003-2004 topic
- Lectures on kritiks, counterplans, strategies, performance, and rebuttals

You won't just hear about these arguments. You will practice plan inclusive counterplans, kritiks, permutations and more specific to this topic. And, when you practice, you won't just talk. Our staff of nationally competitive debaters and coaches will give you specific suggestions for improvement and you'll rework your speeches.

Our camp works hard to produce the briefs you need to be successful during the year. You will leave camp with completely indexed and shelled briefs including affirmative cases, backup briefs, responses to key topic cases, disadvantage, kritik and counterplan shells with backup briefs and responses; and topicality arguments, definitions, and responses.

LD Debate

You receive an outstanding, well-rounded training in Lincoln-Douglas debate to make you nationally and regionally competitive. You'll be part of intensive discussions on:

- Arguments to use for criteria, values, contingencies, and philosophies
- Key aspects of the 2004 NFL LD topics
- Lectures on judge adaptation, rebuttals, innovative strategies that win

You will work closely with our staff to develop your skills in making these arguments. You won't just hear about Rawls or Foucault. You will engage in many debates with critiques and redos plus practice sessions covering rebuttation, rebuilding arguments, cross-examination, philosophy, values and criteria. You will leave with affirmative and negative cases on the NFL-LD topics plus briefs on key values and criteria to use on any topic.

Everyone at camp receives all the policy or LD arguments produced while you are at the camp with no extra charges.

LD and Policy

Want more information?

E-mail Jim Hanson at hansonjb@whitman.edu

www.whitman.edu/offices_departments/rhetoric/camp/

Want policy and LD evidence from the 2002 camp? See our website.
Policymaker's Fact Sheet on the Mental Health System

Who is affected by Mental Illness?

- One in every five adults, or about 40 million Americans, experiences some type of mental disorder every year.
- Of this number, 5% have a serious mental illness, such as schizophrenia, major depression or bipolar disorder.
- Deinstitutionalization has far too often tragically meant moving people with serious mental illnesses from hospitals to homeless shelters, the streets, jails and prisons.
- Mental disorders cross all boundaries of race, gender and ethnicity, although the prevalence of some disorders is higher for some population groups:
  - Women and Hispanics are more likely to experience a major depressive episode.
  - Younger people—ages 15 to 24—are more likely to experience a major depressive episode.
  - Elderly Americans are the demographic group most likely to commit suicide.
  - Among children in the United States, 1 in 10 children and adolescents suffer from mental illness severe enough to cause some level of impairment.
  - Recent evidence compiled by the World Health Organization indicates that by the year 2020, childhood neuropsychiatric disorders will rise proportionately by over 50% internationally, to become one of the five most common causes of morbidity, mortality and disability among children.
  - Suicide is the 3rd leading cause of death among teens, followed only by accidents and homicide.
  - Between 50% to 75% of youth in juvenile justice facilities suffer from a diagnosable mental health disorder and frequently do not receive counseling, treatment or support.

How Well Are Needs Met?

- Fewer than one-third of adults and half of children with a diagnosable mental disorder receive any level of treatment in any one year.
- An estimated 25% of homeless people suffer from serious mental illness. Some groups put that number as high as 50%.
Today, it is estimated that only 1 in 5 children suffering from a mental illness receives mental health services, with unmet needs as high today as it was 20 years ago.  

16% of people in jails and prisons suffer from a serious mental illness.

A NAMI national survey revealed that 23% of parents and caregivers with children with mental illness were told by a state official that they must relinquish custody of their child to the state to receive mental health services and 20% of them actually relinquished custody.

Health care insurers place arbitrary and discriminatory caps on benefits for serious brain disorders like brain disorders like bipolar disorder, schizophrenia and others.

What Does the Mental Health System Look Like?

Caring for people with mental disorders involves myriad providers, services and settings.

Mental health services are provided by psychiatrists (physicians specializing in the diagnosis and treatment of mental illnesses and are able to prescribe medication), clinical psychologists (most of whom have doctorates in psychology and are licensed as specialists in the diagnosis and treatment of mental disorders), social workers, professional counselors, and other service providers, such as general practitioners, occupational therapists, school counselors and school psychologists.

Services range from medical and clinical services (prescribing of medications, counseling and psychotherapy) to psychosocial rehabilitation and assertive treatment services that assist people with severe illnesses in living successfully in the community to services designed to help people with mental illnesses find employment or housing.

Jails, prisons and juvenile facilities have all too often become the treatment facilities for adults, children and adolescents with mental illnesses.

Most private insurance benefit plans unfairly and arbitrarily limit access to needed mental health services. This reflects the historic stigma and misunderstanding surrounding mental health treatment, although mental disorders are typically as treatable as general medical conditions.

A growing body of evidence has demonstrated that most people with mental illnesses who need treatment can be treated more effectively and at less cost in community settings than traditional psychiatric hospitals. Today, fewer than 70,000 people receive mental health services as inpatients in state hospitals.

What Roles Do the Private and Public Sectors Play in Providing Mental Health Services?

Most types of mental health services are available in both the private and public sectors, and individuals often receive services in both sectors.
Private providers may be nonprofit or for-profit, and may offer an array of services that include inpatient hospitalization, partial hospitalization, outpatient counseling and psychotherapy.

The public system often serves people who lack private health insurance or whose private health insurance has bumped up against inpatient or outpatient visit limitations. It provides a range of inpatient and outpatient mental health treatment, rehabilitation and support services.

Publicly financed treatment plays a key role in the overall mental health service-delivery system. Public sector spending accounts for approximately 53% of all spending on mental health and substance abuse treatment services. In comparison, the public sector is the payer for 47% of total personal health care spending.14

Medicaid accounts for more than 50% of state and local mental health spending and is expected to reach 60% by 2007. Medicaid is nearly 15% of many states' budget. It is second only to education in total state spending.

The public system is administered by state mental health agencies and financed through state appropriations, Medicaid, and programs of the federal Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). Many states rely on counties and county-based providers to deliver services in the community.

How Effective is Mental Health Treatment?

Diagnoses of mental disorders made using specific criteria are as reliable as those for general medical disorders, according to the Surgeon General's Report.15

Policymaker Fact Sheet on Mental Health System

Following more than two decades of significant scientific advances and improvements in behavioral and biological treatments, mental disorders are as treatable today as general medical conditions.

Treatment effectiveness rates for disorders like Schizophrenia, Bi-polar illness, Major Depression, Panic Disorder, and Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder compare favorably with such well-established general medical or surgical treatments as angioplasty or atherectomy for heart disease, which have success rates at or below 50%.

Treatment success rates for other non-severe mental and emotional disorders are also high, if not higher.

Treatment for Severe Disorders

As with certain general medical conditions, such as diabetes, some cases of mental illness must be categorized as long-term, severe and persistent. Increasingly, individuals with such disorders can focus on recovery and their well-being and quality of life can be significantly improved with access to services.
Mental health treatments are provided in a variety of settings, including inpatient hospitals, day treatment programs, assertive treatment programs, psychosocial rehabilitation programs, residential providers and the offices of private service providers.

The most effective service system is one that combines a full range of treatment options, with assistance in securing affordable housing, income support, health care services, employment training, social services, social and recreational opportunities and, as needed, the most effective medication as prescribed by their physician.

For individuals with co-occurring mental illness and addictive disorders, integrated treatment interventions delivered simultaneously at the same treatment site by staff trained in both mental health and addictive disorders treatment, is more effective than sequential or parallel treatment of each disorder.

Notes

2. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Sourcebook. SAMHSA, Department of Health and Human Services (1995)
3. Ibid
6. Id. at p.11
12. Families on the Brink: The Impact of Ignoring Children with Serious Mental Illness. NAMI 1999
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Introduce and Improve Communication 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.

Applications Communication
For Personal and Professional Contexts
©2001
Interpersonal, professional, and group communication skills for lifelong use

This comprehensive text uses a decision based approach to help students learn about effective and ethical communication. A SPAM framework helps students plan communication based on Situation, Purpose, Audience, and Method.

The 25 chapters are organized into four units
- communication basics
- interpersonal communication
- group communication
- public communication

Each chapter begins with student objectives, vocabulary, and a short workplace scenario. Chapters conclude with a summary and four levels of activities—remembering, reflecting, teaching, and real-life. The text also addresses communicating with new technologies, such as email, voice mail, and the Internet.

A Teacher Guide saves you time with teaching suggestions for each chapter, grading forms, and quizzes with answer keys.

38 Basic Speech Experiences
10th Edition ©1999
Step-by-step practice for real world public speaking

This comprehensive text is written for those who want to teach and learn public speaking by the simple process of giving speeches. From the first day, students are actively involved in speaking activities. Each of the 38 chapters has all the information needed for students to prepare and present a speech—time limits, model speeches, suggested topics, outlining, organizing, and research strategies.

In addition to informative, persuasive, motivational, and entertaining speeches, the chapters cover real-life speaking situations, including
- business and career speaking
- special occasion speaking
- contest speaking
- speaking for the mass media

The extensive Teacher Guide includes chapter notes, a bibliography, quizzes and answer keys, reproducible activities, and post-creation forms.

Call or visit our Web site today for a FREE catalog and product samplers!
Phone: (800) 831-4196 • Fax: (800) 543-2745 • Web: perfectionlearning.com
Three Great Ways to Use SummerDebate.com...

A Summer Debate Institute
- Work with great lab leaders and America's finest faculty.
- Learn the topic and debate theory.
- Learn online at your convenience from June 1 - August 15.
- Extremely Affordable!  
  Policy: $549
  LD $299 or LD (Topic only) $199

A Comprehensive Classroom Resource
- Summer coach participants can use the program, in which they participate as an online textbook for their own students.
- Program includes self-grading quizzes and assignments for each appropriate unit.
- Online text, access for only $25 per student.

Summer School or Professional Development
- Institute students can earn 3 optional credits through Marquette University (375 fee).
- Coaches participating in the institute can earn three optional continuing education units through Marquette University (300 fee).
- Coaches can learn to teach the program as an online course to their own students during the school year.

Visit www.SummerDebate.com
HOW VERY SMALL DEBATE PROGRAMS CAN ACHIEVE NATIONAL SUCCESS

by
David M. Cheshier

In the summertime I enjoy the extraordinary pleasure of working with the very bright students who attend the Dartmouth Debate Institute. Typical of the major summer programs, the students there reflect the range of American high school debaters. Because the national debate circuit is dominated by a set of large and well supported programs, their students tend to numerically dominate. Every summer, though, I end up talking and working with students who don't fit this "profile" — maybe they come from a part of the country not regularly competing at the big national tournaments, or they have been sent to New Hampshire by a very small or under-resourced program.

Now don't get me wrong. I bear no ill will whatsoever toward the big programs, which succeed thanks to the accumulated hard work of many wonderful students and coaches, often reflecting years of sacrifice and struggle. Because of the great instructional support systems in place on those squads, their students are likely to do well in national competition year after year, and so I do not even disagree that they numerically dominate the top workshops.

But I have to confess: as much as I like any debater who wants to learn and work hard, I often cannot help but root for the small program underdog. Partly this reflects my personal history. Back during the Civil War when I debated in high school, in a very small program in northwest Indiana, there was never much more to the debate program than me and my partner. The program started when I and a friend
expressed interest in debate while 9th graders, and it ended fairly soon after I graduated. Wonderful teachers worked with me at Harrison High School in West Lafayette (Purdue country), but they weren't particularly committed or trained to teach debate.

I vividly remember how thrilled I was to gain admission to Wake Forest University, which I chose on the strength of their summer workshop reputation. But in sharp contrast to their present day size and strength, I was surprised to find how small a college program Wake Forest was back then. Though this would sound absurd to those familiar with WFU's now impressive efforts, I often recall feeling that I debated for a very small squad.

Both my high school and college experiences thus gave me an intimate sense of the frustration of encountering much bigger competitors. But I was also fortunate to succeed in both environments. To this day I am awestruck by the skill Ross Smith and Allan Linden showed in preparing me for competition, often very much against the odds — and today I can only imagine the challenges I created for them as an arrogant 18-year-old (hey, I had made it all the way to the Indiana State final round!). But I benefited immeasurably from their dedication and intellect, and will always be grateful for the enthusiasm they showed for good argument, not to mention their considerable patience.

Since college I've seen the playing field from every vantage point: I've had the good fortune of working with mega-programs, where success seems to come (I hesitate even to say it) easily. And I've also had the good fortune of working with programs where success is a much tougher nut to crack. Here's the point of this tour of my tortured past: After all this, I remain an optimist about the capacity of students from smaller programs to succeed. In what follows, I want to offer a little advice about why I remain optimistic, and in the most practical way, with specific suggestions for how to maneuver in an environment with few resources.

I passionately believe this: Although debate is in too many respects a game rigged to reward the wealthy, the lack of money (and the resources it provides — coaching, prepared materials, travel) is not finally an obstacle to success. With intelligence and hard work and just a little creativity, the advantages bestowed by big bucks can be neutralized. And I don't simply mean: "Beat your head against the wall for ten years, and then maybe some day you'll fluke into the octagonal somewhere so you can be savagely destroyed by the 9th team from Megasucks Academy in front of their minion fans." No! I mean that with dedication you and your small program can win it all. How can this be?

Three Derailing Myths

When I talk with students who are trying to strategize success from the perspective of limited resources, I often hear them express a couple points of view which I find, though reasonable, derailing. These myths are worth brief mention since you may believe them too:

It's us against the world: it's all a matter of "rep," and we don't have any. There is a pervasive sense, even among some coaches I talk with, that success is invariably affected by a school's reputation. The somewhat inbred nature of the national circuit understandably reinforces this impression — national coaches talk to successful debaters, and sometimes have worked with them over the summer-time. Because of the more frequent nature of their interaction, it's easy to believe that nationally successful debaters are the beneficiaries of a secret system of reward.

But that view gets it wrong, seriously wrong. The vast majority of judges work very hard to set aside whatever preferences they have when they judge. And presuming that some judges are predisposed to vote for "winners," they are usually as much disposed to champion the underdog. A strong reputation can be earned by hard work, increasing success, and an openness to improvement. The view to the contrary is nothing more than a psychological barrier which will interfere with your true potential.

We can never beat them: they're too rich! They have all those assistants! Money does matter, no question about it. Programs with access to more money can pay for expensive subscriptions to online databases, travel more widely to national tournaments, and retain the services of additional assistance. I don't intend to deny any of this — when faced with a choice between a $1000 or a $100,000 budget, who wouldn't choose the latter? But I do want to insist that the marginal added value of extra money is easy to exaggerate. As one coach told me a while back, a good friend: "The older I get, the more I realize how unsuccessful programs can just as easily spend $80,000 as ones that win everything!" It is true that big budgets buy research assistants, but the work product of those assistants is often unreliable, and since debaters have not immersed themselves in the argument production, their ability to defend even strong arguments is diminished. And money enables more frequent national travel. But this national interaction soon reaches its own limits: students who travel nationally all the time are the first ones to burn out on the activity, and in the age of email and listservs one need not be present everywhere to acquire a good sense of what new arguments are run there. There is no good reason for debaters to forego weekends of potential work to be debating every single October, November, and January weekend.

As for the assistant issue, the perceived need to connect to a college program is a common one, and programs with access often try to get help from the best available debaters. Sometimes the assistance is wonderful, but sometimes college debaters end up imposing their own pet arguments on teams, sometimes to their detriment. And it can be pretty hard to get useful work out of assistants-for-hire.

We're doomed to run tiny affirmatives and a kritik my whole life. The genesis of this thinking is a little different, and not as thoroughly defeatist as the other myths I've mentioned. Here's the logic behind the sentiment: "We have very few students debating, and not much access or time for heavy year-long research. So the obviously smart strategic alternative is to think small: we'll run one critical argument all the time on the negative, and a little tiny, preferably non-topical affirmative all year too (after all, if we're topical we'd link to all their generics!)."

This way of thinking is common, but often wrongheaded. The problem is that teams often gravitate to this approach even when they debate on a circuit which resists support for one critique round after round, and which may insist on fairly mainstream affirmatives. But even when the circuit is amenable to these choices, they often do not pay off competitively. The big programs will be deep on your critical position no less than they would be on a, say, politics argument. A trade-off can develop, where the team ends up with real expertise on their critique but find the battle to make it link every time is soon uphill, as their opponents learn how to adjust over repeated encounters. And even if you try to slightly diversify, word soon gets around that what you intend to extend is the one preferred position (critique, states, Bush/Iraq).

I also think this approach can be counterproductive since it
doesn't necessarily get you off the hook for doing the extended week-to-week work of updating the bigger positions. Whatever affirmative you run, opponents will run their generics, and they will soon catch up and overtake you if your main answers consist of one-trick turns or takeouts. By a month or so into the season, you'll be scrambling to get caught up either way.

Still, although I've identified this last issue as another myth to be avoided, it does take us in the right direction since it evidences some degree of strategic thinking at work. With some more careful thinking, this direction can yield consistent and year-long success. And yet, other important issues remain, and this brings me to more specific advice.

But There's Not Enough Time!

The greatest frustration of debating in a small program is the absence of time. There just aren't enough hours in the day to keep up with the larger machines. I see many debaters who drown all year just doing weekly updates on the major positions, and then when you add in the difficulty of doing work on a new affirmative, and practice, and money raising, it can quickly become an impossible situation. Here are some ideas:

Run a popular summer affirmative, but with a twist. Some small programs start with the assumption that they need to write brand new affirmatives, but although that can pay off, it also commits you to a high risk strategy. New affirmatives take up a disproportionate amount of preparation time, and at the time of year when time is most precious, before the first tournament. Further, they are risky simply on account of their novelty: because the affirmative has never been run before, it can be very hard to anticipate what teams will say against it. Worse, when teams from big programs (with their deep backfiles) encounter a new affirmative, they are likely to simply pull out their old mega-files, and you start from behind.

I recommend instead that you consider running a case on which the basic mechanics have been briefed by high quality summerers, but that you spend your preparation time modifying the case so that it contains new tricks. Think about the difficulties the case encountered in the summer: how can the plan be changed to address or provide you with strategic options against them? Pick a case that is basically true, and therefore likely to hold up well over time — that is, avoid one trick cases that only obligate you to additional research projects as the year continues.

In my view this approach — old cases, new twists — has benefits. It frees the best debater from the time intensive process of writing a major affirmative for national use from scratch. Instead, when the basic case has a track record of sorts, you are better equipped to anticipate what teams will say. And there is a tournament bonus too. When other good teams ask what you're running, the news which will spread around will emphasize the label knows ("oh, they run eating disorders"). Thus diverting attention from the fact that you've developed hard and creative at-tournament strategies, such as having them hone in on the tricks you've built in, which will travel more slowly.

Practice what you run on the negative; start by concentrating on what you'll have to research anyway, for the pressure affirmative. Here's what I mean: If you know the affirmative is especially vulnerable to the "courts," then why not make the courts counterplan a focus of strategy? If you do, the research you accomplish will benefit you whatever side you're debating on.

Another important aspect of time management is partnership coordination. Maybe you have a colleague who has much less experience, or other priorities more important than debate. The problem arises when the more experienced partner starts to resent their colleague's relatively less than total support. But this can be negotiated, and ought to be: Make explicit arrangements with your partner so work expectations are clear. Is your partner only willing to work three hours a week outside of tournaments? Fine — coordinate that time so it is at least productive.

Take off weekends between tournaments to get serious work done. A lot of high school debaters I know go to too many tournaments — they feel as if they have to literally travel every weekend, and so a season may include an absurdly high number of events, maybe even upwards of twenty. But that number is outrageously high, and is bound not only to subvert your debate preparation but your schoolwork as well. Far better to schedule major tournaments so they are fairly evenly spaced over the season — about, in a given month, a regional tournament weekend one, weekend two off, a national tournament on the third weekend, and the fourth weekend off for work? It may surprise you to realize how great a work time compensation this can produce relative to larger programs, whose coaches are literally on the road nonstop and scrambling to get their own work done.

Find time to get work done at tournaments. I'm often surprised at how much time gets wasted by students from big programs at tournaments. Sometimes they are distracted by the sheer number of students and coaches hanging around, so it seems like they're just chatting or playing all the time. Or maybe they are having to wait around for the big bus to come rolling around. Either way, you can compensate somewhat for the time differences if you remain focused and disciplined at tournaments. As I've tried to stress many times, this does not require you to give up tournament fun or friendships. If you simply take the fifteen minutes immediately following every debate and put it to productive use you'll be surprised at how much new work you accomplish.

Time can be saved in other ways. For instance, I urge you to take full advantage of web-based information sources. And I'm not referring to Lexis-Nexis or web-based news sources, as important as those obviously are. I'm talking instead about debate resources, like the case lists and judge philosophy lists that have sprouted up. Those information sources are great equalizers, since even five years ago only the big programs commanded the resources necessary to collect information so complete.

Do you feel like your at-home time is stolen by novices you're responsible for coaching? Online materials can help you there too. The University of Vermont debate site, Planet Debate, includes hours of web-based video material which can be used to teach novices while you get other work done in the background.

The time deficit relative to the big programs usually gets worse as the year continues. Think about finding times in your own schedule where intensive work can be accomplished. Obviously you should especially coordinate at the start of the year. I've written before about the need for very specific organization at the start of the year. But it's also important, if you can manage it, to find a week or so during the midterm holiday period for a mid-year work push. Setting aside the first full week in January, or the week between Christmas and New Year's for major work will pay major dividends, and often give you an edge against bigger programs whose students may feel confident enough to take a more considerable holiday break. I'm often surprised at how few major
new affirmatives and positions are run at the early January tournaments, such as at the Montgomery Bell tournament right after New Year’s.

But We Just Don’t Have the Money!

Let’s face it — no one has enough money, and the solutions to constant resource pressures are varied. Given the diverse creative ways by which programs pay their bills, I wouldn’t presume to laundry list them here, or give a recommendation to certain strategies over others. Some have found apparently permanent success in acquiring funding from school boards or parent groups, others by institutionalizing successful money-making projects. And every forensics coach in America has explored the many possibilities for saving money: six kids to a room, sharing hotel rooms with other schools, relying on parents and students for transportation, fee swapping, and more.

I do want to mention one possibility that has less to do with making and raising money than with locating research resources. It is one of the ugly secrets of contemporary debate that too many students acquire access to the Lexis-Nexis database by use of bootleg passwords, sometimes provided by friendly law students. To some extent this problem has been reduced by the wider availability of Lexis-Nexis Universe, a web-based subscription option regularly utilized by large institutional subscribers. Universe accesses the same large database as that manipulated by paying law customers, but uses a simpler search engine.

There is much to be said about the benefits of Universe, which is now available in most large university libraries. What you may not know about the Universe pricing system is that institutions are charged based on the number of potential in-house users. Thus, you should make a point of approaching your high school librarian or media specialists, for the purpose of recommending that he or she inquire to see how much a school-wide subscription might cost. The price for a school-wide subscription is often surprisingly manageable. And if this is so, high school media specialists might be more easily persuaded to seek support for institutional access than you might think, since the idea that every student in the school would have online access to the full database of hundreds of newspapers and law reviews should be imately attractive.

If the answer from your media specialist is “no!,” then there are still options remaining for students who desperately need legal access to regularly updated newspaper databases. Consider, for example, collaborating with friends from other programs who do have legal access to databases. What information resources can you exchange with them to receive legally downloaded articles? My point is not that you circumvent the proprietary interests of the Lexis-Nexis corporation, but simply that you consider ways to generate your own work product (that is, briefs produced out of books and other hard copy resources) which you can then exchange on a limited basis with trustworthy collaborators at other schools who will mainly generate positions out of newspaper databases. I’ll say a bit more about these limited trading arrangements in a bit.

But I’m the Only Experienced Debsater!

This is a common circumstance, and I want to just mention advice that will seem, and is, basic common sense, but which if carefully implemented can compensate for the real limitations of being the only experienced debater in a program.

It is especially important to find ways to make your novices productive assistants without exploiting them. As a senior or relatively more experienced debater, you will likely be assigned some responsibility for supervising and training novices. There are more and less productive ways to make this arrangement mutually beneficial. Obviously, younger debaters may be willing to assist you in evidence processing, although I think seeking such help from them can quickly become exploitive — much as senior debaters might like it. To the contrary, novices are human beings and not slaves.

It is better to find ways to involve younger debaters in activities that both ease your workload and also contribute to their own education as competitors. After positions have been produced by you or others with some experience, supervise novice debaters in how best to explain the position and in drills where they debate each other. You’ll find that this kind of specific coaching improves your own understanding of the argument. You might want to consider collaborating in argument production with younger students who show lots of raw talent. Consider supervising two or three simultaneously working novice groups, where you oversee card cutting and research production.

Make an explicit work arrangement with your partner. If one student has considerably more experience than the other, the situation can be combustible. The more advanced student may see success more closely within reach, and thus may be more motivated than her or his colleague, and that can increase tension too. As I alluded to earlier, I think this problem must be addressed in a productive and well-planned way as early as possible. Instead of forever nagging your colleague to invest more time in debate work, have an honest conversation up front, at the year’s start, about the realistic and actual likely work contribution your partner is willing to be held accountable for. If the hours promised vary widely week to week on account of school and other responsibilities, it won’t be a problem if the arrangement is agreed to beforehand. And more than negotiating hours, agree up front on the major positions which you and your partner commit to fully preparing for tournament use. Negotiating specific agreements for practice and tournament schedules can often help too.

I also recommend that you organize very specific trading arrangements with good debaters you trust from other schools. Like most coaches, I oppose wholesale trading, especially the swaps that often occur immediately before big debates — it’s hard to see how evidence changing hands at that point contributes to the educational process.

But if you lack a squad that can offer research support, I think it’s reasonable to create an extended squad. Pick three or four friends in similar circumstances. Make sure they work hard and are basically on your wavelength. Then, make specific assignments to be exchanged at the tournaments you’ll attend together. One might agree to bring politics updates, another a new disadvantage, another a refuted critical argument, and so on. To avoid disillusionment, set specific page targets, so everyone is making a roughly equal contribution. To avoid possible awkwardness, agree up front that these arguments become the common property of everyone, which means you can even run them against each other when you end up debating. And to avoid promissory trading (after all, that defeats the purpose of the arrangement in the first place), make an explicit deal that only your three or four schools may use this evidence in competition, that it won’t be traded more widely.
Finally, two pieces of obvious but no less vital advice. Pick research assignments that are manageable and productive before a team or case. I mean this in the most basic sense. Some experienced debaters end up bogged down either in the long production of a new affirmative which may never see the light of day or obsessing about the Big Case which their most significant competitor prefers. This is wrongheaded, apart for some very narrow exceptions (such as the specific process required in planning end-of-the-year events): instead of picking the weird case for which you have no apparent response, only runnable by one team, make research priorities by perusing the overall list of cases you need to answer. Where can your research achieve the most “bang for the buck”?

Related to this is the imperative that you work especially hard to stay organized. I am often surprised by the number of major program teams who seem positively disadvantaged by the amount of evidence they carry, since they can’t possibly have had the time to read through it all, and their apparently disorganized obliterates the chance of finding the critical page at the critical moment. The result is a filing fiasco where paper is strewn everywhere. I’m also regularly surprised to see how commonly students from smaller programs seem unable to put their hands on a critical piece of evidence. This is obvious but true: If you can’t find it, it may as well not exist.

But My Coach Doesn’t Provide Detailed Argument Instruction!

Debaters from small programs sometimes feel disadvantaged, and reasonably so, because they lack access to well-organized and argument-specific coaching help. Coaches tend to get more credit than they deserve, both for their students’ successes and failures. Still, coaching helps, and good coaches can help their students stay focused on the task at hand.

In my experience, debaters tend to needlessly disparage the possible contributions of their coach, or activity adviser, or program sponsor. They do so because they mistakenly believe that unless the coach is card cutting, he or she cannot provide important assistance. But such a view is way off the mark. Even our metaphors lead us astray here: we talk about coaches as needing to be “in the trenches,” helping to make arguments. The inference is that anything different is instruction at a distance. But debaters need support in many ways, and even if your coach is educationally opposed to generating research (as many are), they can assist you in countless other ways which will enable your education.

It’s important to appreciate your coach for what he or she does. Be grateful for any commitment of time coaches are able to make, since it is an exceptional sacrifice for an overworked teacher (as all of them are) to commit to any support to forensics activities.

Have your coach listen to you do rebuttal rehearsals after tournaments. It saddens me when coaches pull back from providing assistance because of their impression the students they serve are inadequate.

In a worst case scenario, where a program simply lacks access to any reliable teacher support, there are still ways to acquire coaching support from the tournament experience. For instance, it’s indispensable to ask good judges for specific advice after they hear you. Engage your smartest opponents in detailed conversations — see what they do and then integrate their best ideas into your own practice. Carefully read through prepared materials, since they often offer tutorials on the most current controversies in theory and practice. Watch and pay attention (that is, take notes) to elimination round debates. Copy down evidence citations, and if a citation proves unavailable to you, network with your friends from other schools to see if they can track it down for you.

Some other thoughts on the idea of stealing the smart ideas of your opponents: I don’t so much have in mind that you should wholesale rip off the major affirmatives being run in your area; obviously the advantages of such a strategy are limited. But I encourage you to freely borrow at what one might call the “micro” level. Every smart debater has ways of expressing her ideas, mechanisms for explaining the big picture and the overall story, that help them win in close major debates. When those explanations can help you, integrate them into your own debating.

Students usually avoid watching elimination rounds where their own affirmative is being run; after all, why watch something you already know? But if you lack coaching or an experienced second team against whom to have practice debates, these elimination rounds can be invaluable. Carefully flow the first negative, and then set the flow aside. When you are back at home, prepare your own 2AC against the arguments you wrote down. Compare notes with the arguments actually presented in the elimination debate you watched, and see if you can benefit by copying tricks used there.

Finally: read, read, read, practice, practice, practice. Lack the benefits of a strong at-home debate peer group, one simply has to compensate by more fully immersing him or herself in the topic arguments, participating more actively in the major debate bulletin boards and listservs, and practicing whenever possible.

Conclusions: The Limits of Optimism

It’s easier to spin out a series of tips than to find the discipline to implement them. And even after all the extra work entailed by debating for a smaller program, let’s be honest: It will still prove very difficult to defeat well-prepared teams from major schools.

Still, the number of teams from small schools who do manage to succeed must be doing something right, and whatever they’re doing you can do too. And when victory does come, it will be all the sweeter if it’s the result of your own personal initiative and disciplined hard work. The considerable benefits of extended participation in national circuit debate will be all the richer. Good luck, and get to work!

(David M. Chesnier is Assistant Professor of Communications and Director of Debate at Georgia State University. His column appears monthly in the Rostum.)

### Lincoln Financial Group/NFL National Tournament

**June 15 - 20, 2003**

**Georgia State University**

**Atlanta, Georgia**
2002 saw the Inaugural Congress Tournament of Champions establish itself as a premier event in high school forensics.

This year, join us in perpetuating the newest and most competitive Student Congress tradition as we assemble the best legislators, coaches and judges from across the country.

CTOC II

April 10th - 13th, 2003

* Nova Southeastern University
  Ft. Lauderdale, FL

For all official tournament information, including:
  * How to Qualify for CTOC
  * Hotel Reservations
  * At-Large Bids

visit

SEVENTH DIAMOND COACHES

********Roger Brannan
Manhattan HS, KS
December 3, 2001
19,770 points

One of the giants in NFL history is Roger Brannan. Dubbed the "Mahatma of Manhattan" his famous Kansas teams cut a wide swath through the Jayhawk State for 35 years, while he and his wife Doris set a standard of service to others with their professionalism and competence.

Roger, elected to the NFL Hall of Fame in 1990, has been feted with nearly every NFL honor: three Gold Chair Awards; the Distinguished Service Key, four distinguished service plaques, and election to the NFL Executive Council, where he served with great distinction.

Mr. Brannan's ability was always evident in the honors achieved by his large squads: leading chapter awards in 1972, 1981 and 1990; largest chapter fifteen times (4 times in the U.S. top 10); nine district sweepstakes plaques and four district sweepstakes trophies.

His debate team and individual students won Kansas State Tournaments with regularity. At nationals, Roger qualified 68 students to the tournament and 17 to the Congress.

Mr. Brannan coached a National Champion in Girls Exttemp in 1979, as well as five students who placed in the top four in Congress.

Roger's service to NFL includes both holding district and national office, state office, and critical positions at Nationals, including coordinator of double entries, debate tab, speech tab, Ombudsman and serving on the Protect Committee. Doris has served as speech auditor.

He is now NFL historian and is capturing the oral and video history of NFL. Roger also is President of the Manhattan, Kansas, School Board where he continues to serve students.

Nicknamed "Mr. Integrity" by Secretary James Copeland, Roger is one of the greatest NFL citizens of all time.

********Dr. Jane Eldridge
Goodpasture HS, TN
February 5, 2002
22,911 points

The Doctor is fit! She is in contention to be NFL's leading diamond coach of all time - one of only seven (and the only woman) to earn NFL's prestigious seventh diamond award.

Her glittering career is unmatched in NFL history. Few have been so honored: winner of the Thomas Gilmore Pelham Commendation for "devotion to the forensic art"; winner of the Ralph E. Carey Trophy for "Distinguished Career Service"; winner of the NFL District Chair Gold Award and elected to both the NFL and Tennessee Speech Halls of Fame. Jane has set a standard for service to the profession that may never be equaled.


Jane has earned the Barkley Forum Gold Key, the NFL Distinguished Service Key and the Distinguished Service Plaque.

A fine coach of all events, Jane's debate teams have won the Barkley Forum and Bi-Centennial Forum in debate and the NFL Nationals in Congress.

Dr. Eldridge has served as co-director of Congress and co-director of Exttemp Prep at the National Tournament.

Her distinguished career at three schools: Madison, Hunter's Lane, and Goodpasture yielded three Leading Chapter Awards, a district plaque and four district trophies.

NFL congratulates Dr. Jane Eldridge for earning seven diamonds; a great honor for a Great Lady of Speech.
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS TOPIC BRIEFS

We’re back!!
For the Jan-Feb and Mar-Apr topics
and forthcoming LD seasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single Issue</th>
<th>Half-Year Subscription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Diskette</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or CD-ROM</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comprehensive Lincoln Douglas Topic Briefs (50 pp.)
- Two affirmative and two negative cases
- Specific and originally researched topic area briefs
- Not a collection of downloaded paste-ups from on-line text retrieval.

David Berube, Ph.D., Editor in Chief
Assoc. Prof., University of South Carolina
Author of Non-Policy Debating and over 30 published non-policy debate theory articles in refereed journals.

StarMakers' track record:
We have published over 50 brief books
for university and high school communities in the USA and abroad.

Either e-mail orders to alpstarmakers@earthlink.net or
send purchase orders, check or money order and a copy of this ad to:
StarMakers Communications, 1200 St. Andrews Rd., Ste. 511, Columbia, SC 29210

INDICATE PREFERRED FORMAT
and issue if not subscribing.

Forward questions to alpstarmakers@earthlink.net.
SIXTH DIAMOND COACH

*****Brother Rene’ Sterner, FSC
La Salle College HS, PA

February 11, 2002

16,016 points

Brother Rene’ Sterner, FSC, has been an NFL coach for the past 42 years. He has served as an NFL District Chair in two NFL Districts, Pittsburgh (1970-1977) and Valley Forge (1978-1980) where he was the founding Chair. He has also served as Diocesan Director of three CFL Leagues - Pittsburgh (1962-1977), Baltimore (1981-1987), and Philadelphia (1994-1996). He has been Director of Forensics at three secondary schools – Pittsburgh Central Catholic HS, Calvert Hall College, Baltimore, and La Salle College HS, Philadelphia. He has been a member of the National Forensic League's Executive Council since 1984. His career as a school administrator began in 1967 and has included service as Assistant Principal for Academic Affairs, Principal, and since 1991 as President of La Salle College High School. He served as President of the NCFL from 1969 to 1971 and as NCFL’s National Grand Tournament director from 1972 to 1994.

Over his 42 years of coaching, he has attended every NFL Nationals since 1961 except the 1968 Tournament at Macalester College when an emergency appendectomy prevented his attendance. His students have won NFL Nationals in Debate and Extemp. He has had finalists in Extemp and Original Oratory. His students won back-to-back National Championships in American Legion Oratory in 1988 and 1989. In 1972 his team at Central Catholic won the Pi Kappa Delta/Bruno E. Jacobs Sweepstakes Award. Each of the Chapters he has directed have won the Leading Chapter Award and some of them several times. He also served on the National Debate Topic Selection Committee from 1972 to 1994.

The inspiration for his enthusiasm and commitment to NFL and forensic activities is rooted in the educational significance and value of training young people for leadership.

"Leadership is at the heart of education. I've seen nothing in or out of the classroom that produced the substance of leadership that NFL, NCFL, and our State Leagues do. Too much of the rest is untested games playing and wheel spinning. I can say of forensics what G. K. Chesterton said of Christianity: 'Christianity has not been tried and found wanting. It has been tried and found difficult.' We might say the same about speech and debate activities. They have been tried and found challenging. But that's all the more reason that they deserve our finest efforts."

Bro. Rene’ Sterner has been honored by the State House and Senate of both the Pennsylvania and Maryland Legislatures. In 1990 he received the "Pro Pontifice Et Ecclesia" Medal from Pope John Paul II, for his contributions to Catholic education. In 2000 he was honored by the NCEA at their National Convention with the NCEA Secondary Schools Department Award for his leadership in secondary education as a teacher and administrator.

Brother is a member of the NFL Hall of Fame and currently is serving for the second time as Facilitator of the Executive Secretary Search Committee.
SIXTH DIAMOND COACHES

***** Greg J. Cullen
Alhambra HS, CA

January 9, 2002

16,284 points

One of America’s leading coaches is Californian Greg Cullen, from Alhambra HS.

Mr. Cullen has served both as CHSSA area chair and as NFL district chair for 15 years, earning two NFL Gold Awards.

His squad at Alhambra has been very successful: seven times the district’s largest chapter, five times the leader in new degrees, Alhambra earned the Leading Chapter Award in 1976, 1982, 1988, and 1994.


Greg has qualified 23 students to 16 national finals in Debate, LD, Extemp, OO, IX and Congress. Among these qualifiers was Albert Giang, National Champion Representative in 1993 (who was also in LD semi in 1994) and Lyndon Cullen. Greg’s son. Lyndon was NFL high point student in the East Los Angeles district in 1982. Four other of Greg’s student’s also earned district high point honors. In 1994 Mr. Cullen coached an NFL All American, Albert Giang, whose point total ranked him 6th in the U.S.

Greg Cullen is known in California for helping new coaches. He and his wife developed a curriculum guide for coaches that has been very successful. Mr. Cullen has served as national parliamentarian, debater tabulator and speech tabulator at the national tournament.

Greg is very creative and often develops innovative ideas. His squad raises funds by serving as “seat holders” at the Pasadena Auditorium – home of the Emmys and other large events. The Auditorium does not wish the TV camera to show empty seats. So Alhambra NFL members sit in those seats if they are unsold or people leave early.

A hardworking coach, Greg year after year builds his fine record by teaching and coaching students and serving his profession.

*****

Don Crabtree
Park Hill HS, MO

May 27, 2002

27,086 points

Don Crabtree, NFL's thirteenth Vice President, is lucky for NFL.
Since Don gained membership in May of 1972 he has been a most positive force for speech education in America. His services to the profession and NFL is far reaching: twice he hosted the National Tournament (in 1983 and 1994) and was willing to do it a third time if a host city cancelled at the last moment. Recently Don developed the very popular interpretation rating list which has greatly aided interp coaches in all parts of America.

Mr. Crabtree has been widely honored for his work. He has been elected to the NFL Hall of Fame, selected as Outstanding Speech Educator by the Speech and Theater Association of Missouri; awarded the District Chair Gold Award, earned the Distinguished Service Key and the Distinguished Service Plaque - 6th honors (a record).

His service to NFL includes five terms as District Chair, three terms (re-elected recently to a 4th) on the Executive Council, and a continuing role as NFL Ombudsman at nationals.

Mr. Crabtree's record as a nationally recognized coach is also impressive. Coach of the Dramatic Interp National Champion in 1986, Don has attended 22 nationals with 48 students including six who reached the semi-finals or finals.

Don's squads have won three district plaques and three district sweepstakes trophies. Park Hill has been the district's largest chapter in 13 different years and led the district in new enrollment eighteen times, including three times in the U.S. top ten. Four Leading Chapter Awards have been earned by Park Hill students and their coach.

As Vice President, Mr. Crabtree will be adjunct director of the 2003 National Tournament and be influential in the selection of the next secretary. He will continue as the "Don" of Speech Coaches.
SOMEONE OUT THERE IS BETTER THAN YOU.

CHANCES ARE THEY TEACH HERE.

FLORIDA • FORENSIC • INSTITUTE

TEACHING ALL SPEECH AND DEBATE EVENTS INCLUDING:

HI DI DUO OI LD OO SC EX

FOR ALL OFFICIAL TOURNAMENT INFO, PLEASE VISIT OUR NEW WEBSITE

www ffi4n6 org
FOURTH DIAMOND COACHES

***Sister Mary Patricia Plumb  
Academy of the Holy Names  
October 29, 2001  
16,694 points

***Steven Wood  
Lawrence HS, KS  
December 3, 2001  
18,108 points

***Don Ramsey  
Kansas City-Rockhurst HS, MO  
December 13, 2001  
10,103 points

***Sandra Maguire  
Miramonte HS, CA  
March 6, 2002  
18,204 points
FOURTH DIAMOND COACHES

March 19, 2002
Michael Starks
Cheyenne-East HS, WY
11,977 points

April 3, 2002
Gay Brasher
Leland HS, CA
15,239 points

April 7, 2002
Pam C. Wycoff
Apple Valley HS, MN
14,556 points

April 14, 2002
Terry Peterson
Millard North HS, NE
10,751 points
TRIPLE DIAMOND COACHES

***Cathy Berman
El Cerrito HS, CA
March 24, 1999
6,121 points

***David M. Montera
Pueblo-Centennial HS, CO
December 20, 2000
6,010 points

***Joseph Buzzelli
St. Ignatius HS, OH
June 18, 2001
6,016 points

***Cynthia Burgett
Washburn Rural HS, KS
December 3, 2001
10,310 points
TRIPLE DIAMOND COACHES

***Michael Marks
Hattiesburg HS, MS
December 3, 2001
6,128 points

***Reth Goldman
Taravella HS, FL
December 6, 2001
9,523 points

**Karen Colton-Milkap
Aurora HS, MO
December 11, 2001
6,273 points

***Gloria Wasilewski
Riverside HS, PA
January 11, 2002
6,193 points
TRIPLE DIAMOND COACHES

David McKenzie
Plymouth HS, IN
January 15, 2002
7,706 points

Joseph Wycoff
Apple Valley HS, MN
February 21, 2002
6,145 points

David Trippe
Nixa R2 HS, MO
March 5, 2002
6,196 points

Stan Magee
Dulles HS, TX
March 20, 2002
8,426 points
Learn to Coach LD from the Best!

KENTUCKY INSTITUTE

The LD Division of the Kentucky National Debate Institute is seeking six to eight new or current debate coaches to participate in our 2nd LD Coaches Program from June 22 to July 13, 2003. Attendees will receive thorough training in LD theory, moral and political philosophy, and hands-on coaching techniques; our small size will allow us to customize the program to the needs and interests of participants.

In the past few years, Kentucky has become recognized as one of the most innovative and educationally stimulating summer LD workshops. We are also, by a happy coincidence (or is it?), the most competitively successful. Our staff, composed of experienced LD coaches and former LD champions, is eager to share the Kentucky way of teaching LD with an emerging generation of coaches. The traditional educational values of the Institute make us accessible and appealing to teachers from non-debate backgrounds.

The Institute will provide tuition and room in exchange for part-time service as a monitor in student dormitories. Eligible coaches must be employed as a debate coach or assistant debate coach by a high school. For more information about this outstanding opportunity, contact us at jwpatt00@pop.uky.edu or www.kndi.org.
International Summer Speech and Debate Institute

LOCATION:
The institute will be held at the United World College of the Adriatic campus, which is located on cliffs overlooking the beautiful Adriatic. In addition to the formal sessions, the campus offers opportunities for swimming, hiking and other outdoor activities. Sightseeing excursions to nearby cities such as Venice and Trieste will be offered.

SESSION 1: (June 30 - July 14)
Lincoln-Douglas Debate & Speech
The L-D workshop will be for students wishing to work on 2003-2004 NFL debate topics. The Speech workshop will offer instruction in Humorous and Dramatic Interpretation, Original Oratory, and Extemporaneous Speaking (including in-depth topic analysis). Students can cross-register in speech and debate.

PRICE: $1,400 USD

Institute Director: Eric Di Michele
(212) 288-1100, ext. 101 - Email: edimiche@regis-nyc.org

SESSION 2: (July 15 - 21)
“Bridge Program” to IDEA’s International Youth Forum in Ljubljana, Slovenia
For students interested in attending both the IDEA Speech and Debate Institute and IDEA’s 9th Annual Youth Forum in Ljubljana, Slovenia, a special one-week program will be designed. Students will prepare for the Youth Forum debates through research and discussion. Students will also have the opportunity for advance research and discussion on the NFL topics covered at the Lincoln-Douglas camp. Additional sightseeing trips around Northern Italy will also be planned.

Session Director: Nina Watkins, IDEA
(212) 548-0185 - Email: nwatkins@sorosny.org

PRICE for Sessions 1 & 2 - $2,200 USD
Session 2 is not available without Session 1.
These prices include:
• Housing and meals
• Research materials
• a “survival” Italian course
• two excursions per session
• transportation to and from the Trieste airport or train station

Travel to and from Italy is not included. IDEA will be arranging a group travel discount for students departing from and returning to JFK International Airport in New York City.
What Makes Our Institute Unique:

Our camp provides the opportunity for intensive debate and speech preparation with the caring guidance of nationally recognized versus coaches within an international community of students. Last year’s participants included students from the United States as well as Uzbekistan, Macedonia, Slovenia, Azerbaijan, Estonia, Albania, Croatia, Romania, Slovakia, Lithuania and the Czech Republic.

STAFF:

Eric Di Michele (Institute Director) has been the speech & debate coach at Regis High School in New York City for over twenty years. His teams have won the New York State Forensics Championship eleven times. He has coached NFL national champions in Lincoln-Douglas Debate and Foreign Exttemp. (Seven of his students have been national finalists in exttemp). He was the co-chair of the NFL Lincoln-Douglas Debate Writing Committee for five years. As a consultant with the Open Society Institute, he has taught speech & debate seminars in over fifteen countries—from Haiti to Uzbekistan.

Lydia Esslinger, long-time forensics coach and an NFL 5-Diamond coach, at Syosset High School on Long Island (NY), has extensive experience in all areas of speech and debate. She has coached over twenty-five New York State champions, and her students have advanced to semi and finals in every event at CFL nationals. NFL achievements include semifinalists and finalists in every speech event at nationals, a 1st place in Congress and Dramatic Interpretation. Her past seven summers have been spent teaching debate, exttemp and interp in eastern and central Europe, as a senior consultant to the Open Society Institute. In her “day job” Mrs. Esslinger teaches A.P. English, coaches acting, and has directed more than twenty main stage musicals.

Noel Seleggi, (Guest Lecturer) has coached debate at Hunter College High School in New York City for thirteen years. His teams have won numerous tournament championships. In addition, he is the Executive Director of IDEA. A student of social and political philosophy, he specializes in the history of political thought ranging from the Ancient Greek philosophers to contemporary political theory.

Marcin Zaleski obtained his International Baccalaureate at the United World College in Duino, Italy. In 1995 he became the coordinator of the Polish debate program, and also wrote a book about debate. As a consultant for the Open Society Institute, he conducted trainings throughout Central and Eastern Europe. In 1999 Marcin was elected the President of the Board of Directors of the International Debate Education Association (IDEA), and continues to work as a debate trainer, curriculum developer and a fundraiser for the debate program.

Additional Staff will be added in the spring and will be posted on our website: www.idebate.org

For further information contact:
Eric Di Michele (212) 288-1100, ext. 101, edmichele@regis-nyc.org
Nina Watkins, IDEA (212) 548-0185, nwatkins@sorosny.org
William Dresdell and Joseph Zoppi

The book provides a practical introduction to the Karl Popper Debate format. It discusses the importance and nature of educational debate in an open society and presents rules and guidelines for preparing and running a debate session, training judges and involving the community. The revised edition contains a transcript of a full debate on International Efforts to Eliminate Human Trafficking with step-by-step critique, as well as new and expanded sections on logic, on debating in an international setting, and on how to frame and structure evidence. The book also includes 50 exercises to be used in the classroom or debate club. (pb)
Price $29.95 / ISBN 0-9702130-9-3

The Democracy Reader: Sonia Myers (Editor)
Foreword by Benjamin Barber

A comprehensive tool for understanding democracy and the central role that citizens play in making democratic work. The first section contains essays by distinguished scholars and discussion questions on the basic elements of democracy; the second, using the same format, deals with the obstacles encountered on the way to democracy and strategies for addressing them. The third is an alumni of civic centers, accounts of civic applications and transformations from around the world. (pb)
Price $25.95 / ISBN 0-9702130-3-4

Many Sides: Debate Across the Curriculum
Alfred C. Shifts and Maxwell Schruder

A comprehensive guide for using debate in an educational classroom setting, including plans to integrate debate into the curriculum, design proper formats, develop specific methods for debating, preparing students for debating, and evaluating and assessing classroom debate. (pb)
Price $26.95 / ISBN 0-9702130-4-2

Art, Argument and Advocacy: Mastering Parliamentary Debate
John Maury and Kate Shuster

Provides a theoretical and practical foundation for effective participation in a mock parliamentary debate competition. It explains contemporary American and international parliamentary debate formats, offering a comprehensive examination of argumentation, construction and resolution, case development, critical examination of given arguments and data, and persuasive speaking. (pb)
Price $24.95 / ISBN 0-9702130-7-7

On That Point!: An Introduction to Parliamentary Debate
John Maury and Kate Shuster

This is the first parliamentary debate textbook for secondary school students. The text is designed to provide a theoretical and practical foundation for effective participation in parliamentary debate competition or in the classroom. (pb)
Price $25.95 / ISBN 0-9702541-1-1

The Debatable Book: A Must-Have for Successful Debate
By the Editors of DEBATEBASE

An invaluable resource for debaters, this book provides background, arguments and resources on approximately 150 debate topics in areas as diverse as business, science and technology, environment, politics, religion, culture and education. Each entry presents: a definition, an introduction, an introduction placing the question in context, arguments pro and con, pro and con positions and web sites and print resources for further research. Organized in a book A-Z format, the book also includes a topical index for easy searching. (pb)
Price $25.95 / ISBN 0-9702130-8-6

Transforming Debate: The Best of the International Journal of Forensics
Jack L. Rogers (Editor)

Represents the very best scholarly work published in the International Journal of Forensics. It is an essential work for anyone interested in the role of academic, competitive debate in shaping the social persuasion movement. (pb)
Price $24.95 / ISBN 0-9702130-1-8

Perspectives in Controversy: Selected Essays from Contemporary Argumentation
Kathleen Broda-Baum (Editor)

Brings together recently published essays from the journal Contemporary Argumentation and Debate into a single volume. These essays explore current controversies in the theory of competitive academic debate. (pb)
Price $24.95 / ISBN 0-9702130-5-0

SOURCEBOOK ON CONTEMPORARY CONTROVERSY SERIES

AIDS, DRUGS AND SOCIETY
AnnaAleksidova (Editor)

Brings together articles that address the interconnected epidemics of HIV/AIDS and drug abuse. Background readings in the introductory section show how these epidemics are connected. The substantive part of the book offers fourteen essays on the role of government, law and courts in responding to the epidemic. (pb)
Price $24.95 / ISBN 0-9702130-2-6

GLOBALIZATION AND THE POOR: EXPLORATION OR EQUALITY?
Julie Clark (Editor)

Brings together articles that address both sides of the debate does the global economy harm or help the poor? The first section argues that the global economic system disadvantages and exploits the poor; the second section advances the claim that globalization has the potential to empower and enrich the poor. The book concludes with original source documents and a glossary of key terms. (pb)
Price $24.95 / ISBN 0-9702541-0-3

ROMA RIGHTS: RACE, JUSTICE AND STRATEGIES FOR EQUALITY
Claude Cafin (Editor)

Brings together diverse materials related to combating anti-Romani racism. Early sections of the book present facts on the human rights situation of Roma in Europe. Subsequent chapters present arguments surrounding the strategies and approaches used by anti-racism activists in areas including the problem of hate speech, the promotion of minority participation in a democratic society and methods of combating discrimination in the criminal justice system. (pb)
Price $24.95 / ISBN 0-9702130-6-9
DOUBLE DIAMOND COACHES

**Judith A. Robinson**
Gresham HS, OR
June 12, 2001 3,004 points

**Mary C. Green**
Pasadena HS, TX
November 26, 2001 3,048 points

**Opal Morse**
Pt. Pleasant HS, WV
December 3, 2001 3,001 points

**Tom Coughan**
Great Falls Russell HS, MT
January 3, 2002 4,783 points

**Steven L. Hamersma**
Sioux Falls-Washington, SD
January 11, 2002 3,110 points

**Gloria O'Shields**
Farmington HS, NM
January 22, 2002 3,440 points

**Jimmy L. Smith**
Princeton HS, TX
January 28, 2002 3,073 points

**Ken Paden**
St. Joseph Central HS, MO
February 5, 2002 4,805 points

**Teri Robinson**
Green River HS, WY
February 5, 2002 3,049 points
**Debra Thorson  
Foothill HS, CA  
February 5, 2002  4,742 points

**Josette Surratt  
Teurlings Catholic HS, LA  
February 19, 2002  3,095 points

**Michele Coody  
Saint James School, AL  
February 24, 2002  3,070 points

**Steven D. Estenson  
Cottage Grove Park HS, MN  
March 4, 2002  3,101 points

**Martin A. Cronin  
Douglas HS, NV  
March 13, 2002  4,124 points

**Charlotte Botelho  
Baldwin HS, HI  
March 20, 2002  3,035 points

**Dr. Robert Littlefield  
Fargo-Shalney HS, ND  
March 25, 2002  4,400 points

**Diana Krauss  
Phoenix-Central HS, AZ  
April 1, 2002  3,252 points

**James W. Rye III  
The Montgomery Academy, AL  
April 1, 2002  4,651 points
DOUBLE DIAMOND COACHES

Mary Knutson
Cedarburg HS, WI
April 24, 2002  3,111 points

Timothy M. Neville
Wood River HS, ID
April 29, 2002  3,048 points

Truman Humbert
Estill HS, SC
April 30, 2002  6,210 points

Constance Leyendecker
Benilde St. Margaret's School, MN
May 20, 2002  3,009 points

SINGLE DIAMONDS

Loree L. Gentry
Independence-Fort Osage HS, MO
April 30, 2002  1,527 points

Thomas P. Durkin
Loyola HS, MD
May 7, 2002  1,545 points
DELIVERED TO YOU:

2002 - 2003
Lincoln - Douglas
Research Series

Contents of each Set
** 3 different affirmative cases
** 3 different negative cases
** Extension evidence
** Topic analysis

$59.00

Mail to: CDE, P. O. Box Z, Taos, N.M. 87571
Ph: (505) 751-0514
Fax: (505) 751-9788
http://www.cdedebate.com

Name ___________________________________________________________
Mailing Address ________________________________________________

☐ Research Series    ☐ L. D. Encyclopedia $175
Jim D. Rynders
Benilde-St. Margaret’s School HS, MN
April 7, 2000
1,527 points

Kathleen Miller
Shawnee Mission West HS, KS
May 24, 2001
1,617 points

Charles Holvoet
Baldwin HS, KS
May 25, 2001
1,526 points

Dr. Randy Patterson
St. Andrew’s Episcopal School, MN
July 5, 2001
1,521 points

Kenneth Grodd
St. Pius X Catholic HS, GA
September 11, 2001
1,554 points

Joseph F. Russo
Cathedral Prep Seminary, NY
September 14, 2001
1,592 points

Leigh Stovall
Pearland HS, TX
September 25, 2001
1,560 points

Fran Bogos
North Allegheny HS, PA
October 26, 2001
1,504 points

Judie Roberts
Salt Lake City-Skyline HS, UT
November 27, 2001
1,940 points

Carol R. Clanton
Brookhaven HS, MS
December 3, 2001
2,143 points

John Day
Palm Beach Gardens HS, FL
December 3, 2001
1,850 points

Jim Dorman
Longmont HS, CO
December 3, 2001
2,296 points
SINGLE DIAMONDS

*Holly Hathaway
Connersville HS, IN
December 3, 2001 1,797 points

*Donald Hilt
Madison County HS, VA
December 3, 2001 2,771 points

*Steve Medoff
Pennsbury HS, PA
December 3, 2001 2,289 points

*Leo J. Williams
Beiden Jesuit Prep, FL
December 3, 2001 1,687 points

*Timothy J. Hughes
Belton HS, MO
December 8, 2001 1,652 points

*Jose Medina
Riverside HS, TX
December 10, 2001 1,821 points

*Christina Balleweg
LaReina HS, CA
December 20, 2001 1,587 points

*Annellen Johns-Hughes
Southside HS, SC
January 2, 2002 3,844 points

*William K. McBride
Neenah HS, WI
January 2, 2002 1,632 points

*Chad Ries
Niles McKinley HS, OH
January 4, 2002 1,799 points

*Paul Wexler
Needham HS, MA
January 5, 2002 1,501 points

*Donal May
Clarke Community HS, IA
January 14, 2002 1,551 points
NFHS Speech & Debate Products

Original Oration Video

On this new 55-minute video, Dr. Robert Littlefield of North Dakota State University discusses the complex process of selecting a topic and creating an effective oration. A high school student then demonstrates an oration presentation and discusses both the presentation and preparation process with Robert Hetler of the North Dakota High School Activities Association.

Cost — $39.95, plus shipping and handling

The Lincoln Douglas Debate Annual 2003

This publication is designed to introduce debaters to the ten potential resolutions for National Forensic League competition in the year 2003. The analyses are intended to stimulate thinking about the issues and to provide a starting point for thoughtful analysis and research.

Multiple authors reflect a variety of styles and approaches common to LD debate. Useful bibliographies are included.

Cost — $10.00, plus shipping and handling
Lincoln Douglas Annuals 2001 and 2002 available for $8.00 each

The NFHS Coach’s Manual for Speech and Debate

Designed specifically for novice coaches, the loose-leaf notebook format makes it easy to add information specific to your state. The manual contains information on a number of elements of coaching, including contest descriptions, finances, travel, judging, attending tournaments and building and developing a squad.

Cost — $19.95, plus shipping and handling

Forensic Quarterly

This annual publication in four issues remains one of the most credible and valuable resources for CX policy debaters and coaches across the country. Used by beginners and experienced debaters, the four volumes provide a basis for individual research and a springboard for critical analysis of the area selected each year for high school debate. See the NFHS Web site for a description of each issue.

Cost — $6.00 per issue; $24.00 for the set, plus shipping and handling

Visit the NFHS Web site at www.nfhs.org for a complete list of speech and debate resources.

To place an order, contact us by phone, fax or mail.

Phone: 800-776-3462
Fax: 816.891.2414

Customer Service Mailing Address:
NFHS Customer Service
PO Box 20506
Kansas City, MO 64195-0606
SINGLE DIAMONDS

*Carolyn Wait  
Port Angeles HS, WA  
January 24, 2002  
1,501 points

*Ivanna Fritz  
Flathead County HS, MT  
January 28, 2002  
1,502 points

*Carolyn Kiesewetter  
Fossil Ridge HS, TX  
January 31, 2002  
1,612 points

*Chris Goddard  
Upper Arlington HS, OH  
February 5, 2002  
1,500 points

*Jennifer M. Jerome  
Millard West HS, NE  
February 5, 2002  
1,567 points

*John L. Mercer  
Olmsted Falls HS, OH  
February 5, 2002  
1,519 points

*Russell Rach  
Croisy HS, TX  
February 5, 2002  
1,970 points

*Diana J. Andrade  
Conifer HS, CO  
February 13, 2002  
1,538 points

*Patricia Cheney  
Oak Park River Forest HS, IL  
February 15, 2002  
1,697 points

*Debra J. P. Corbin  
Branson HS, MO  
February 15, 2002  
1,574 points

*Marjorie A. Bieraugel  
Snohomish HS, WA  
February 18, 2002  
1,538 points

*Monica Wheaton  
Great Bridge HS, VA  
March 6, 2002  
1,516 points
SINGLE DIAMONDS

*Steven R. Dubois  
St. Thomas Aquinas HS, KS  
March 11, 2002  
1,519 points

*G. William Grier  
Whitestone HS, AK  
March 11, 2002  
1,513 points

*Jeanne Christen  
Alliance HS, NE  
March 14, 2002  
1,835 points

*James Wade  
Milton HS, GA  
March 14, 2002  
1,751 points

*Nancy E. Wedgeworth  
Springfield Parkview, MO  
March 17, 2002  
2,873 points

*William F. (Rusty) McCrady  
Walter Johnson, MD  
March 18, 2002  
1,531 points

*Donna Riffe  
Wheat Ridge HS, CO  
March 20, 2002  
2,664 points

*Anna M. Tarr  
Granby HS, VA  
March 23, 2002  
1,556 points

*Greg Brown  
Northridge HS, CO  
March 27, 2002  
1,500 points

*Pam Lyons  
Avon HS, IN  
March 27, 2002  
1,529 points

*Marie D. Hansen  
Northridge HS, CO  
April 16, 2002  
1,529 points

*Chris Meservey  
Bonanza HS, NV  
April 18, 2002  
1,529 points
Executive Council
Meeting
September 29-30, 2002
Atlanta, Georgia

The meeting was called to order at 8:36 a.m. Sunday, September 29 by President Billy Tate. Moved by Sterner, seconded by Belch to accept the minutes of the last meeting.
Passed. Unanimous.

Election
Council School Administrator Brother Rene' Sterner conducted the election for NFL Officers. For President, Glenda Ferguson nominated Ted Belch; Don Crabtree nominated Billy Tate. Billy Tate was elected President. For Vice-President, Glenda Ferguson nominated Ted Belch; Donus Roberts nominated Don Crabtree. Don Crabtree was elected Vice-President.

Frank Sierra announced that he would offer a constitutional amendment at the next council meeting to return the election of NFL officers to a vote of the chapters.

Executive Secretary Search
The Council accepted by consensus the job description reports by Executive Secretary James Copeland and Bro. Rene' Sterner. A committee was appointed to draft minor revisions.

President Tate appointed the following coaches to the NFL Secretary Search Committee: Tim Averill, Manchester Essex Regional HS, MA; Patricia Bailey, Homewood HS, AL; Chuck Ballingall, Damien HS, CA; Pauline Carochi, Canon City HS, CO; Randy Pierce, Patonville HS, MO; and Bro. Rene' Sterner, La Salle College HS, PA, facilitator.

Moved by Roberts, seconded by Crabtree that the pay range for the new secretary will be $60-$75 thousand dollars based upon experience.
Passed. Unanimous.

Moved by Roberts, seconded by Sierra that the council meet and conduct interviews with the candidates recommended by the Search Committee on March 22, 23, 24 at the National Office.
Passed. Unanimous.

Atlanta Nationals
An extensive report was given about the Georgia State University 2003 Nationals hosted by Dr. David Cheshier. Moved by Roberts, seconded by Belch to commend Dr. Cheshier for the extensive work he has done planning the tournament and for his excellent report.
Passed. Unanimous.

New Debate Event
Moved by Keller, seconded by Crabtree to reconsider the motion: "to introduce a new debate event at the 2004 District and National Tournaments," (passed at the Summer Council meeting).

Moved by Sterner, seconded by Sierra to implement a new debate event in 2005 on a one year trial basis at the District and National Tournaments.


[NWm the new event is discussed in the November and December Rostrum. Each school may enter one team above school entry quota. Each district may send one team to nationals. The trial event scores no sweepstakes or $5 Karpa Delta/Britton E. Jacob points.]

Moved by Keller, seconded by Roberts to recess until Monday morning.
Passed. Unanimous. Meeting recessed at 7:05 p.m.

Meeting called to order at 8:33 a.m. Monday, September 30 by President Tate. All councilors and alternate Les Phillips present.

Moved by Sierra, seconded by Roberts to adopt the revised job description for the position of NFL Executive Secretary in toto.
Passed. Unanimous.

[The job description is at: www.nfllonline.org. Click on line Rostrum and go to page 43]

NFL Points
Moved by Roberts, seconded by Belch to create a new student degree at 1500 points with no more than 750 points (exclusive of district and national points) in each category.
Moved by Keller, seconded by Sierra to table the motion.
Passed. Unanimous.

Moved by Roberts, seconded by King that no person is a member of NFL until the membership fee has been paid.
Passed. Unanimous.

[Many of last years members were enrolled online but no dues were paid]

Congress
Moved by Keller, seconded by Roberts to adopt the new Congress schedule for the 2003 Georgia Nationals.
Passed. Unanimous.

[The new schedule will be published in a future Rostrum]

Districts
Moved by Sierra, seconded by Keller to postpone redistricting for one year.
Passed. Unanimous.

Financial
Moved by Sierra, seconded by Roberts to grant a 2.5% cost of living raise to all NFL staff members and to extend the apprecia-
Margaret Louise Meredith passed away on Monday, August 12, 2002 at the Groves, Rosewood Health Center, Missouri.

Margaret retired in 1976 after teaching and coaching forensics thirty-one years at William Chrisman. In recognition of Margaret’s outstanding career, in 1999, the little theater at the school was named the Margaret Meredith Little Theater.

Miss Meredith attended twenty-eight National Tournaments out of her thirty-one years of coaching. Margaret’s students won first place twice at the National Tournament. Margaret was a member of the National Forensic League Hall of Fame.

Miss Meredith remained in her home on Delaware Street in Independence until the summer of 2001 when she moved to the Groves Health Center. She was proud of the fact that Harry Truman referred to her as the second Margaret on Delaware.

A special thank you to Chris Adams, Heart of America District chair for notifying NFL. Many former debaters, judges, attorneys and a host of friends and former students attended the service for Margaret Louise Meredith. Margaret greatly influenced the lives of many and will continue to be remembered.

---Morris Block---

NFL has lost a valued member. Morris Block of Riverdale High School in Jefferson, (LA) passed away Monday, October 14, 2002.

Mr. Block’s coaching successes were numerous. His students reached late elimination rounds at several national tournaments, including a national champion in Dramatic Performance at NCFL Nationals in 2001 as well as several semi-finalists and finalists in main and supplementary events at NFL Nationals. He was a diamond coach and served for many years on the Executive Council of both New Orleans CFL and Louisiana High School Speech League.

Mr. Block was highly respected by fellow coaches, students and colleagues. Greg Malis, formerly of Newman School in New Orleans wrote, "Morris Block was an outstanding coach - loving, caring, successful. He had many friends in this activity and will be sorely missed! It is a great loss to forensics everywhere, but it will be felt most strongly in the New Orleans area and throughout Louisiana. We lost a good friend." Cheryl Gilmore, Louisiana NFL District Chair from Acadiana HS, adds, "A great void will be felt for many years to come with the loss of Morris. He always put the needs of his students above his own and was a friend to all. His wonderful stories and smiling face will be greatly missed. National Tournaments will never be as much fun without Morris."

The New Orleans Times-Picayune (October 15, 2002) quoted a captain of the Riverdale High School speech team, Brynn Cox, stating, "He gave all of his life to us. We were his kids. He never hesitated to give up a night or a weekend. A lot of us spent more time with Mr. Block than our own fathers."

Our Deepest Sympathy
The Best of the Rest

This exciting series of videos offers some of the best NFL performances ever given. Each tape includes TEN winning speeches! We exclude 1st and 2nd place winners; however we include some of the very best final round contestants. This variety of subject matter will challenge your students and provide insight into what it takes to be a "Nationals" finalist.

EACH TAPE IS $49.95

VOLUME II
Best of the Rest in OO 1990 - 1996 Item No. BR 1004
Best of the Rest in USX 1990 - 1996 Item No. BR 1005
Best of the Rest in FX 1990 - 1996 Item No. BP 1006

VOLUME I
Best of the Rest in OO 1983 - 1989 Item No. BR 1001
Best of the Rest in USX 1983 - 1989 Item No. BR 1002
Best of the Rest in FX 1983 - 1989 Item No. BR 1003

NFL's Greatest Hits

See the winners of NFL National final rounds. Here, for the first time are the best together on one tape. See the first and second place winners in individual events and the final rounds of Lincoln Douglas Debate. This teaching tool will significantly improve your classroom instruction and student performance.

EACH TAPE IS $49.95

Volume IV
Best of Original Oratory 1992 - 1994 Item No. VB 1015
Best of Foreign Extemp 1992 - 1994 Item No. VB 1017
Best of Lincoln Douglas Debate 1993 - 1994 Item No. VB 1018

Volume III
Best of Original Oratory 1991 - 1991 Item No. VB 1010
Best of US Extemp 1989 - 1991 Item No. VB 1011
Best of Foreign Extemp 1989 - 1991 Item No. VB 1012
Best of Lincoln Douglas Debate 1989 - 1990 Item No. VB 1014

Volume II
Best of Original Oratory 1988 - 1988 Item No. VB 1006
Best of US Extemp 1988 - 1988 Item No. VB 1007
Best of Foreign Extemp 1986 - 1988 Item No. VB 1008
Best of Lincoln Douglas Debate 1987 - 1988 Item No. VB 1009

Volume I
Best of Original Oratory 1985 - 1985 Item No. VB 1001
Best of US Extemp 1983 - 1985 Item No. VB 1002
Best of Foreign Extemp 1983 - 1985 Item No. VB 1003
Best of Lincoln Douglas Debate 1985 - 1986 Item No. VB 1004
Best of Lincoln Douglas Debate 1983 - 1984 Item No. VB 1005

Name ____________________________

Address ____________________________

City ____________________________

State _______ ZIP __________

Phone ____________________________
DIAMOND KEY COACHES
(Points on record July 31, 2002)

Sandra Maguire
Miramonte High School, CA
19,315

Lincoln Record
Fort Wayne Northrop HS, IN
10,920

Donus D. Roberts
Waite County High School, SD
23,919

Terry Peterson
Millard North High School, NE
10,865

Ron Underwood
Modesto Beyer HS, CA
37,926

John R. Revezzo
Niles McKinley High School, OH
10,842

Jane Eldridge
Goochpasture High School, TN
22,911

Timothy C. Averill
Manchester High School, MA
10,625

Richard V. Young
Little River HS, KS
22,992

Carly C. Lindsey
Academy of the Holy Names, FL
10,657

Roger Brannan
Manhattan High School, KS
19,770

S. L. Chandler
Archbishop Riordan HS, CA
10,649

Rene Sterner, FSC
La Salle College HS, PA
16,149

Robert D. Nordsve
Wichita Campus High School, KS
10,612

Richard B. Sodickow
Bronx HS Of Science, NY
19,098

Donald Ramsey
Kansas City Rockhurst HS, MO
10,141

La Salle College HS, PA
16,149

Bob J. Sietert
Logansport High School, IN
10,030

Park Hill High School, MO
27,080

David Johnson
Houston Bellaire HS, TX
20,514

Ron Carr
San Antonio Heights HS, FL
22,220

A. C. Eley
Shawnee Mission South HS, KS
19,996

Paul Geringer
Marshall High School, MO
13,308

Frank Sierra
Mullen High School, CO
16,933

Tod W. Belch
Glenbrook North HS, IL
13,254

Robert F. Bierschke
Brooke High School, IN
16,933

Terese E. Sparkman
Kickapoo High School, MO
13,156

Gregory J. Cullen
Alhambra High School, CA
16,557

Kickapoo High School, MO
13,108

Ralph E. Bender
Centerville High School, OH
16,261

Steven Davis
Easley Catholic HS, WA
13,089

Dale McCall
Wellington High School, FL
16,190

Michael W. Burton
Riverside High School SC
13,064

George Zeinle, Sm
Chaminade High School, NY
16,352

Debra Butcher
Springfield High School, MO
12,706

Davies R. Edmonds
Jordan High School, UT
18,675

Kim R. Bass
Sioux Falls Lincoln HS, SD
12,685

Randy Pierce
Pattisonville High School, MO
18,530

Daniel H. Durrant
Loganport High School, IN
12,706

Harold M. McQueen
Ben Davis High School, IN
16,386

Ron Jackson
North Kansas City HS, MO
12,688

Ben Davis High School, IN
16,386

Barry Campbell
San Gabriel High School, CA
11,326

Georgia Brondy
Blue Springs South HS, MO
16,290

Michael W. Allgood
Northwestern College, IA
11,305

Carl F. Grecco
Truman High School, PA
15,817

Doug Campbell
Norfolk High School, NE
11,302

Gary G. Harmon
Salina Central High School, KS
15,313

Rebecca Pierce
Parkway South High School, MO
11,326

Donald L. Smith
Salt Lake City East HS, UT
14,716

Julie Sheehan
Stuyvesant High School, NY
11,245

Carl Swanson
Sioux Falls Lincoln HS, SD
14,681

Mike Jeffers
Independence Truman HS, MO
10,507

Sioux Falls Lincoln HS, SD
14,681

Cynthia A. Burget
Washto Ranch High School, KS
10,503

James Menchinger
Portage Northern HS, MI
14,142

Elizabeth L. Ballard
Norman High School, OK
9,919

Lee D. Alto
Grand Rapids High School, MN
14,101

Allen Janovec
Norfolk High School, NE
9,007

Leora K. Hansen
Blackfoot High School, ID
13,995

Rebecca Pierce
Parkway South High School, MO
9,840

Harold C. Keller
Davenport West High School, IA
13,983

Beth Goldman
Taravella High School, FL
9,823

Lydia Essinger
Sykesville High School, NY
13,762

W. E. Schuetz
Gregory Portland HS, TX
9,751

Lowell Sharp
Golden High School, CO
13,258

Glenn M. Nelson
Hutchinson High School, KS
9,687

Donald N. Belanger
Caddo Magnet High School, LA
13,093

Bill R. Bland
Dallas Washington HS, OK
9,519

Pamela M. Kegels
Topeka High School, KS
19,718

Harry B. Davis
Hunter High School, UT
9,464

Chuck Bongiorno
Damen High School, CA
9,224

Jack D. Tuckness
Springfield Central HS, MO
9,137

Lydia Essinger
Sykesville High School, NY
13,762

Douglas R. Sprague
New Trier High School, IL
8,980

Lowell Sharp
Golden High School, CO
13,258

Anthony K. Cavall CFC
Archbishop Curley Notre Dame, FL
8,945

Donald N. Belanger
Caddo Magnet High School, LA
13,093

Sandra E. Bird
San Juan High School, CA
8,945

Terry Peterson
Millard North High School, NE
10,865

Niles McKinley High School, OH
10,842

Ron Jackson
North Kansas City HS, MO
12,688
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William C. Robinson Jr.</td>
<td>Shawnee Mission South HS, KS</td>
<td>5,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne S. Munsell</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esperanza High School, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Chumley</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Edward High School, OK</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Robertson</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont High School, NE</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby McMurtin</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City High School, KS</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Fergo</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creekview HS, TX</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda C. Dencer</td>
<td>Howell North High School, MO</td>
<td>5,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalvin R. Yager</td>
<td>Derby High School, KS</td>
<td>5,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.J. Brown</td>
<td>Blue Valley HS, KS</td>
<td>5,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah E. Simon</td>
<td>Milton Academy, CA</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell A. Loschen</td>
<td>Worland High School, WY</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janis B. Myers</td>
<td>Spencer High School, IA</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan J. Baker</td>
<td>Sheridan High School, WY</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory N. Davis</td>
<td>Lakewood High School, CO</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael C. Grove</td>
<td>La Costa HS, CA</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne E. Theisen</td>
<td>Stow High School, OH</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Cook</td>
<td>Cherokee Washington HS, IA</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mickey D. Hulsen</td>
<td>Collieville HS, TN</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Krikak</td>
<td>Sheridan High School, WY</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve O'Brien</td>
<td>Waterfront HS, SD</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynda Luce</td>
<td>Waupaca High School, WI</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne W. Terry</td>
<td>Hamblen HS, TN</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Long</td>
<td>Plano HS, TX</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheryl Kaczmarek</td>
<td>Newburgh Free Academy, NY</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D. Ettman</td>
<td>Yucca High School, CA</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John R. Wodden</td>
<td>Enloe High School, NC</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen O'Halloran</td>
<td>North High School, PA</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony E. Myers</td>
<td>Dunwoody HS, CO</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristine Haynes</td>
<td>Sioux Falls HS, SD</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Janis</td>
<td>Gilmore Academy, OH</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert D. Neulib</td>
<td>University High School, IL</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Loe</td>
<td>Aillet High School, TX</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Vasconcelos</td>
<td>Reno High School, NV</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jody Eves</td>
<td>Safina High School, KS</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Meulestein</td>
<td>Watertown High School, SD</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah H. McBride</td>
<td>The Barstow School, MO</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Gist</td>
<td>Springfield Central HS, MO</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline F. Fock</td>
<td>South View HS, NC</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Carter</td>
<td>Calhoun High School, GA</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Ralston</td>
<td>Topeka West HS, KS</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip M. Wertz</td>
<td>Thomas County Central HS, GA</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clair M. Myers</td>
<td>Fort Wayne Northside HS, IN</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Gagnon</td>
<td>Jackson Hole High School, WY</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert H. Steffen</td>
<td>Olate North High School, KS</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Rogers</td>
<td>Northside High School, GA</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel R. Santu</td>
<td>Foss High School, OH</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie S. Watkins</td>
<td>Brookwood High School, GA</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Henry</td>
<td>Ruskin High School, MO</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhea Hoppe</td>
<td>Moonbeam High School, IN</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn L. Martinez</td>
<td>Palisades High School, CO</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieran Larkin</td>
<td>The Mary Lou Academy, NY</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim R. Cranston</td>
<td>Marquette High School, MO</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedge Crouch</td>
<td>Ozark High School, MO</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Paden</td>
<td>St Joseph Central HS, MO</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Johnson Phd</td>
<td>Beverly Hills High School, CA</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Stegall</td>
<td>Bartlesville High School, OK</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary T. Gormley</td>
<td>Montevallo High School, NJ</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Borst</td>
<td>Sierra High School, CO</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Rasmussen</td>
<td>Hillsdale High School, UT</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad J. Nunn</td>
<td>Wichita East High School, KS</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Lewellan</td>
<td>Bettendorf High School, IA</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry B. Ross</td>
<td>Humble High School, TX</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Durkee</td>
<td>Laramie High School, WY</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Wilson</td>
<td>Henry County High School, TN</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary A. Schick</td>
<td>Michael Krop High School, FL</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel S. Stelle</td>
<td>Hunter College High School, NY</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Thorson</td>
<td>Foothill High School, CA</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Cook</td>
<td>Greeley Central High School, CO</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent A. Farrand</td>
<td>Science High School, NJ</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Cubbage</td>
<td>Great Falls Russell HS, MT</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita Boyd</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Ross</td>
<td>Mark Keppel High School, CA</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary A. Betancourt</td>
<td>Moorstown High School, NJ</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane G. Boyd</td>
<td>Grapevine High School, TX</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich D. Riggelman</td>
<td>Deerfield High School, IA</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'Arcy F. Patey-Robinson</td>
<td>Poland Regional HS, ME</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Rose</td>
<td>Kearney Jr High School, NE</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven M. Helman</td>
<td>Kardinal High School, WA</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Miller</td>
<td>South Mecklenburg HS, NC</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William J. Rye</td>
<td>The Montgomery Academy, AL</td>
<td>5,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bart Sprague</td>
<td>Topeka High School, KS</td>
<td>1,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Gibron</td>
<td>Academy of the Holy Names, FL</td>
<td>1,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin Heleys</td>
<td>Mansfield High School, MO</td>
<td>1,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Wingfield</td>
<td>Wichita Northwest Magnet HS, KS</td>
<td>1,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Balzer</td>
<td>Midpark High School, OH</td>
<td>1,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary E. Willoughby</td>
<td>Grady High School, GA</td>
<td>1,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory W. Bowen</td>
<td>Kentucky Country Day, KY</td>
<td>1,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernita L. Melvin</td>
<td>Castle High School, IN</td>
<td>1,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Uecker</td>
<td>Stelux Falls Washington HS, SD</td>
<td>1,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hurley</td>
<td>Wheeling High School, IL</td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Lunetta</td>
<td>Hanover Park High School, NJ</td>
<td>1,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Hanson</td>
<td>Niwot High School, CO</td>
<td>1,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis Hirt</td>
<td>Briar HS Of Science, NY</td>
<td>1,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton Thomas</td>
<td>Northwest Whitfield HS, GA</td>
<td>1,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Felietro</td>
<td>Bangor High School, ME</td>
<td>1,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary A. Williams</td>
<td>Blue Ridge High School, AZ</td>
<td>1,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas M. Pines</td>
<td>St Paul Academic &amp; Summit Sch, MN</td>
<td>1,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristine Besel</td>
<td>Worthington HS High School, MN</td>
<td>1,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Nelson</td>
<td>Plymouth High School, IN</td>
<td>1,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Russo</td>
<td>Cathedral Prep Seminary, NY</td>
<td>1,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Hoverson</td>
<td>St Thomas Academy, MN</td>
<td>1,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh Stevall</td>
<td>Pearland High School, TX</td>
<td>1,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Medina</td>
<td>Riverside High School, TX</td>
<td>1,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen A. Prody</td>
<td>Helena High School, MT</td>
<td>1,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellie Lasater</td>
<td>Alba-Valley High School, NM</td>
<td>1,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Vogt</td>
<td>Pekin Comm High School, IL</td>
<td>1,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren K. Cooper</td>
<td>Woodburn High School, OR</td>
<td>1,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Stich</td>
<td>Bishop Kelley High School, OK</td>
<td>1,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Black</td>
<td>Brentwood Academy, TN</td>
<td>1,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Ewan</td>
<td>Pekin Comm High School, IL</td>
<td>1,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim D. Rynders</td>
<td>Benilde St Margaret's School, MN</td>
<td>1,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra K. Rose</td>
<td>Fenwick High School, IL</td>
<td>1,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine C. Stamps</td>
<td>St Cecilia Academy, MN</td>
<td>1,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon McGIllen O'Donnell</td>
<td>Flathead High School, MT</td>
<td>1,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Laner</td>
<td>Kapaun Mt Carmel HS, KS</td>
<td>1,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Martin</td>
<td>Newman Smith High School, TX</td>
<td>1,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Perry</td>
<td>Yukon High School, OK</td>
<td>1,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Day</td>
<td>Palm Beach Gardens HS, FL</td>
<td>1,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John M. Mazucco</td>
<td>Austin High School, TX</td>
<td>1,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndal Westmoreland</td>
<td>Okarche High School, OK</td>
<td>1,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Hathaway</td>
<td>Connexsville Sr High School, IN</td>
<td>1,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn F. Sutsky</td>
<td>Dreher High School, SC</td>
<td>1,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Streeter</td>
<td>Clackamas High School, OR</td>
<td>1,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Kern</td>
<td>Belleville West High School, IL</td>
<td>1,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Voss</td>
<td>Apple Valley High School, MN</td>
<td>1,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin E. Ong</td>
<td>Elkhart Central High School, IN</td>
<td>1,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lary Wood</td>
<td>The Woodlands' High School, TX</td>
<td>1,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucinda Reed</td>
<td>Woodland Park High School, CO</td>
<td>1,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Firestone</td>
<td>Homestead High School, CA</td>
<td>1,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin High School,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Agliardo</td>
<td>Ursuline School, NY</td>
<td>1,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Miller</td>
<td>Oconomowoc HS, WI</td>
<td>1,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James W. Weaver</td>
<td>Tulsa Union High School, OK</td>
<td>1,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry T. Adams</td>
<td>Bakersfield High School, CA</td>
<td>1,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila S. Sundquist</td>
<td>Cheyenne East High School, WY</td>
<td>1,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Johnson</td>
<td>Jacoba High School, IL</td>
<td>1,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene T. Pinkston</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Central Catholic HS, PA</td>
<td>1,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Waas</td>
<td>Woodland Park High School, CO</td>
<td>1,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Yutz</td>
<td>Mc Dowitt High School, NC</td>
<td>1,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo J. Williams</td>
<td>Bolan Jesuit Prep School, FL</td>
<td>1,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Oakley</td>
<td>Oologah High School, OK</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad Ries</td>
<td>Stories McKinley High School, OH</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Gonsor</td>
<td>Grason High School, SD</td>
<td>1,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Boeger</td>
<td>Conroe High School, TX</td>
<td>1,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert M. Candelaria Jr</td>
<td>ElPaso Cathedral High School, TX</td>
<td>1,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry A. Barber</td>
<td>Casper Kelly Walsh HS, WY</td>
<td>1,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Bogard</td>
<td>Air Academy High School, CO</td>
<td>1,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James O. Payne</td>
<td>Blue Valley North HS, KS</td>
<td>1,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Duffee-Lunaford</td>
<td>Mankato High School, OK</td>
<td>1,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent F. Neis</td>
<td>Wahlt High School, IA</td>
<td>1,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Rosene</td>
<td>Indep North Central HS, IN</td>
<td>1,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Gerin Strange</td>
<td>Hanover HS, WY</td>
<td>1,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Martinez</td>
<td>Putnam City North High School, OK</td>
<td>1,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viva Yriss</td>
<td>Grove High School, OK</td>
<td>1,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Hotvrcet</td>
<td>Baldwin High School, KS</td>
<td>1,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Dobbs</td>
<td>Edmond Santa Fe High School, OK</td>
<td>1,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Wade</td>
<td>Milton High School, GA</td>
<td>1,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad H. Anderson</td>
<td>South St Paul High School, MN</td>
<td>1,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David J. Ziegler</td>
<td>Liberty High School, CA</td>
<td>1,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kenneth p. grodd</td>
<td>william w. clayd</td>
<td>ivanna fritz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st. pius x catholic school, ga</td>
<td>holy cross regional school, va</td>
<td>flathead co high school, mt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sean o'donnell</td>
<td>jeffrey d. mccallan</td>
<td>pamel a. lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flathead co high school, mt</td>
<td>independence chrishman hs, mo</td>
<td>avon high school, in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sea shepherd</td>
<td>maureen m. delgado</td>
<td>john l. mercer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denver north high school, co</td>
<td>bishop guerin high school, nh</td>
<td>o'gismead falls high school, oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jennifer m. jerome</td>
<td>maas d. hansen</td>
<td>greg brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>millard west high school, ne</td>
<td>northridge high school, co</td>
<td>northridge high school, co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nancy west</td>
<td>debra j. corbin</td>
<td>jim connor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gig harbor high school, wa</td>
<td>branson high school, mo</td>
<td>sioux falls washington hs, sd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>robert t. shepherd</td>
<td>clarke community hs, ia</td>
<td>micael carr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duncanville high school, tx</td>
<td>dennis henry</td>
<td>becki sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carolyn wait</td>
<td>mount miguel high school, ca</td>
<td>golden high school, co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>port angeles high school, wa</td>
<td>chris meservey</td>
<td>steven r. dubois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patricia cheney</td>
<td>bonanza high school, nv</td>
<td>st. thomas aquinas hs, ks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oak park river forest hs, il</td>
<td>joanne cunningham</td>
<td>elizabeth dilow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stacey bonder</td>
<td>clinton high school, ms</td>
<td>cheyenne central hs, wy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rock bridge high school, mo</td>
<td>anna m. tarr</td>
<td>patricia g. rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peter gokey</td>
<td>granby high school, va</td>
<td>capital high school, id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blaine high school, mn</td>
<td>kevin damassa</td>
<td>sharon a. townsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mary elen johnson</td>
<td>la salle college high school, pa</td>
<td>plano west sr high school, tx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salt lake city west hs, ut</td>
<td>larry laas</td>
<td>monica wheaton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nellard townsend</td>
<td>concordia high school, ks</td>
<td>great bridge high school, va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ind'pis north central hs, in</td>
<td>amy l. kimura</td>
<td>debb meehw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bobbi b. briasot</td>
<td>kamehamea schools, hi</td>
<td>muskogee high school, ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>englewood high school, co</td>
<td>diana j. andradis</td>
<td>elizabeth a. monohan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>susan h. saxon</td>
<td>conifer high school, co</td>
<td>milton high school, ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evans high school, ga</td>
<td>sharon e. smith</td>
<td>bob groven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bret mclendon</td>
<td>los gatos high school, ca</td>
<td>roosevelt high school, mn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>washburn rural high school, ks</td>
<td>aron p. smith</td>
<td>paul h. wexler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tammy shedroft-waller</td>
<td>logansport high school, ca</td>
<td>needham high school, ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mountain ridge high school, az</td>
<td>vincenza russe-haber</td>
<td>c. william grier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kathy richter</td>
<td>youngstown boardman hs, oh</td>
<td>whittlestone high school, ak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plymouth high school, in</td>
<td>dana hemphill</td>
<td>kathleen talley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mary a. hamburger</td>
<td>norman high school, ok</td>
<td>northwest high school, tx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheyenne central hs, wy</td>
<td>brian geffre</td>
<td>anne jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>todd richmond</td>
<td>fargo stanley high school, nd</td>
<td>candy high school, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>byrd sr high school, nc</td>
<td>thomas p. durkin</td>
<td>kim bentley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lee kallis</td>
<td>loyola high school, md</td>
<td>greer high school, sc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yankton high school, sd</td>
<td>marjorie a. bieraugel</td>
<td>robert white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elaine m. daly</td>
<td>schnomish high school, wa</td>
<td>shaker heights high school, oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centerville high school, oh</td>
<td>christopher godard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>judith rawls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alt academy high school, co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>robert c. burgoyne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eagle point high school, or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NFL KEY OR PIN AWARDS**

Reward student efforts with a hand-crafted key or keypin.

Each colored stone—emerald, sapphire, ruby or diamond—represents progression as communication skills advance.

**Student Pins/Keys Available**

- **Plains**
  - Medium Pin, Silver Plate: $11.00
  - Large Pin, Silver Plate: $12.00
  - Medium Key, Silver Plate: $10.00
  - Large Key, Silver Plate: $11.00
  - NFL Monogram Pin, Silver Plate: $9.00
  - NFL Monogram Tie-Tac, Silver Plate: $8.00
  - NFL Student Service Bar (NEW): $6.00

**Coach Pins/Keys Available**
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<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>California Coast</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>Gay Brasher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Three Trails</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Bill Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>New England</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Leslie Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>Northern South Dakota</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Donor Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Heart of America</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Don Crabtree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>East Kansas</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>A. C. Eley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Eric DiMiche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Show Me</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Georgia Brady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>West Kansas</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Richard Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Rushmore</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Carl Swanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>East Los Angeles</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Gregory Cullen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Sunflower</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Robert Nordyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Kansas Flint-Hills</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Roger Braman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Central Minnesota</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Pam C. Wycoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Illini</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Jan Heitzen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>San Fran Bay</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Sandra Maguire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>Northwest Indiana</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Daniel Tyree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain-South</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Lowell Sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Anne Sullivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>Northern Ohio</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Kenneth Carano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Florida Manatee</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Lisa Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>South Kansas</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Darrel Harbaugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Northern Illinois</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Ted W. Belch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Hole in the Wall</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Michael Starks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>West Oklahoma</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Charlene Bradt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>South Texas</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>David Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Martha Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>Southern Minnesota</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Robert Iriq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>Carver-Truman</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>David Watkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Eastern Missouri</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Randy Pierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>Carolina West</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Steven Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>Eastern Ohio</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Todd Casper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td>Northern Wisconsin</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Ronald Steinhorst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Leora Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>North Coast</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>C. Frederick Snook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Terry Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Florida Sunshine</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Ron Carr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>East Texas</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Stan Magee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Florida Panther</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Dale McCall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>+39</td>
<td>Deep South</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Marilee Dukes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td>North Dakota Roughrider</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Gayle Hyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Mary Gormley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>Northern Lights</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Lee Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Ozark</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Teresa Sparkman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Don Oberti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>+16</td>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Ali Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>North East Indiana</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>James Menchinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>Eastern Washington</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>N. A. Cossette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Ruth McAllister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Golden Desert</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Lara Bouchard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NFL'S TOP 50 DISTRICTS
(as of October 31, 2002)
<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>51</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Chesapeake</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Joe Gutberlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td>Lone Star</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Barbara Garner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Great Salt Lake</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Donald Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Central Texas</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Kandi King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>South Oregon</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Daphne Mormon-Sturtz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Frank Sferra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Janet Robb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Colorado Grande</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>David Monteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Robert Neuleib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Southern Wisconsin</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Rev. Raymond Hahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>West Texas</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Doris Sexton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Big Valley</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Zane Harwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td>South Florida</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Bro. Anthony Cavet, CFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>New York State</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Ron Underwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>Valley Forge</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Rose Joyce-Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>Western Ohio</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Bro. Rene Sterner, FSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>Georgia Southern Peach</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Ralph Bender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>Georgia Northern Mountain</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Richard Bracknell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain-North</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Eric Brannen, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>+19</td>
<td>East Oklahoma</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Dianne Moeller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Bill Bland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Sundance</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>William Tate, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>Utah-Wasatch</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Dennis Edmonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Gulf Coast</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Kent Hyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>W. E. Schuett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>Hoosier Heartland</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Mal Olson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Harold McQueen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>Nebraska South</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Randall McCutcheon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>Tall Cotton</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>G. D. Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>North Texas Longhorns</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Connie McKee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>Wind River</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Cynthia Timmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Mississipi</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Doug Galvin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Michael Marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>Hoosier Crossroads</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mark Etherton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>West Iowa</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>William S. Hicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>North Oregon</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>James Donekas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Heart of Texas</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Wayne Gessford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>Western Washington</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Debbie Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>East Iowa</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Michael Burton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>Sagebrush</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Harold C. Keller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Judith Vasconcelos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>Tarheel East</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Donald Belanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Jacqueline Foote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>UIL</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Frances Schoolcraft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>Puget Sound</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Jimmy Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Capitol Valley</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Dewain Lien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Rita Prichard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Karen Finch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Richard Mullen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Iroquois</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Charlotte Botelho</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LARGEST NUMBER OF NEW DEGREES
#### 2001 - 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>C: Name</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lexington HS</td>
<td>Mr. Leslie Phillips</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gabriello HS</td>
<td>Mr. Derek L Yuill</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lynbrook HS</td>
<td>Ms. Michaela Northrop</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>James Logan HS</td>
<td>Mr. Tommie Lindsey Jr.</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Blue Valley North HS</td>
<td>Mr. Max H Brown</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Leland HS</td>
<td>Ms. Gay Brasher</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Downers Grove South HS</td>
<td>Ms. Jan Reitzen</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Regis HS</td>
<td>Eric Dimichile</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Chesterton HS</td>
<td>Mr. James Cavallo</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Shawnee Mission East HS</td>
<td>Paulette M Mason</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Washburn Rural HS</td>
<td>Ms. Cynthia Burgers</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pattonville HS</td>
<td>Randy Pierce/Mr. Don Schatte</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Neosho HS</td>
<td>Mr. David L Watkins</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Watertown HS</td>
<td>Rich Miteiště</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Norman HS, North</td>
<td>Jim Ryan</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bronx HS Of Science, NY</td>
<td>Richard B Sedlik</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sioux Falls Lincoln HS</td>
<td>Kim Maass</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Riverside HS</td>
<td>Ruth McAllister</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Blue Springs South HS</td>
<td>Georgia Brody</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Plymouth HS</td>
<td>Dave McKenzie</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Brookings HS</td>
<td>Judy Kroll</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Flathead Co HS</td>
<td>Greg Adkins</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Aberdeen Central HS</td>
<td>Jan Frey</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Nova HS</td>
<td>Lisa Miller</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Apple Valley HS</td>
<td>Pam Cady Wycoff</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Independence Truman HS</td>
<td>Christine Adams</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Cheyenne Central HS</td>
<td>Nick Ponapoulos</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[This page corrects the page which ran in the October Rostrum. A computer software error generated incorrect information that was published earlier. The National Office regrets the error which has been corrected.]
THE 2003 CAPITOL CLASSIC
DEBATE INSTITUTE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

“Best of Luck to the Class of 2002”

2003 Dates!
CHAMPIONS SERIES • June 21 - July 10, 2003
WASHINGTON GROUP • July 11 - August 6, 2003

For more information, contact Ron Bratt at 202-319-5447 or bratt@cua.edu

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Participants:

Champions Series:
- Stephen Adams
- Abigail Aron
- Laura Allen
- Luciana Arnedo
- Nick Aviño
- Caralos Axti
- Maya Azran
- Katie Bailey
- Sue Bannaras
- Brett Beder
- David Beer
- Joseph Bellamy
- Samaritha Berman
- Neil Bhagat
- Robert Brent
- Edward Bredekamp
- Daniel Cardenal
- James Carter
- Martin Caruso
- Ski Castell
- Angela Cheng
- Cindy Cheng
- Kejo Cheron
- Noah Chestnut
- Courtney Clinkhammer
- Caitlin Cohen
- Benjamin Cole
- Francesco Corillo
- Colby Dewey
- Timothy Dean
- Taylor Dean
- Sapul Desai
- Benno Dostew
- Lindsay Dulal
- Josh Diamond
- Diana Dickey
- Clark Donley
- Lawrence Erickson
- Nydia Felder
- Marvina Figueroa
- Sonya Galperin
- Joe Gartman
- Joseph George
- Feld Gay
- Namrata Gogia
- Navdeep Gogia
- Jack Goldin
- Ben Gonzalez
- Lawrence Grandoe
- Shmilh Grossman
- David Gutierrez
- Alex Gutierrez
- Sarah Elenon
- Jaimie Henry
- James Holley
- Chris Huang
- Mary Huggins
- Lisa Kerner
- Malika Khanne
- Fernando Kirkman
- Aash Kumar
- Ran Lava
- Patrick Lundy
- Marcus Lusha
- Ziti Lee
- Sophie Li
- Lara Leth
- Marcus Luciano
- Edeomynd Mageto
- Matt Malia
- Abbey Marshall
- Alex Martin
- Sam Mathews
- John Maziar
- Will Macias
- Victor Monterroza Jr.
- Kyle Munch
- Ike Myers
- Richard Naceto
- Ralph Porez
- Shadia Patel
- Stephen Pettifer
- Stephen Pfeffer
- Stephen Phipps
- Your Poonam
- Andy Prisco
- Dominique Pugh
- Kenny Rabitz
- Srinivas Rao
- Mika Raymond
- Robby Reed
- Jose Reggio

Washington Group:
- Edward Kelly
- Peter Rench
- Patrick Restler
- Alejandro Reis
- Paul Roth
- Silvio Romero
- Nilsa Sarti
- Allen Sanchez
- Heidi Sanchez
- Vanessa Sanyou
- Kyle Schneider
- Tim Schreiber
- Irit Shal
- Poowla Shen
- Nicole Sherwood
- Emily Shippie
- Alex Soden
- Benjamin Sonneman
- Thomas Smith
- Jessica Speiser
- Matthew Strath
- Dean Sullivan
- Sarah Taubes
- Angela Theodosopoulos
- Chris Thompson
- Jeffrey Thum
- Dan Vitanovic
- L.C. Wade
- Donald Wurman
- Elliot Wess
- Michael Williams
- Cole Williams
- Ivan Wu
- Jenna Yeh
- Christopher Yen
- Matthew Young
- Christian Zimmer
- Christopher Zyzak

Washington Group:
- Michael MacDermid
- Deepa Mahajan
- Allison McCarthy
- David MacNamara
- Sadash Mehta
- Ravi Mehta
- James Mitchell
- Robert Muldowney
- Matt Nadell
- Caitlin O'Reilly
- Sara O'Connor
- Neal Paraisan
- Gideon Perer
- Matt Perlman
- Jessica Pfeifer
- Michael Phan
- Dominique Pincet
- Chris Poole
- Sarah Press
- Allison Puente
- Reuben Quitman
- Ryan Radin
- Alexandria Rivas
- Troy Roth
- Molly Ryan
- Erick Schmidt
- Climp Schubert
- Kyle Socolar
- Eric Socolof
- Arnold Shah
- Graham Sevco
- Tim Sowers
- Chris Sos
- Timmy Sutherland
- Christopher Tickle
- Chris Teppen
- Allison Tomancik
- Ana Veiaa
- Lilliana Villasenor
- Remi Villaret
- Samara Zain
- Josalia Ziloof
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 hold it up and dry it before the fires of the mind."

— Abraham Lincoln