CDE L.D., Exttemp, Team Debate, Congress
And Parliamentary Debate Camps
The Best in the Nation
More rounds, More classes, More success, Guaranteed.

* In 1990 became the first U.S. debaters to win the World College Debate Championship.
* In 1991 CDE graduates won two events at Nationals plus second and fourth place trophies.
* In 1993 CDE graduates won three events at Nationals plus two second places and two third place trophies.
* In 1994 CDE graduates were the first U.S. team to ever win the World High School Debate Championships.
* And at NFEL Nationals 5 of the 12 Lincoln Douglas finalists were CDE graduates!
* In 1995 CDE graduates won three National Championships.
* In 1996 CDE graduates took second in L.D. Nationals, won three National Extemp Championships, and second in debate nationals.
* In 1997 CDE alumni won two National Championships.
* In 1999 CDE alumni won the National Debate Championship and another National Extemp Championship.
* In 2000 won our 12th National Extemp Championship.

This year YOU are invited to join us.
$1125, Alumni $985, Commuters $540, Teachers and Coaches $440
(Held at Northern Arizona University in Flagstaff).
Costs include tuition, room, meals, free tourist day, 1,500 debate blocks or 400 articles,
15-24 critiqued practice rounds. Acceptance guaranteed or money refunded.

Both camps will be headed by WILLIAM H. BENNETT, the former national debate champion, author of over 50 texts and books,
and coach of 9 national champions and championship debate teams.

Teacher-student ratio is guaranteed to be 8-1 or lower. Class actions are monitored.

Each camp is limited to the first 60 applicants. An $85 application fee must accompany entry. Check or credit card accepted.

Mail to: CDE, P.O. Box Z, Taos, N.M. 87571
Phone: (505) 751-0514 Fax: (505) 751-9788
Visit the CDE Web Site - www.cdedebate.com
Email - bennett@laplaza.org

☐ Student Congress
☐ Team Debate
☐ Parliamentary Debate
☐ Lincoln Douglas
☐ Foreign Exttemp
☐ Domestic Exttemp
☐ Generic Exttemp
☐ I have enclosed my $85 application check (or CC# and expiration). Send me my full packet today.

Name_________________________
Mailing Address_________________________
Phone #_________________________

[Image of group of debaters]
WHICH CAMP IS REALLY THE "BEST IN THE NATION"?

by William Bennett

The next few months you will see numerous ads, flyers, and other sources proclaim that their camp is a "great" camp, maybe even the "best in the United States." But, as you well know, only one camp can TRUTHFULLY make the claim. The thing you need to know is to select the best camp for you is which one is telling the truth. And the answer is CDE. And there are six reasons why that is true.

First is the quality of the staff. No other institute offers you Catherine Bennett (coach of three national extemp champions and the ONLY coach whose students "closed out" final round at Nationals at Lincoln Douglas), and a staff of 27 more who between them have produced top debate speaker, two national championship debate teams three firsts in L.D. at Nationals, and seven National champions in extemp.

Other teachers include Geoff Brodak (1999 National Debate Champion, 2nd at L.D Nationals in 1996), Bob and Anne Jones of Oregon (coach of 17 National qualifiers, and National trophys in both Extemp and Lincoln Douglas debate), Isaac Potter (the 2000 National Extemp champion), Ben Krupieka (Willamette College), Caleb Schoen (Lewis and Clark College), Bill Bennett (author and co-editor of over one hundred books, past national policy debate champion, coach of National Champions in team debate, extemp, and Lincoln Douglas debate).

Second is the work commitment of the staff. Our people do NOT come in to give the occasional "guest lecture." We all work ten to fourteen hours a day to be sure that you get your money's worth.

Third is our record of empirical success. It is in your best interest to compare what percentage of CDE graduates qualify for Nationals compared to the other camp(s) you are considering. At CDE as many as 87% of our graduates in any given year make it to Nationals. No other camp has this success rate. Only CDE graduates have won both the high school and college level international debate championships for the United States (Scotland 1990 and New Zealand, 1994).

Fourth is the amount of critqued practice rounds you receive. We don't just give you a "tournamnet" at the end. At CDE you get critqued non-decision rounds through the whole camp. If you are in policy debate that means 16 debates before you graduate. In Lincoln Douglas you average 21 in Extemp it's 24 rounds, 20 rounds in Parliamentary debate, and twelve Congress sessions. And they are all critqued in constructive ways by successful professionals.

Fifth is the class structure you will enjoy. It is hard work for you but it assures learning and growth. And it is different from other camps because we do not assign you to "labs" for most of your time; too often "labs" are a name for subjecting you to the erratic vagueries of an individual coach or two. At CDE you follow a class, practice, and research format perfected since 1969. Hour-by-hour you move through a learning plan that exposes you to different teachers who excel at the subject they are helping you with. And this happens to you 6 days a week, from the day you arrive until the day you leave. You are exposed to every teacher on our staff, you are helped and prodded and even eat some of your meals with staff members to assure that your individual needs are met.

Sixth is cost. Unlike many other camps CDE figures the cost of all your meals into the price we quote to you. And unlike many other camps we figure in the cost of A.I.L. debate blocks or L.D. blocks and extemp materials in the price we quote you. CDE's price tells you the truth.

Only one camp is the BEST in the nation. And that camp is CDE. We accept the first 60 students who apply.

CDF students also do well after they get to Nationals. Since 1983 CDE has produced more National Champions than any other camp. I hope you'll join us this upcoming summer.
Get to the Head with Graphics

Mary Brazee, Regional Vice President, Lincoln Financial Group

I've participated in many types of training programs during my twenty-year career in the financial services industry, including sales, marketing, administration, and technology. But none has been more important in my current position than speech and presentation training. I learned a great deal about myself and what I was capable of in those grueling sessions.

Anyone who has participated in speech training discovers right away the importance of knowing and understanding the topic, analyzing the audience and using visual aids when appropriate. Research on the subject matter and lots of practice are very important, but I think it's equally important to put yourself into the piece. Being yourself and developing your own personal presentation style helps you be more relaxed with the audience and in turn, makes communication easier. Have fun with it and whenever possible, pull from your own experience.

I recall a speech class I took in college many years ago. I was trying to do a really good job, impart some important information, and make my classmates sit up and take notice.

The topic was "Giving a Professional Shampoo" (I worked in a beauty salon at the time). I spent a lot of time interviewing hairdressers regarding proper technique and reading up on special shampoos and conditioners. But the thing that topped off the entire presentation was holding up an enlarged picture of a head louse, complete with pincers and leg hair, and announcing "It could be crawling around in your scalp if you don't shampoo your hair properly!"

That was a graphic that got right to the heart of the matter and made as much of an impression on the audience as all the words I had spoken.

Another important idea I've learned has to do with the composition of the speech or presentation and how your remarks are organized. You might call it the "rule of three" tell them what you're going to tell them, tell them; then tell them what you've told them. This concept allows you to stay focused on your topic and draw in the audience. I have found I can use this "rule of three" concept, or at least a loose form of it, in most speech or presentation situations. It's relatively simple to run the common theme throughout, from topic to details and supporting information to the summary.

Ultimately, the goal is balancing the use of these concepts in speech and presentation development. The audience should remember the message, not you. Although personal style is important in delivery, you don't want to get in the way of the message.

I wish all students good luck in competition and all future speech endeavors.
William S. Hicks

Brebeuf Jesuit HS, IN

October 30, 2000

Since 1967 William S. Hicks has served his students, his state, and the National Forensic League. A member of both the NFL Hall of Fame and the Indiana Speech Hall of Fame, Mr. Hicks is also a "Sagamore of the Wabash," a coveted honor bestowed upon citizens of Indiana for service to their state.


While at Brebeuf, Bill has earned Leading Chapter Awards in 1986 and 1994. He has coached the largest chapter in the district seven years and led the district in new enrollments eight times. Six times Mr. Hicks coached the district high point students - three of whom earned All-American Honors. Brebeuf won the District Trophy in 1986 and 1993 in the tough Hoosier Central District.

Bill's service to his profession is well documented. Six NFL distinguished service plaques, one silver and two gold District Chair Awards, six terms as District Chair, member of the Debate Topic Writing Committee, and longtime Secretary of the Indiana High School Forensic Association. Bill has served in several key positions at the National Tournament -- most recently as Parliamentarian in Congress and an Tournament Photographer.

As a young man, Coach Bill Hicks was a protege of the great Hall of Fame Coach and NFL President Jim Hawker. He has made his mentor proud.

2002-2003 Policy Debate Topic
R1 That the United States federal government should substantially increase public health services for mental health care in the United States.

Lincoln Financial Group/NFL March/April LD Topic
R2 Limiting the freedom of expression of adults is justified by society's interest in protecting children.
Reasons to Choose an NFC Summer Camp

1) Tried and True Programs. Last year hundreds of students from throughout the nation chose NFC summer camps over other options. Over the last two years NFC students have participated in late elimination rounds of such tournaments as Wake Forest, the Glenbrooks, Greenhill, St Mark's, USC Redlands Emory the Tournament of Champions NFL Nationals and virtually every other major national circuit tournament. We encourage you to check out our past NFC participants and discover for yourself why NFC camps are superior. You can get the same quality experience!

2) Staff/Student Ratio. Attend a program where you will get access to personalized debate and events instruction. Last year's NFC camps averaged staff to student ratio of 1:7. This is based on primary instructors only and does not even include access to supplemental staff.

3) Experienced, National Caliber Instruction. Our staff is composed of instructors who have achieved the pinnacle of success in every important aspect of the forensic community, including collegiate and high school coaches who have led their students to final rounds at most major national tournaments and former competitors who have attained similar success, including NHL and TOC final round participants. Our staff is handpicked for their ability to teach their successful techniques to students of every level of experience.

4) Unique Combination of Value & Quality. NFC camps provide an optimal combination of quality instruction, individualized attention and value because we recognize that a great camp is useless if you've got no money left over for tournaments!

Applications available now at www.educationunlimited.com!

510-548-4800 • debate@educationunlimited.com
The NFC Presents

The Berkeley Mentors Lab 2002

as part of the California National Debate Institute at UC Berkeley
June 14 - 29 $1,325 for resident, $700 for commuter

The Berkeley Mentors lab is a unique chance to be mentored by some of the finest college coaches and debaters in the nation. This two week program, now entering its fifth year, focuses on topic analysis, theory, strategic decision making in the debate round, kritiks, and in-depth research at one of the finest libraries in the nation. This exciting lab will be led by one of the most successful NDT debaters of recent years, Randy Luskey of UC Berkeley. Randy and his partner were the winners of last year's Wake Forest and Northwestern tournaments, and ranked #1 in the nation by the 2001 NDT ranking report. Co-directing the lab with Randy will be Sarah Holbrook, of the State University of West Georgia, where she was the CEDA National College Champion for the past two years. Sarah has won numerous speaker awards, including first at the South Carolina Round Robin. Sarah has won out rounds at every tournament she attended, including late out rounds at the NDT.

We have tentatively arranged for the lab to feature guest seminars by Jon Sharp, the veteran Mentor and Swing Lab leader, and extremely successful college coach for West Georgia and the University of Southern California. Mr. Sharp has qualified teams to a first round at the NDT for the last six years in a row.

Mentors will also have access to the other staff at the CNDFI camp, including Dave Arnett, the coach at UC Berkeley; Judy Butler, a veteran of over 40 camps; Russ Falconer, the coach of the 2000 NDT champions at Emory University; Jen Johnson, one of the highest rated instructors at the Stanford debate camp, and Robert Thomas, the California National Debate Institute director and one of the most experienced instructors in the nation. The Mentors lab is open only to extremely advanced debaters. This highly selective program will accept very few individuals to participate in the lab. If you fall in this category, please fill out and return the application below. If you don't qualify, consider the CNDFI and work alongside the mentors with our fabulous staff! Applications should be returned by April 10th. Successful applicants will be announced no later than May 1.

Mentors Application

Name:________________________

Address:________________________

Phone:________________________ Email:________________________

School:________________________ Coaches Name:________________________

Year of Graduation:______________ Number of Years Debating:______________

2001-2002 Win-Loss Record:______________ Past Camp Experience:______________

On the back of this form indicate tournaments attended and record for the past two years. At least one recommendation from a coach, former lab leader, or former Mentor is required. Send form to CNDFI Mentors, 1677 Shattuck Ave., Berkeley, CA 94709. For more information, please call 707-528-7509.
We'll Let Our Students Speak for Us

Here's what our 2001 participants had to say about Kentucky LD.

I had more fun here than at any other institute and learned more at the same time. The staff are extremely well versed and knowledgeable. They're responsible, in the whole to any other institute and the only reason to come to Kentucky. Nothing else can give you as much fun and experience as the Kentucky Institute. But none, it's the best there is.

"Awesome staff—some of the coolest, most intellectually stimulating instructors I've ever had."

"This camp stresses the perfect amount of education and competition. Debate is a form of communication that ought to be traditionally pleasing. Understanding that will help you not only in debate but in the real world. Thank you!"

"Kentucky has taught me the true value of your own issues and strategies, not so much entering all the frills but selecting real arguments and addressing them with high quality responses, instead of saying anything and everything I can think of."

"Kentucky is an all-around excellent workshop. I had a great time."

"Kentucky really improved my outlook on debate. I no longer focus on flow games but am more concerned with building strong, legitimate arguments. I hope to be here next year."

"Kentucky emphasizes knowledge and preparation over speed and cheap tactics."

"The best staff ever, bar none. [Other institute] was inferior to KDI. The staff was better and I truly learned more because of the variety of activities. I am more selective with my arguments. I utilize the syllabus and have learned to debate more slowly. Thanks a lot! You guys truly helped me."

"I went to other institutes last summer. Kentucky was much better. There were more lectures, better instructors, book readings, and more in-depth instruction here. I have learned to really appreciate the value of research."

"I now think of LD as more than just attacks and responses. You realize there is real strategy involved. I really enjoyed the advice and appreciate all you've done for me."

"Kentucky has turned me down and brightened me up. The whole get-thoughtful debate UK teaches has changed the way I do LD. As Tiny the Tiger said, "I love it!""

"The lectures were incredibly useful. I learned so much. The staff was friendly, fun, and sincere. It was a great experience—thank you!"

June 25-July 14, 2002 • $1450

Attention Coaches: This summer we inaugurate our LD Teachers Program for new coaches. A limited number of full-tuition assistantships are available. We may also accept paying students if the demand warrants. Full information is available on our website.

Visit us at www.kndi.org for full details, including staff.
Editors Forward

This year's NFL National Tournament marks the 23rd year that a champion will be crowned in Lincoln Douglas Debate. LD has in a sense "come of age". Those students who will be competing in Lincoln Douglas at this year's NFL tournament were not even born when the event was inaugurated over 20 years ago. Many of the coaches who pioneered the development of this event and were major forces in shaping the direction it took have retired or moved on to other pursuits. Many coaches of LD today were in fact competitors in the event themselves. Lincoln Douglas Debate has certainly evolved greatly from its beginnings. As is very often the case when "coming of age", LD has experienced growing pains.

As we as a community struggle to define the nature of our activity it is important to understand the unique experiences that have shaped the perspectives of the participants—coaches, judges, and students alike. In many of the articles in this issue you will be exposed not only to the author's views and opinions concerning their topic, but also to their experiences in this activity that have shaped their views. It has always amazed me how debaters love to talk about debate and I believe that the saying everyone has a story to tell holds especially true when it comes to debaters.

It seems that every debater has a narrative of some sort to communicate concerning his or her participation in this activity. The story of how he came to be involved in the activity or of his first round is one that I am sure every person involved in debate has shared with someone at some point.

In preparing this issue I felt fortunate to have the opportunity to share in the unique and diverse experiences that these authors bring to the issues that they discuss. As we continue to attempt to make our activity a more meaningful and educational one for all involved I hope that we do not lose sight of the many lessons beyond simply the ability to think critically and communicate effectively that participation in debate can bring. Debate provides a unique opportunity for each of us to learn first and foremost a great deal about ourselves as well as others.

In tackling the issues that face our activity we should strive to embrace the diversity of viewpoints that exist among the members of our community and take the opportunity to learn and benefit from their unique perspectives. We are fortunate to have an organization like the National Forensics League that provides the forums through which this can be accomplished.

Richard J. Pellicciotta, Jr.
GENDER ISSUES IN LINCOLN DOUGLAS DEBATE

It's difficult to know where to begin a discussion of sexism in debate from a male perspective. After all, aren't girls the ones who are supposed to feel the weight of discrimination on their fragile little shoulders? And aren't my fellow guys—chauvinist lackeys all of us, down to the last sorry couch potato—the sole progenitors and beneficiaries of such prejudice and bigotry?

While I certainly won't be an apologist for male chauvinism, I do want to relate my own debate experiences with an eye towards convincing you that such emotionally charged generalizations are little better than nonsense.

When I debated girls at local tournaments, where the judging pool was exceedingly random at its brightest moments, I always felt torn. How could I toe the line between condescension and callousness?

This was less of an issue at national tournaments, where perhaps because it never really entered my mind that experienced, flowing judges would care, but it still happened occasionally. A few times I even felt resentful when I perceived a female opponent intentionally playing the role of the helpless maiden specifically to make me appear overbearing. I couldn't get over the feeling that this was somehow "playing dirty," and that it was just as sexist and resulting to women as a male letting out a wolf whistle at a female opponent.

I would tend to answer yes to that question. But let's not commit the mistake of assuming that one side is clearly right and the other unabashedly evil—even if nothing else is clear, we can be sure that the jury is still out on that one. American culture in general, and debate culture in particular, seem to require of male debaters two contradictory attitudes in their conduct towards female debaters. One dictum commands us to be the liberated man we aspire to be, treating our female opponents no differently than we would treat another male. On the other hand, the same cutthroat aggressiveness that usually characterizes a much stronger male debater demolishing the arguments of another male feels curiously violent when the "victor" is instead female.

What appears to be "manly sparring" in one instance looks like abuse in the other. Inexperienced "lay" judges in particular can be especially prone to perceive them as beating up on a "defenseless little girl." I don't claim to have an answer this problem, but it's certainly one that the debate community at large needs to grapple with.

Let me state unequivocally my belief that there should be no gender roles in a debate round. Sexism and sexual harassment are reprehensible, but I merely want to point out that the issue cuts both ways. We can't view a male debater who seems a bit patronizing as merely a pig and a bigot, dismissing out of hand the strong cultural and situational factors that might command such behavior. After all, that's a hard line to walk for a 16 year old, especially when adults don't even have the proper feel for where it should be.

James Scott graduated from Katy High School near Houston, Texas, where he debated for four years. As a junior James earned second at the Texas TFA State Tournament in LD. During his senior year he finished runner-up at the 2000 Tournament of Champions, was the Texas state champion, cleared at every national tournament he attended, and attended three round robin tournaments. James now attends the University of Texas.
by Allison Pickett

In the fall of 1994, my debate career nearly ended as quickly as it had begun. Lord knows I was already nervous enough as I stood outside the classroom, waiting for my very first debate round to begin. Never mind the fact that I had three (!) more to do before I could go home and cry, the only thing I could imagine doing afterward promised to be one of the most mortifying days of my life. (Yes, ladies and gentlemen, I think I may have had a self-confidence problem.) I was on the brink of emotional meltdown—and then, it happened...

Whew! Hey baby, what's your name? I need your number.

And so it went. For twenty minutes outside the room and then throughout the entire round. No, you can't be a freshman, you've gotta be a junior—or even my judge... where did you get those eyes? Aw, honey, don't be scared, I'm just going to ask you a few easy questions. Could I really cross-examine someone with such beautiful eyes as yours? Did I mention the starring, perhaps better termed leer? I'm not kidding, I was ready to quit debate forever after round one.

Luckily, I didn't, and I learned a few things along the way:

Gender in debate rounds was usually subtle, but often important. A seemingly clear concept became anything but in assessing what to wear, how to talk, what to say, whom to imitate... For some people, the choice of a skirt versus pants in the morning was decided on a whim; for me, and for many of my fellow female debaters, what to wear was inevitably a decision about my image as a young woman as well. Makeup or not and how much became more of an issue than I had ever thought it could be. And there was always that question in the back of my head: Am I a debater who happens to be a girl, or am I a girl who happens to be a debater? In no way did I feel paranoid regarding how to project myself in a debate round, but the question of "how much me" would be allowed into the overall image was always there. I often wondered whether male debaters struggled with similar issues.

Surprisingly, I found that I believe they did. Granted, the choice was not skirt or pants, but it seemed to be a decision regarding whether to consider their female opponents females first or debaters first, and it often seemed accompanied by an assessment of the judge's tolerance of how they might want to approach defeating the young woman they were arguing against.

After several years of participation in and a few more in observation of high school debate (or, at least I.D.), here is what I believe I have learned:

1. The issue, sexism, exists, but usually in less overt ways than were demonstrated in my first round ever. My senior year in debate, I was probably more assertive than most of the other female competitors that I came into contact with; I am still not sure whether my level of assertiveness worked for or against me. To tell you the truth, it probably depended on the judge. Some judges said that they were tired of girls being (gasp!) "fishty," so to speak, and that I needed to "tone it down." Others said assertive is good and worth the risk of being labeled as something else. Regardless, though, of the way an individual judge felt about how assertive a female could be, the question was always there, and a question I tried to answer every weekend, every round.

2. However, as James and I both believe, it cuts both ways. I was and still am friends with a number of male debaters who ran into trouble dealing with female assertiveness, or a lack thereof. It's not just a problem for women. Many of my male peers simply could not be as assertive against a female as they would against another male because they would be seen as "beating up on poor little Betty" or something like that. So, as unfortunate as the stereotypes are, "sometimes* female debaters benefit from the, even if only in a very indirect and ultimately insulting (the assumption that a female could not handle the pressure) way I personally enjoyed the rounds when guys seemed to challenge me for control of the round beyond argumentation— I thought that that facilitated a lot
of learning that could not be obtained directly from debating the actual "issues" at hand, but lots of times (no, I don't have an exact number, but I did notice this), I felt as if I was given at least the benefit of the doubt in these rounds sometimes because the guy was perceived as "beating up on Betty," or in this case, poor little 5'4"ish redhead named Allison. Little did the judge know that I was probably accused of threatening Betty more often than my male opponent for that round ever would be. Sometimes I really wondered if I had lost the issues but won the mental game, and that's why I won.

3. It may also be the most vicious in girls' assessment of other girls, rather than in males' treatment of them (Flagrant exceptions exist of course, but the point remains valid). Young women's in-round actions often led to accusations outside the round, unfairly leveled by other females. There seemed to be a trend, for some (*some*) debaters to assume that some females won rounds based on particular bodily attributes and/or how they accentuated them. This may have been true in some (*some*) cases, but I believe that this claim was overused, and was often used to speak disparagingly of some talented female debaters who dressed a little more liberally than others. Unfortunately, sometimes we (I am intentionally including myself here) forgot they were talented, and only focused on their "presentation skills." (These comments were less often directed at male debaters, but perhaps some of that may have been due to the fact that men can't exactly accentuate their attributes as obviously as women can.) However, the interesting thing is that female debaters in my experience were much more willing to accuse another female of this.

4. Many of the "top" (however you would measure that anyway) female debaters were fortunate enough to have strong female coaches, which I believe had a substantial subconscious effect on the attitudes of many young women toward debate. I am not saying that female debaters do not benefit from male coaches. What I am saying is that it may make an intangible difference to have a direct influence like that that keeps a female interested in and confident in debate as an activity despite the influence of sexism on the activity. This might also be accomplished by having several strong female debaters for a novice female to "look up to"--I don't know. I have had Marilee Dukes as my coach, mentor, and role model made all the difference in the world in a lot of spheres; this was one of them.

And this is where we return to the beginning, and why I did not quit after that very first round I affectionately called hell. Fortunately, the (male) judge pulled me aside after the round and told me debate was NOT supposed to be like that. Several varsity girls told me that that was not typical, and Dukes gave me several good ideas about how to handle such situations in the future...and then she took me aside and literally kept me from quitting. (Whether or not she remembers the exchange I do not know, but I

(Sexism was not the norm, and that it could be overcome.)

(Sexism both overt and more subtle is definitely there. It affects both male and female debaters, but I fear that the sexism may create lifelong impressions on some of the females that it may not on most males. Unfortunately, often the young women unknowingly continue the cycle against themselves through paying more attention to the presentation of personality than the talent of some of the more liberal and aggressive female debaters. Luckily, though, even though the debate has its problems with sexism, my experience with the issue shows that the debate community is aware of the problems, and cares about addressing them. My first year that is what made the difference. A judge, several older female debaters, and a wonderful coach addressing sexism, one debater at a time. In September 1994, that debater was me, and for that I am eternally grateful.)

(Allison Pickett graduated from Vestavia Hills High School, AL. As a high school debater she reached the late elimination rounds of virtually every national tournament and participated in every major round robin. She ended her debate career by capturing the 1998 NFL National Championship in Lincoln Douglas Debate. She has also been a staff member of both the University of Iowa and Stanford University's I.D. Institute. She currently attends the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.)
BAYLOR UNIVERSITY
A tradition of excellence
for over 60 years

- Outstanding faculty at every level
  Our policy debate staff includes Dr. Karla Leeper, Dr. Lee Polk,
  Dr. William English, Dr. Phil Vaughn, Ms. Susan Stanfield,
  Mr. Ryan Galloway and other experienced instructors.
  Our LD staff includes Mr. Joseph Johnson, Mr. Ryan Cunningham,
  Mr. Steve Wilbur, Mr. Stephen Babb and other
  experienced instructors

- Outstanding library resources for all of our students
  Students have access to the holdings of the Baylor University libraries
  In addition, a reserve collection created just for our workshop, will
  assist students in preparing for their upcoming season

- Outstanding curriculum
  For policy debaters we emphasize the skills of education, extensive
  analysis of the topics and contemporary debate theory, brief specific to the
  topic and practice debates and speeches
  For LD debaters we emphasize instruction in analyzing values and value
  propositions, preparation for the upcoming season topics practice
  speeches and debates, as well as instruction in 1D practice and strategy.

  We offer instruction at the novice, intermediate and varsity level in both
  forms of debate

A SPECIAL THIRD WEEK OF INSTRUCTION
Students may choose either, intensive advanced
instruction in policy debate or intensive advanced
instruction in extemporaneous speaking. The third week
is a chance for participants to spend extra time working to
develop new skills or to refine their current skills in
preparation for the highest levels of competition.

P.O. Box 97368
Waco, TX 76798-7368

Phone 254-741-4371
The Scholars Program at the
Emory National Debate Institute

June 16 - June 29, 2002 • Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia

The Emory National Debate Institute, which has contributed to the education of high school debaters for a quarter of a century, now offers a specialized workshop-within-a-workshop catering to current and high school debaters with advanced skills. The Scholars Program, which was conceived and designed by some of the nation's most competitively successful college coaches, gives accomplished debaters the opportunity to refine the kind of instruction, research opportunities, and feedback they will need in order to meet their competitive goals for the coming year.

The Scholars Program will take place alongside the established Emory National Debate Institute, under the direction of Melissa Maxey Wade. Those who enter the Program will have access to the entire faculty of the ENDI. However, the Scholars Program contains a number of additional features designed specifically to benefit the advanced debater.

Special Features of the Scholars Program

Advanced curriculum: Every aspect of the Scholars Program has been re-designed by our staff of accomplished coaches, from the lecture schedule to the structure and pace of lab groups. Members of the Program will receive advanced library instruction, including guided research in the Woodruff library system and targeted use of Internet resources. Our curriculum helps students understand and utilize the most advanced modern debate positions, but without sacrificing their ability to win rounds with traditional skills and strategies.

Emphasis on evidence accumulation: Rather than forcing experienced students to endure redundant basic lectures, we let Scholars get on with the business of researching the topic and practicing advanced techniques.

Amazing staff-to-student ratio: We maintain a 1:1 staff-student ratio in lab groups, and each student will interact with nearly every member of our large scholars Program faculty.

Unique, separate lectures: Outside their lab groups, members of the Program will receive direct instruction from top-ranked college coaches. Even in lecture settings, our staff-student ratio is unusual, with no more than 20 students listening to one instructor. Furthermore, we offer a small group theory seminar menu targeted to students' needs and interests.

Numerous debate rounds: Our curriculum includes a minimum of 12 rounds, with extended time for critiques from our staff.

Select faculty: The Program will be directed by Joe Zimpetti, David Heidt, and Casey Woolmer. Dr. Zimpetti, the award-winning Director of Forensics at Mercer University, is a veteran of the ENDI and a past Director of the Scholars Program. Mr. Heidt, a past winner of the National Debate Tournament and a past Director of the Scholars Program, is an Assistant Coach at both Emory University and The Westminster Schools of Atlanta. He is widely recognized as one of the most talented debate coaches in the country and has coached many college teams into the late elimination rounds of the National Debate Tournament. Casey Woolmer, a graduate of Stayton in New York, is currently a debater at Emory. In her young career, she has already competed in the final round of the CFDA National Tournament, and is a regular participant in the late classes of national tournaments. Mr. Woolmer is also a veteran of the Scholars Program.

Great value: Scholars will pay the same price as other students at the Emory National Debate Institute. We are a nationally competitive institute at a threecent price.

You must apply for the Scholars Program at the ENDI. Those seeking admission should call or write

Melissa Maxey Wade
P.O. Drawer U, Emory University • Atlanta, GA 30322
Phone: (404) 727-6189 • email: lohman@emory.edu • FAX: (404) 727-5367
Barkley Forum • Emory National Debate Institute
June 16 – June 29, 2002 • Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia
Under the Direction of Melissa Maxcy Wade

The Emory National Debate Institute has been contributing to the education of high school debaters for twenty-six years. The curriculum is steeped in the most fundamental aspects of debate, presentation, research, and critical thinking. An excellent combination of traditional argument and debate theory and an emphasis on current debate practice makes the Emory National Debate Institute one of the most successful curricula year after year. Middle-, high-, and college-level, and various competitions have found the Institute a worthwhile learning experience because the staff has the expertise to teach all levels of students and the experience to adjust to a variety of student needs.

Features of the Policy Division
Under the Direction of Bill Newnam

Experienced staff: Our senior level staff has worked at the Institute and many others, including American University, Bates College, Bard College, Berkeley, Dartmouth College, Georgetown University, University of Iowa, University of Kansas, Northwestern University, University of Michigan, Wake Forest University, Stanford University, and Stanford University.

Excellent staff student ratio: The Institute offers debaters the opportunity to work with one senior level instructor accompanied by at least one active college debater in small lab groups of 10 to 20 students.

Flexible curriculum: The Institute has always provided students a wide variety of instruction suitable to their level of experience. Each laboratory group has explicit objectives and a fluid, tested curriculum for the two-week period, dependent upon their level of experience.

Commitment to diversity: The Institute has always been committed to making instruction accessible to urban and rural areas. We have several funded scholarships dedicated to promoting diversity. Additionally, ongoing grants make it possible to support more students from economically disadvantaged areas.

Dormitory supervision: An experienced staff including high school teachers, graduate students, and college upperclass students will supervise the dormitory.

Coaches workshop: An in-depth coaches workshop in conducted. Topics will include administration, organization, and training strategies. A full set of lectures appropriate for the classroom will be developed.

Inclusive Fees: The standard Institute fee includes tuition, housing, meals, lab phonocopying fees, entertainment, and a handbook— the works.

Features of the Lincoln-Douglas Division
Under the Direction of Jim Wade

Experienced staff: The Director of the Lincoln-Douglas division has been at the Institute for over twenty years, and has served in his current position for eight years. Other staff members include a roster of former college debaters, as well as some of the top college debaters in the nation.

Excellent staff student ratio: The Institute offers debaters the opportunity to work with one senior level instructor accompanied by at least one active college debater in small lab groups of 10 to 14 students.

Flexible curriculum: The Institute has always provided students a wide variety of instruction suitable to their level of experience. Our classes deal both with general philosophical issues and practical technique. There is a strong emphasis on lab groups on building speaking experience and promoting constructive criticism. A typical day involves three classes dealing with philosophy or technique and theory, followed by five hours of practical lab sessions.

Commitment to diversity: The Institute has always been committed to making instruction accessible to urban and rural areas. We have several funded scholarships dedicated to promoting diversity. Additionally, ongoing grants make it possible to support more students from economically disadvantaged areas.

Dormitory supervision: An experienced staff including high school teachers, graduate students, and college upperclass students will supervise the dormitory.

Inclusive Fees: The standard Institute fee includes tuition, housing, meals, lab phonocopying fees, entertainment, and a handbook— the works.

For an application, write or call

Melissa Maxcy Wade
P.O. Drawer U, Emory University
Atlanta, GA 30322

Phone (404) 727-6189 • email: lablen@emory.edu • FAX: (404) 727-5367
"THIS IS L-D": THEORY ARGUMENTATION IN LINCOLN DOUGLAS DEBATE

by

R. J. Pellicciotta

It has been over twenty years since the inception of Lincoln Douglas Debate. Created as an alternative to the format of policy debate, L-D seems to have always suffered from an identity crisis. Very often L-D has defined itself by what it is, but by what it is not. How often have we heard debaters make statements like the following? "This is not policy. This is L-D." These statements are not only overused, but they are also not very meaningful when really examined. They are, however, reflective of the problems underlying Lincoln Douglas Debate as it evolves as an activity. What does it mean to say "this is L-D"? This statement seems to assume that there is some common agreement as to what the nature of Lincoln Douglas Debate is or at least should be. It is not clear to anyone who has judged at an NFL National tournament (or any other large event with a diversity of influences represented) that this is simply not the case. Yet in spite of the vast differences in the way different people in different areas view L-D, rarely are these differences the subject of meaningful debate or discussion during the course of a round. While it is not unheard of to listen to a theory debate in a policy round, that is virtually unheard of in Lincoln Douglas. Most of the time deep theoretical or philosophical differences are glossed over by debaters, with broad sweeping generalizations like the ones mentioned above "This is L-D." This is NOT policy. The results often debates that are frustrating and unsatisfying for both the competitors and judges. This is more likely the result of the fact that the theory aspect of Lincoln Douglas debate is both undervalued and often overlooked by students, judges, and coaches alike.

In discussing theory argumentation in L-D it is first necessary to define exactly what we are referring to when we talk about debate theory. In debate, theory refers to arguments as to how any particular form of debate ought to be conducted. In other words, what rules or guidelines ought to govern how the debate is carried out by the debaters, or adjudicated by the judge? Traditionally in policy debate, theory argumentation has focused on such issues as the legitimacy of counterpoints or critiques, the proper use of flat, or the importance of various stock issues like topicality or relevancy. In L-D, theory argumentation (when it occurs) seems to be limited to the proper use of value or criterion standards to evaluate the round. Even in these cases there seems to be very little actual discussion as to why the interpretations presented by the debaters are in fact justified or superior to that offered by the opposition. Rather both sides simply assert that their position is correct. These claims are almost as facile as if they factual statements to which there can be no counterargument advanced. This is simply the way it is and there is no real need for discussion. Anyone who has judged more than a few rounds of L-D can attest that such widespread agreement concerning the use of values, and criteria, in any other issue for that matter is at best illusionary.

Why is it that Lincoln Douglas debaters seem so hesitant to engage in discussion of theoretical differences during the course of a round? The most likely explanation for this lies in the fact that theory in Lincoln Douglas is not well developed. Many of the conventions that govern the practice of the activity seem to lack any substantive justification. Many others tend to be applied so broadly that they often serve only to prevent the meaningful discussion of issues that the activity is intended to facilitate. There is also the problem of the recognition that theory in L-D must be flexible due to the nature of the activity itself. Lincoln Douglas theory should be viewed as topic specific. In other words, the nature of the topic should be the primary factor in determining what is and is not proper argumentation. All too often debaters seem to be more interested in learning their positions in terms of the ill defined and vague conventions that are prevalent in the practice of L-D then in developing subtle, realistic, and persuasive arguments. This is not to say that there are not certain guidelines that should be used to define the sphere of debate on any given topic. These guidelines, however, should be clearly and narrowly defined to allow the necessary flexibility to embrace the diversity of topics that are debated in the Lincoln Douglas format.

The most prominent of these guidelines is derived from the fact that Lincoln Douglas is considered to be value debate. The resolutions debated are intended to be viewed as resolutions or value as opposed to resolutions of fact or policy. While there is universal agreement that L-D is "value" debate, what exactly that means is not as easily ascertained or agreed upon. One simplistic interpretation of this idea is to state that we are debating what we ought to value. In other words we are determining what values we ought to hold and which ones ought to be prioritized over the others. This would seem to imply that the two sides in the debate are therefore supposed to hold different things to be of value. While this may certainly be true on some topics, this interpretation does not always hold true. Sometimes a value resolution may question how best to achieve what is held to be of value, rather than to compare two different competing values. Political scientists make this distinction when they distinguish between what are called position issues and what are called value issues. Position issues are ones in which the opposing sides hold different values to be of importance. One such issue is abortion where one side holds the sanctity of human life to be most important and the other side values the right of personal choice to be paramount. Value issues on the other hand are ones in which both sides hold the same value or values to be of importance, but have differing conceptions of how best to achieve these values. Issues like economic prosperity, political corruption, and civil liberties are prime examples of value issues. No one is against economic prosperity or political corruption. There are clearly differing opinions as to how to best handle these matters however. L-D resolutions can be broken down in a similar man-
Take the resolution, "Resolved! A just social order ought to value the principle of equality above that of liberty." This is clearly an example of a resolution where the value conflict is similar to the conflict surrounding the issue of nuclear weapons. Two sides in this resolution are called upon to defend two different and competing values. This is not always the case, however. Take for example the resolution, "Resolved! A lease developed nation's right to develop might to protect the environment." One of the negative strategies on this topic was to take the position that true economic development could be best achieved by developing within the constraints of one's obligation to protect the environment. "Sustainable Development" as it is often referred to, lies at the heart of much of the literature concerning this topic. Yet many affirmative debaters would preclude arguments of this sort claiming that they did not fulfill the negative’s burden. These affirmative debaters believe that the negative was required to treat the conflict in the resolution as a position issue, rather than allowing them to view it as a valence one. There does not seem to be any valid reason that the negative in this resolution should be required to argue their position based on a completely different and competing value. When the term “value debate” is properly understood, it should be apparent that it can still be a value debate even if we are not directly comparing competing values, but rather attempting to determine how best to uphold a commonly held value. The fact that the actual real world discussion of this topic is centered on the concept of sustainable development should weigh heavily in any critic’s assessment of the legitimacy of such a position. The topic itself should define the proper parameters of how to intelligently discuss the issues inherent within. Attempting to establish a set list of rules that govern what are and are not legitimate positions ignores the variety of forms that value conflict can take as well as the diversity of issues that value debate is capable of embracing. Anytime debaters make claims as to what is or is not appropriate argumentation, they should be sure to explain such claims in terms of how they relate specifically to the topic at hand. In defining what is appropriate ground for debate it is imperative that the primary focus be on capturing the conflict inherent in the resolution under consideration. This will ensure that debate is focused on meaningful and relevant issues and that the educational value of the activity is maximized for the participants.

To illustrate this one can look to the topic concerning the morality of possessing nuclear weapons. The question, "The possession of nuclear weapons is immoral," is one interpretation advanced by the affirmative was that the resolution dealt with universal disarmament. Such an interpretation would completely eliminate the word "deterrence" from the discussion of the topic. Any person who has done the least bit of research on this topic would be apparent that the idea of deterrence lies at the heart of the issue. Any world power discussion of the issue would be considered shallow and incomplete if it neglected to address this issue. Any interpretation of this resolution that would eliminate the issue of deterrence from consideration would therefore not be well grounded from a theoretical standpoint. Since the very purpose of debate theory is to create meaningful discussion, it should be clear that any interpretation of a resolution that is counter to this purpose should be rejected. Recognition of this by both debaters and judges would go a long way to increase the quality and substance of debate in the Lincoln-Douglas format.

Another controversial issue in L-D concerns the extent to which pragmatic argumentation is appropriate. It is clear that in L-D no "plan" is required to meet the burden of defending the resolution. Yet, what is exactly meant when one refers to a "plan" is not quite as clear. In policy debate a plan is offered by the affirmative team as a means of narrowing and defining the ground that they will defend in the round. That plan must fall within the interpretation established by the resolution, but the affirmative is not considered to be defending the entirety of the resolution. Any attempt in an L-D round to narrow the ground in the debate to a specific course of action would be inappropriate. This does not deny, however, that it may very well be necessary to provide practical explanation of the position one is advancing in an L-D round or even to explain the real world implications of the position which is advanced by one of the sides. To label such arguments as a plan and attempt to discredit them from consideration in the round would be to misinterpret what should be meant when one refers to plans and plan attacks.

In addition, the use of so-called "counterplains" has created controversy in L-D. The primary argument advanced against the offering of alternatives to the resolutionually denied position is that counterplains are a policy argument. When scrutinized this argument lacks substance and is founded on a faulty premise. Simply because something is useful in policy debate does not mean that it should be precluded from use in L-D. It must be evaluated independently to determine their appropriateness for a given format. The use of such ideas in one formal debate should have no bearing on whether they can be used appropriately in another format. The appropriateness of "counterplans" or alternatives in L-D should be defined primarily by the topic under consideration. There are certain topics where the failure to discuss alternative options would prejudice a full and comprehensive discussion of the issue at hand. For example, the resolution concerning violent revolution as a response to oppression. (Resolved! Violent revolution is a just response to oppression.) For any person actually confronted with this choice it would be unthinkable not to consider what alternatives might exist before deciding to use violence as a means to accomplish one’s goals. In debating this topic it would only make sense to consider such alternatives before making a judgment. This type of consideration should be more important than whether or not such arguments fit what have traditionally been commonplace practices in L-D.

The use of "knucks" in L-D has also been an extremely divisive issue. Basically "knucks" seem to have wide acceptance amongst the policy debate community today as in Lincoln-Douglas debate. Many people seem to forget that when "knucks" first became prevalent in policy debate many attempted to discredit them by labeling them as L-D arguments. Certainly there are "knucks" that would be inappropriate for value debate. "Knucks" of the resolution itself that essentially lead to the conclusion that the topic is undebatable obviously do not sustain the substantive discussion of ideas that is the purpose of any format of debate. Just like any other theoretical stance the nature of the topic itself should guide our consideration as to the acceptability of a particular form of argumentation. Arguments appropriate to the topic should not be rejected because they vary from the traditional ideas that are most often utilized. At this same time, "knuck" arguments that are tangential to the issues embedded in the resolution itself that fundamentally change the focus of the debate away from those issues. (Postscriptum in page 20).
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Stanford National Forensic Institute

Three Week CX Program: July 28 - August 17  Two Week LD/IE: July 30 - August 12
Four Week CX Program: July 28 - August 24  Three Week LD: July 30 - August 19

SUPERIOR PROGRAM: The Stanford National Forensic Institute offers a unique national caliber program which features policy debate, LD debate, and NFL events. The policy program is 3 weeks, the IE and LD programs are 2 weeks. The SNFI is conducted by the Stanford Debate Society of Stanford University, a registered student organization of the Associated Students of Stanford University. An excellent faculty teaches students both fundamentals and advanced techniques in a rigorous, carefully structured environment that caters to the needs of forensics students at all levels. Policy debate students who have attended an institute of sufficient rigor earlier in the summer may apply for acceptance into the “policy debate swing lab,” designed for students desiring the most comprehensive instruction possible.

SUPERIOR FACULTY: The majority of SNFI faculty will be current or former high school and collegiate coaches of national repute. Initially confirmed staff for this summer are:

Gerard Grigsby, Harker School
Russ Falconer, UC Berkeley
John Hines, U. North Texas
Casey Kelly, Wake Forest
Chris McFarlane, USC (CA)
Dan Shalmon, UC Berkeley
Byron Arthur, Stuart Hall
Jonathan Alston, Newark
Eric Holland, USC (CA)
Josette Surrat, New Orleans
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Michelle Coody, St. James
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Mazin Shaiti, RL Turner
Morris Block, Riverwood HS
Matthew Froster, SNFI Director

 Listed affiliations are for identification purposes only. The institutions noted are the relevant SNFI staff member works, debates or debated, and/or studies during the academic year. More detailed staff qualifications are enumerated in the program brochure, now available.

SUPERIOR SETTING: The SNFI is held on the Stanford University campus, located in Palo Alto, CA. There is no better location anywhere to study forensics. Stanford provides a beautiful setting for the students to study, practice and learn. Supervision is provided by a staff which collectively has hundreds of previous institute teaching sessions of experience. The SNFI specializes in advanced competitors, but comprehensive programs at all levels are available.

REASONABLE COST:
Policy Debate
$2,055 Three Week Program
$3,000 Four Week Program
$1,595 3 Week Commuter

LD and Events
$1,525 Two Week Program
$2,475 Three Week LD Program
$1,195 2 Week Commuter

Given the nature and quality of the 2002 program the cost is quite low. This program, both in faculty composition and structure compares favorably with programs costing nearly twice as much. The resident plan includes housing for the duration of the program, 3 meals a day on most days of the program, tuition and all required materials. The commuter plan includes tuition, lunch and dinner on most program days, and some materials. An additional SSF application fee is required upon application to the SNFI.

TO APPLY
Stanford Debate Society - SNFI
555 Bryan St., #599
Palo Alto, CA 94301
Scholarships in the form of need-based aid are available.
(650) 723-9086
E-mail: snfi@mail.com
2002 Stanford National Forensic Institute

Policy Debate (CX) July 28 - Aug 17
Resident $2055, Commuter $1595
Aug 17 - 24 CX Lab $950, Commuter $750

LDE: July 30 - Aug 12
Resident $1525, Commuter $1195
Aug 12 - 19 LDE Lab $950, Commuter $750

Additional $85 application fee required with all applications

APPLICATION FOR ADMISSION

Student Information:

First Name: ___________________________ Last Name: ___________________________

Gender: M ☐ F ☐ Age: ___________ Grade in Fall 2002 ___________________________

Address: ______________________________________________________________________

Phone: ___________________________ Email Address: ___________________________

Mother's Name: ___________________________ Daytime Phone: _______________________

Father's Name: ___________________________ Daytime Phone: _______________________

Coach's Name: ___________________________ Phone: ___________________________

High School: ___________________________

High School Address: ____________________________________________________________

Application Information:

I am applying for (choose one on each line)

1. Division: ☐ Policy Debate ☐ Lincoln Douglas ☐ Individual Events

2. Housing Status: ☐ Resident ☐ Commuter

3. Number of Rounds: ☐ 0-10 ☐ 10-15 ☐ 15-20 ☐ 20-30 ☐ 30-40 ☐ 40-50 ☐ 50-60 ☐ 60-70 ☐ 70-80 ☐ 80-90 ☐ 90-100 ☐ 100+

4. Years Experience: 0 1 2 3 4

On an additional sheet experienced students should list their complete record, including:
tournaments attended, win/loss record or scores, division and placement and any awards won
at each. Policy debate students who would like to debate with a specific partner at camp should
list that person.

Mail completed application to 555 Bryant St #599, Palo Alto, CA 94301
650-723-9084 - sraa@mail.com
2002 Stanford National Forensic Institute

Program Information:
Please complete only the section corresponding to the division of the program you wish to be enrolled in. Please see information in the brochure regarding special programs before selecting those options. Applicants should also be aware that admissions to special programs are competitive.

Policy Debate:
Session Length: □ 3 Week Session □ 4 Week Session □ 4th Week Only

Special Program: □ Swing Lab (please list previous camp attended during 2002)
(Limited, most students do not select a special program)

Lincoln Douglas:
Session Length: □ 2 Week Session □ 3 Week Session □ 3rd Week Only

Special Program: □ Stanford Advanced Seminar

Individual Events:
Please list two desired events: ____________________________
______________________________
(Primary) (Secondary)

Special Program: □ Extemp Lab

Important Information: (Please read "How to Apply" and "Program Information" sections of the SNFI brochure)
Program Information: Resident fees include room, board, and tuition. Community fees include tuition and lunch and dinner most days of the program. Upon application, all accepted students will receive a comprehensive enrollment packet which details enrollment procedures, including final payment deadlines. Limited extra based financial aid is available.
Enrollment Fees and Deadlines: To secure enrollment, submit the completed application and an $85 non-refundable enrollment fee (which is additional and refundable only in the event that the applicant is not accepted to the program). Applicants who pay in full by May 1 are guaranteed admission. Priority enrollment deadline is May 28, but late applicants can be accepted as space permits. There is a late fee of $50 for applications received after the May 28th deadline. $30 for enrollment forms returned after the June 15th deadline, and a late fee of $300 for applications received after June 15. Express mail is recommended after June 15.
Refund Policy: The SNFI is unable to offer refunds without the purchase of cancellation insurance. This insurance provides a refund, except for the insurance premium and initial application fee of $85, if you cancel in writing prior to the start of the program. Refunds are given according to the following schedule:

- Days before Camp: Refund
  - 22 or more: 100%
  - 21 - 7: 70%
  - 6 or fewer: 0%

The cost of insurance is $125 for the Three Week policy sessions, $195 for the Four Week policy sessions, $95 for the Two Week LD and IL students, $165 for the LD Three Week session, and $70 for CX or LD one week programs. Cancellation insurance is not available for applications submitted after June 15. Cancellation insurance may only be purchased upon application. No refund of any kind is offered without cancellation insurance. If you do not select a cancellation insurance option, we will assume you do not wish to purchase the insurance.

I would like to purchase cancellation insurance: □ Yes. Insurance payment is enclosed □ No

I have read and understood the information above. I certify that the information I have provided in the above application is true to the best of my knowledge.

Student's Signature: ____________________________ Date: __________

Parent's Signature: ____________________________ Date: __________

Mail completed application to 555 Bryant St. Suite 650, Palo Alto, CA 94301
THE IMPORTANCE OF USING THE CRITERION EFFECTIVELY

by Nathan Carle

Lincoln-Douglas debate focuses on philosophical dilemmas, either questioning the truth of a single normative statement, or attempting to prioritize two competing values. The key terms are: the value premise and the value criterion. Debaters present a value premise to identify the general good questioned in the resolution. The value criterion allows judges and debaters to weigh arguments in relation to the broad notion of good established by the value premise.

Typical criteria do not function as weighing mechanisms; instead, they replace the value premise with an equally ambiguous concept. Although the fulfillment of obligations is narrower than morality, it performs poorly as a weighing mechanism to resolve the conflict because most debate topics place two competing obligations in conflict. Effective debate and fair adjudication demand a more focused standard, so more specific standards frequently appear later in the case or, in the worst situation, after the round in the judge's mind. Utilizing a narrow criterion increases the potential for objectivity in judging and allows debaters to achieve greater persuasive clarity.

The Real Importance of the Value

Lincoln-Douglas requires debaters to demonstrate the validity or falsity of a proposition of value. In most resolutions the wording suggests a value premise. For example, the resolution “the possession of nuclear weapons is immoral” and “human genetic engineering is morally justified” both outline the value dilemmas debaters must resolve. In these topics, linking arguments to morality meets the burden established by the resolution. Taking time to explain a link between the resolution and a different value other than one implicit in the resolution risks confusion, wastes time necessary for more important argumentation, and focuses on less important issues.

Comparative resolutions pose a challenge because the wording seldom directly contains the value. For example, the topic “the public’s right to know ought to be valued above the right to privacy of candidates for public office” reveals a conflict between two values but does not suggest an overarching value. To determine a value premise that links your arguments to the resolution, debaters must analyze more than just the text of the topic. To determine a value that underlies both values competing in the resolution. In our example, both sides of the resolution are democratic values, so the debate should be evaluated in terms of who better facilitates democracy. Picking a value of democracy, for example, would link to the resolution being true or false. Ultimately, a good value clearly relates your case to the truth of the resolution.

A well-chosen value should provoke little question over its permanence. Unless a value is irrelevant to the resolution, a comparative resolution allows for different resolutions. Interpretations, values should vary only in wording, there is no point in arguing the priority of morality over moral justification. The definition of proper values also breaks little reason for disagreement. Morality and justice are both synonymous with “what ought to be.” By definition, morality and justice are supreme values. A value for comparative resolutions, although not necessarily morality, should work the same way. Referring to the previous example, one could not disagree with the value of democracy since the conflict of the resolution assumes the framework of a democratic government. This is consistent with the purpose of the value premise: a value premise that links to the truth of the resolution should be inherently supreme. Debate should focus on the criterion.

Where the Real Debate Begins

An ideal criterion outlines the burdens that must be met to prove the resolution true. This provides two important winning components: first, it clearly identifies what debaters need to prove in their case, and second, it provides the judge a definitive standard to weigh issues in the debate.

Clearly identified burdens significantly increase the quality of arguments. Rather than itemizing claims in a shopping list with no clear direction, debaters know specifically what claims to present, allowing debaters to focus more on making warranted and cogent arguments. Such arguments are analytically stronger and more compelling than a shopping list of unwarranted assertions. Additionally, predetermining burdens ensure ideological consistency within arguments. Since the same standard is ultimately not used to weigh each argument in a case with a broad criterion, inconsistent standards may inadvertently arise.

Providing the judge with a definitive standard significantly influences the outcome of the debate. An overbroad criterion forces the debaters to prioritize competing values as the round progresses, or forces the judge to adapt some standard so she can weigh. Weighing mechanisms established during the course of the round are typically unclear and conflicting. Debaters have control of the direction the round takes as poor standards invalidate the round. Allowing the judge to decide how to weigh values impacts diminishes the debate’s influence over the outcome of the round. Although it might seem clear that one right is more valuable than another to the debater, a judge may have a completely different point of view. Instead of his or her own point of view, a narrow criterion gives the judge a far more objective and clear standard.

Establishing a Definitive Criterion

Narrowing a resolution into specific principles or burdens is difficult, and it is certainly easier to establish on some resolutions than others. Broad criteria may be appropriate on some topics as well since arguments are equally broad. Arguments that specifically impact to a government's capacity to protect individual rights in general may very well necessitate a broad crite-
ion such as the protection of individual rights. Arguments that impact to the protection of a specific right require a more specific criterion that provides a mechanism to prioritize different rights' claims.

To decompose the resolution into definitive standards, debaters should determine what issues are crucial to the truth of the resolution. However, criteria generally require more resolution criteria than broad criteria. An example can be taken from, "The public's right to know ought to be valued above the right to privacy of candidates for public office." Assuming that democracy is the value premise, and given the two issues in conflict, what is necessary for either side to prove the resolution true? One answer is that "it is necessary for the electorate to have all information relevant to making their vote." This standard narrows the debate into the burden of whether it is necessary to reveal information about a candidate's private life to provide voters with relevant information. Winning the issue of relevance is necessary and sufficient for proving the resolution.

Enhancing Debate

A definitive criterion requires less general claims to prove the resolution. Like in the previous example resolution, it debaters only need to empirically prove that information provides relevant information, not otherwise available to the voters. Narrowing the debate into a few specific claims enhances the quality of debate for four reasons.

First, broad criteria open the debate to numerous different independently weighted claims. Numerous arguments impacted by numerous standards render the round completely unweighable. The strategy of overwhelming shopping list cases to cases extending individual claims dropped by the opponent, which need no warrant to stand in the round, and then attempting to weigh arguments at the end. Such debate is unclear, and seldom works against debaters effectively utilizing narrow criteria. Eliminating the necessity for numerous independent claims through a narrow criterion avers confusion over weighing issues.

Second, narrow positions give debaters more time for warranting arguments. Warranted arguments from opponents to put more time into developing responses, since one cannot simply point out that a claim is an unwarranted assertion. A narrow position established by a definitive criterion allows debaters to quantify the benefit of a shopping list case through extending numerous warrants; however, a narrow position is more efficient, since multiple warrants that lead to the same position are weighed by a specific criterion.

Third, a narrow position is better prepared for overwhelmed cases with numerous independent claims. Defending a criterion that focuses the debate on one central issue makes all claims that impact to a different standard irrelevant and insignificant. Applying your criterion to an overwhelming shopping list case significantly diminishes the number of important claims, by weeding out the irrelevant arguments.

Fourth, the intellectual quality of argumentation increases when time is given to a few well-developed claims. Narrowing the realm of the debate leads to a greater need for research and elevated analysis. Emphasizing the quantity of independent claims requires less thought on the actual underlying analysis, focusing on underlying analysis of claims proves deeper and more complex issues. Certainly more impressive than a collection of assertions, detailed analysis underlying the truth of a few specific claims increases the overall educational value of the activity.

Conclusion

Breaking down the topic into one central issue establishes a specific criterion utilizing a specific criterion is advantageous in two main areas of debate. First, specificity increases debaters influence over the decision, by increasing overall clarity and providing a more objective weighing mechanism for the round. Second, a definitive criterion promotes four important aspects of strong debate coherent weighing, better warranting, better coverage of opposing arguments, and more intellectual preparation. Ultimately, utilizing the criterion effectively is critical to winning rounds.

Nathan Carle

Second, narrow positions give debaters more time for warranting arguments. Warranted arguments from opponents to put more time into developing responses, since one cannot simply point out that a claim is an unwarranted assertion. A narrow position established by a definitive criterion allows debaters to quantify the benefit of a shopping list case through extending numerous warrants; however, a narrow position is more efficient, since multiple warrants that lead to the same position are weighed by a specific criterion.

Third, a narrow position is better prepared for overwhelmed cases with numerous independent claims. Defending a criterion that focuses the debate on one central issue makes all claims that impact to a different standard irrelevant and insignificant. Applying your criterion to an overwhelming shopping list case significantly diminishes the number of important claims, by weeding out the irrelevant arguments.

Fourth, the intellectual quality of argumentation increases when time is given to a few well-developed claims. Narrowing the realm of the debate leads to a greater need for research and elevated analysis. Emphasizing the quantity of independent claims requires less thought on the actual underlying analysis, focusing on underlying analysis of claims proves deeper and more complex issues. Certainly more impressive than a collection of assertions, detailed analysis underlying the truth of a few specific claims increases the overall educational value of the activity.

Conclusion

Breaking down the topic into one central issue establishes a specific criterion utilizing a specific criterion is advantageous in two main areas of debate. First, specificity increases debaters influence over the decision, by increasing overall clarity and providing a more objective weighing mechanism for the round. Second, a definitive criterion promotes four important aspects of strong debate coherent weighing, better warranting, better coverage of opposing arguments, and more intellectual preparation. Ultimately, utilizing the criterion effectively is critical to winning rounds.

Nathan Carle is a freshman at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He Debated for Zebulon B. Vance High School (NC) where he placed in the Top 20 at the 2008 Oklahoma NFA Nationals.

(Polliscotta from page 15)

should be rejected.

To conclude it is important to recognize that topics are framed carefully and that much thought and research goes into selecting and wording them. The topic itself should define the proper parameters for debate. Only through proper consideration of the issues embedded in a resolution and adequate research of the importance of such issues can we hope to have the opportunity for relevant and educational debate on important issues. We as a community must recognize this in order for Lincoln Douglas Debate to remain a relevant and valuable activity. This will require that we approach original ideas with an open mind and with the flexibility to stray away from traditional practices when we no longer serve their fundamental purpose of creating a meaningful educational experience for all involved.

(R.J. Polliscotta teaches at South Mecklenburg High School (NC). He is a graduate of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and previously coached at Chapel Hill High School. His students have qualified and reached the elimination rounds of both the NFA National tournament and the National Tournament of Champions. In addition, he has reached the late elimination rounds of such national tournaments as the Wake Forest National Invitational, the Glenbrook National and Forum Debater Forum. He also teaches at the debate academy hosted by the University of Idaho and Stanford University.)
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
Home of The National Tournament of Champions
THE 2002 KENTUCKY INSTITUTES

Two Person Debate
Regular Three Week Institute
June 21st - July 14th

One Week Institute
June 21st - July 7th

2001 L/D Fellows

2001 L/D Fellows were Jacob Goldstein, left; Ian Squires, center; and Dr. John Aberson, right

Lincoln-Douglas Debate
Three Week Institute
June 25th - July 14th

Two Week Institute
June 21st - July 7th

2001 L/D Fellows

2002 Institute Policy Fellows with Phoenix Rosemary, Lloyd Kaplan, Harrison Dant, Jodi Blair, Monique Ford, and Jacky Johnson

2001 Policy Fellows

2007 Policy Fellows

2007 Institute Policy Fellows with Phoenix Rosemary, Lloyd Kaplan, Harrison Dant, Jodi Blair, Monique Ford, and Jacky Johnson

2002 INSTITUTES

2002 Institute Policy Fellows with Phoenix Rosemary, Lloyd Kaplan, Harrison Dant, Jodi Blair, Monique Ford, and Jacky Johnson

2001 L/D Fellows

2002 INSTITUTES

2002 Institute Policy Fellows with Phoenix Rosemary, Lloyd Kaplan, Harrison Dant, Jodi Blair, Monique Ford, and Jacky Johnson

TWO PERSON STAFF
(Most will be returning)
Dan Davis
Natalie Clark
Aaron Kall
Chris Landberg
Aaron Monick
Rachel Salerno
Dan Shafman
Jason Trace

LINCOLN DOUGLAS STAFF
(Most will be returning)
Jason Hallahan
Brian Eavesman
Alex Goldner
Nathan Graboville
Kate Harris
Peter Moyer
Mike Peltz
Seth Robinson
Joe Rouse

Name: Penn University

Valle University

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Stanford University

Iowa State University

Northern Illinois University

Washington and Lee University

University of Texas at Austin

University of Texas at Dallas

"TRADITIONS OF EXCELLENCE CONTINUE"
The National High Northwestern

The Coon-Hardy Program
July 14 through

The Unique Coon-Hardy Curriculum

- Teamwork, Teamwork, Teamwork!!
- Interactive Learning Environment
- Integrated Curriculum Design
- Small Group Topic Analysis and Design
- Matching Faculty Expertise to the Needs of Individual Students
- College Caliber Strategy and Research Skills

For Further Information Contact:

The National High School Institute
617 Noyes Street
Evanston, IL 60208
(800)-662-NHSI
http://www.nwu.edu/nhsi
E-Mail: nhsi@nwu.edu

"Come. Be a Part of One of America's Most Successful College Debate Programs"

Northwestern University
National Debate Tournament Top Speakers

Rex Copeland Memorial Award – Top First Round At-Large
1999 * 1996 * 1988 * 1979
School Debate Institute
University

For High School Students
August 10, 2002

The Coon Hardy Teaching Staff Includes:

- Scott Deatherage, Director, Northwestern
- Adrienne Brovero, Associate Director, Northwestern
- Alan Coverstone, Associate Director, Montgomery Bell Academy
  - Dan Fitzmier, PhD Candidate, Northwestern
  - Kristin Langwell, University of Iowa
- Dan Lingel, Director, Jesuit College Prep, Texas
- Brian McBride, Associate Director, Northwestern
  - Andy Ryan, University of Iowa
- Nate Smith, Associate Director, Northwestern

Recent Northwestern Debate High School Alumi Include:

- 2001, 1999 and 1998 NDT Top Speakers

"Go to College before you Finish High School"

Northwestern University
National Debate Tournament Champions

Cross Examination Debate Association National Champions
1997
Policy Debate Institutes

Rookiecat Workshop
July 7-13, 2002

Powercat Institute
July 7-27, 2002, 2002

Wildcat Workshop
July 7-13, 2002

Wildcat Institute
July 7-20, 2002

Coaches

Coaches Policy Topic Clinic
July 7-10, 2002

Coaches Policy Workshop
July 14-20, 2002

Lincoln Douglas Debate, Congressional Debate and Extemporaneous Speaking Institutes

For Students
July 21-27, 2002

For Coaches
July 21-27, 2002

http://www.dce.ksu.edu/dce/cl/debate
info@ksu.edu

K-State Debate Institutes
Division of Continuing Education
Kansas State University
13 College Coury Building
Manhattan, KS 66506
WEIGHING AND IMPACTING IN LINCOLN DOUGLAS DEBATE

by

Anna Manasco

As an institute staff member and judge, I have arrived at a new appreciation for the intricacies and strategies of debate, one grounded in a understanding of the activity clearer than that I professed as a competitor and reflected in every paper I wrote, speech I make, and intellectual argument in which I engage. Most of this new understanding revolves around proving why arguments matter, though arguments matter because arguments may be convincing and believable, essential to their credibility and force is proof of WHY it is worth it to the listener to believe or be convinced. Weighing and impacting strategies, critical to proving why arguments matter, are strategies I thought I executed effectively four years ago, but have since learned I often misunderstood and misused.

Central to my misunderstanding was the belief that arguments must be impacted EXCLUSIVELY to the value premises criteria structure of my own case. This problem still plagues many debaters, especially those who wrongly think that only the value premises and criteria links in their case are relevant. Too often debaters tell me that their claims only matter because they carry them to justice, or because they benefit the entire society, or because they protect individual rights, none of those impacts being either the value or criteria criteria. Though such strategies make cases fit nicely together, they allow debaters an flexibility in rounds. That is, once you limit the impacts of his/her own arguments to his/her own value structure, he/she eliminates the possibility that those same arguments, likely the most thorough and evidenced ones given that they are in case, might also win him/her some of the benefits that the opponent professes. Put simply, if a debater impacts exclusively to his or her own value premise, she significantly reduces the likelihood that she will be able to turn any of her/his opponent's arguments. This is not to say, at all, that debaters should avoid impacting to their value structures. Instead my claim is that debaters should impact not only to their own value structure, but also to other things, particularly anticipated opponent value structures and claims.

a) Anticipated opponent value structure. When affirmative or negative value ground is clear debaters should make every effort to include in their own cases arguments that might turn the thesis of their opponents' cases. If I anticipate that my opponent will defend justice, I should construct arguments and make in case (in constructive) impacts to justice in addition to those I make to my own value.

b) Anticipated opponent claims. Debaters should attempt to include arguments in their cases that preemptively turn arguments they expect their opponents to make. If I assume, this strategy backfires, especially on affirmative, who sometimes make arguments for their opponents well before the inciting. In executing it, then, it is not necessary for affirmative in state an argument and then turn it instead, it is only necessary for them to create an argument, complete with claim and warrant, about why exactly they win an argument that they expect their opponents to make. For example.

Resolved: In the US justice system, due process ought to be valued above, the pursuit of truth when the two conflict.

If I expect that my opponent is going to argue that citizens have faith in a government that pursues truth and looks behind bars, even at the expense of due process, I should argue that people will actually have MORE faith in a government that adheres to its own written laws. As an argumentative, I have made no argument for the negative, but have simply made one for my own position that I reasonably expect that they will make for theirs.

Such impactinig external impactinig (a) relies on one's ability to impact in case, but invites further weighing and impact, in rebuttal and refutal if not done properly. Exposes one to easy attack in rebuttal.

The mechanics of impacting effectively in case are simple and clear, but often eludes debaters. At the risk of sounding basic, debaters should highlight their impacts:

"The impact is" or "This matters because" or "As a result, a number of things happen" are all acceptable phrases. This is particularly important for debaters who speak quickly, as judges will often offer wide-miss the transition from premise (claim and warrant) to impact. The impact should come immediately or directly after the link to the value premise and criterion, for otherwise, it will seem misplaced.

Impacting in case invites counter impacting and weighing in rebuttal, as gives one's opponent an early idea about key points in the round. THIS IS A GOOD THING. It will make better debate, and will create a more informed argument. Debaters too often think there is something to win with muddled or one-sentence impacts early on that magically clarify themselves in the final minutes of the round. This strategy is not only deceptive, but also likely to undermine the force of the argument, may be so much so that it is not able, at the last minute, to overcome an opponent's claim. In any event, counter-impacting should either 1) turn the impact or 2) attempt to outweigh it.

Both impact turns and outweighing strategies should be thought of as home. It is entirely possible to conceive turns and moves to impacts well before they are mentioned, only now puts in enough time and thinks hard enough before arriving at the tournament, in fact, pre-conceived impacts and arguments are more likely to be successful than those shut off with just a few seconds of thought. Pre-conceived does not mean canned, however, arguments can be thought about and responses devised with little particular words or phrases being applied (Manasco in page 14).
UTNIF
SUMMER 2002

Cross Examination Debate Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CX Plan I</td>
<td>June 29th July 16th</td>
<td>$1199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX Plan I Experienced Seminars</td>
<td>June 28th July 19th</td>
<td>$1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX Plan I Novice</td>
<td>June 29th July 16th</td>
<td>$1099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX Tutorial Extension</td>
<td>July 16th July 19th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(plus plan I = $1,599; plus plan II = $1,899)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX Plan II</td>
<td>July 20th August 8th</td>
<td>$1599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX Plan II Novice</td>
<td>July 20th August 6th</td>
<td>$1099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX Supersession</td>
<td>June 29th August 8th</td>
<td>$2899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX Supersession with Experienced Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Events Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Events</td>
<td>June 29th July 14th</td>
<td>$999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE Tutorial Extension</td>
<td>July 14th July 18th</td>
<td>$399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major/Minor Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lincoln-Douglas Debate Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln-Douglas Session 1</td>
<td>June 29th July 14th</td>
<td>$999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln-Douglas Session 2</td>
<td>July 20th August 4th</td>
<td>$999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln-Douglas Supersession</td>
<td>June 29th August 4th</td>
<td>$2399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coaches Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaches Focus</td>
<td>July 13th July 18th</td>
<td>$599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coaches are invited to any of the CX, LD or IE sessions for full room and board rate less $200.

Prices include lodging in an air conditioned dormitory, 3 meals per day, and library privileges. Prices also reflect 3% cash/check discount. Not included is a non-refundable application fee of $75 before May 15th and $100 after May 15th.

Your Institute Directors:
Dr. Peter Pober, The University of Texas, IE's and LD
Dr. Joel Rollins, The University of Texas, CX and LD
Dr. Kevin Kuswa, Richmond University, CX
Professor Jairus Grove, Northwestern University, CX
The University of Texas Forensics Union invites you to UTNIF 2002

The summer marks the 9th year of one of the most influential, educational, and affordable workshops in the country. The UTNIF sessions will continue to offer the best instruction across all skill levels with small teacher-to-student ratios and all the amenities a camp should provide: a top-ten library, internet access, thousands of pages of evidence included in CX tuition, housing in a private dormitory known for its excellent cafeteria (all meals in the dorm are included in tuition) and its professional security. We hope you make take advantage of one of the many UTNIF sessions this summer!

Just a few accomplishment of UTNIF students this fall:

CX: 1st Place winners at Houston-Memorial, The Iowa Caucus, Washburn Rural (KS), and University of Colorado.

LD: Close out of the UT Longhorn Classic.

IE: 1st, 2nd and 3rd in Extemp at Yale and Villager, 1st in Dramatic at Wake Forest, Yale, Penn and St. Marks.

Just a few of our 2001 staff:

CX
Sarah Apel, Kansas
David Breshears, UT
Kirk Evans, UI, U Chicago
Jonathan McCarthy, UT
Steve Clemmons, Macalester
Eric Jenkins, UNKC
Brian McBride, Northwestern

LD
Josh Deahl, Arizona State
Chetan Hertz, Brandeis
Ben Rothstein, UC
Shane Mecham, UT
Joey Seiler, Austin High

IE
Steffany Oravetz, UI
Randy Cox, Star School
Casey Garcia, UTT
Casey Garcia, UTT
Deb Simon, Milton

For more information, contact Dr. Peter Pober at ppober@mail.utexas.edu
For questions about the cx sessions contact Dr. Kevin Kuswa at kkuswa@richmond.edu
For questions about the Experienced Seminars contact Jarius Dwyer-Grove at airusgrove@hotmail.com
Excellence in debate has been a tradition at Bates since 1994, when the college christened its program by hosting Boston University in the finals of the first New England Debating League Championship. Competitive excellence remains the hallmark of the Bates debate program. In addition to its active participation in debate tournaments throughout the U.S. and Canada, Bates conducts an annual debate exchange with Japanese universities and makes frequent international tours.

The Bates Policy Debate Institute was founded in 1974 by the late Professor Robert Bravo. The Lincoln Douglas workshop was added in the 1980s, and 1997 marked the addition of a one-week program in individual speech events.

The student-faculty ratio is carefully limited to 6:1. The program features daily supervised library and internet research, numerous criticized practice rounds, and a full program of recreational and social activities.

Bates ensures that all instructional groups are led by professional forensics coaches with years of teaching and coaching experience, assisted by outstanding college debaters. All lab groups are led by senior staff and each student works with each faculty member. The 2002 teaching faculty includes John Blanchette, R. Eric Barnes, author of Philosophy in Practice.


Students live in double rooms in one of the college's modern dormitories, supervised by student and forensics coach at Carrollton Hall, and full-time director of residence life for the Bates Institute since 1993. The pastoral 109-acre campus is located in Lewiston, Maine, is about 140 miles northeast of Boston and within half an hour's drive to the coast.

Comprehensive fees include tuition, handbook & copies of the institute briefs, policy debatist, edited med, critiques, speech participants room and board. All meals, including a lobster bake are included in the comprehensive fee. Direct request copies of the Bates P.D. Reader and Eric Barnes book, Philosophy in Practice: Understanding Value Debate. No hidden costs. Bates Debate Institute 512 253, Lincoln Douglas Debate Workshop, 1990. Speech 5300. Need-based financial aid and payment plans available to qualified applicants. This year, applications will be processed on a first come, first-served basis -- apply early for best chance at admission.

For further information:
Bates Forensics Institute, Office of Summer Programs
Bates College, Lewiston, ME 04240
E-mail: summer@bates.edu, telephone: 207-786-6077
http://www.bates.edu/summer

Come to Maine! Study with the best at Bates!
COLLEGE LD

THE NEXT STEP?

by

Jason Gordon

When the National Forensics League pioneered Lincoln Douglas debate in the early 80's, no one had any idea that it would become as successful as it is today. Lincoln Douglas debate is offered at many schools around the nation and is debated at the three national tournaments. On local and national circuits alike, it is paired side by side with policy debate. My experience with LD has been from the ground up.

As a freshman at Glenbrook North, I knew very little about debate, or the school's success. LD was virtually nonexistent when Cheryl Nicraus, then LD coach at GBN, approached me to come after school one day in November. She introduced me to an activity that she participated in at杧ber Newman High School, which was in high school debate. At the time, I was uncertain of what debate was, but I decided to take part in the new activity. After a few tournaments, I decided LD was very intriguing, and I continued to work at it.

As spring neared, I was told that I could go to debate camp. "Debate camp!" They have camps for debate!? That summer, I attended the Summer Institute for Forensics at the University of Iowa. I was amazed to see how much I had to learn. I came back excited to participate, and called Cheryl as soon as I got back. "I got Delch, head coach at GBN, recognized that I was serious to take this program to a new level. I asked if I would be interested in traveling with the policy team, and as a sophomore, I began going to national circuit tournaments.

Four years later, I went to the first Lincoln-Douglas National Debate Tournament at the University of Colorado Boulder. I defeated Joss Chen from Yale on a 2-1 decision, with Professors Nelson and Farnell on top, and Professor Sappey in dissent. While this tournament was a large step toward a national program, it also shed some light on the challenges that the activity faces as we move forward.

The first challenge is funding. Students need to be able to go to their existing speech clubs in college and ask for money to participate in college LD. This becomes troublesome. While some organizations are small and tight for money, I have heard others that are not. I asked each of the largest NDT teams in the country and asked if their coaches were interested in traveling with students in our tournament. The coach said she could not justify the expense, because the money would be better spent on NDT. I was offended that these same individuals would host LD at their tournaments for high school, but not the willing to put their money where their mouth is.

At that point, I want to commend Dr. David Ligon and Mr. Bellus for reaching out, as Ted Delch did when I was in high school. All of them have had very successful policy teams in recent years, and yet they still want to branch out. I thank them for their willingness to explore other forms of debate.

That being said, there are some students who wish to participate in college LD without speech clubs at their respective colleges and universities. These individuals must work through their student governments to receive funding. Without a budget, it becomes hard for these individuals to travel. Learning how to request funding from student governments may be the largest bit of red tape some debaters face. When they go at it alone, this burden would deter a great number of individuals from trying to travel.

The second challenge is convincing existing programs to open their arms to new debate. As noted from the unnamed coaches responses above, some programs may feel LD is not something they want to pursue. Ask them why? I have yet to get a sufficient response. I will admit that some programs feel their efforts to start college LD, as they feel, will take away students from their existing infrastructure, but I argue that activities will bring new kids to the program, not steal them. Regardless, I cannot comprehend why so many are scared of a new program. Maybe it's because they don't want to spend the money, or that I am attending at such a response! I should note that some of the participants at our round robin paid for it out of their own pockets.

The third challenge is forming a national organization. After this is accomplished, we can attack other challenges becoming easier. Membership to a national organization would allow students to form local chapters and request funding...
thermore, regional contests could attract students who cannot travel far. Finally, the activity could be held at tournaments side by side with NDT, as Palitoy and LD are on the high school circuit.

At this point, some questions still remain. First, why not participate in parliamentary debate, instead of Lincoln Douglas? The answer to this question is rooted in the fundamentals of Lincoln Douglas debate. LD is a unique activity that encourages careful preparation. LD requires extensive research on a topic, and careful preparation (i.e., finding more frequently, that high school debaters who do extensive research are those with well-developed arguments. Students moving away from the quick evidence towards quality literature are those debaters who are in the later elimination rounds. Further, with the changing of topics on a frequent basis, LD debates gain a greater depth of knowledge on different current issues.

Lincoln Douglas debate also allows individuals to participate in an activity which individual elements can make quick decisions on their own. Unlike policy, or parliamentary debate, judges and debaters hold unique weight in the cross-examination period. Conceding arguments, mapping opponents, and setting up responses become very important in cross-examination, and are unique to LD debate. Unlike collegiate parliamentary debate, collegiate DD forces individuals to make quick decisions about which arguments to emphasize in rebuttals, time allocation, word economy, and flow coverage. Finally, LD provides a unique activity that discusses issues of value. The development of a value premise, criteria and arguments that circulate around a central thesis are all distinctive to LD.

The second question that many are asking is why participate in College LD at all, instead of focusing more on academics. My response is that LD has a close relationship with academic research, writing, learning in the humanities and social sciences. Specifically, topics including philosophy, political science, political theory, communication studies, journalism, fine arts, history, and sociology. Students who debate are exposed to core issues in all of these fields. As noted above, LD forces students to research extensively. Not just the ability to research effectively, but the topics being researched. Debate directly permeates the issues being discussed in the class. Ultimately, the more informed student is the student who writes the better papers, and essay on exams.

College Lincoln Douglas, similar to NDT, forces students to think in a certain way. Critical thinking forms an important function in the fields of academics, business, law, medicine, and many other professional fields. My point here is simple, continuing to think this way through debate, will allow success in both undergraduate, and post undergraduate experiences.

Ultimately, it is each student’s decision to debate in a post high school atmosphere. My argument is simple. Despite the initial hurdles that the activity faces, a greater benefit exists to the student, both in academics, and as an alternative to parliamentary debate. College LD serves unique functions in the fields of research, critical thinking skills, and breadth of knowledge that students would not be exposed to otherwise.

Jason Gordon and Larry Vass de bating at the Boyd Law Building

(Jason Gordon is a double major in political science and economics in the honors program at the University of Iowa. Jason is a member of the A. Craig Board Debate Forum at the University. Each spring Jr. varsity hosts the Iowa Juniors Round Robin. The top 28 sophomores and juniors are invited each year to participate in the tournament. Outside of debate, Jason participates in Dance Marathon, Phi Alpha Delta Pre Law Fraternity, Student Government, local politics, and is an avid Hawkeye fan.)
Join the most exciting, intensive, and rewarding institute in the country!

FFI: July 26th-August 9th

NCI: July 224th-28th

FFI Teacher Workshop: July 31-Aug 9th

Fees include 3 hours of graduate credit!

Register Now!

PHONE: 1-800-458-8724 Ext. 3

WWW.FORENSICS2000.COM

Summer Theatre Experience
June 24-July 20, 2002

Write and perform your own part in your own play

Immerse yourself in total theatre with this unique opportunity to discover your creativity. Realize your potential as you work with teenage theatre students from all across the country to create, write, stage, perform, and produce an original multi-media theatre production! The 4 week workshop is held on campus at Nova Southeastern University with performances at a prestigious local arts center. Housing is available in the NSU dorms.

The emphasis of this intensive workshop is on the creative and conceptual aspects of choosing the issues, developing the theme, characters, plot, songs, dialogue, design, choreography, direction, and production. An original production will be created from the ideas, imagination, and experiences of the participating students. The show will be filmed and edited on videotape, and an original cast album will be recorded.

Harriet Mathis
YMCA of Broward County
5100 N. Federal Highway
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33308
(954) 489-2426 Voice Mail x221
Harriet@lovewell.org

Limited space so apply now!

www.lovewell.org

www.ymca-broward.org

LOVEWELL INSTITUTE
1600 N.E. 18th Avenue
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33305
(954) 565-4111
David@lovewell.org
idea Announces the Launch of its International Annual Intensive Summer Debate Institute

The Institute in 2002 will include the following workshops:

Session 1 — Duino, Italy

LINCOLN-DOUGLAS A two week workshop beginning on July 4th and running through July 15th. Students will focus on the Lincoln-Douglas format and learn how to argue effectively. The workshop will be led by a team of distinguished experts who will work with the students on a wide variety of debate topics.

Program Director Dr. Michael A. Hogan, Catholic University, NY

Session 2 — Duino, Italy

ADVANCED LINCOLN-DOUGLAS An eight day workshop beginning on July 4th and running through July 11th which will focus on the Advanced Lincoln-Douglas format. The workshop will be led by a team of distinguished experts who will work on advanced debate topics and prepare students for the LD format.

Program Director Dr. Michael A. Hogan, Catholic University, NY

WORLD SCHOOLS DEBATING FORMAT A four day workshop beginning on July 3rd and running through July 6th which will focus on the World Schools Debating Format. The workshop will be led by a team of distinguished experts who will work on advanced debate topics and prepare students for the WSD format.

Program Director Dr. Michael A. Hogan, Catholic University, NY

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE FORMAT An eight day workshop beginning on July 6th and running through July 13th which will focus on the Parliamentary debate format.

Program Director Dr. Michael A. Hogan, Catholic University, NY

KARL KOPPER DEBATE FORMAT An eight day workshop beginning on July 6th and running through July 13th which will focus on the Karl Kopper debate format.

Program Director Dr. Michael A. Hogan, Catholic University, NY

Session 3 — High Tatras, Slovakia

IDEA YOUTH FORUM A two week workshop beginning on July 3rd and running through July 13th which will focus on the topic of youth arts and debates.

Program Director Dr. Michael A. Hogan, Catholic University, NY

Prices

Session 1 $499.00
Session 2 $499.00

SPECIAL Discount Sessions 1 and 2 for $799.00

SPECIAL Discount Sessions 2 and 3 for $799.00

SPECIAL Discount Sessions 1, 2 and 3 for $999.00
For more information or to reserve a space, please contact:

Nina Watkins

455 West 57th Street
New York, NY 10019
Tel.: 212-991-1295
Fax: 212-991-1341

WATERMARKED.jpg
For more information or to reserve a space, please contact:

Nina Watkins
idea
info@ideaspace.org
410 West 52nd St.
New York, NY 10019
212.553.5200
www.ideaspace.org

Make art. Break stuff. Have fun.
SUMMER EXTEMP INSTITUTE
AT CARY ACADEMY

July 27 through August 2, 2002 (six full days)
Research Triangle Park, Cary, North Carolina

CO-DIRECTORS

Chris Kristofco: a four-time national collegiate finalist in Extemporaneous Speaking with two
national championships in 1999. Chris was also a two-time collegiate champion in Impromptu
Speaking and is the author of the book Advanced Extemp. Chris coached the 1999 Villiger Tour-
nament Champion in Extemp and had an invitee to the 1999 Montgomery Bell Academy Round
Robin. Chris currently works in research in Washington, DC and coaches at Good Counsel in
Wheaton, MD.

Steve Conaway: a graduate of St. Joseph's University and the Temple University School of
Law who also attended the University of Athens Law School in Greece. For the last six years
Steve has coached at St. Joseph's University in extemporaneous and impromptu speaking. He
has coached over a dozen national finalists, including four national champions, and has over 25
years experience with forensics. Steve has a special talent for teaching novice and intermediate
students how to improve and excel in extemp. He is currently a trial attorney in Philadelphia.

What Cary Academy offers

- Personal attention that only an extemp-specialty camp can provide
- Instruction geared from beginner to advanced
- Individual critiqued rounds daily
- High caliber, friendly instructors
- In-depth Extemp Theory and Style lectures designed to develop proper habits
- Computer-aided cutting and filing to maximize efficiency
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"A PROPOSAL FOR RESOLUTIONALLY BASED CRITERION AND OPPOSING INFORMING VALUES IN LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE"

by Fred Robertson

It was my first year at Fremont High School, 1985, I was the assistant speech and debate coach. I had 8th period on one of my planning times, and this was when the rambunctious group of students known as the speech and debate class met across the hall from me in Room B-110. I had begun occasionally taking in a few extemporaneous speeches and debating with them, in a few minutes I might give them feedback on their practice speeches, and I might watch an interpretation piece now and then, but my duties were not yet serious. There was one particular student, however, who stood out to me, not because of any special talent—though I later found he had quite a bit of ability—but because this particular student kept getting drawn out of the group, and therefore spent a lot of time in the hallway just outside my room. One day, he came to me to ask me about the next period in the hallway. After knocking on my door, he said, "Could I come visit in the B-110?" I found him sitting there and he was quite tired. I asked him to come in and we chatted about Lincoln-Douglas debate.

Within about a month and a half, after finding out what the topic was, and putting the Baylor Briefs, we decided that we were ready to enter the world of competitive debate. We had 8th period at Millard North High School, and my new nephews were in 11th grade. At this time, there was no such thing as novice LD, so in our first round, we found ourselves facing a third-year senior from Omaha Westside. I say "our" first round, because I went to the round with my young, nervous to see what our weeks of training and study would yield. My eager novice was wild, and he delivered his ACT with sincere belief and engaging enthusiasm. My heart was happy. Next came cross-examination, but we felt we were prepared. Although barely 4 feet tall, my voice was still strong, my body language extended the confidence of a man twice his size, I figured he could handle himself.

I'll never forget that first question from his opponent. "I don't believe you mentioned a value in your case. Do you have a value or any values?"

My debater and I exchanged puzzled glances. "Value"? Values? We must have skipped that section in the Baylor Briefs. I shrugged, silently giving him the message. "Your guess is as good as mine."

After a brief pause, my nephew Lincoln-Douglas debater, a lad by the name of John Gibson, answered, "Values? I don't have any values. Aren't they supposed to?"

Some of you who are reading this who know Gibson (John) judged Lincoln-Douglas debate and was an assistant coach for most of the 80s, he taught and coached debate very successfully at Millard West High School (for the past two years) may be thinking that no such statement was ever made by him, but I didn't tell the story to embarrass John. Instead, I told it to illustrate my own lack of knowledge as I began coaching LD, and in general, the rather "new event" nature of Lincoln-Douglas at that time, which wasn't until that long ago.

One thing remains the same, however, in my reaction to Lincoln-Douglas debate, 16 years later. I am still often puzzled by the way values or a value are used in a round, and I am also usually a bit perplexed by the way in which a criterion (which was added in the value or values in most places, I believe, in the early 90's) is utilized in LD debate.

It really shouldn't be so confusing. A criterion is quite simply "a rule or standard for making a judgment." A value is an "established idea of life that the members of a given society find desirable." Perhaps the "given society" part of that explanation is questionable, since some values are perhaps more universally recognized, but this definition of a value still seems quite accurate. When a couple of people debate a resolution in which such desirable ideals and their prioritization are at stake, values usually will be in conflict, with proponents on the different sides of the issue selecting different values which they believe deserve higher rank. For example, the November-December topic currently being debated is this article—"Resolved: A lesser developed nation's right to develop ought to take priority over its obligation to protect the environment"—it appears that the affirmative might value "the provision of basic human needs" or "progress in economic, social, and political advancement." Conversely, the negative might argue that "environmental preservation" or "ecological balance" or "equal respect for all life" is an ideal that deserves higher prioritization. On, as used to be the case in many Lincoln-Douglas debate rounds in the late 80's and early 90's, a debater might argue that his or her side of the resolution was informed by more than one value.

I know that some people reading this are already saying—"No you're not all wrong. The value is the one ideal that we could all agree upon, desired by both sides of the debate when they argue about this issue." Therefore, the value should perhaps be proposed as "governmental legitimacy" or "in the fulfillment of the social contract" or old standbys such as "morality" or "justice." The value shouldn't be argued about at least not that much, according to this view of Lincoln-Douglas debate; rather, it is the criterion portion of the debate in which the real clash ought to take place.
"A PROPOSAL FOR RESOLUTION-BASED CRITERION AND OPPOSING INFORMING VALUES IN LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE"

by

Fred Robertson

It was my first year at Freeport High School, 1985. I was the assistant speech and debate coach. I had 8th period as one of my planning times, and this was when the enterprising group of students known as the speech and debate class met across the hall from me in Room B-110. I had begun occasionally asking a few experimenters to give them feedback on their practice speeches, and I might watch an interpretation piece now and then, but my duties were not yet onerous. There was one particular speech and debate student, however, who soon caught my eye not because of any special talent—though I later found he had quite a lot of ability—but because this prised sophomore kept getting thrown out of class, and therefore spent a lot of time in the hallway just outside my room. One day, he saw me watching him endure another period in exile. After knocking on my door, he asked if I could come visit him in B-111. Foolishly, I saw no harm in this. And then thereafter, the little cunning devil had convinced me to coach him in something called Lincoln-Douglas debate.

Within about a month and a half, after finding out what the topic was and persuading my Baxter Street. We decided we were ready to enter the wild world of competitive debate. He and I were at our first tournament at Millard South High School, where my tiny muscled was an entrant to LD. At this time, there was no such thing as novice LD, so in our first round, we found ourselves facing a third-year senior from Omaha Westside. I say "our" first round because I went to the round with my young charge, anxious to see what our weeks of training and study would yield. My eager novice was affirming, and he delivered his TAC with sincere belief and engaging enthusiasm. My heart was proud. Next came cross-examination, but we felt we were prepared. Although barely 4 feet tall, my once ball-extended youngster extolled the confidence of a man twice his size, I figured he could handle himself.

I'll never forget that first question from his opponent: "I don't believe you mentioned a value in your case. Do you have a value or any values?"

My debater and I exchanged puzzled glances. "Value? Values? We must have skipped that section in the Baylor book. I shrugged, silently giving him the message— "Your guess is as good as mine."

After a brief pause, my superior Lincoln-Douglas debaters, a skill by the name of John Cohn, answered, "Values? I don't have any values. Am I supposed to?"

Some of you who are reading this, who know debaters, (John judged Lincoln-Douglas debate and was an assistant coach for most of the '90s, he taught and coached debaters very successfully at Millard West High School for the past three years) may be thinking that no such statement was ever made by him, but I didn't tell the story to embarrass John. Instead, I told it to illustrate my own lack of knowledge as I began coaching LD, and in general, the "new era" nature of Lincoln-Douglas debate that time, wasn't all that long ago.

One thing remains the same, however, in my reaction to Lincoln-Douglas debate. 16 years later, I am still often puzzled by the way a value or values are used in a round, and I am also usually a bit perplexed by the way in which a criterion (which was added to the value of values in most places, I believe, in the early 90's) is utilized in LD debate.

It really shouldn't be so confusing. A criterion is quite simply "a rule or standard for making a judgment." A value is an "established idea of life that the members of a given society find desirable," perhaps the "given society" part of that explanation is questionable, since some values are perhaps more universally recognized, but this definition of a value still seems quite accurate. When a couple of people debate a resolution in which such desirable ideals and their prioritization are at issue, values usually will be in conflict, with proponents on the different sides of the issue selecting different values which they believe deserve higher rank. For example, the November-December topic currently being debated as I write this article — "Resolved. A lesser developed nation's right to develop ought to take priority over its obligation to protect the environment" — it appears that the affirmative might value "the provision of basic human needs" or "progress in economic, social, and political advancement." Conversely, the negative might argue that "environmental preservation" or "ecological balance" or "equal respect for all life" is an ideal that deserves higher prioritization. Or, as we used to be the case in many Lincoln-Douglas debates in the late '80s and early '90s, a debater might argue that his or her side of the resolution was superior by more than one value.

I know that some people reading this are already saying — "No, you've got it all wrong. The value is the one ideal that we could all agree upon, desired by both sides of the debate when they argue about this issue." Therefore, the value should perhaps be proposed as "governmental legitimacy" or "the fulfillment of the social contract" or "old standbys such as "morality" or "justice." The value should be argued about, at least not that much, according to this view of Lincoln-Douglas debate, rather, it is the criterion portion of the debate in which the real clash ought to take place,
In the different sides of the debate, there was a disagreement about the different criteria that should be used to determine whether a resolution is "legitimate" or "improper." However, while there are many different points of view on how the value criteria are applied, it is worth noting that Lincoln-Douglas debaters are often asked to argue in this manner because the question of how to define and apply these criteria becomes more complex than may be initially apparent. Nevertheless, it is always an issue for me as well, like Heath Dixon, former coach at San Antonio High School, that this way of asking questions has provided me with much more depth on both sides. Opposing sides on issues that cause values arguments to differ usually disagree because they value the same thing in different ways, and this is likely to happen because they disagree about different values or because they value the same thing differently. Proponents of the legitimacy of capital punishment value retributive justice and believe that it deserves to be prioritized over the sanctity of human life, whereas opponents of capital punishment value the sanctity of human life above any retributive value. I realize that there are folks who would argue that these assessments of values on the opposing sides of the capital punishment issue. Some would contend, along with Kant, that advocates of capital punishment take their position because of a respect for the dignity of all life, along with a high value placed upon autonomous choice. I won't deny that there are times when opposing sides of a resolution may be informed by the same value, however, I would still argue that this is not the case as a general rule.

But if this is so, where does the criterion come in? This is a reasonable question that one must ask in this debate. If a criterion is ever agreed upon by opponents in Lincoln-Douglas debate, there would then be no reason to have the alternative and negative presuppositions different criteria as ways to meet the same value.

However, I believe that if one looks at the definition of criterion as "a rule or standard for making a judgment," it becomes clear that the criterion can serve a vital role in a debate in which someone is asked to make a judgment, namely, the judge. Therefore,Fine Sett, former debate coach at Lincoln Southeast High School,(5,10),(994,987) has proposed a standard for judgment which ought to be clarified from the resolution at hand, and which ought to be argued for by both sides of the resolution. After all, the debaters are arguing about a resolution, and the judge has to decide which debater better supports either affirmation or negation of that resolution. Therefore, the debaters ought to propose a standard, not in the topic at hand, but for making that judgment, and then prove that they meet that standard. For example, on the development of environmental protection, since the decision-makers on the resolution is a lesser developed "nation," and since the resolution asks what that nation "ought" to prioritize, I believe a very clear standard for determining who wins a round on this topic would be who best meets "governmental duty"

The resolution is, after all, a proposal of what ought to be placed in a position of higher priority for a lesser developed nation's duties—either development or environmental protection. The two sides of the debate, because of different value prioritization, do not agree on what is more important in fulfilling governmental duties, and the affirmative might argue that it would be unfair to expect that the same priority to protect the environment be placed upon lesser developed nations, but both sides are clearly arguing "I am telling the real story of what ought to be a lesser developed nation's moral duty." It's the criterion that ought to be the more likely to be agreed upon standard at least as I see it (as do some others, like John Gibson, he and I eventually become a lot less confused about such things). A few of you have read what I have written on the IAJ (a great debate history administered by P.J. Wester) concerning this subject may still be asking "But aren't you just arguing that duties ought to come first and criterion around?" and/or "Isn't the criterion like "governmental duty" still very general and haven't you argued in the past that such vague generalities lead to mind-numbing debate rounds?"

To the first question, I answer "Yes."

That's pretty much exactly what I am arguing—"the way the majority of Lincoln Douglass debaters argue the value and criterion invents what the world actually means." I understand how the more commonly accepted approach developed. When one side argued "freedom is a great value and most important to us all," and the other side argued "security is a great value and even more important," which happened frequently in Lincoln-Douglas rounds in the late 80's, coaches searched for a way to clarify such nebulous debate. Critical to the ongoing development of the value premise/Value criterion format was the idea that a values premise ought to be the core of any argumentative or negative case, and that such a values premise attributable to both sides of a resolution can actually be denoted. I have never encountered with those who argue that such an agreed-upon values premise, common to both sides of a resolution, is actually determinable, or that this form leads to better debate. However, I do believe that agreement of both sides is possible in the criterion debate, when the standard is proposed as a decision-making mechanism based on the resolution, which leads to my answer to the second question.

Minh Luong, at a National Debate Coaches’ Association workshop a few years ago (and in an article published in the Rostrum), proposed that specific, concrete values and criteria ought to be agreed upon in Lincoln-Douglas debate. I agree. It makes for better debate if a negative values "preservation of ecosystems" instead of "nature," since the latter is too more nebulous in meaning and not conducive to straightforward argument. I argue that the same specificity is necessary for quality criterion debate, and that debaters ought to explain the actual qualities that define their proposed criterion. For example, an affirmative proposing the criterion of "governmental duty" on the November/December topic might explain that a nation's duties must include securing its interests, rights, and needs of its people and that a lesser developed nation especially ought to pursue this duty, because it is by definition (I know this is arguable, developmentkritik lovers) not adequately meeting its obligations to its people. Even given some harm to the environment, an affirmative could argue, these obligations must be the nation's priority.

On the negative side, one could argue that the "governmental duty" of any nation is not so simple. Although nations must certainly value the needs, rights, and interests of their people in the here and now, countries also have duties not to harm the needs, rights, and interests of their own future citizens. Nations also have duties to do no intentional harm to other countries that have done them no harm. Despite the special conditions of a lesser developed nation, which appear in call for heightened
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LINCOLN-DOUGLAS MAKES UDL DEBUT

by

R. Eric Barnes

In September 2004 the nation's first Lincoln-Douglas Debate League (UDL) will begin in Springfield (MA). The Springfield program, known as the Debate Improvement, and Leadership (DIAL) Program, is sponsored by the Western Center for Leadership at Mount Holyoke College. More than a year of preparation has been spent coordinating efforts between the college and Springfield Public Schools.

The Springfield league is unique among UDLs because it focuses on LD debate rather than Policy debate. It is worth explaining why both Policy and LD offer students a remarkable opportunity to gain a wide variety of essential academic and leadership skills. The reason behind choosing LD fall into three categories. First, an understanding of the resources available in this area, second, a comparison of the skills taught by each form of debate, third, the comparative benefits of experimentation and replication.

Available Resources

Springfield is a small city with big city problems. There is widespread poverty, racial tension, and high dropout and truancy rates. The neighboring cities of Holyoke and Chicopee have similar problems. Yet, just north of this metropolitan area is a major center for higher education surrounding Amherst (MA). Improving the public schools can help these cities significantly, and the surrounding colleges can help establish such partnerships as a basic principle of the UDL movement. The question is, how best can we use the resources of these colleges to develop a successful UDL in Springfield?

College students in this area are better prepared to coach LD. None of the area colleges has a Policy debate team, but three have Parliamentary (Parli) debate teams, which is similar to LD. Parli debaters easily become LD debaters, but it is difficult for them to coach Policy. Moreover, students at these liberal-arts colleges are generally familiar with the historical, political, and legal theories most commonly used in LD, so the greater availability of college mentors at an LD program within this area was a significant factor.

A second factor was the lack of mainstream school debate programs in any sort in Western Massachusetts. There is very little debate at any sort in the surrounding area. It will be easier for area high schools that are not part of the Springfield UDL to develop LD programs in response. In a new LD UDL because it takes less formal training to start reaching LD than the likely greater availability of local mainstream competition was also a factor.

The latest factor was that the initiative for this UDL came from one person who has extensive experience coaching LD debate. So the resources for training teachers and college students to teach LD debaters were much more available than the resources for Policy. This, together with the first two resource considerations suggested that an LD league was a better option — but this was not the final consideration.

Skill Development

Before considering the skills developed by LD and Policy, one must realize how remarkably similar these events are in the context of all available curricular and extracurricular activities. LD and Policy are two peas in a pod, only of slightly different color and texture. In large part, the skills being taught by both are the same. Both have the ability to change students lives through opening their minds to the world of dialogue and critical inquiry.

With that perspective firmly in mind, Policy and LD are not the identical. Their participants develop somewhat different sets of skills. The choice of which to use in a UDL should be informed by these differences. Consider the primary differences as outlined in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy &amp; LD Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| P: Unarguably lose on year Alats 
| L: Debate based on skill, not content |
| P: Team based on skill, LD on content |
| P: Emphasis on intellectual debate |
| L: Emphasis on intellectual debate |
| P: Focus on policy |
| L: Focus on policy |
| P: Greater emphasis on novelty |
| L: Greater emphasis on novelty |
| P: Emphasis on policy aspects |
| L: Emphasis on policy aspects |

The comparisons are more complex these brief remarks will adequately illuminate. To begin, students spending four years in Policy will gain an exceptionally detailed understanding of four significant issues, while students doing LD will be exposed to a less detailed understanding of eighteen to twenty significant issues. It seems like a simple choice between depth and breath of understanding, neither being clearly superior. But this is misleading, because the Policy debaters' research extends well beyond the apparent scope of the resolution, while the LD debaters' research returns to the same issues in many different ways — flipping the previous depth breadth distinction. This flip is captured by the research skills banked by each format. Excelling in Policy demands research from a wider variety of sources, while excelling in LD demands development of a deep understanding of the history of moral, political and legal theory. Even if we were to conclude that success in Policy required more research than success in LD, it is unclear whether this will include the study of LD. This study and policy in LD is called "nothing that has been said so far about the differences between the two formats carries much weight in deciding which to use in a UDL.

There are certain stylistic differences between Policy and LD. First among these is the demand in Policy for the affirmative team to propose a specific plan, not required in LD. Because of this, Policy is more concerned with empirical claims, while LD focuses on the philosophical aspects of an issue. But this is a gross misunderstanding to think that either theorem of "value" have no place in Policy or that empirical evidence has no place in LD. Both forms of debate employ empirical (i.e., empirical based) questions and both are about the real (i.e., empirical) world; they just focus on different aspects. An exclusive concern with either is a mistake, but neither focus is inherently better than the other.

Other stylistic differences also develop different skills. Policy teaches teamwork, while LD teaches independence. The style of speech and longer rounds in Policy allows students to get deeper into the issues, simply by allowing more information.
Experimental

Clearly, Policy UDLs have a positive and significant impact on the educational and lives of urban youth in under-resourced schools. However, it would be foolish to assume that no significant improvements can be made upon the current model. Since the only way to discover improvements is to experiment, it is imperative that we try new methods and variations. It is in this spirit that the DEAL Program is beginning the Springfield UDL using LD.

Despite the remarkable similarity of LD and Policy, it is possible that one form is more effective in a UDL context. This may consist in teaching a more valuable set of skills or in teaching for some other advantage such as ease of initiating a UDL. Auxiliary benefits for teachers from learning in coach-wise of student recruitment and retention, ongoing costs and sustainability, and numerous other possible advantages lets examine some of these possible advantages, keeping in mind that they may not actually materialize. Indeed, the point is that although there is an important reason to expect some of the advantages, only by experimenting with an actual league can we determine if they exist.

First, it seems easier to initiate an LD league, because there is considerably less debate specific theory and jitron, which coaches need to become comfortable with. By the point that they are themselves able to teach in the D.E.A.L. Program, began with two Saturday workshops for the new coaches, which is considerably less training than is required for a new Policy coach. Although, it requires less training than is required for a new Policy coach, College mentors also require less training to help with LD. This decreased need for people with specialized knowledge may increase the access to debate, and increased access is a cornerstone of the UDL movement. Moreover, an LD league requires only half as many students needed, since there are no worries about partners being unavailable, etc. LD leagues seem easier to start. Second, it seems easier to sustain an LD league and integrate it into the wider community. It avoids the extensive photocopying and other research costs incurred by Policy debate programs, and our summer workshop will be shorter than typical Policy workshops typically are. Furthermore, training parents and other members of the community to judge LD will be significantly easier, which will help to achieve the goal of parent and community involvement with the UDL. Finally, the relative ease of training coaches college mentors and new debate coaches also makes replacement of coaches and others easier. Running an LD UDL is not cheap or simple, but it avoids certain significant costs and difficulties.

The last point is the benefit to the current LD community. Mainstream Policy debaters have already begun to benefit from an exposure to different perspectives that are being brought to the debate community by UDL debaters. There are a lot of LD debaters and coaches who would similarly benefit from an increased diversity in the population of LD debaters. Indeed, the types of issues debated in LD may benefit to an even greater degree from additional perspectives of different sub-cultures. This is a goal that is certainly worth pursuing.

Big Picture

Policy and LD build very similar sets of skills, but they do emphasize different subsets of these skills. We should reflect on their similarities in order to keep perspective, even though I have been focusing on their differences to critically compare their use in a LD context. Policy is better at teaching some skills and LD is better at teaching others. But neither is clearly superior in this respect. The available resources in and around Springfield made it a bit better for us. But these circumstances are not especially peculiar, and many other locations considering starting a UDL may have similar circumstances. The more significant reason for starting an LD UDL was to try to make a good thing even better. The considerations presented above may not have convinced you, but that was not the point. The point is that we need to experiment to discover if these advantages really do exist. One should at least be willing to admit that we do not now have all the answers.

The Future

The UDL movement should continue to expand to more urban centers across the country, and this should provide a model for introducing debate as an significant element in secondary education in all school systems. Moreover, the future should include a diversity of debate styles and formats from which schools and students may choose. Different people have different needs and different tastes. We need to find a way to create these without losing the value of the activity. Adding LD to the off-(Barnes' to page 36)
to be presented while the style of speech and brevity of F.D. rounds teaches students to be simultaneously precise and concise, and also to speak in a manner that is persuasive and accessible to a broad audience. The claim that the Policy style is detrimental to good public speaking is not entirely incorrect—although LD does have some value, it is not as effective as it could be. Moreover, LD does provide some other advantages, such as the opportunity to develop good debate skills.

Again, this does not mean that LD should be entirely abandoned. The value of LD lies in its ability to provide a foundation for more advanced topics. The key is to integrate LD into a broader framework that includes other forms of debate as well. This will allow students to develop a well-rounded set of skills that can be applied to a variety of contexts.

The Big Picture

Policy and LD build very similar sets of skills, but the emphasis on different aspects can have a significant impact on the way students approach and practice debate. The key is to find a balance that allows students to develop a strong foundation in LD while also gaining exposure to other forms of debate. This will help them to become effective debaters in a variety of contexts and to feel comfortable participating in a wide range of events.

The Future

The LD movement should continue to expand to more urban centers across the country and should provide a more diverse set of resources and opportunities to LD students. This will help to ensure that LD remains a relevant and engaging form of debate for years to come.
NCPA's High School Debate Research Resource

www.Debate-Central.org

- The most comprehensive online resource for debate research and evidence.
- Features information on the CX, Lincoln Douglas and home school debate topics.
- Regular updates make it the most up-to-date resource for high school debate information.
- Links to all the major debate sites across the nation, providing users easy access to the best materials on the internet.

National Center for Policy Analysis
"Making Ideas Change the World"

12085 North Central Expressway, Suite 7211, Dallas, Texas 75243
Phone 972/386-6272  fax 972/365-0924
Washington, D.C. 703/636-4671

The NCPA is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit public policy organization. We depend entirely on the financial support of individuals, corporations and foundations that believe in private sector solutions to public policy problems.
COLD WAR RELICS FUELING TERRORISM FEARS

by

Jack Strayer

Vice President-External Affairs

National Center for Policy Analysis

The National Center for Policy Analysis maintains an office in Washington, D.C., across from the U.S. Treasury Building on 15th Street, placing it in the bubble of White House security operations since September 11.

All around the perimeter of the White House, including 15th and 16th Streets on the east and west, and 12th Street on the northern edge of Lafayette Square, ordinary citizens are on the lookout for suspicious vehicles that could be used to transport homemade bombs. Immediately following the bombing of the federal building in Oklahoma City security precautions like closing Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House were put in place around Washington to protect potential targets and the people inside them.

The newest concern across America and in Washington is about McVeigh-type truck bombs, but a far more destructive weapon of mass destruction: a truck bomb fueled by radioactive nuclear elements, or “dirty bombs.”

Much scrutiny has been given in the media lately to the former Soviet Union and Moscow’s inability to account for all its nuclear arsenal in the wake of the break-up of the U.S.S.R. Radioactive elements from its vast network of nuclear power plants, and the various treaties regarding nuclear weapons reduction initiated and signed following the December 1991 breakup of the old Soviet Union, still pose potential risks for the rest of the world with the latest in international terrorism.

The Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START I & II) were drafted to illustrate to the world that as the Soviet Union broke into a number of independent states, its reduced nuclear arsenal would still be the responsibility of Russia. Under the terms of these treaties, strategic (long-range) and tactical (short-range) nuclear weapons in the outlying states, particularly Belarus, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan, were all removed, both the missiles and the nuclear warheads they were designed to carry, to Russia by mid-1996.

Ten years later, arms experts and negotiators are pleased with the nuclear arms reduction initiatives, but many of the pieces of the puzzle are still missing. According to the Congressional Research Service, the official think tank of the U.S. Congress, the former Soviet Union had at one time almost 45,000 nuclear warheads or 12,000 more than we were originally led to believe. But what is truly frightening is the amount of bomb-grade uranium in the Russian nuclear inventory in 1993, nearly 1,200 tons. This is twice the amount the U.S.A. thought the Russians possessed at the end of the Cold War.

If some of the uranium is missing from the Russian inventory, the potential for smuggling and terrorism is real. The populations of former Soviet republics have lived under communism for so long, many have forgotten what it is like to work hard, pay one’s own way, and still remain a law-abiding citizen. Their own nuclear scientists and uranium specialists are finding themselves without meaningful employment. Mafia-esque gangs have become well established in the former Soviet Union and many fron the former Soviet Union and many foster that arms dealing and uranium smuggling are among their chief endeavors. Mix in a few disgruntled and penniless nuclear physicists, the private funds to appease them and you have a perfect recipe for nuclear holocaust.

The geographical proximity of many of these former Soviet states to Afghanistan, Pakistan, Syria, Iran and India makes for easy uranium smuggling to terrorists, including the al Qaeda and other groups with desires on their minds.

President George W. Bush and Russian President Vladimir Putin say they can trust each other and have begun working together for a safer and more prosperous world. But fighting terrorism involves a lot more than keeping peace treaties, accords, protocols and nurturing budding relationships between former feuding nations.

While we may feel safe from any Russian military nuclear attack here on 15th Street, we are still fearful of a nuclear attack using former Soviet weapons in the hands of suicidal maniacs. Terrorists do not drop leaflets warning of impending doom prior to their attacks. Terrorists do not abide by treaties and arms reduction agreements. Nor do they take advantage of weakened, anabolic and frequently desperate people, promise them riches, and then make martyrs out of them and victims of the rest of us.

How ironic it would be if the world ended with a terrorist-inspired nuclear conflict, using the vests of destroyed weapons of a once-great age that was just witnessing the dawn of international peace and freedom.
CIVICS IN THE CLASSROOM

This 10th and last article in the "Civics in the Classroom" series explores how we may ensure that young people know enough about the country's system of government so they can effectively consider the public sector with its millions of jobs—when thinking about employment and career possibilities.

The first article in Part I of this series appeared in the September 1999 issue of the Public Employees Roundtable's newsletter "Unioning Heroes," and in the February 2000 issue of the National Forensic League's publication "The Rosarium." The remaining four articles in Part I, published in 2000, briefly described our form of government, federal rather than centralized, with separated rather than unitary powers at each of the three levels—and then remained the great variety and number of occupations and jobs at each of these levels (local, state and national). Without some basic understanding of the nature of the public sector in this country it is quite impossible for young people to take advantage of public sector employment opportunities.

The next four articles, in Part II of the series, were devoted to explaining the reasons why government employment is not considered very prestigious in our country and often has a poor public image. This image varies over time. Public service can be quite popular when its special challenges are articulated well by a capable leader or during periods of war when patriotism was high among our citizens but, in general, Americans seem to be more attached to private sector employment.

Mentioned as factors were:

- The geographic breadth of our country, fostering a sense of individual independence.
- The political development of our country, characterized by a reaction against the hierarchical and authoritarian type of government in the Old World.
- The economic aspect of our society, growing in counter-reaction to the government-regulated and class-ridden environment of the Old World.
- The social order developed in our country, fostering class-consciousness rather than class-ridden environment of the Old World.

Thus, it was the private sector that Americans looked to for prestigious, interesting and important work—with the government's role being simply not to abstract.

While it seems evident that government service has become far more important in our country's welfare—and not just during wartime, nor even when it was in the 19th and early 20th century, there is still an lingering feeling that public sector work is less interesting and important than that performed in the private sector. I believe that this feeling is due primarily to the lack of knowledge the average citizen has of what public employees actually do. That in turn is due in large part to a general ignorance about our federal, separated-powers form of government.

There are three major steps that need to be taken to turn this situation around so that the wealth of important and interesting types of work in the government of our towns, cities, counties, states and nation are generally known and considered when people think of part-time, temporary or career employment.

- Parents, students and teachers in primary and especially secondary school systems should insist that the curriculum—somewhere in the last six or the 12 years—covers the basic information of our country's form of government. Whatever line such a course is given—e.g., Civics, American History, Our Governmental System, etc.—it should explain the importance of:
  - The federal, state, and local and national levels of government, and
  - The separation of powers (executive, legislative and judicial) at each level.
- High school counselors should ensure that their students have the opportunity to become acquainted with the multitude of occupations and employment available in regional, local and state governments as well as at the national level. In addition to obtaining available brochures and information from these systems, schools can arrange for representatives of all these three government levels in the community to make in-school presentations at the school as well as have interested students become acquainted with these government offices through orientation and short work visits.
- Finally, because of its wide geographic dispersion throughout the United States as well as its great variety and types of work, the federal, state and local government should be given additional attention during the last high school years. While the civilian and military branches have extensive networks of local offices and installations from which speakers can be obtained for school presentations and to which student groups can make orientation visits, these include field offices and job opportunities in such organizations as the FBI, the Peace Corps, the Department of Agriculture, the Internal Revenue Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Defense. Also the U.S. Office of Personnel Management in Washington, D.C. with its network of local offices has information on federal jobs throughout the United States and sponsors an excellent website which contains a great deal of useful information at http://www.studentjobsgov.

There is such a thing as "government work," and there are thousands of managerial, supervisory, professional, technical and clerical jobs in a myriad of different fields—such as the physical and natural sciences, health and human services, law enforcement, education, transportation, communication, administration, finance, etc.—at all three levels of government. Our young people are short-changing themselves if they do not consider public sector employment when thinking about jobs and careers.

(Professor Paul Lorentzen is retiring as Committee Chair of the Public Employees Roundtable Youth Programs)
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EXTENDING TOPICALITY ARGUMENTS

by

David M. Cheshler

It has become even more difficult to win topicality arguments on the high school national policy circuit, for several reasons. The topic wording committee has tended in recent years to prefer more open-ended terminology, which makes it more difficult to make convincing grammatical claims. And the major terms have not been themselves to conservative interpretation, this season, for example, it has proved virtually impossible to win arguments that would have the meaning of terms like "foreign policy." Even the most precise term on this resolution -- "means of mass destruction" -- has not enabled much successful topicality implementation.

There is also the fact of accumulated suspicion about the value of topicality debating. Today winning a topicality violation on many circuits requires an all-out multi-movement of rebuttal time, and some prominent judges regularly broadcast their hostility to T debates.

Still, the perceived tactical benefits of incurring topicality arguments remain. The time limit often favors the negative, since violations can be cut down to fifteen seconds or so while it usually takes longer to constructively respond. And despite some applications to detect "reverse voting issue" claims against underdeveloped violations, the rules remain one way. Only the affirmative can lose the debate on topicality. The result is the odd situation now characteristic of the national circuit: while topicality violations are advanced in as many as 35% of first rounds, conservatives, they remain a part of the second negative rebuttal perhaps only 3% of the time.

In what follows I offer some tips for arguing topicality, whether you're trying to win violations on the negative or simply trying to keep the position.
active in the negative block as a way to pressure the IAR. Think about these factors.

You can go to other arguments in the IAR. There are five in which topicality is a

*small* or *nothing* issue (for example, a plan's topicality is a *bit* like being pregnant or infected with it isn't). But I disagree with those who believe topicality requires an all-or-nothing commitment of time, either in the block or at the rebuttal. While obviously some judges feel this way, and for them you should play to the prejudice, most topicality arguments are simply not as committed as to require a full five-minute exposition in the 2NR. I cannot imagine a topicality argument containing the total dedication of a constructive speech. Often, over-exploration of a violation can actually backfire — either by inducing repetitively excessive explanation, or revealing just how simple (or foolish) the argument is. Give the violation only the time it requires. If answering the three IAR arguments only takes two minutes in the 2NR, that splintery, and an extra three minutes of motion will not enhance the argumentative power of the violation.

I've heard many answers to this point over the years. Some say, "Making T the exclusive focus of the 2NR communities on's contentiousness." But there are other ways to sustain immediate contentiousness, including short, pointed, forceful and passionate exposition, and sequenc ing the violation at the end of the rebuttal. Others say, "of course don't overkill but it is no-nothing — so take the two minutes you need, and then at least I find that point of view a bit absurd, a conclusion outright of valuable time that might either be used produttively to extend other winning arguments, or divert the IAR from the argument you really love.

Be prepared to go for the topicality arguments depending on the affirmative answers. An obvious point, I suppose. But it's one of how often I see topicality arguments initiated in the first negative where the team communicates their utter disinterest in going for it. They'll cheerfully admit to the 2AC as the judge they haven't flowed their own violation. OK, and this is worse, while the 2NR fights his way through the violation, the affirmative will set with their own four eyes that the 2NC isn't flowing her colleague on the argument. Such behaviors necessarily give away the game, and they deny you the possibility of actually going for the violation if the IAR wipes it out. Even if you imagine the T position as a time wasting pure and simple, preserve your options.

Flaw especially carefully avoid ganging up when you respond. Topicality arguments can be extended are ubiquitous, and even judges friendly to T often give the benefit of the doubt to affirmative arguments under heavy 2NC topic pressure. They'll permit creative IAR interpretations of obviously irrelevant 2AC answers. To avoid this problem, make absolutely sure 2AC arguments are well understood. Take a careful flow

Core construction time to review the an

ners to ensure the judge's flow entirely agrees with yours. And debat carefully. Topicality is one argument requiring time by time relation (the only exception is when one of a group of positions is relevant to the violation, and you're grouping simply to point this fact out.)

Make the argument as complex as necessary, and your extension as simple as possible. The common judgment predisposition to give affirmative latitude on topicality is enhanced when the original violation is unclear-developed. In closest potential 2AR escape routes to put a little extra effort into the original structure — preempt which you can — so that when the time comes, you can be pointed out that they have "missed this from the very beginning." On the other hand, do not make your extension of the position needlessly complicated. Avoid absurdly intricate overviews (they only provide IARs with a hook on which to hang their new arguments), and don't add new explanations essentially making the violation new or different. Start with a detailed position, and then simply reinforce it later in the round.

Carefully explain the violation in an overview that is necessary. Some violations are basic and well understood by all, and they do not require even a new explanation in the block. This advice is often viewed by the more intricate positions, where the plan may appear to react to the violation but fails because of a technicality "buried in the 1NC definition." If that's so a quick overview explanation of exactly how the plan fails short is a good idea.

Visualize the specific 

Another basic point, but one often forgotten. It is the plan we are testing for topicality purposes, and it is the rhetoric of the case in the 2AC. It's a plan, keep your eye and debuting centers on what the plan says. Keep true to its quashes, and explain how they fail short of meeting your definition (or, for that matter, yours).

Refine on topically with "When a judge decides topicality at argument's end, she or he will often lay your definition side-by-side with the text of the plan. The judge faces the simple task of determining if the plan meets this definition. Your debates must provide the judge with a test or tests for making such a determination. In other words, often called "direct" tests, these tests judge produce clear-cut determinations. In topicality debates, such tests can be simple. Does the plan's plain language reduce weapons of mass destructions by 50% or not? - 33%

If not they are not a significant limit." Or "look at the plan language do they use the State Department or the implementation agency" — if yes you are not a foreign policy" Or they can be a little harder to communicate clearly such as the so-called "vacant test" I proposed years ago. Either way debate focused on such "tests" gives judges clear roadmap for decision, and can help the negative clearly explain both the specificity of their violation and the reasonability of its application to the affirmative plan.

Avoid tests debating "Dead, "trump sans arguments. Debate "as if." Topicality does having concern on questions of semantic interpretation or grammatical construction. The

The decisive arguments do not reference specific pieces of evidence. Given this, topicality nu such are often reduced to "yes" versus "no" claims, "they over-linear," "broadly is better than depth," and so on — which are not decisively resolveable for either side. Even well-prepared debaters can fall prey to this problem by failing to argue as if their argument will win any of the claims. That is, even passionately and carefully argued violations end up as a mess for the judge when both sides fail to incorporate any fall back positions into their extensions. Here now on any other issue it is important to build in such fall back arguments — even if they win that "limits" is the most important standard, they may lose, because. Where possible, present the judge with clear path out of the thicket of discussion and counter-argument.

Foul repetition. Topicality debates are often tedious because the time limit is as frequently repeated. As you prep you may find that you've been writing down the same explanation or argument. When you do, move the point into the same overview any time, then and refer to your introductory analysis later on as necessary.

In the block, extend the violation in the 2NC if possible. Or the 2NR should at least flow the partner's 1NR on topicality. This advice may seem like counter-intuitive, since miscalculated teams know how 2NC's are more experienced than the 1NC's (often use the strategy of having the 1NR extend the 1NC). The logic is that the 1NR will do no real damage — if they don't care, everyone will know what the 2NC's are not clear, the 1NR can control for a little or much time as they want to use. But this strategy is often a giveaway that the 2NR will not extend the violation, and many 2NC's compound the problem by not flowing their partners on it. As a result of this conventional wisdom, you can sometimes get mileage simply by extending topicality in the 2NC. It doesn't have to take very long, and should not be driven from the major positions extending in the 2NC (crucial argument counterplan etc). Since the 2NC is a constructive speech, there won't be any flit the arguments run there will be "new". Leave topicality for the constructive and extend everything isn't recovered the 2NR can take care of the rest.
Debate topics by example. Topicality definitions are usually devoted to the extent they focus on standards or impact arguments. In addition to remaining focused at all times on the plan's mandates, smart topicality debaters also use above assertion and counter-assertion to give any examples as possible to illuminate their points. Instead of asserting their definition creates abusive affirmatives, list six or seven of the most ridiculous cases enabled by their interpretation. Instead of simply arguing "they over-limit," list four or five popularly accepted heart-of-the-topic cases that would be disallowed by their interpretation.

Only offer and extend relevant standards. Most topicality violations end up coming down to the issue of whether the affirmative plan meets a reasonably limited definition of the key term. Given this, it's usually a diversion to offer and defend multiple alternative topicality standards, like grammar (which is almost never actually a issue) or "legal definitions" (again, usually not relevant). Defend only those standards necessary to make effective, your particular violation.

Keep the number of violations you offer to a minimum. It is a waste of time to offer numerous irrelevant violations, and doing so only reinforces the position of some judges against topicality debate. There is also the problem of cramming, meaning multiple violations only compensate the risk of affirmative answers which can be made relevant to the serious violation you intend to extend.

The decision to run a topicality argument reflects one of two judgments: either you think the violation is a genuine winner or you're running it because "it can't hurt" to add a no-lose argument to the negative's case. The trick of course, is to convince your opponent of your serious intention to go for topicality while simultaneously minimizing your investment of time in it. By thereby enabling you to extend other positions you also care about. But keep in mind the need to keep your foot firmly on this fine line and creating the credible impression you want the judge to vote on topicality is only partly a function of the time you invest in the violation. Simplicity can be conveyed in many other ways that will not rub you of speech time more urgently needed to keep other arguments alive.

*David M. Chester*

(David M. Chester is Assistant Professor of Communications and Director of Debate at Georgia State University. His columns appear monthly in The Rostum.)
CDE Debate and Extemp Camps!

Anton Ford
Twice a National Champion (1993, 1994)
Twice an L.D. Trophyist: CDE Alumnus

Isaac Potter
2000 National Champion
Twice a CDE Alumnus

Winfred Hayes
CDE Alumnus
National Champion
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CDE Alumnus

Jennifer Roman
CDE Alumnus

Team Debate
World Champions
Twice

Lincoln Douglas
National Champions
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Both CDE alumni, 1999 National Debate Champions
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* Since 1989 CDE alumni have won 14 National Championships in Extimp
* 3 Student Congress National Champions have been CDE alumni
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2nd U.S. Extemp
CDE Alumnus
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CDE Alumnus
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Visit the CDE WEB SITE today.
Free Lincoln Douglas Blocks Free C. X. Case and Blocks
FREE Internet Links for Extemp, CX, and L.D.
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- and much more
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Perfection Learning® Corporation
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Anxiety Dream

I had a bad dream the other night. It was so bad that I woke up paralyzed, unable to move. I have bad dreams a lot - in fact some of them are so spectacular that my subconscious runs credits at the end. This was one of those dreams.

The first Part of the Dream directed by Woody Allen

It's an immense school building. This is one of those monstrosities that have been built for generations so it has tile floors, hardwood floors, and a sub-basement for archaeologists. The lockers are scaringophobia (that may not be a word, but it should be). The hallways wind higher and you like the maze of the Minotaur.

It's the beginning of a huge debate Qualifier, and two downs and you're out. This is the culmination of thirty years of debate experience (OK, so I've been held back a few times).

The dream begins as my partner and I walk into our first round. For the solid reasons of all anxiety dreams we've been scheduled for the judge's lounge. The place is crawling with really angry people because they haven't been assigned to any debates, mostly because they are psychopaths. There are patients in Strait jackets, guarded by white-coated aides. With horror, I see my mother pouring out spiked punch and holding a plate of brownies from Alice B. Toklas Bakeries. There's a werewolf wandering around looking longingly at people's throats.

I am debating with Busy Spazek, who is a great actress, but unfortunately, this is in her Carrie days, and confidence is not her strong suit. I could use some magical powers from her, but apparently she hasn't discovered them yet.

We are matched against a team from Hollywood High. These guys would never be caught debating, but this is an anxiety dream so let her rip. One of them is Andre the Giant, and in my dream he is even more gigantic. He needs three chairs to sit. His legs are the size of free trunks and indeed they are extending from his shoes. Searching the floor for something A.T.G. is throwing pens at people who are walking through the opening in the folding wall. They turn angry, then they see him then protest due to their mouth. He doesn't smile.

His partner is Danny DeVito. He has a hang for bow ties. His choice for my dream is one of those electrified jobs that lights up into a sign. "Talk slow, no go." He shakes hands with me and the bow tie lights up, and I get shocked. He laughs.

I have no judge yet. A team has been given a bye plots down at the table behind us and start laughing about dealing drugs. I turn to look at them, but the one who looks like Keanu is shaving his face with a switchblade, and I look away.

Finally our judge shows up. She is absolutely gorgeous, intellectual, and very angry. "I look all over this 50-year-old school for this room and I end up back here!" She looks at me. "Isn't it the negative's job to get the judge in the room? Is that too much to ask?" We're off to a great start. I look closer. It is Sharna Stone. Fortunately, she is wearing slacks. So she sits down and says "I don't have any paper. If there's no paper I demand to flow on your leg!" She pulls out a nasty looking tattoo gun from a backpack. And so I look desperately for paper and there is no paper. In fact I don't have any paper for myself, only for helplessness.

And DeVito gets up and saunters over with a big stack of paper and gives it to her. She says "Thank you" as she takes it from him, then there is an audible hiss and DeVito's head drops. She shakes with the poll and she and DeVito are locked in a shocking embrace. Suddenly the floor is illuminated! "Wow!" she says. "I love guys with bow ties!" DeVito laughs and his bow tie twinkles, but his eyes remain dead cold.

Now she says she doesn't have a pen. And I hurl a pen at her, but he nearly catches it in her teeth. Now that she has two huge diamonds on each finger.

I'm looking for paper, my partner is beginning to cry, this is not a good beginning to the most important tournament in my life. DeVito waddles to the front of the tables. No one notices, a woman who looks like Jane Fonda is screaming behind us, "I was a hypo tester, and he pulls out a bunch of needles! Can you imagine the gaff!" DeVito turns to the judge and winks, and his bow tie flashes but his eyes remain cold. The judge whispered "Is there anything you would like to say before I start?" DeVito inquires.

She takes her chin, and her jewels flash from her teeth. "I'm a licensed computer newsletter! I can write so fast my fingers are registered on the FBI, the CIA, and the ACLU. I can flow anything you say."

"Anything?" DeVito simpers but his eyes betray him.

"Anything, cute," she answers.

A.T.G. rumbles from his table. "Is that all right if I talk in a medical parameter?"

"Of course!" she tweets. "I think medical parameter is so sexy!
"The room is instantly covered with spit. I understand absolutely nothing. I suddenly realize that I still have no paper. I reach into my
pocket and came out with a day-by-day calendar. I frantically tear off pages and begin writing, although I understand nothing. Sissy screeches me around the neck and screams incoherently in my ear. I look at the judge. She's getting it all down perfectly.

Behind me the bye team is complaining that it's too hot. They wheel an industrial size electric fan over to them. The rate of the wheels is outrageous. I have hundreds of slips of dead days in front of me, each with unintelligible words scrawled upon them. The fan begins to roar. The papers take off. I step desperately at them. The judge turns and glares at me. I let the papers fly, and pull more out of my pocket and stuff them into my mouth to keep them from blowing away. I feel dreams of little paper cars swirling through my tongue.

Suddenly DeVito stops and says, "Here's the plan, we won't do 4-2-8." Then he launches again. I have no idea what he's talking about. "We won't do 4-2-8. What's that? Is it a weapon of mass destruction?" Then he says, "I see I have three minutes left. Evaluate the round based on this." He pulls a huge copy of The Cue and Cue of Pure Reason out of his jacket pocket and begins with page one. His hand begins sparking, and smoke is coming out from under his neck.

I go over to my file box and there's nothing about 4-2-8. Absolutely nothing. By this time my partner has her head on the table buried in her arms. Her back is quaking. I try to put it but my hand returns, working wet. Suddenly DeVito stops. He slams the book closed on the last page. He says, "That's the moral imperative. And if there aren't any questions, we win." The judge nods her head yes, and blows him a kiss.

Suddenly an entire class of kindergartners floods the room, followed by a chuckling man in full regalia. They start writing down in front of our debate putting, shaving and being each other. The man clacks one kid and then turns to us. "You don't mind if my children watch this '80s debate do you? I've heard these guys are really good. "She is, of course," muttering to Andy and DeVito. "Who are you, she asks, but turns away before I can answer. "Now, sweet angels, listen and learn!" Suddenly the humm from the fan hits her and she flies away through the door. One of the kids turns to the other "Bad habit he makes.

So I sue, panting the calendar pages back into my pocket and as I'm walking up I hear, "Does anyone want to keep time?" and they start yes, so he pulls out a stopwatch and throws it to the kids. There is a mass battle as the kids fight over it, but one savagely defeats the other. I look closer. It's Yoda. He is dressed in a Pokemon t-shirt and a head of the rings cap. He obviously has issues.

I begin, "What about vagueness?" The timer instantly goes off and Yoda screams "TIME LIMIT!" and lets the timer go on and on without stopping. As he charters a bloody truth falls out of his mouth.

The judge laughs and says, "Oh, that wasn't nice. Go ahead and try again."

So I say, "What about the time gone off and Yoda yells "TIME LIMIT!"?" The timer's alarm goes off again. Yoda starts sitting in the chair. The judge laughs and says, "Isn't that cute? You'd better think he's cute."

"He's cute."

"Let him have longer this time. Sweetie."

"Can you explain your plan?"

"It's about volunteers, but it's not 4-2-8."

"TIME LIMIT," the judge says. "Why don't you give your full time, so you might as well sit down."

"But I don't."

"Your time is up," the judge says. "Let him have his say!" It has started to rain. The judge asks, and the bye team begins to say they're going to start over. The teams both turn to the judge. The judge laughs and says, "Isn't that cute? You'd better think he's cute."

"I'll think of something. Of course I will."

"No new in two. No new..."

This produces renewed talking from the partner team. The sound of woman's voice makes her laugh. The judge-keeper says, "We are Medusa on a bad hair day. She moans and slams to the front of the room. The kindergartners fall to the floor. "Bad habit he makes."

"I told you I'll think of something."

"It's a mistake. The papers go flying and sticks with my saliva plaster themselves in the backs of the kindergartners. They eek and begin to laugh, and then they start like they are being attacked, which, I guess, they are.

I try my extroverted colleague goes back to the back. She looks downcastly at me and says, "My partner's going to think of something."

So I say, "What about...?"

"No new in two. No new..."

"TIME LIMIT!"

"Let him have longer this time. Sweetie."

"Can you explain your plan?"

"It's about volunteers, but it's not 4-2-8."

"TIME LIMIT."

Then I say, "The bye team has to think of something. I reach into my pocket, but all the calendar pages are gone. I look at the judge. "I can't borrow the veteran?"

"Sure," she says, "But I can't swear that."

I plunge the needle into my arm and begin to write. Nothing seems to make any sense. "John G killed my wife. What does that mean?" "Don't answer the phone." I feel like I'm in a backwards movie.

Then suddenly I start to get great ideas! I rip my trouser legs off and begin to write really good analyses on my thighs that can bring us right back into this debate! And my thighs are big enough for the book of Genesis! Then suddenly, there's an awful gust of bad breath over my shoulder and it's Sidney Greenstreet. He has a huge stack of evidence, and says "I hate this team. Here, use this!" He slams it down next to me, and I pick up the first stack before the fan can blow it away, but it's all in Arabic, and I can't read it. I turn to tell him to take it back, cause I know this is murder. But there's only the two of us, discussing the techniques of mass terrorism.

About half way through the stack, the evidence turns to English translated very badly from Arabic. "It is, volunteers are not good," that type of thing. What the heck? It's better than nothing. My partner finally stops shouting, and a T.G."..." he seems to go up and up like a mushroom cloud, and there's this gigantic rumbling through the building and then total silence. He rolls towards her, the tree roots prest
I'm reaching for her, and she shrinks onto the floor, begging for her life. She grabs his leg, a tree trunk, and he goes down upon her, a redwood. The judge says "Oh, wow! Isn't he great? Oh, isn't he just great?" My partner lays on the floor sobbing. She won't get up.

"What makes you cry, my child?"

André pronounces "He does! That's a &%*%^" &%*%^ partner over there?"

Grievously, he asks me "And I see the coldest deepest space in his eyes. He snarls, "Why didn't you just admit that you didn't have any non-4-2-8 evidence?"

"I leave!" the judge says, "Juvenile authorities will be here any minute."

As we run, people slip away from us. I hear an old man hiss at another, "Internal collapse, versus our!"

"Shun them, the other replies."

"The Second Part of the Dream directed by Quentin Tarantino"

So Sissy and I flee back up to the judges lounge, just past the trophies to be awarded. They are seated, heads, Jefferson at first place, Madison at second, the Douglas as third. We keep moving, go down stairs, through garish hallways, down steps, again and again, and end up walking up steps. I know, we're late, but all the clocks tell 10:10. Suddenly my partner drops our file box, and it goes tumbling upwards, papers flying at each cycle. Voda the Evil Elf appears at the top of the stairs. He pulls out a lighter and his file starts burning furiously. We can't even begin to stamp it out. We leap through the flames. Just around the corner the elf disappears. In front of us is a heavy iron door with a brass sign: "Cathedral Cloakroom." It begins: "All Ye That Enter Here Better Have A Cloak." We don't even have a clue. My partner opens the door and enters. The door slams back on my foot. I open the door and there is a small room with walls covered by layers and layers of cloaks. Many have fallen off on the floor, where they flunk disturbingly like bodies.

There are three enormous old ladies all on walkie-talkie wheels... and they have balloons. Then there's another team with a guy in blue pants and no shirt with the physique of the Starman. The partner calls him Tony. The other guy looks disturbingly like the Roswell Alien Sharpton. They are the affirmative. My partner slumps down in a pew. There's a narrow door out of cloakroom into the cathedral. The head judge, a blue harried witch with a freezing lump on her forehead, says, "It's about time you got here. Let's start the debate."

"One makes a move."

"Where do you want us to speak from?" I ask.

"From the podium."

She must mean the pulpit, but it's obvious they can't hear us from there. The Rev. A.'s still inside the cathedral. It is immense—the entire national tournament could fit in a corner if the national tournament could have fins. I gesture towards the front pew. No one answers. Sharpton and I start walking down. There is absolutely no one else in the cathedral and our steps echo like thunder. That makes it hard to explain a moving sound that I hear all around us. When we finally reach the front pew, and A.'s in the pulpit. He looks comfortable up there. He begins, "The Kansas City Chiefs are a terrible football team. The Kansas City Royals are a terrible baseball team. Thousands die of boredom watching them every year. They are weapons of mass destruction. He pauses for dramatic effect then continues. "Therefore, we demand the Yankees share their money with the rest of the baseball and football teams. And oh, year, Derek Jeter Wouldn't be too bad either."

Then the speaker. The speech was only 15 seconds.

"I have questions," I say.

"This is about baseball and football. No one asks questions about sports, you just blather stupid opinions. That's all you need to know."

We start back up the long ramp towards the cloakroom. I notice the door is closed.

Suddenly something wet falls on my head. I slap my head and my hand comes away sticky. I sniff— it's sour cream! I look up and discover what causes the rustling sound. There are a vast number of baked potatoes with wings, all piled up on the rafters like vegetable bats. They seem about to attack. I have heard that potatoes have eyes, but I never believed their starchy could be scary.

We walk faster all the way back to the cloakroom. open the door and it's freezing! The chicks have been replaced by sides of meat. The head judge says, "What's going on?"

"He looks like Sylvester Stallone. The other judges have become Muhammad Ali and Oprah. The door slams behind us. "Wonderful," mutters Oprah. "I'm lucky to be here with these pigs."

"Hey, guinea Stallone, these beings couldn't help it."

"Shut up!"

"Now, for crying out loud, speak up!"

"Ali puts me at two. "You're up!"
Suhrig

As I stagger, I pull out the instant-dried blood mix with my fingers, but then there's more and I can't talk faster than the clotting and I start getting dizzy and weak and I'm not tired every time I say "p" or "b" or "analytical." The dwarves aren't listening, instead they are snatching at the flying potatoes and when they catch one they squeal over it, like vultures at the kill. The potatoes would be screaming, if they had mouths. But I'll never forget the look in their eyes.

I get through the topicality argument but Grumpy is unperturbed. "That's right; he's right. Maybe it wasn't personal. I can't go on. I fall on the ground, right at the feet of the head judge. After a moment with flecks of sour cream falling in my staring eyes, the Queen ushers me out. Does that mean you're finished?" I can't even answer. My mouth is too cluttered, unnerved. "That's the point," she says, "just as it was getting good." The judges walk out singing "Rhythm and Blues Ramblin."".

I pull myself up by the edge of the pock, the roof and crawl to the water fountain. I put my face in the water, trying to drink, but my mouth is so full it bounces back out. I collapse on the floor. The crowd is surging in my ears and I know I'm dying.

Suddenly the lights shining in my eyes dim, and there is a face slowly emerging through the tip. It begins to coalesce into the visage of my high school coach, Mr. Chips. The NFT pin on his chest is the size of a shield, and his seven diamonds glitter upon it. There is no pity in his face. Suddenly he backs up and then kicks me out. You've got a loser's consolation round in five minutes. Not that it's any consolation to me."

Roll credits.

(Bill Davis coaches at Blue Valley North in Overland Park Kansas)

(Manessa from page 25)

plied every single time, although such strategies may be useful.

Outweighing impacts, unlike turns, RFOUR'S comparative language. If debaters expect to weigh effectively two competing claims, they must make clear both the framework in which they are to be weighed and exactly how one rates over the other. That is, if the agreed-on value in a round is justice, debaters must make clear how their claim is more likely to be, more long-term, more immediate, etc than their opponents' claims. Black-and-white claims about justice are ineffective, instead claims that tell how one argument is better than an opponent are forceful.

If in-use impacts are not done properly, opponents will find it unnecessary to turn or outweigh impacts. Instead, they should likely focus on explaining how the case impacts are based on flawed premises, or worse yet, that the case is all impact and no premise. To avoid this problem, debaters should pay close attention to their claims and warrants, and seek specific, well-respected evidence to make them logically sound. To exploit this problem, debaters should pinpoint one or two problems with their opponents' logical premises, and explain that if the opponent cannot win the premise then she cannot win the impacts either. Such strategy should conclude with a statement about what this means in terms of the value and criterion.

So understand what I didn't, and do your judges a favor. Make clear for them not only what your arguments are, but also why they matter. Remember to impact not only to your own value, but also to your opponent's value and arguments. Impact early on—in case—no sense in waiting for rebuttal! Attempt to turn or outweigh your opponent's impacts. And, don't ever forget one must win the premise to claim the impact. Both premises and impacts are necessary conditions for a valid, meaningful argument.
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weight to be given to development as a governmental duty; these universal moral obligations of nations also apply to lesser developed nations, the negative could explain, illustrate a priority needs to be placed upon environmental protection, since without such a priority, harms to future citizens as well as other nations would occur, and more important principles of governmental duty would be violated.

Those will be many who look at a proposal such as one law reforming and ask "But doesn't this mean that the value is decontextualized as the central focus of argument, and that a relativist conclusion instead becomes the main focus, with arguments which flow forth more specific explanation of what that conclusion means? Wouldn't the value then become nothing more than an abstract concept that is given higher influence in informing the arguments on one side of a resolution?"

My answer in both these questions is "Yes" (and I'm pretty sure a few others, like 1st man State College debater and multiple debate camp instructor Shane Muckno, would agree not only that the answer is yes to the questions above, but that better debate would more consistently occur if more people agreed that the answer should be yes). However, I would qualify my "Yes" answer to the second question by arguing that if a value is an ideal conception that informs arguments that does not put the value into a position of being "nothing more than" what a presuppositional genius Isaiah Berlin pointed out long ago, discussions about the ideal conceptions called values--how they ought to be ranked, and which value ought to be sacrificed when two important ones come into conflict—are perhaps the most important decisions that any just government must make.

I used to think this value criterion turnaround was a radical proposal, but now I realize that I wasn’t thinking straight. In most of the rounds I’ve seen lately, debaters avoid getting into consequential arguments about value/criterion interpretation by collapsing both issues into the “standards debate”. In many other debates, the arguments given to the contentions become much more crucial to the round adjudication, and the value criterion debate just fades away. Nevertheless, I insist that the orientation to both value and criterion argument that I propose in this attack would lead to better clash and clearer delineation of the issues that really matter on most Lincoln-Douglas debate topics. I believe that the more common value criterion is two step—my value is governmental legitimacy and my criteria is the assurance of individual rights.” When under-explained and perfunctorily presented, adds little more than obscuration and confusion to most rounds (and I’m fairly sure a few others, such as Bishop Left and Memorial coach Terrance Simmon agree)!1

Do I have a value, or any values, that inform my position in this article? I called Gibson to ask for help in answering this question, but he just told me to do something I can’t print after I read him the first part of this article. So I guess I have to come up with my own answer. I value clarity and specificity of argument and straightforwards and clear on heart of the resolution is sure. Most importantly, however, I propose as a criterion that will produce the highest quality argumentation on the resolutions before us in Lincoln-Douglas debate that I believe that the type of “standards” debate I’ve proposed in this article, with a criterion-based criterion focus and operating informing values, will best produce such argument.
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## NFL's Top 50 Districts
(as of January 2, 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Ave. No. Degrees</th>
<th>Leading Chapter</th>
<th>No of Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Three Trails</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Blue Valley North HS</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>Rushmore</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Sioux Falls-Lincoln HS</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Northern South Dakota</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Watertown HS</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>East Kansas</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Shawnee Mission East HS</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>Heart of America</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Park Hill HS</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+35</td>
<td>California Coast</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Leland HS</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Sunflower</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Wichita-East HS</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>West Kansas</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Hutchinson HS</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Bronx HS of Science</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Show Me</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Blue Springs-South HS</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Kansas Flint-Hills</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Washburn Rural HS</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>Northwest Indiana</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Plymouth HS</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>Central Minnesota</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Apple Valley HS</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Kansas</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>El Dorado HS</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>Illini</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Downers Grove-South HS</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Northern Ohio</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Youngstown-Boardman HS</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>+18</td>
<td>San Fran Bay</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>James Logan HS</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Florida Sunshine</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Sarasota-Riverview HS</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Southern Minnesota</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Eagan HS</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>South Texas</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Houston-Ballare HS</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Millard-North HS</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>Florida Manatee</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Taravella HS</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Hole in the Wall</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Cheyenne-Central HS</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Carver-Truman</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Naosha HS</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Bozeman HS</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain-South</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Wheat Ridge HS</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Eastern Ohio</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Canton-GlenOak HS Career Ctr</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>East Los Angeles</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Gabrielino HS</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>+29</td>
<td>New England</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Manchester HS</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>North East Indiana</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Chesterton HS</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Northern Illinois</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Glenbrook-North HS</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>Eastern Washington</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Gonzaga Prep HS</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>+31</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Riverside HS</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Bakersfield HS</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>+34</td>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Yucaipa HS</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Ozark</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Springfield-Hilcrest HS</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Big Valley</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Modesto-Bayer HS</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>North Coast</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Gilmore Academy</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>Great Salt Lake</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Salt Lake City-Skyline HS</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>Northern Wisconsin</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Appleton East HS</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>Eastern Missouri</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Pattonville HS</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>Northern Lights</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Moorhead HS</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>Carolina West</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Myers Park HS</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>West Oklahoma</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Norman HS North</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Great Lakes HS</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>+26</td>
<td>Deep South</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>The Montgomery Academy</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>Florida Panther</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Cherry Creek HS</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>Hoosier Crossroads</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Trinity Prep School</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>+38</td>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Indpls-North Central HS</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Loyola HS</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Loyola HS</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Ave. No. Degrees</td>
<td>Leading Chapter</td>
<td>No. of Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>South Oregon</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Ashland HS</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>+30</td>
<td>Gulf Coast</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Gregory-Portland HS</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>South Florida</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Michael Krop HS</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>Hoosier Mama</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Ben Davis HS</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>East Texas</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Jersey Village HS</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Lone Star</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Plano Sr. HS</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>North Dakota Roughrider</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Fargo-Shanley HS</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>West Iowa</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Ankeny Senior HS</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Hillcrest HS</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>Sagebrush</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Ramo HS</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>Valley Forge</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Truman HS</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>Central Texas</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Ronald Reagan HS</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Utah-Wasatch</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Layton HS</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Cathedral Prep School</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>Southern Wisconsin</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Marquette University HS</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>Nebraska South</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Lincoln-East HS</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Colorado Grande</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Pueblo-Colorado HS</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain-North</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Greeley-Central HS</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>Golden Desert</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Green Valley HS</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Seton Hall Prep School</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>Chesapeake</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Calvert Hall HS</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>Greater Illinois</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Belleville-East HS</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Dobson HS</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Albuquerque Academy</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>New York State</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Hendrick Hudson HS</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>Heart of Texas</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Hays HS</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mark Hill Bible School</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>Georgia Southern Peach</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Caddo Magnet HS</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>North Texas Longhorns</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Thomas County Central HS</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>Western Ohio</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Colleyville Heritage HS</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>Wind River</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Dayton-Oakwood HS</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>Western Washington</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Gasper-Natoma County HS</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Gil Harbor HS</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>East Oklahoma</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Boone County HS</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>North Oregon</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Tulsa-Washington HS</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Sundance</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Greer-Brady HS</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>Tall Cotton</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Jordan HS</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Abilene HS</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Georgia Northern Mountain</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Portage-Central HS</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>East Iowa</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Chattahoochee HS</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>UIL</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Iowa City-West HS</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Princeton HS</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>Tarheel East</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Hattiesburg HS</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>East Carteret HS</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Blackstone HS</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>West Texas</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>El Paso-Cathedral HS</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Brunswick HS</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Puget Sound</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Kamiah HS</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Wheeling Park HS</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Patrick Henry</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Madison County HS</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>Capital Valley</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Rio Americano HS</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>Hawai'i</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Kamehameha Schools</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Iroquois</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mount Mercy Academy</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHO CAN IT BE?
Are these famous stars or NFL coaches?

Is Elvis in the building?

No, it's Brother Rene' at the La Salle High School Auction!!

It's not Anne Robinson
(TV's rudest woman)!
It's New Trier's Coach Linda Oddo!

You are not watching Animal Planet TV.
It's R. J. Naegelin in Alaska

GET YOUR AUTOGRAPHS HERE
THE 2002 CAPITOL CLASSIC
DEBATE INSTITUTE
Washington, D.C.

THE CAPITAL CLASSIC CHAMPIONS SERIES
A Three-Week Workshop Tailored to All Levels of Debate
JUNE 16 – JULY 6

THE WASHINGTON GROUP
A Four-Week Select Institute Designed Exclusively for Advanced Debaters

A tradition of excellence in teaching returns to the nation's capital.

STEVE MANCUSO, Catholic University. Coached 14 first-round teams to the N.D.T., 24 teams to the elimination rounds at the N.D.T., and the top speaker at the N.D.T. in 1993. Taught at 45 workshops.***

ROGER SOFT, University of Kentucky. Coach of five top speakers at the N.D.T. and the 1986 N.D.T. champions. Taught at 45 workshops, including the top-senior lab at Michigan for seven years.***

SHERRY HALL, Harvard. Coach of the 1990 N.D.T. Champions. Taught at 30 workshops, including the top-junior lab at Michigan for six years. Author of major national handbooks and the HARVEX database.**

DALLAS PERKINS, Harvard. Coached 40 teams to the N.D.T., including the 1985 and 1990 N.D.T. Champions. Taught at debate workshops for over 20 years.**

ANDY PETERSON, Catholic University. 2001 N.D.T. Champion. Winner of the 2001 West Georgia Tournament. Four-time N.D.T. first round bid debater. Taught at Michigan and Iowa Workshops.***

RANDY LUSKEY, Stanford. 2001 Copeland Award winner. Winner of the 2001 Northwestern Tournament and the 2000 Wake Forest Tournament. Taught at Stanford, Capitol Classic, and Berkeley debate workshops.***


STEFAN BAUSCHARDT, Boston College. Prolific debate author of handbooks such as The Hitchhiker Companion, Paradigm Affirmatives and the Disadvantage of the Month Club. Taught at Wake Forest Debate Institute.*


*Champions Series only; **Washington Group only; ***Both sessions. Additional faculty to be named at a later date.

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

Apply online at http://debate.cua.edu
If a man with just one year of schooling could lead a nation, imagine what you could do with a little help.

2001 National Tournament Qualifiers

Abraham Lincoln had almost no formal schooling. But he loved learning, and he understood the power of words — to stir men’s souls, to influence thought, even to change the world around him. That’s why, at Lincoln Financial Group, we’re proud to sponsor the National Forensic League, A&E’s BIOGRAPHY® Project for Schools, and other educational programs for young people. If you think you’re ready for the NFL, give them a call at 920-748-6206. After all, four score and seven years from now, there’s no telling what the history books will be saying about you.

“Plow to dig up the question by the roots and hold it up and dry it before the fires of the mind.”
— Abraham Lincoln

Clear solutions in a complex world®

© 2001 Lincoln National Corporation. Lincoln Financial Group is the marketing name for Lincoln National Corp. and its affiliates.