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2000-2001 Topic: Protecting Privacy
Affirmative Cases Book
Meet your need for both cases to run, and learning what
cases other squads will be running.
The Biggest book you can buy.

A NEW PRODUCT FOR A
NEW RESOLUTION

EIGHT FULLY WRITTEN AFFIRMATIVE CASES. On the final consideration
lists are cases on I.R.S. reform, sexual preference, information sales, intellectual
rights protection, due process, Escobedo, Search warrants, polygraphs, credit
ratings, espionage excess, restricting the Freedom of Information Act, and terrorism.

AFFIRMATIVE ANSWER BLOCKS TO:
1. GENERIC DISADVANTAGES such as cost, court clog, taxes and financial collapse,
   industrial theft, national security, AIDS, balance, Federalism, Big Brother, corporate
   bankruptcies.
2. GENERIC COUNTERPLAN such as states, international business NGOs.
3. KRITIKS such as Nationalism, communitarianism, rights, and Individualism.
4. TOPICALITY ANSWERS on in, protection, increase, significantly, should, federal
   government, the.
5. Justification Answers.
6. SOLVENCY answers on issues such as: government, circumvention, hackers,
   internet hackers, technology intrusion.
7. CASE SPECIFIC extension.

A GREAT teaching and coaching aid. It lets you and your debaters practice against each others cases. It gives your novices a
choice of great cases to use. The extensions serve as both models to help students learn how it's done and as in-round tools
to help with debates. 250 plus pages, a wonderful diversity of cases and so many extension blocks it boggles the mind.

Complete. $44 Available June 30, 2000
Available on COMPUTER DISK as well as paper. Disk copies, IBM compatible, sell for $74.00.

KRITIK
THE
KRITIK
Fourth Edition

The KRITIK book
offers you the tools to achieve two
goals: run a kritik on the negative, or
answer and defeat a kritik when you
or your teams are on the affirmative.

Included are:
- Fifteen negative kritiks. Shells plus some extension
  blocks and evidence pages.
- 80+ affirmative response block, extensions, labeled evidence pages,
  330+ pages.
- Includes: threat construction, education, tech bad, patriarchy,
  nationalism, eco-modernism, deterrence, critical security, deontology,
  consumption, speech censorship, kritik of reason, rhetoric,
  metaphysics, epistemology, causality, deconstruction,
  postmodernism, normativity, language, nuclearism, feminism,
  Heidegger, and statism, education, objectivism, critical legal
  studies, social molding.
- Theory articles by William Bennett, Prof. Patrick Gehrke, and
  Greg Schnipple of the CATO Institute.

More Complete. $39, Four or more $29

The Crucial Complete Tool
YOU GET THE BIGGEST THEORY BLOCK BOOK
"This is an amazing work of analysis and logic. It contains hundreds of blocks. The evidence is from
legal, arumentation, logic, philosophy and even literary sources. The coverage and quality has this
book bordering on being a masterpiece"

YOU receive:
1. Over 300 theory blocks
2. Major sections on
   TOPICALITY (110 blocks)
   COUNTERPLANS (68 blocks)
   DISADVANTAGES (18 blocks)
   JUSTIFICATION (21 blocks)
3. Affirmative and Negative
   blocks on presumption,
   inherency, significance,
   voting issues, paradigms,
   fiat, incrementalist, hypostating and more.
4. These blocks can be used on ANY topic.

Researched and written over 14 years by William
H. Bennett, the man recognized as the intellectual
leader of American high school debate.

ORDER TODAY

NEW SECOND EDITION
THE REALLY BIG THEORY BLOCK BOOK
$45.00

New Second Edition

The Crucial Complete Tool
YOU GET THE BIGGEST THEORY BLOCK BOOK
"This is an amazing work of analysis and logic. It contains hundreds of blocks. The evidence is from
legal, arumentation, logic, philosophy and even literary sources. The coverage and quality has this
book bordering on being a masterpiece"

YOU receive:
1. Over 300 theory blocks
2. Major sections on
   TOPICALITY (110 blocks)
   COUNTERPLANS (68 blocks)
   DISADVANTAGES (18 blocks)
   JUSTIFICATION (21 blocks)
3. Affirmative and Negative
   blocks on presumption,
   inherency, significance,
   voting issues, paradigms,
   fiat, incrementalist, hypostating and more.
4. These blocks can be used on ANY topic.

Researched and written over 14 years by William
H. Bennett, the man recognized as the intellectual
leader of American high school debate.

ORDER TODAY

NEW SECOND EDITION
THE REALLY BIG THEORY BLOCK BOOK
$45.00

Has affirmative answers to genric attacks better than
I could find anywhere else" — G. Streach, Kansas
"Every year we find affirmative cases that we love in
the CDE Affirmative Book." — Harry Johnson, Valley H.S.
"Send me a book by priority mail. The only 2 case we
lost to were both from CDE." — Shirley Cooper, Ohio
"I was really surprised by how big your affirmative book is." — M Brady, North H.S.
"We bought 4 different affirmative books. Next year CDE
is all we will buy. Yours had the most cases, by far the
most answers to negative generics, and the most
original analysis." — B. Carr, Dallas
CDE DEBATE HANDBOOKS
FOR 2000-2001: PROTECTING PRIVACY
EXCLUSIVE NEGATIVE BLOCKS ON:

1. TOPICALLY
   The
   Federal Government
   Stakes
   Significantly
   Increased
   Protection
   In
   Employment
   Medical Records
   Consumer Information
   Search and Seizure

2. INHERENCY
   Privacy is increasing
   Legal Protection & Laws Increasing
   Suitability
   Triviality

3. JUSTIFICATION
   The
   Federal
   Government
   Protection of Privacy
   United States

4. HARM
   Group needs outweigh (Turi)
   Not Significant

5. COUNTERPLANS
   States
   Business
   International
   United Nations
   G-8

COMPLETE. EACH BOOK HAS OVER 200 DIFFERENT NEGATIVE BLOCKS and the case specific blocks will ALL be on next year's specific topic. Rated the best handbooks published in both Texas and National camp comparisons. The biggest handbook solo!

Mail Today

6. SOLVENCY ATTACKS
   Computers
   Technology
   Web
   Internet
   Hackers
   Enforcemen mechanisms unworkable
   Circumvention

7. DISADVANTAGES
   Tax/Financial Collapse
   Big Brother
   Corporate Bankruptcy Increase
   Federalism
   Community/Rule Balance
   AIDS
   STDs
   Terrorism ESCalate
   Espionage
   National Security Declined
   Crime Increase
   Business Confidence
   Court Clog
   Malpractice

8. KRITIKS
   Communism
   Imperialism
   Rights
   Individualism
   Nationalism

9. CASE SPECIFICS
   Information Sales
   14th Amendment
   Lie Detection/Psychoanalysis
   Espionage excess
   Terrorism/Threat
   Medical Insurance
   Credit Rating
   Search/Warrants
   Sexual Privacy
   Sexual Preference
   I.R.S. Reform
   Racism
   Sexism
   Ageism
   Writable
   Writedowns
   Electronic Eavesdropping

➤ 1993: NATIONAL CAMP SURVEY ranks CDE Handbooks "the best in the nation".
➤ 1994: Texas-based speech newsletter finds CDE Handbooks and Affirmative Cases Book the biggest, most complete, and best debate books available.

Mail to: CDE, P.O. Box Z, Taos, N.M. 87571
(505) 751-0514
FAX: 505-751-9788

Name ___________________________________________________________________________

Mailing Address __________________________________________________________________

Affirmative Cases Book ................................................................. $44
Kritik ................................................................................................. $39
The Really Big Theory Block Book .................................................. $45
Debate Handbooks, 3 Vol ................................................................. $69

(4 or more copies - $9 each)
The largest, most complete, and most used debate site on the internet. To learn, research, get information, shop for debate products, join organizations, watch internet videos, grow, network, and explore this is the #1 spot on the internet, now used by 2800 visitors a day and by debaters from 55 countries.

We recently broadcast the NDT & CEDA final rounds and the first international internet debate between the USA & the UK. Complete, free online streaming video debate instruction. Complete, free online debate and argumentation texts.

DEBATE CENTRAL PROUDLY HOSTS:

National Forensic League  CEDA

World Debate Institute  URBAN DEBATE LEAGUES

DEBATE CENTRAL BROADCAST NETWORK

An educational program of the University of Vermont
NATIONAL TOURNAMENT EXTEMPORE AREAS

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES ROUNDTABLE
AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
UNITED STATES EXTEMPORE

Education and Problems of Youth
Social Welfare and Health Issues
Science, Technology, Energy and the Environment
Politics
Politicians
Media, Sports and Leisure
Military and Defense Issues
US Foreign Policy and Foreign Affairs
Constitutional Issues
Government Issues: Local, State and Federal
US Economy and Economic Issues
Crime and the US Justice System

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICERS
RETIRER FOREIGN EXTEMPORE

US Foreign Policy and Foreign Affairs
Africa
Western Europe
Eastern Europe
Russia
Latin and South America
Canada, Mexico, and the Caribbean
The World Economy
China and Japan
The Rest of Asia including India and Pakistan
The Middle East
Global Issues

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES ROUNDTABLE
EXTemporaneous Commentary

The 2000 Election
Science and Technology
Entertainment 2000

Names in the News
20th Century in Retrospect
The American Heritage
The American Family

The American High School
International Hotspots
Local Issues

STORYTELLING TOPIC AREA
Native American Myths and Legends or Stories of the Old West

LINCOLN FINANCIAL GROUP NATIONAL TOURNAMENT L/D TOPIC
Resolved: Inaction in the face of injustice makes an individual morally culpable

The Rostrum provides an open forum for the forensic community. The opinions expressed by contributors to the Rostrum are their own and not necessarily the opinions of the National Forensic League, its officers or members. The National Forensic League does not recommend or endorse advertised products and services unless offered directly from the NLF office.
LINCOLN FINANCIAL GROUP
NORTHWEST ROSE NATIONALS 2000
REGISTRATION TIME SCHEDULE
SUNDAY
JUNE 11

8:30
Registration for Tournament Officials
Oregon Convention Center Hall A
Portland, Oregon

9:00-5:00
General Registration
Oregon Center Hall A

9:00
Speech Tab Meeting - Oregon Center Room 106

9:00
Debate Tab Meeting - Oregon Center Room 105

9:00
L/D Tab Meeting - Oregon Center Room 107

10:00
L/D Wording Committee - Oregon Center VIP Suite

10:00
Supplemental Tab Meeting - Oregon Center Room 104

11:00
First Time Coaches and First Time Schools Reception
Doubletree-Lloyd Center Hotel

11:00
Congress Officials Meeting - Oregon Center 103

11:00
Consolation Tab Meeting - Oregon Center Room 104
(Impromptu and Storytelling)

12:00
Congress Parliamentarians Meeting - Oregon Center 103

12:30
Extemp Officials Meeting - Oregon Center Room 104

1:00
District Chair Reception - Doubletree-Lloyd Center Hotel

2:00
District Chair Seminar - Doubletree-Lloyd Center Hotel

5:00-8:00
Late Registration
Lobby, Doubletree-Lloyd Center Hotel

5:00
Northwest Rose Nationals 2000 Opening Ceremony
Oregon Center Clark Ballroom

7:00-9:00
Coaches Reception
Student Party
NFL Diamond Award Presentations
Jazz at the Zoo
Portland Zoo
Breaking Down Barriers

How to Debate

- Advanced material on counterplans, critiques, and rebuttals!
- Prepare Privacy cases, disadvantages, and topicality arguments!
- Illustrations, stories and examples!
- Clear step-by-step learning process!
- Superb Lincoln-Douglas Sections!

TEXTBOOKS THAT WILL HELP YOUR CLASS LEARN

This is the textbook that has revolutionized how debate should be taught. With the class package, your students learn to bracket evidence, brief, write cases, practice refutation, do cross-examination, flow, and prepare disadvantages. Advanced sections on counterplans, rebuttals, strategies, critiques, generic arguments and more make this a must have. And, because each textbook comes with a Prepbook (see below), your students will be prepared to debate the Privacy topic. Teachers will love the three ring binder Teacher Materials that include lesson plans, handouts, course syllabi, and practical tips.

PREPBOOKS THAT GET STUDENTS READY TO DEBATE THE PRIVACY TOPIC!

A great help for getting started on the Privacy topic because now you have topic specific handouts. Your beginners read the Privacy topic overview, bracket short sections of articles, tag Privacy evidence, use definitions for topicality arguments, and practice refutation and rebuttals with real evidence. Students will learn how to debate AND they actually construct their own privacy topic briefs, case, disadvantages, case responses, and topicality arguments. They practice debating on the new Privacy topic with their own arguments made from the 100 plus pieces of real evidence, definitions and activities included in the Prepbook!

ORDER THE PACKAGE FOR YOUR CLASS!

You and your students will be happy you did. Use Breaking Down Barriers in your class with either the Textbook Package or the Prepbook Package.

VISIT US AT WWW.WCDEBATE.COM

WHAT'S IN BREAKING DOWN BARRIERS: HOW TO DEBATE

SECTION 1 BASIC DEBATE SKILLS
PREPARING FOR MINI-DEBATES
Chapter 1: Introduction to Debate
Chapter 2: Preparing Arguments
Chapter 3: Preparing Cases
Chapter 4: Preparing Cases
Chapter 5: Responding to Arguments
Chapter 6: Rebuttalizing Arguments
Chapter 7: Cross-Examination
Chapter 8: What to do if you win a Mini-Debate
Chapter 9: Different Kinds of Debate

SECTION 2A POLICY DEBATE SKILLS
PREPARING FOR SHORT POLICY DEBATES
Chapter 10: Issues in Policy Debate
Chapter 11: Preparing a Policy Affirmative Case
Chapter 12: Preparing a Policy Negative Case
Chapter 13: What to do if you lose a Traditional Policy Debate

SECTION 2B VALUE DEBATE SKILLS
PREPARING FOR LD DEBATES
Chapter 14: Issues in Value Debate
Chapter 15: Preparing an Affirmative Value Case
Chapter 16: Preparing a Negative Value Case
Chapter 17: What to do if you win a Lincoln-Douglas Debate

SECTION 3 ADVANCED ARGUMENTS
PREPARING FOR TOURNAMENT DEBATES
Chapter 18: Research Assignments
Chapter 19: The Library, Special Interest Materials, and Internet Information
Chapter 20: Topicality Arguments
Chapter 21: Generic Policy Arguments
Chapter 22: Counterplans
Chapter 23: General Value Arguments
Chapter 24: Value Alternatives
Chapter 25: Critiques
Chapter 26: Rebuttalizing Arguments

SECTION 4 ADVANCED SKILLS
DEBATING AT TOURNAMENTS
Chapter 27: Budget, During and After Tournaments
Chapter 28: What to do in National Circuit Style Policy Debate
Chapter 29: Judge-Adaptation
Chapter 30: Advanced Refutation Skills
Chapter 31: Advanced Rebuttal Skills
Chapter 32: Advanced Initiation Strategies
Chapter 33: Negative Initiation Strategies
Chapter 34: Advanced Theory—Fall, Pests, Conditionality

Updated for 2000, BDB provides the punch you need!
The Privacy Policy Package includes

AFFIRMATIVE HANDBOOK includes at least 170 pages of briefs in six affirmative cases, briefs on the key privacy areas of the topic, and responses to disadvantages and counterplans.

NEGATIVE HANDBOOK offers at least 170 pages of briefs including at least six disadvantages, responses to key cases and scenarios on the topic, privacy counterplans, and definitions for topicality arguments.

PRIVACY KRITIK HANDBOOK includes at least 150 pages of shells and briefs that explain, advocate and respond to kritiks specifically on the privacy topic.

POLICY SUPPLEMENT HANDBOOK includes at least 240 pages of updates on affirmative cases and negative disadvantages and counterplans, a new affirmative case, new disadvantages, a new counterplan, and responses to more affirmative cases and disadvantages.

EMAIL SUPPLEMENTS are sent the tenth of each month, November through March plus June 10th. Each includes 21 pages on the latest cases and negative positions except January's supplement has 100 pages. You are encouraged to send us requests for briefs that you want. Please include your email address on the order form.

The LD Package includes

PHILOSOPHER AND VALUES HANDBOOK, VOLUME 7 includes in-depth discussions, pages of evidenced arguments, and suggested readings on the innovative names in philosophy. Philosopher-Value Volume 7 Handbook also includes pro and con briefs on a variety of values. The philosophers and values that this handbook will cover are brand new and have not been covered in previous editions of the handbook.

LD TOPIC SUPPLEMENTS are mailed First Class 12 days after each Topic is released. Each Topic Supplement is 50 or more pages and includes affirmative and negative cases, definitions and value and topic specific briefs. Each offers an impressive topic overview including strategies and insights on the topic wording, values, criteria, and affirmative and negative cases. You can receive one of the following supplements: NFL TOPIC SUPPLEMENTS--Published for the Sept-Oct Nov.-Dec., Jan.-Feb., Mar.- Apr., and Nationals Tournaments; TEXAS UIL TOPIC SUPPLEMENTS--Published for the Fall and Spring Texas UIL Topics; CALIFORNIA TOPIC SUPPLEMENTS--Published for the California First and Second Semester LD Topics.

Policy Theory Handbook Volume 2

The Theory Handbook Vol. 2 includes over 150 pages of briefs that discuss entirely different arguments from Volume 1. Your team can use the briefs in Volume 2 in debates to argue for and against plan-inclusive counterplans, intrinsic permutations, delay counterplans, executive order counterplans, irony, language use, narrative argumentation, and many advanced, indepth, cutting-edge theory arguments. The briefs in this handbook show your students what good theory arguments look like so you can spend your time focusing on topic issues. We have compiled the finest thinkers in debate theory, policy analysts, critical thinking scholars, philosophers, and strong analytical arguments to make clear, well-supported arguments. The Volume 2 Handbook is a must have for successful debating!
West Coast Order Form

We are committed to excellent products and customer service. If you have any concerns or questions, call Matt Taylor toll free at 1-888-255-9133 or email him at wcdebate@aol.com

1. Fill out the Items you Want

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Description of Item</th>
<th>Price ea.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Squad Handbook Packages</strong>&lt;br&gt;Each Package includes all of the items included with the Policy and Lincoln-Douglas Packages</td>
<td>$225 ea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NFL Lincoln Douglas Handbook Packages</strong>&lt;br&gt;Each Package includes 1 of the Phil. and Value Handbook Volume 7 plus the LD Topic Supplements that we first class mail or email 12 days after each NFL LD topic is announced.</td>
<td>$125 ea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Texas UIL Lincoln Douglas Handbook Packages</strong>&lt;br&gt;Each Package includes 1 of the Phil. and Value Handbook Volume 7 plus the LD Topic Supplements that we first class mail or email 12 days after each UIL LD topic is announced.</td>
<td>$65 ea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>California Lincoln Douglas Handbook Packages</strong>&lt;br&gt;Each Package includes 1 of the Phil. and Value Handbook Volume 7 plus the LD Topic Supplements that we first class mail or email 12 days after each California LD topic is announced.</td>
<td>$65 ea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Breaking Down Barriers: Debate Prepbook Class Package</strong>&lt;br&gt;Each Prepbook Package includes 1 Teacher Materials, 20 Prepbooks</td>
<td>$125 ea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- If you pay with a Purchase Order, please add 10% to your total. If you are a Washington State school, add 8.2% sales tax.
- Unless you tell us otherwise, LD Topic Supplements are sent First Class and all other items are sent Third Class or Library Rate.
- If you wish, circle the items you want shipped first class and add $3 per book you want sent First Class.

2. State where you want the materials mailed:

Name ____________________________  School ____________________________
Mailing Address ____________________________
City ____________________________  State ________ Zip ________
E-mail Address (please write very, very clearly) ____________________________
School Phone ____________________________  Home Phone ____________________________
Check one: ______ I want my order regular mailed. ______ I want my order e-mailed (note: BDB textbooks cannot be e-mailed)

3. Send Your Order with Payment

TO FAX: Fax this form to Matt Taylor at 1-888-255-9133. Include Credit Card Info (below) or P.O. payable to West Coast Publishing.

TO MAIL: Mail this form to Matt Taylor at West Coast Publishing; PO Box 8066; Fountain Valley CA 92728-8066. Include P.O. or check payable to West Coast Publishing or provide Credit Card Info (below).

TO E-MAIL: E-mail the info requested on this form and P.O. number or Credit Card Info (below) to Matt Taylor at wcdebate@aol.com

TO PHONE: Call Matt Taylor at 1-888-255-9133. Have a P.O. number or credit card handy.

CREDIT CARD INFO: Circle the type of credit card you have: Mastercard or VISA (Sorry, no Discover or American Express)

Credit card Number ____________________________ Expiration date ____________________________

For a complete list of West Coast products, visit our web page at www.wcdebate.com or call Matt.
California National Forensic Institute
LD program: June 16 - 30

The strength of any debate camp lies in the strength of its staff. And to be great, a debate camp staff needs to be superbly qualified, and enthusiastic enough about teaching to be fully involved in every step of each student's learning experience.

Students who have worked with the CNFI LD staff are the ones most able to give an unbiased assessment of these great educators:

"I strongly recommend this camp to other students because it helps you not only with basic technique, but also teaches extremely advanced varsity level philosophy and strategic tactics. I loved all of the lectures, particularly the ones on philosophy and logic. And the student to staff ratio was great!"

Munish Puri, previous CNFI camp participant

"The lectures were very informative, and I especially liked the detailed philosophy discussions. I would recommend this camp to kids from anywhere because even though I come from a very different part of the country, I found the camp to be very good. I also felt that the emphasis on research was just right."

Chrissy Stear, previous CNFI camp participant

"The CNFI staff was easy to approach, and really friendly. The stop and go critiques of debates were very helpful, and I liked the intensity level of the camp because it really kept me on my toes. I would recommend this camp to others not only because you learn a lot, but also because of the comfortable environment."

Amber Veldkamp, previous CNFI camp participant

The 2000 faculty includes:
- Nick Coburn-Palo of Hopkins High School
- Additional national caliber staff to be added and announced shortly!
- Our faculty specialize in teaching philosophy, LD technique, and instructing students of all levels in the art of LD debate

Prospectus and Costs

Costs for the full resident program for LD, including tuition, housing, lunch and dinner on most days of the program, and most materials is approximately $1,275. Commuters, for whom there are only a limited number of spots in the program, pay approximately $700. One-week programs are also available, for an approximate cost of $675. There is an additional $75 non-refundable application fee. Students not accepted will have their application fee returned.

CNFI, 1678 Shattuck Ave, Suite 305, Berkeley, CA 94709 or call: (510) 548-4800 and on the web at: www.educationunlimited.com
California National Forensic Institute
Policy and LD programs: June 16 - June 30, 2000

The California National Forensic Institute is a national caliber two-week summer forensics program located in Berkeley, California. The CNFI is an independent program held in the residence hall facilities of the University of California at Berkeley. The CNFI provides serious debate students the opportunity to interact with some of the finest and most renowned forensics instructors in the nation at an incomparable cost for a program of this nature, quality and location. The program is directed by David Arnett of UC Berkeley and Ryan Mills of College Prep and the California Invitational, the nation’s largest speech and debate tournament.

POLICY and LD DEBATE

• The policy and LD programs offer intensive instruction for students of all levels of experience and skill. The instructors will include accomplished collegiate and high school debate coaches, as well as current collegiate debaters who are former NFL Nationals and TOC participants.
• In addition to topic and theory lectures, students will receive numerous critiqued debates with rebuttal reworks, free materials from the central evidence files, and personalized seminar instruction. All policy and LD materials are included in the program cost, with no additional fees charged for evidence distributed by the camp. Students also receive access to the best evidence researched at each of the other three NFC summer camps.
• LD students will participate in a unique curriculum designed to maximize individual improvement through philosophy lectures, technique practicums, and theory seminars.
• The mentors program returns to the CNFI and will insure a variety of top quality debaters will be in attendance. This program will be co-ordinated by David Arnett and Ryan Mills.

Last year’s policy and LD debate staff, most of whom are returning, and additions for this year include:

JON SHARP, WEST GEORGIA
DAVID ARNETT, UC BERKELEY
ANNE MARIE TODD, USC
NICK COBURN-PALO, HOPKINS HS (LD)

RANDY LUSKY, UC BERKELEY
DAN FITZMIER, ELLORY
JON DUNN, STANFORD

PROSPECTUS and COSTS

A detailed program prospectus can be obtained by writing to the address below, or calling and leaving a complete address on the program’s message service. Materials will be sent in late February.

Costs for the full resident program for both team debate and LD, including tuition, housing, lunch and dinner on most days of the program, and most materials is $1,275. Commuters pay $700. One-week programs are also available, for a resident cost of $675. There is an additional $75 non-refundable application fee. Students not accepted will have their application fee returned.

CNFI, 1678 Shattuck Ave, #305, Berkeley, CA 94709 or call: (510) 548-4800

www.educationunlimited.com
Whitman Policy and LD Camps
hosted by Whitman College, home of the 1999 CEDA National Champions

Outstanding Instructors
Topic and Theory Strategies
Practice Debate Skills
Cases, Evidence, and Arguments

The Whitman-Walla Walla 2 Week Camp
For Advanced, Intermediate, and Novice LD and Policy debaters who want lots of evidence and skill improvement
$800 if you register by June 1; includes instruction, all briefs, supervised housing, and three meals a day
Whitman-Walla Walla 2 Week: Sun., July 30 thru Fri., Aug. 11
Held at Whitman College in Walla Walla, Washington

The Whitman-Auburn 1 Week Camp
For Novices just starting out, and intermediate and advanced Policy and LD debaters who can’t go to major institutes
$200 if you register by June 1; includes instruction and all briefs; food and housing is not included
Whitman-Auburn 1 Week: Mon., Aug. 14 thru Fri., Aug. 19
Held at Auburn High School in Auburn, Washington, 45 minutes south of Seattle

Our Philosophy
Practice so you learn how to do it
Prepare arguments that will win
Understand and appreciate styles and theories of debate for your region and for nationally
A friendly, cooperative atmosphere while maintaining a focus on improving

Prepare for a great season!

Registering is Easy!
Send the info requested below to Jim at hansonjb@whitman.edu
Provide your name, address, phone number, email address, and your school’s name.
Tell us how many tournaments you have attended in debate and in individual events, do you want to do policy or LD debate or you’re not sure, and do you want to attend the Whitman-Walla Walla 2 Week, the Whitman-Auburn 1 Week camp, or both.
You can also mail this information to Jim Hanson; Whitman College; Walla Walla WA 99362; or fax this form to Jim at 509-527-4959

Want more information?
E-mail Jim Hanson at hansonjb@whitman.edu
www.whitman.edu/offices_departments/rhetoric/72institute.htm
FACTS ALONE ARE NOT ENOUGH: A PLEA FOR COORDINATED VOICE AND MESSAGE

by Wayne C. Mannebach

Reality over Cliche

A cliche among many coaches of debate, oratory, and other forms of public speaking occurs when they tell their students to “Research your topic and get the facts!” Some of these coaches quickly allude to Aristotle and others like him who contributed greatly to the development of rhetorical theory and criticism, and who strongly promoted the use of evidence, enthymeme, and syllogism.

A cliche resulting consciously or unconsciously among many students of the aforementioned instructors is: “Since I have researched my topic, gathered evidence, and weaved this evidence into logical arguments to support my message, I will be effective in the classroom and in tournament competition.” Coupled with the aforementioned cliche should be another one, namely: Not necessarily so!

Aristotle, for instance, did advocate research and fact-gathering, but his remarks should be treated in proper context. Aristotle also realized that external matters like voice, gestures, movements, and facial expressions have much importance because of the “defects of our hearers.” Aristotle meant that in theory public speakers should focus on inspiring their hearers to accept ideas, evidence, and logic rather than aim on entertaining their hearers through the use of vocal and visual techniques. However, as a keen observer of human behavior Aristotle realized that speaking situations don’t work by the preceding desired theory. Instead, delivery is an important instrument of persuasion, and the vocal and visual ways by which a speaker presents his or her messages do make a difference. In short, facts alone are not enough for effective communication.

In the February 2000 edition of Rosstrum, the author urged his readers not to forsake their physical ethos, namely facial expressions, movements, and gestures. The purpose of this article is to urge the readers to appreciate and employ advantageously the following principal elements of vocal delivery: quality, rate, volume, pitch, pronunciation, and articulation.

Quality Should Blend with Message

Sound always has for its source some vibrating body which produces disturbances, or waves, in some transmitting medium such as air. The waves spread through the medium and reach the ear for the hearer’s interpretation. The sounds may seem rich, pleasant, charming, or beautiful; or they may seem thin, rough, harsh, or ugly. These sounds, or colors, are a speaker’s vocal quality.

Vocal quality refers to a tone’s complexity, namely the frequency and relative intensity of certain vibrations. For instance, at a humanities concert combining Western music with ancient Japanese court music, successive tones from an oboe, saxophone, clarinet, trumpet, violin, and harp will sound different from each other. Variation in sound also will come from successive tones from a ryuteki (flute), hichiriki (short, double-reed pipe), sho (mouth organ), kakko (small, horizontal, two-headed drum), taiko (large, hanging drum), shoko (small gong), biwa (lute), koto (zither), and ko-tsuumi (shoulder drum).

Vocal quality in humans is produced by the amount and shape of the breath stream passing over the vocal cords in the larynx, or voice box, by the vibrations of the vocal cords; and by the size, shape, texture, number, and manner of coupling of the various resonance chambers, including the cavities of the throat, mouth, and nose.

For example, deep mellow, and rich voices tend to come from people whose throat muscles are appropriately relaxed. High, sharp, and squeaky voices tend to come from people whose throat muscles are tense and rigid. Dull, muffled voices tend to come from people whose throat muscles are too relaxed. Other unpleasant voices come from people with sore throats and stuffy noses. Judges and other members of the audience easily can respond negatively to a speaker whose voice is nasal, breathy, colorless, rasping, piercing, or grating.

Desire for success in the classroom or in tournament competition should be sufficient reason to develop voice quality control. However, many students of debate, forensics, and public speaking seem unaware of, or even indifferent to, the effects their voice quality has on their audience. Students who want to improve their vocal quality should learn to hear and evaluate it, and must realize that it is determined only partly by the structural limitations of their respective resonance system.

This article is not intended to correct extremely undesirable deviations of a clinical nature. A medical doctor is needed for that. Instead, this article is designed to help the readers develop awareness of vocal quality and its production. Since good quality generally means the absence of certain negative tonal characteristics, this article describes certain deviant qualities and recommends simple, yet often pragmatic, ways to control the objectionable features. This should help the readers to improve their vocal quality.

One way to improve vocal quality is to utilize listening skills. This can be accomplished, for illustration, by listening to different voice qualities on radio and television; in movies, classrooms, shopping malls, and restaurants; at work or public forums; or during play or other social gatherings. Try to identify various types that can sharpen listening skills and develop awareness of vocal factors. Personal vocal quality also can be developed by delivering speeches or reading aloud into a tape-recorded and then, with an instructor or friend, trying to identify the pleasant and unpleasant tones that are heard.

To discuss vocal qualities with exactness is difficult, because no universally accepted name exist for them. Many disagreements and contradictions occur, in this respect, among authors of textbooks on public speaking, voice and diction, acting, oral interpretation, radio and television broadcasting, and speech pathology. However, such authors recognize the important of quality differences and advocate control of quality for making voice effective. The following examples of poor quality control usually are easy to detect.
Some Inappropriate Vocal Qualities

BREATHTY vocal quality results when the vocal cords are not brought together closely enough during tone production, and when air rushing through the glottis (the space between the vocal cords) produces friction heard as a whisperlike noise in addition to the vocal cord tone. This vocal quality may be appropriate for an actress trying to appear and sound sultry, but it is inappropriate for effective public speaking!

HOARSE vocal quality is characterized by a grating, rough, sometimes husky sound heard from people with laryngitis. This quality can be caused by organic problems in the larynx. Swelling, growths, paralysis, or other organic problems can cause laryngeal malfunctions likely to produce the harshness. This quality may be appropriate for drill instructors yelling at their recruits in bootcamp, but it is inappropriate for effective public speaking!

NASAL vocal quality occurs from inadequate closure of the nasal port by the velum (the soft palate) and associated structures. It is characterized by resonance from the nasal cavities during the production of sounds normally non-nasal. This quality may be appropriate for a stereotyped villain in a movie, but it is inappropriate for effective public speaking!

STRIDENT vocal quality usually comes from strain and tenseness in the resonators during vocal production. The harsh and piercing vocal quality may be appropriate for an actor pretending to have a severe cold, but it is inappropriate for effective public speaking!

THIN vocal quality generally is flat colorless, and drab. It may be appropriate for a stereotyped nagging, forceful, and domineering wife or mistress, but it is inappropriate for effective public speaking!

Once one is aware of what vocal qualities are and what it should not be for effective oral communication, at least four steps can be taken to improve vocal quality:

LEARN TO RELAX. Tension and vocal strain cause numerous vocal problems, including vocal distortion. It is easier to achieve efficient, effective voice production by relaxing the body to a level of tension just adequate to the task at hand. Exercises to relax the muscles of the neck, shoulders, pharynx, larynx, face, and mouth can be helpful, but one should approach these exercises easily, without a feeling of urgency.

SEEK VOICE AWARENESS AND IMPROVEMENT EXERCISES. Exercises to identify different vocal qualities and to improve known negative qualities can be helpful, but practicing these exercises should be done daily and without a feeling of urgency.

WHEN NECESSARY, SEEK PROFESSIONAL HELP. If an important, undesirable vocal quality exists after trying the aforementioned drills, then professional help should be sought. One should not persist in exercises and drills that are not producing the desired result. Perhaps x-rays of nasal and nonnasal vocal production are required. Another possible need is a laryngoscopic examination to determine voice practice or medical attention. In such cases, a physician or speech pathologist should be consulted.

USE VOICE QUALITY FOR PERSONAL ADVANTAGE. Everyone who talks has voice quality characteristics, mostly unconsciously controlled. Voice quality occurs whenever talk occurs, so voice quality should be used for personal advantage. Exercises and drills prescribed, for example, by a physician, speech pathologist, speech instructor, or singing instructor, should not be wasted. Students of public speaking should note that their primary goal is to transmit their intended thoughts, and that vocal quality must coordinate with the intended thoughts. In short, voice must blend with sense!

Rate Should Blend with Message

If someone were to blow numerous soap bubbles in front of a two-year-old child, for instance, the child probably would become confused over which bubble to catch and thus would not catch any. However, if someone were to blow one bubble every two minutes in front of the same child, the latter might catch the first bubble, but likely would not be present to catch others. The child’s attention would wonder, causing the child to play elsewhere. Similarity holds true in public speaking.

If a speaker were to bombard his audience with multiple ideas rapidly delivered, many of the audience probably would be unable to discriminate among sounds, think about what was said, assimilate the messages, respond to them, or work with them. People who lack sufficient time to apprehend and comprehend a message may give up trying. In such cases effective communication is absent.

Then, too, speakers who talk too slowly tend to lull their hearers to daydream or even to sleep. Again, effective communication would not occur.

Effective public speakers talk neither too rapidly nor too slowly. Most people speak American English within a range of 130 to 180 words per minute. This does not mean that a rate of 90 words is too slow, nor that 200 words is too fast. The ultimate test of a desirable rate of speech is whether or not the audience understands the intended message.

Rate of speech depends on many factors, especially pause, phonation, occasion, subject matter, and personality.

PAUSE determines rate. Pauses are periods of silence with several functions. For illustration, pauses are normal places to breathe; breathless gaps often reflect inexperienced speakers. Pauses act as oral punctuation, serving to separate words and phrases from one another like commas do; and clarifying and strengthening their meaning like periods, question marks, and exclamation points do. Pauses serve as transitions from one thought to another, serve as attention-getting devices, and give the audience time to digest and react to what is said.

PHONATION determines rate. Phonation refers to duration or time consumed in uttering vowel and consonant sounds. Whether the rate is fast or slow, short or long, some words should be made to stand out from the context by changing their time value. Regardless of the speed or duration, phonation should adapt to the particular audience, message, mood, and the like.

OCCASION determines rate. Fast delivery usually is for gayety, eagerness, and joy as expressed, for example, at pep rallies, athletic events, and political rallies. Slow delivery usually is for reverence, solemnity, and peacefulness as expressed, for illustration, at funerals, graduation exercises, and business meetings.

SUBJECT MATTER determines rate. Subjects that are light, simple, and familiar usually are spoken at a faster rate than subjects that are deep, complicated, and unfamiliar or esoteric.

PERSONALITY determines rate. Speakers who are confident, socially-minded, ego-centric, or well prepared on their subject tend to speak faster than those who are nervous, introverted, shy, or poorly prepared on their subject.

In summary, the ultimate test of a desirable rate of speech is whether or not the audience understands the intended mes-
sage. One should speak slowly enough to be understood and fast enough to sustain audience attention. Skilled public speakers frequently modify their rate, well-placed pauses, and phonation.

Volume Should Blend with Message

Volume concerns the loudness or force of the voice. Variation in loudness occurs by increasing or decreasing the force of impact of air against the vocal cords. When the force of the impact is great, the cords become tense and elongated; vibrations occur through a greater distance called the amplitude; and a loudness occurs. As the force of the impact is lessened, the cords become relaxed and shorter; vibrations occur through a shorter distance; and a soft sound or even a whisper occurs. This can be seen by using a rubber band. Pulling the band makes the sides long and tense. When plucked in this condition, the band gives a loud noise compared with what happens when the sides of the band are released and allowed to hang loosely. So, too are the vocal cords.

Details about the levels at which sound becomes perceptible and pleasant or painful are best handled by physicians, audiologists, and engineers. However, students of public speaking should be concerned with volume, for it can capture or lose attention, give or lose emphasis, convey or destroy meaning, and transmit or smother feelings and emotions. In short, speakers who antagonize their hearers by talking too loudly, too softly, or with monotonous volume should not expect to be effective communicators. Speakers must change their volume according to degree and form.

DEGREE of volume refers to variations in the amount of energy applied in speaking. Volume can vary from a shout to a whisper. Of course, the meaning of the message should dictate the degree of volume. Some speakers are fortunate to perform in rooms with excellent acoustical design and high-quality, properly-working microphones. Other speakers must perform in rooms with poor acoustical design, improperly-working microphones, and numerous distracting noises coming from the surrounding area, like noises from lawn mowers or construction jackhammers. Whatever the situation, speakers must adapt their volume to the environment; speakers must be clearly heard by the audience.

FORM of volume refers to the ways by which force is applied. Some instructors categorize form into the explosive, expulsive, and effusive.

EXPLOSIVE FORM is applied abruptly like when a coach shouts an order from the bench to his players on the field.

EXPULSIVE FORM is applied in normal conversation.

EFFUSIVE FORM is applied gradually, resulting in a draw-out tone which indicates control but also sentiment, contemplation, or even grandeur.

Perhaps the most universally known forms of volume are accent, stress, and emphasis.

ACCENT refers to vocal power applied to syllables within a particular word. It is often used to distinguish words spelled the same but different in meaning. Consider, for instance, how the syllabic stress in the following pairs of words changes the meaning of the words:

ADDRess - addRess
(What is the ADDRess of the person about to addRess the audience?)

COMbat - combAT
(If we must enter COMbat, then I will combAT to the death of one of us.)

conTent - conTent
(Are you conTent over the conTent of the chapter?)

conTRACT - CONtract
(Did you see his fact conTRACT when he read his new CONtract?)

CONflict - conFLICT
(If there is another CONflict, will your heritage conFLICT with your loyalty?)

defECT - DEfect
(I shall deFECT from your team, if you have one more DEfect in your plan).

preSENT - preSENT
(Please come forward to preSENT the preSENT to Mrs. Winthrop.)

PROject - proJECT
(This PROject should proJECT your image move favorably.)

OBJECT - obJECT
(The OBJECT of this exercise is to learn how to obJECT more strongly.)

REcord - reCORD
(The REcord department has no secretory to reCORD inventory.)

Usually nouns and adjectives receive primary accent on the first syllable, and verbs receive accent on the second syllable.

STRESS refers to vocal power applied to words. Stress makes certain words stand out from other words in a sentence, thus strengthening the meaning of the specific message. Usually stress is applied to action words, idea words, and picture words; rarely is it applied to connective or structural words. Abraham Lincoln's "of, by, and for the people" is a notable exception to general usage.

Consider, for illustration, the sentence, "Marge was determined to win the automobile." Notice how stress on a particular words changes the meaning of the sentence:

(1) MARGE was determined to win the automobile.

(2) Marge WAS determined to win the automobile.

(3) Marge was DETERMINED to win the automobile.

(4) Marge was determined to WIN the automobile.

(5) Marge was determined to win THE automobile.

(6) Marge was determined to win the AUTOMOBILE.

The first sentence implies that Marge alone was determined to win the automobile. The second sentence implies that Marge was but no longer is determined to win the automobile. The third sentence stresses Marge's attitude. The fourth sentence focuses on Marge's method for winning. The fifth sentence implies Marge was after the best automobile. The last sentence identifies the object of Marge's determination. Indeed, stress does determine meaning.

EMPHASIS refers to vocal power applied to units longer than syllables and words. For example, read aloud the following statements and emphasize volume when reading the capitalized parts. Notice how volume strengthens the meaning.

*To err is human, TO FORGIVE DI-VINE.

*The man who saves money nowadays isn't a miser, HE'S A WIZARD!

*It should be EASY to make an honest living, for FEW PEOPLE pursue it.

*Before marriage, a man YEARNS for a woman. After marriage the Y is SILENT.

*When a man says, "I run things in my home," he means the LAWN MOWER.

*It is very difficult to stand prosperity, ESPECIALLY YOUR NEIGHBORS'.

*One advantage of being stupid is that you NEVER GET LONELY.

*If a man wants his dreams to come true, then he MUST WAKE UP.

*Give EVERY man your EAR, but FEW your VOICE.

*Cruelty is FED, not WEAKENED by
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tions.

Whether it be accent on syllables, or stress on words, or emphasis on phrases or larger units of syntax, every form of volume must coordinate with the intended thoughts, or communication effectiveness cannot occur.

RECOMMENDATIONS. Prior to presenting your speech, try to visit the place where you will be speaking. Take along a friend and have him or her sit in various places while you practice your address. Make sure that your friend can hear you clearly from different locations. If certain places have poor acoustics, then try to adapt to those places while speaking.

Prior to speaking, also try to discover what distractions you will confront during your address. For instance, if heavy construction or lawn mowing is occurring outside your speech setting, then combat such distractions by increasing your volume. Such advice may seem like a "no brainer," but not surprisingly many people fail to employ sufficient volume in such circumstances, thus causing communication breakdown.

Before using a microphone, be sure that everything is working properly. Also remember not to shout into the microphone.

If you have a voice that usually falls below a level adequate for effective communication, then seek instruction for breathing and phrasing exercises. Often the voices that is inadequately loud gets trapped in the speaker's mouth and fails to find its way to the hearers. In other words, the speaker fails to open the mouth wide enough, so oral inactivity or failure to project is the problem.

In summary, the strength of the signal must be above the threshold of the receiver. The speaker must be loud enough to be heard by the receiver, and louder than environmental noises. Signal strength, (volume and intelligibility (understanding the message) have a close relationship.

Pitch Should Blend with Message

Pitch basically is the position of a sound on a musical scale, and it is determined by how fast the vocal cords vibrate per second. For example, a sound having 256 cycles per second is called Middle C. A tone one octave higher is produced by 512 cycles per second. Most people have a usable pitch range of two octaves, but few use this range effectively.

As a person matures, pitch usually follows a downward course. At maturity the voice is pitched at a lower range than that of an immature voice. Thus, grade school children usually have pitches higher than those of high school students, and the latter often have pitches higher than college students. Also, men's voices, because of the length and thickness of the vocal cords, usually are lower in pitch than those of women's voices. An appropriate pitch for either sex is that which produces the most resonant tone.

Meaningful communication demands variation in pitch, and the latter comes about primarily in three ways. The STEP is a distinct change that goes either up or down. The SLIDE, sometimes called inflection, is a change which starts gradually and continues in the upward or downward direction in which it started. The DOUBLE SLIDE, sometimes called the circumflex, involves two slides with a change of direction. Raising pitch patterns usually suggest indecision, uncertainty, incomplete thought, suspense, or a question. Downward pitch patterns usually suggest decisiveness, resolution, finality, confidence, or annoyance.

The relationship of the above changes in pitch must vary and adapt to the intended thoughts and language used. If variety of pitch does not occur, then a mechanical pattern develops, resulting in a sing-song pattern or a chant-like monotone.

The causes of vocal inflexibility include, for example, temporary illness, poor health in general, functional problems, emotional upset, hearing loss, or poor ear training. Whether the cause of the deadening effect on pitch is temporary or long-ranged, the important factor is that a limited range makes a dull delivery, and the latter does not produce communicative effectiveness.

It is unlikely that occasionally in your speech you can simply insert various pitch changes. Instead, you must discover the pitch changes you possess and then study how to improve them in value and number. Perhaps the simplest way to do this is to record your voice while delivering a speech and while engaging in normal conversation. Compare the two recordings, note how they differ, and then try to adopt for your public speaking the best elements of your conversational pattern. Also try to determine how you can strengthen your intended thoughts by using a wider range within the pattern you established.

Pronunciation Should Blend with Message

Like most respected leaders in society, public speakers are expected to use pronunciation that meets the standards of well educated people. Pronunciation means choice in uttering sounds and stressing words in such a way that the words do not call attention to themselves. For instance, a speaker would employ incorrect usage by pronouncing salad as saLAD, Chevrolet as ChevRolet, tomato as ToMaTo, basketball as basKeTball, and transportation as transPORtation. Therefore, it is advisable to rephrase the proper pronunciation of one's message. Standard references of pronunciation are mandatory for communication effectiveness.

One should be especially careful not to pronounce the following frequently used words: just, can, get, been, to, many, hundred, something and for. Too often the words are pronounced jist, kin, git, bin, ta, miny, hunerd, sompin, and fer. Such pronunciation makes the speaker appear slovenly or ignorant of appropriate usage, and either image prevents effective communication.

Articulation Should Blend with Message

Whereas pronunciation essentially involves human choice as to the ways sounds are uttered and words stressed, articulation involves capacity or ability to produce sounds. To understand the important of articulation, it is necessary to review how the speech mechanism works.

The first step for producing speech is the breath stream or power mechanism. The primary biological function of breathing is to take oxygen and release carbon dioxide. Speech formation begins with the escaping air.

The second step for producing speech is phonation. The breath stream produces a controlled column of moving air that furnishes the power for speech. During exhalation, the escaping air passes through the throat and larynx. When the air passes over the vocal cords in the larynx, the cords assume various positions. When the cords are in a wide position, the air can escape with no significant noise. The cords can also take a partially closed position, thus causing friction noises characteristic of whispering. The cords can go into a very rapid motion, causing the space (glottis) between them to open and close alternately. When this happens, the air column is allowed to escape in the rhythmical puffs of air that produce the sound waves of typical speech. Finally, the vocal cords can go into
a closed position, completely stopping the passage of air and thus forming the glottal stop, so typical of a Scotsman's speech.

Once the vocal cords flutter and cause sound to develop, the sound waves in the breath stream bounce against different sounding boards and enter various chambers. This stage is called resonance and produces voice quality. Sounding boards include the chest walls, bones in the head, and the hard palate (alveolar ridge). Chambers include the throat, mouth, and nose. Before the sound waves and their quality escape from the body, they are shaped into various forms. The latter is the fourth state, namely articulation.

The articulators act as valves or valve contacts for the interruption of the breath stream by complete stoppage, or by constriction of the passage. The major articulators of the human voice are the soft (velum) and hard palates, lower jaw, teeth, lips, various parts of the tongue, and the opening and closing of the vocal cords.

To appreciate the value of the articulators, slowly recite the following words and feel which articulators are involved in the formation of the capitalized sounds. The following words represent the major sounds of American English. Each line stresses a single sound. (Refer to the middle column)

RECOMMENDATIONS. Most people are capable of producing the primary sounds of American English, but careless habits develop when attention is not devoted to articulation. When practicing for a speech, it may help to request someone to sit in the farthest seat from the rostrum, if possible, and check for articulatory effectiveness. One can also listen to oneself via a tape recorder, video recorder, and the like.

Another exercise for good articulation is to abandon phonation when practicing a speech. This is the act of whispering so that the vocal cords are not vibrating and producing sounds. Without phonation, the speaker can concentrate on clearly enunciating the vowels and consonants to increase intelligibility.

Probably the most effective method is to invite someone formally trained in speech to analyze one’s vocal characteristics.

The Educational Trinity - a Closing Remark

The Attic orator Isocrates clearly identified the educational trilogy of theory, followed by criticism, followed by professional, constructive criticism. The theory

Wayne C. Mannebach
(Wayne Mannebach directed debate and forensics at Ripon College for nine years, and for the past twenty-five years he has taught English at St. Mary Central High School in Neenah, WI.)
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Policy Debate Division: The SSFI Policy debate program is designed for students entering their first or second year of debate. Experienced coaches stress the fundamentals of debate. At the end of the institute, each student will have participated in writing an affirmative case, writing a disadvantage and a kritik, and taken part in at least eight practice debates. First year students learn how to flow and cover the fundamentals of debate. As of 1 January, policy debate labs will be directed by Michael Janas, Ph.D. (Samford University), Ben Coulter, MA (Samford University), David O’Connor, BA (Iowa City West High School), Thom O’Rourke, MA (University School, TN) and Heidi Hamilton, Ph.D. (Augustana College, IL).

Lincoln-Douglas Debate Division: Samford hosts one of the longest-running Lincoln-Douglas workshops in the nation. The program is designed for students who are in their first or second year of debate and acts as a complimentary program to the University of Iowa Summer Institute. In addition to providing a primer on the basics of moral and political philosophy, the L-D institute also seeks to develop fundamental skills such as flowing, briefing and casing. The Lincoln-Douglas workshop is directed by Marilee Dukes (Vestavia Hills H.S., AL), Pat Bailey (Homewood H.S., AL) and Claire Carmen (Episcopal H.S., TX).

Teacher’s Institute: This year we are pleased to add a teacher’s institute to our offerings. Designed for new teachers or those that find themselves in charge of a program for the first time, successful long-time coach Skip Coulter (Mountain Brook Jr. H.S. and Samford University) will conduct a workshop on the fundamentals of debate coaching. While we cannot promise to make you a champion coach in your first year, we can help orient you to the bewildering world of high school forensics and make you feel confident as you enter the forensics classroom for the first time.

Cost: $925.00. Includes all room, board, tuition and group copying fees. Housing is in air conditioned, double-occupancy Samford dormitories. Classes are held on the Samford campus and dining is in the Samford cafeteria. There are no additional lab fees. Dormitories are directed by William Tate (Montgomery Bell Academy, TN). Financial aid is available for students with demonstrated need.
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Birmingham, AL 35229
(205) 726-2509
mjjanas@samford.edu
The Scholars Program at the Emory National Debate Institute
June 18 - July 1, 2000 • 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 experienced 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 receive 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 Maxcy 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
Under the Direction of David Heidt

Advanced curriculum: Every aspect of the Scholars Program has been redesigned 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 1:4 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-rated 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 tailored 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 David Heidt, past winner of the National Debate Tournament and coach of numerous national collegiate champions at Emory over the past several years. Assistant Directors will include Kristin Dybvig and Stephen Bailey. Kristin is the coach at Arizona State University, where she was a nationally ranked debater, and has coached teams into the elimination rounds of national championship tournaments. Stephen Bailey, a veteran instructor of the Emory and Michigan Institutes, set a national college record last year when he compiled the second best win-loss record in the country as a sophomore. The rest of the Scholars faculty has been selected from among the ENDI’s staff of accomplished college debaters and coaches.

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 discount price!

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

Melissa Maxcy Wade
P.O. Drawer U, Emory University • Atlanta, GA 30322
Phone: (404) 727-6189 • email: lobrien@emory.edu • FAX: (404) 727-5367
Barkley Forum • Emory National Debate Institute
June 18 – July 1, 2000 • 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-five 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 year after year. Novice, mid-level, and varsity competitors 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 this Institute and many others, including: American University, Bates College, Baylor University, Berkeley, Dartmouth College, Georgetown University, University of Iowa, University of Kentucky, Northwestern University, University of Michigan, Wake Forest University, Samford University, and Stanford University.

Excellent staff-to-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 levels of experience. Each laboratory group has explicit objectives and a field 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 many 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 is conducted. Topics will include administration, organization, and coaching strategies. A full set of lectures appropriate for the classroom will be developed.

Inclusive Fees: The standard Institute fee includes tuition, housing, food, lab photocopying fees, entertainment, a t-shirt, 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 in the activity for over twenty years, and has served in his current position for eight years. Other staff members include an array of the finest college coaches, as well as some of the top college debaters in the nation.

Excellent staff-to-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 levels of experience. Our classes deal both with general philosophical issues and practical technique. There is a strong emphasis in lab groups on building speaking experience and providing constructive critique. 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 many 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, food, lab photocopying fees, entertainment, and a t-shirt—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: jlobrien@emory.edu • FAX: (404) 727-5367
HARD TO BELIEVE THEY ACTUALLY CALL THOSE THINGS DEBATES!
LET'S PUT “DEBATE” INTO PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES

by William L. Benoit

Presidential debates come in all shapes and sizes. The presence and length of opening statements and closing remarks, the opportunity and length of rebuttal, the nature of the questioner, and other factors have created a bewildering variety of formats. However, most scholars agree that these confrontations are not “really” debates but merely “joint press conferences.” This observation raises the question of whether presidential debates should be more like traditional debates. I propose six modifications in political debates based on five important principles (campaign discourse should: inform voters, address topics that matter to voters, encourage candidates to distinguish themselves from competitors, facilitate “cost-benefit” analysis by voters by emphasizing clash, and address primarily policy topics but also character). These improvements are designed to improve the ability of this important form of communication to better inform voters.

Scholars have deliberated about whether we should consider presidential debates to be genuine “debates” (Bitzer & Rueter, 1980; Carlin, 1989; Weiler, 1989). Auer (1962) characterized these encounters as counterfeit debates and as “a double public press conference for simultaneous interviewing” (p. 147). Jamieson and Birdsell coined the phrase “joint press conference” to describe presidential debates (1988, p. 6). Zarefsky made explicit the argument that presidential debates do not live up to their potential:

Debates have great potential for focusing the audience’s attention, for identifying issues, and for inviting deliberation. Sadly, however, this potential is largely unrealized. The [presidential] debates have been formatted for television — the confrontation with reporter-questioners adds dramatic conflict and the short time limits respond to audience’s limited attention span. But these same conventions thwart sustained discussion of serious issues; they encourage one-liners and canned minispeeches. (1992, p. 412)

I believe that the artificial format of presidential debates, which makes them “joint press conferences” rather than true debates, is flawed. I will first argue for the importance of presidential debates, then articulate five principles for presidential debates, and finally use those principles to develop six specific suggestions for improving the format of presidential debates.

Importance of Presidential Debates

Political debates are important for three reasons. First, they give viewers an opportunity to see the principal contenders for office, meeting eye to eye, treating the same topics (Hellweg, Pfau, & Brydon, 1992). Jamieson (1987) explains that “As messages running an hour or longer, debates offer a level of contact with candidates clearly unmatched in spot ads and news segments. . . . The debates offer the most extensive and serious view of the candidates available to the electorate” (p. 28).

Voters have the opportunity to compare the candidates in a relatively extended period of time in a political debate.

Second, viewers can obtain a somewhat less contrived impression of the candidates from debates than from other forms of campaign messages. While candidates do prepare for the debates, they cannot anticipate every question from the panelists, moderators, or audience members or every remark from an opponent. Furthermore, unlike speeches or TV spots with scripts, candidates are not usually permitted to bring notes to debates. Thus, voters may obtain a somewhat more spontaneous and accurate view of the candidates in debates.

Finally, political debates routinely attract the largest audience of any campaign message form (Jamieson & Birdsell, 1988). For example, in 1964, for example, no message by either Johnson or Goldwater was seen by even a quarter of the audience that watched the first 1960 Kennedy-Nixon debates. (p. 122). Carlin develops a detailed argument about the size of the audience for presidential debates:

Nielson (1993) reported that the second presidential debate in 1992 attracted 43.1 million television households or 69.9 million viewers . . . (p. 4). Those numbers contrast sharply to the 4.1 million homes or 20.5 million viewers who tuned in for each of the major party conventions (p. 1). In 1980, nearly 81 million people watched Ronald Reagan and Jimmy Carter in their only debate encounter (p. 4). Miller and MacKuen (1979) noted that 90% of the adult population watched at least one of the Kennedy-Nixon debates, and 83% watched at least one Ford-Carter match-up. These numbers compared favorably to 73 percent who read the news in the paper, 4 percent who read magazines, and 45 percent who listened to radio reports. (1994, pp. 6-7)

The large size of the audience for presidential debates means that opportunity for influence from these campaign messages is substantial.

Is this potential for influence realized? Hellweg, Pfau, and Brydon concluded that “most studies suggest debate viewing contributes to considerable learning about the candidates and their positions” (1992, pp. 106-107). Research has found that presidential debates can influence many voters. Middleton (1962) indicated that the 1960 Nixon-Kennedy debates were “extremely important” for the voting decision of one out of eight voters. Roper (1960) reported that 4 million viewers changed their voting intention on the basis of the 1960 Kennedy-Nixon debates. Debates may also affect the outcome of elections. Wayne asserted that “Kennedy and Carter might not have won without the debates” (1992, p. 229). Kelley (1983) indicated that about one-fifth of voters reported that they had decided how to vote after watching the Carter-Reagan debate. Kirk, reported that “focus groups and exit polls told us that more people based their decision in 1992 on the debates than any other single means of information throughout the course of the campaign” (1995). So, research strongly suggests that presidential debates can influence voters and election outcomes.

However, Jamieson and Birdsell (1988) asserted that “debates don’t very often convert partisans on one side to the other.”
While this statement is true, debates can influence elections without converting partisans, by persuading undecided voters to favor one candidate (Carlin, 1994; Pfau & Kang, 1991). Zakahi and Hacker (1995) provided concrete evidence on the margin of victory in several elections:

In 1960, John Kennedy beat Richard Nixon by about 100,000 popular votes. This is a fraction of a percentage (0.2%) of the total vote. In 1968, Nixon defeated Hubert Humphrey by 500,000 votes (0.7%). In 1976, Jimmy Carter won by less than 2% of the popular vote. Polls in late September of 1976 showed an unusually large number of undecided voters (Reinhold, 1976). In 1980, Ronald Reagan beat Carter by less than 10% of the popular vote, yet two debates) ought to inform voters. Voters are the ones who choose the president. The essence of democracy is for voters to select who will represent them in their government. This means that campaigns should be designed to encourage candidates to provide voters with information on which to base their voting decisions.

Second, campaign discourse should inform voters about issues that matter to voters. It would be a waste of time for two candidates to wax eloquent about foreign policy toward Albania if no one in the electorate cares about Albania. On the other hand, if voters care passionately about public education, candidates can help them make their voting decision by discussing education. I don’t mean to imply that candidates should not be allowed to try to influence what the public believes are key issues; my point is that campaign discourse should not ignore the issues that matter to the public and it should not dwell on topics voters consider inconsequential.

Third, campaign discourse should highlight the differences between candidates. By definition, voting is a comparative act: Citizens vote for the candidate who appears to be the better choice. One cannot choose between two (or more) candidates who seem to be the same. The only possible basis for choosing between candidates are differences, or contrasts, between them. Thus, debates should encourage candidates to display the differences that will allow voters to choose who is likely to be the better office-holder.

A fourth general principle emerges from this conception of voting as choosing the better candidate. For voting decisions to best resemble cost-benefit analysis, campaign discourse should encourage clash (acclamations, attacks, and defenses). Acclamations tell voters of the candidate’s (alleged) benefits. Attacks tell voters of an opponent’s (alleged) costs. Defenses refute alleged costs. Together, these three discourse functions can help voters decide who is probably the better office-holder (see, Benoit, 1999; Benoit, Blaney, & Pier, 1998; Benoit, Blaney, & Pier, 2000; Benoit & Hardock, 1999, Benoit, Wells, Pier, & Benoit, 1999). Of course, attacks (and other utterances as well) should not distort the record. The main point is that only with attack and defense, as well as acclamations, can voters get desirable clash.

Fifth, campaign discourse should address both policy and character topics, but focus more on policy. Political office holders create or implement governmental policy. Of course, there are limits to what any given political office holders can accomplish. Even presidents have limitations on their ability to create and carry out policy.

Table 1. Most Important Vote Determinant: Policy or Character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaign</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Poll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>NBC/Wall Street Journal, 10/19-22/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>143%*</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Harris Poll, 11/3/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>USA Today, 12/30-1/1/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>LA Times, 2/4-9/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>LA Times, 10/5-9/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>CBS/New York Times, 10/24-27/76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents were allowed to pick the two most important factors in this poll.

"Don’t know" and "unsure" responses also occurred.

All polls obtained from Lexis/Nexis Academic Universe on-line.

weeks before the election, 25% of the voters were undecided. (p. 100)

The number of voters who are neither Republicans nor Democrats has increased substantially: The proportion of independents has risen from 22.6% in 1952 to 38.0% in 1992 (Weisberg & Kimball, 1993). Neither political party enjoys a majority of citizens, so it is not possible to win the presidency without persuading millions of these voters. Thus, presidential debates need not influence committed partisans to influence the outcome of the election, because the number of citizens who are not committed to the two major parties is quite large. Thus, presidential debates clearly merit attention.

Principles for Better Campaign Discourse

I will articulate four principles that inform my suggestions for improving the format of presidential debates. First, campaign discourse (including presidential should not ignore the issues that matter to the public and it should not dwell on topics voters consider inconsequential.
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Fifth, campaign discourse should address both policy and character topics, but focus more on policy. Political office holders create or implement governmental policy. Of course, there are limits to what any given political office holders can accomplish. Even presidents have limitations on their ability to create and carry out policy.
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weeks before the election, 25% of the voters were undecided. (p. 100)

The number of voters who are neither Republicans nor Democrats has increased substantially: The proportion of independents has risen from 22.6% in 1952 to 38.0% in 1992 (Weisberg & Kimball, 1993). Neither political party enjoys a majority of citizens, so it is not possible to win the presidency without persuading millions of these voters. Thus, presidential debates need not influence committed partisans to influence the outcome of the election, because the number of citizens who are not committed to the two major parties is quite large. Thus, presidential debates clearly merit attention.

Principles for Better Campaign Discourse

I will articulate four principles that inform my suggestions for improving the format of presidential debates. First, campaign discourse (including presidential
he or she will deal with unanticipated crises or opportunities in appropriate ways. Thus, I believe debates ought to focus primarily on policy and but also address character concerns (although not private personal details).

Suggestions for an Improved Debate Format

I will advance six specific suggestions for improving the format of presidential debates. They do not all need to be implemented together, which is important because candidates and their campaign advisors may well resist some suggestions more than others.

- (1) Debates should focus on a single topic.

Within reason, the more narrow the topic of debate the better (domestic issues, for example, should be considered too broad). It is unrealistic to expect candidates to be prepared to address thoughtfully, in an extemporaneous debate, any conceivable topic. When the topics are not restricted, that inevitably has the effect of encouraging the candidates to prepare superficially for many topics. When topics are restricted, candidates have the opportunity to prepare more thoroughly and to do a better job of informing the electorate. Of course, candidates may object about the narrowing of topics (for example, it seems possible that in 1996 Clinton would have benefitted more from a debate on education than Dole). Choosing narrower topics for presidential debates is likely to improve the information available to voters on those topics, and the clash that ensues from the candidates.

- (2) Debates should feature as topics the issues most important to voters.

Debate topics should not be chosen at random (or by the whims of journalists). Instead, I propose that the topics of presidential debates should be chosen that reflect the issues most important to voters. How better to inform voters than encouraging candidates to address the issues that matter most to voters? This can give voters a choice when they learn more about the topic(s) that are most important to them.

- (3) Debates should encourage clash between the candidates.

Candidates should be given the opportunity to make statements (in alternating order), to refute their opponents’ positions, and to defend their own positions. Clash, in which we hear both of the candidates refute and defend, is important for voters to be able to distinguish between the candidates. In March of 1996, the New York Times quipped that the Clinton-Dole race would pit the “center against the middle” (Toner, 1996, p. 4.3). Obviously, one candidate can only be better than an opponent if there is a difference between those candidates. For voters to be able to exercise meaningful choice, they must know the differences between the candidates. This means the debate format should not discourage attacks (although it should discourage inappropriate attacks). Direct clash will highlight contrasts between candidates, making it easier for voters to see the differences between them and facilitating their voting choice.

- (4) Questions, when they are used, should come from voters, not journalists.

Journalists should report the news, not create it. I think it would be difficult for a journalist to retain his or her objectivity when faced with the opportunity to “get” a candidate (of course, no one can be completely objective, so it would be better to say that the opportunity to question candidates may exacerbate this inherent subjectivity). Furthermore, given that debates are staged to help voters decide between the candidates, it makes more sense to use questions from voters as prompts for candidate statements. This procedure will make it more likely that debates will focus on the issues that matter most to voters.

- (5) Candidates should be permitted to question one another.

Candidates who are well-prepared will know the places where their opponents are most vulnerable. This will facilitate clash among the candidates. Skillful questioning has the potential to pin down elusive rhetors (although it, like other forms of discourse, can be abused). Thus, it can help give the electorate information about the candidates and differences in their positions that might not emerge without questions.

- (6) Debates should have a limited number of participants.

One of the problems I see with primary debates (especially early in the campaign) is that they often feature as many as nine candidates. For example, in 1996, ten candidates (Alexander, Buchanan, Dole, Dornan, Forbes, Gramm, Keyes, Lugar, Specter, and Taylor) participated in one or more presidential primary debates. We cannot expect voters to be able to contrast that many candidates at once (especially if the debate has no restriction on topics). This is a clear example of information overload. We must balance competing interests here: the more candidates who participate, the more choices given to the electorate; the more candidates, the more difficult it is for voters to compare them all. I would rather see two or three debates among three or four candidates than one debate with nine candidates. Note that voters would have a choice about which debates (with which candidates) to watch. This procedure will facilitate voter learning about candidates.

Conclusion

Together, these changes will probably improve the quality of presidential debates. Debates ought to inform the voters, treat topics that matter to voters, highlight the differences between candidates, and encourage clash on issues of policy and character. These changes ought to result in a better informed electorate and better voting decisions. Of course, these changes need not all be adopted for political debate to see an improvement -- and surely some of these suggestions would be more palatable to candidates and their advisors than others. Any one, or any group, of these changes could improve the quality of presidential debates.

Some people may not be aware that primary debates have a longer history than general debates (Davis, 1997). The first primary debate featured Thomas Dewey and Harold Stassen in 1948. Kennedy warmed up for the Nixon-Kennedy debates by contesting Humphrey in a primary debate. I find it ironic that these debates employed, arguably, superior formats. Dewey and Stassen debated a topic (that communism should be outlawed in the United States) and featured constructives and rebuttals with no questions. Kennedy and Humphrey had constructives and rebuttals. While they did have questions, they had been submitted by citizens rather than reporters. It is unfortunate that we strayed from our roots into the formats used today. These early experiments, which enacted some of the ideas championed here, demonstrate that these suggestions are viable.

(William L. Benoit (Ph.D., Wayne State University, 1979) is a Professor of Communication at the University of Missouri. With William T. Wells, he wrote Candidates in Conflict: Persuasive Attack and Defense in the 1992 Presidential Debates. With Allison Hartcock, he analyzed the 1960 Nixon-Kennedy debates in Communication Monographs. He competed in debate and individual events at Ball State University and served as Director of Forensics at Bowling Green State University from 1980-1984.)
A Tribute to Kenneth M. Sharp

(Kenneth M. Sharp, 82, of Comanche (OK) died Sunday, February 6, 2000.
Mr. Sharp was a longtime, outstanding speech and drama coach and English teacher at Comanche HS (OK)

It is unlikely that many of you knew Ken Sharp. Mr. Sharp was my high school speech coach. To my knowledge, he qualified one student for the NFL Nationals in his career, and it wasn’t me. Comanche is a small school and competes in the small school classification in Oklahoma. He had a number of state champions during his tenure but more importantly he changed hundreds of lives. Ken Sharp was a missionary for the National Forensic League. While he never achieved national academic celebrity status, he made important contributions as a disciple of forensics.

The door to his room represented one of the few exits from the farms and oil fields of rural Oklahoma. During my years there, (1972-1976) a large percentage of college bound students came from his program. Several of his students went on to debate in college and a good percentage of them became coaches. He brought global vision to a small town. It was a mission and a focus that I could never hope to replicate. Unless you were raised in a small town, you could never understand the strength of forces that keeps people there.

More than anything else, Ken Sharp was about excellence, and he proved daily that high standards can motivate people to achieve more than they might imagine. He deftly juggled the perceptual conflict between liberal education and local values. He taught parents as well as students.

As with most coaches, Mr. Sharp’s lessons extended well beyond the classroom. He was an example of class and grace to the entire student body. He was firm and unremitting in his expectations. We knew what he expected from us, and we worked very hard not to disappoint him. In a world where poverty was common, every student on the squad competed in dress clothes. I guess I should have known that he was the secret source of ties, jackets and dresses for those who couldn’t afford them, but I never thought much about it then.

I suspect that there are and have been thousands of Ken Sharp’s in America. Coaches who will never hold the H. B. Mitchell Trophy or qualify for the NFL Hall of Fame. Coaches who go about their business every day making the world a better place by exposing students to the educational miracle of forensics. He was a fine man, and I thought you should know a little more about him. Thank you Mr. Sharp!

[David Baker coaches at The St. Mark’s School of Texas. His team was national debate champion in 1990 and national runner-up in 1987 and 1992]
The comeback is complete! Our first year back was a resounding success. We expect this year to be even better, led by our popular LD debate line, the expansion of our extemp line, and the introduction of our new policy line.

Lincoln-Douglas Debate

NFL Topic Series ($18). For each topic, a 80+ page book, featuring 3-5 overviews, including one for novices.

How To LD Book ($15). Now a classic beginner text.


Exttemp Materials

How To Exttemp ($15). For Novice and Intermediate.

✓ NEW!!! Advanced Exttemping by Chris Kristofco ($20 Avail. 6/2000). This book by Chris, a two-time College Nat'l Champ and Ass. Dir. of Forensics at Loyola Blakefield, reveals the strategies and techniques necessary for any experienced extemper who wants to be a champion.

✓ NEW!!! U.S. and Foreign Exttemp Briefs ($25 each. Avail. 9/2000). Two unique handbooks (one for U.S. and one for foreign) designed to provide background and historical information that extempers can use to buttress their knowledge of current events. By teaching extempers about certain areas, the goal is to deepen the level of understanding to enable a more insightful analysis of current news. Each book has approx. 10 chapters written by former champions covering topic areas such as the economy for US Exttemp and Russia for Foreign Exttemp.

It's all about the staff...

At Victory Briefs, we are obsessed with the quality of our products. We define “quality” in terms of our overarching purpose – which is to teach high school students to think, to analyze, and to learn... We have been successful in large part because of our staff who embody those very values.

- Steve Davis 1999 National LD Champion
- Ann Miura 1994 TOC Champion
- Jay Steed 1992 National LD Champion
- Thomas Marlowe 1991 National LD Champion
- Beth O'Connor 1999 CFL National LD Champion
- Anita Wu 1999 NFL LD 4th place
- Ben Silbermann 1999 NFL LD 5th place
- also, Paul Gravely, Eric Melin, Michael Ososky, Jon Gegenheimer, Eric Beebohum, Eric Pai, Jason Ciarochi, Tammy Jih, and more...

And for extemp...

- Jay Cox 1999 Exttemp Natl Final Round Champion
- Chad Ho 1990 Exttemp Natl Champion
- Chris Kristofco Two-time College Nat'l Champion
- Ravi Belani Three-time NFL Top 10 Exttemp

If you’re graduating and would like to become a part of Victory Briefs, contact us at info@victorybriefs.com!

Going to Nationals in Portland? You can order the LD topic handbook for Nationals online for instant download at www.victorybriefs.com.

All of our materials are available in electronic format for instant download and delivery. For those of you who prefer paper, hardcopies are available as well (with an extra charge to cover printing and shipping). The electronic versions are PDF files, which can be read on any computer with a free Adobe Acrobat Reader (see www.adobe.com).

For more information, you can write: Victory Briefs, 1144 Yale St., #3, Santa Monica, CA 90403. Email info@victorybriefs.com Fax: (208) 248-9801.
Victory Briefs Policy

Victory Briefs has teamed up with some of the best policy debaters in the past few years to bring you the best policy materials you can buy for the coming school year.

- Caitlin Talmadge While at Greenhill H.S. in Texas, she was the 1998 NFL Policy Debate Champion and two-time Texas State Champion. She was the runner-up at the 1998 TOC. She also won the Barkley Forum and the Glenbrook Round Robin. Currently at Harvard, she now enjoys working as an assistant coach at Lexington High School in Lexington, MA.

- Andrew Bradt Andrew was also the 1998 NFL Policy Debate Champion and TFA State Champion. During his senior year, Andrew also won the Harvard Round Robin, the Mid-America Cup, and the Barkley Forum, and finished second at the 1998 TOC. Currently pursuing an honors degree at Harvard, Andrew is splitting his assistant coaching duties between Lexington (MA) and Highland Park (TX).

- Todd Fine Also at Harvard, Todd debated at Woodward Academy in GA and Glenbrook South, IL. Todd was the 1998 TOC Champion, the 1999 Barkley Forum Winner, and Georgia All-State Champion.

- Jeff Rosenfeld Four-time state champion for Pace Academy in Atlanta, Georgia. Jeff is currently studying international relations at Harvard. When he grows up, he either wants to be a fireman or a cowboy.

- Arsalan Suleman Currently attending Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service, Arsalan graduated from Jesuit H.S., New Orleans (LA). A two-time state champion and two-time TOC participant.

NEW!!! How-To Policy Debate by Caitlin Talmadge and Andrew Bradt ($35 Avail. 6/2000). Bradt and Talmadge are back! A good comprehensive how-to has not been written in at least ten years. This book is by far the most up-to-date book on the subject. Drawing upon their coaching experience, their institute teaching, and their 1998 National Championship, Bradt and Talmadge have written a book for coaches and students alike, beginners and champions, persuasive and national-circuit styles. The book covers the basics, paradigms, disads, counter-plans, permutations, topicality, the kritik, speech strategies, research and writing, and much much more.

NEW!!! The Victory Briefs Privacy Handbook ($50 Avail. 6/2000). The most important resource for next year's topic. Unlike most companies (who just blindly collect "cards"), Victory Briefs has always been about quality (with a focus on education) and not mere quantity. This translates into an outstanding 300+ page policy handbook: including a Novice Section (how do you do this?), How to Research, The State of Privacy Law in the United States, fully-evidenced affirmatives for each of the topic areas, and core negative strategies and positions.
www.victorybriefs.com
2000-2001 Season

Name: ____________________________
Address: ____________________________
High School: ____________________________
Phone: ____________________________
Email: ____________________________

**Choose Download or Hardcopy or Both.** Victory Briefs offers the unique option to download our books from the internet, in addition to the traditional hardcopy mailing. We encourage the download option as an opportunity for quicker receipt of materials while saving money. Instructions to download can be found at our website www.victorybriefs.com.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Policy Debate</strong></th>
<th>Qty. Download</th>
<th>Qty. Hardcopy</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Handbook new</td>
<td>(Total ___ x $50)</td>
<td>(Total ___ x $57)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How To Policy Debate new</td>
<td>(Total ___ x $35)</td>
<td>(Total ___ x $40)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Lincoln-Douglas Debate</strong></th>
<th>Qty. Download</th>
<th>Qty. Hardcopy</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NFL1 (Sept/Oct)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFL2 (Nov/Dec)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFL3 (Jan/Feb)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFL4 (Mar/Apr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFL Nationals</td>
<td>(Total ___ x $18)</td>
<td>(Total ___ x $22)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How To LD</td>
<td>(Total ___ x $15)</td>
<td>(Total ___ x $19)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Handbook 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Handbook 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Handbook 3 new</td>
<td>(Total ___ x $25)</td>
<td>(Total ___ x $31)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Extemp Materials</strong></th>
<th>Qty. Download</th>
<th>Qty. Hardcopy</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How To Extemp</td>
<td>(Total ___ x $16)</td>
<td>(Total ___ x $19)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Extemping new</td>
<td>(Total ___ x $20)</td>
<td>(Total ___ x $24)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Extemp Briefs new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Extemp Briefs new</td>
<td>(Total ___ x $25)</td>
<td>(Total ___ x $30)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Payment Options:**
- [ ] Check or money order
- [ ] Purchase Order No. ____________________________
- [ ] Credit Card
  - Visa ___
  - Mastercard ___
  - Expiration Date: ____________________________
- Credit Card #: ____________________________
- Signature: ____________________________

Subtotal: $ 
CA residents add 8.25% sales tax: $ 
Grand Total: $ 
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RESPONSE TO DR. GLASS’S ESSAY ON FOUCAULT AND HEIDEGGER

by Asher Haig

Having just read the essay written by Dr. Glass in the March 2000 Rostrum, I felt that a response was necessary. I want to begin by saying that I appreciate such a thorough examination of the kritik (critique). It seems to be an important area that begs further discussion -- particularly in areas that conflict with philosophical understandings of the work that is being utilized in the round.

It seems, however, that the essay relies on a limited approach to Foucault in order to attack the position of the kritik in debate. Many of these issues seem to rely on an understanding of the kritik that ignores current or potential developments.

It seems that the article comes down to a few points:
1. Kritik are inherently contradictory with debate because debaters use them “to win.”
2. Kritik establish their own “truth” in the process of the debate round.
3. Kritik demand rejection of modes of thought, inherently creating the same situations they intend.
4. Kritik aren’t unique.
5. Kritik aren’t “competitive” which ultimately becomes a means for excluding the affirmative team and establishing a regime of truth.

Not so surprisingly, these five arguments seem to make up just about every 2AC that I hear when running the kritik. I have trouble finding these to be compelling arguments.

Perhaps the problem is not the kritik or the forum, but the manner in which they have been combined? I have several particular responses to the arguments advanced in the essay.

Debate is Inherently Contradictory

It seems that Dr. Glass’s point seems to be that the use of either Foucault or Heidegger within debate necessarily relies on what each of them would classify as calculative thought — an analytical mode of discourse that believes everything can be reduced to a manner of causality that is defined in terms of a population. In other words, we think about people in a way that makes them people rather than individual persons, each one represented as a number rather than an individual.

I’m not sure why this necessarily conflicts with debate. Certainly, both Heidegger and Foucault find conflict with the mode of analytics that is used to describe the realm of policy, but to say that they reject the analytics of policy-making as a whole seems to ignore the agenda of both. A fundamental part of Foucault’s critique is to reinsert the “I” in a mode of discourse that is so reliant on the “we.”

To say that Foucault’s representations cannot be utilized in terms of policy analysis ignores a large part of Foucault’s work — Madness and Civilization, The Birth of the Clinic, Discipline and Punish, and all of the History of Sexuality books come to mind. This description of Foucault’s work seems to selectively utilize Foucault’s analytics in favor of describing Foucault as “a historian.” Certainly, Foucault fits within the field of history, but I think that many would find dispute in the claim that he was a historian.

Foucault’s work might make more sense put in terms of anthropology. This distinction can probably be best understood from Foucault’s The Order of Things and Archaeology of Knowledge. The purpose is very much to reject the notion of history as it is currently conceived — but that does not leave Foucault in a realm of historical nihilism.

Fundamental to this understanding is the concept of the genealogy. Although not explicitly considered until Archaeology of Knowledge, the approach is clearly considered in all of Foucault’s works. The concept seems to be to understand history in terms of its contingencies — to go beyond our simplistic understandings or representations of history and realize that those representations are simply part of history itself — culturally constructed understandings of what “is.” Foucault’s analytics involve a deeper investigation, sometimes so deep as to ignore the surface entirely, expecting the observer to piece together new meaning from that which is exposed. The point is to analyze the historical process in terms of what is now.

This distinction is seen in Foucault’s work as the distinction between Continual History and the Genealogy. Foucault’s rejection of continual history means that we must begin to try to understand history not in terms of now, trying to prove why the status quo was inevitable, but in terms of the past, trying to understand why the now is contingent — part of a historical process of knowledge that was not inevitable.

Now the question probably remains, where does this come back to debate? It seems to me that the point is rather simple: the kritik in the debate round serves as a form of Genealogy. It is an approach to policy making intended to understand the manner in which we enframe (to borrow from Heidegger) our political process in terms of certain political formations of knowledge. The purpose of the kritik is thus twofold: one is to expose, the second to de-struct (more on this later).

Understanding the Contingencies vs. Negating

And so we’ve all heard it before — “It’s a negation theory. We just have to prove the affirmative wrong.” The questions seems to remain: What the Hell does that mean?

Dr. Glass argues that Foucault’s position is that rejection is not an option. He quotes Foucault as saying “These pre-existing forms of continuity, all these syntheses that are accepted without question, must remain in suspense. They must not be rejected definitively of course, but the tranquility with which they are accepted must be disturbed, we must show that they do not come about of themselves, but are always the result of a construction the rules of which must be known, and the justifications of which must be scrutinized...” (p25, Archaeology of Knowledge). The insight indicates rather a middle ground that does not appear to be considered. Certainly Foucault does not advocate rejections in terms of absolutes. Humanism is not bad — it is merely contingent. The distinction comes in the manner of approach.

To reject the affirmative does not
mean to refuse its framework. Negation theory seems to mean quite the opposite — we, as the negative, don't have to prove the affirmative's framework wrong, merely the approach to resolve that framework. The kritik is a process of exploring those contingencies and exposing them. If we can illustrate what is wrong with a policy, the natural step that follows is not to accept that policy as a solution. This serves, in Foucault’s words above, as part of the process to show that "the tranquility with which they are accepted must be disturbed."

Thus endorsing the kritik does not mean endorsing some sort of new replacement framework that would represent a new regime of truth, but instead voting not-aff. The consequence certainly means voting neg, but that is not on the pretense that voting neg somehow rejects as a whole the framework the affirmative used. Much to the contrary, voting negative recognizes the contingencies that are inherent in such a framework, a first step toward finding an alternative.

Ultimately the importance of this view is in understanding that Foucault does not find the concept of rejection problematic, but instead the manner in which we move toward rejection. Accepting is the binary opposite of rejecting. Voting negative, then, might be better understood as not-accepting, rather than rejecting.

**Leaving Foucault Behind**

All of these arguments seem very obsessed with accepting or denying Foucault in binary terms. Certainly there may be contingencies within the forum of the kritik itself, but it seems that the exact point, as established above, is not to necessarily reject, but to recreate or to develop. That seems to mean that rather than refusing the kritik because of potential problems we should work to develop beyond those problems. It seems to me that a large part of that process means using Foucault's theories to move beyond Foucault. There is never an explicit denunciation of the debate forum. The methods, however, seem to serve as a perfect forum for the modes of resistance that Foucault discusses. A fundamental part of that resistance includes the creation of a Counter-Hegemony — in effect a new mode of truth that serves to counteract the existing, dominant mode. The claims that the kritik is a truth-claim seem to be interesting non-sequiturs. Foucault’s point is never that truth does not exist or is necessarily bad, but that we should recognize the sociological construction of truth. It is not a matter of avoiding truth-claims altogether — such a move is impossible — but of understanding the political implications of particular claims to truth.

It seems impossible to divorce argument from agenda. Even Foucault carried a constant agenda, beginning with May 1968 and the response to socialism, where Foucault breaks away from the socialist movements in search of a new form of resistance. The point seems to be that nothing is neutral — the kritik is not an exception. This does not seem to be a reason to reject the kritik out of hand. The point seems to be that the kritik has an agenda which conflicts with the affirmative. One or the other has to win out — the very structure of debate. I’m not sure why this necessarily conflicts with the philosophical process as discussed by Foucault. In fact, using the analysis that nothing is neutral and the understanding that rejection is impossible, it would be impossible to ever have a discussion that could result in change; we would always reject things that are said to have an agenda, and since everything has an agenda, we would never go anywhere.

**The Question of Uniqueness**

At a more technical debate level, such criticisms seem to face the question of uniqueness that is fundamental to disadvantages.

Dr. Glass’s description of uniqueness is that “it would not matter much if the plan resulted in inflation if inflation was already occurring.” This in itself seems to make some sense — unless you are involved in economics and are working from the recognition that inflation is necessarily evil. The following explanation clarifies the position: “unless there was an additional and unique harm to increasing inflation further.” Such a clarification seems to change the consideration dramatically.

The point seems to be that things can always get worse. It seems to be the purpose of the kritik to prove why this is true. Perhaps the problem is that we have to reconceptualize the meaning of uniqueness. Perhaps putting it in a different context makes it easier to understand. The affirmative (200 years ago) says that slavery exists now, and says that we should reform the work conditions for slaves. The negative says that slavery is bad to begin with. Wait — this claim seems hopelessly non-unique working from the current notion of uniqueness. Affirmative claims that kritiks are non-unique disads work from very much the same position.

But let’s assume that it isn’t unique, for a moment. So what? A non-unique case turn still serves as an absolute (that is, absolute) solvency take-out with at least a risk of uniqueness. That still seems to be a reason NOT to endorse the affirmative.

**Fiat is Illusory**

(Directed at Kritik Debating in General rather than the Essay)

Yes it is. Such an observation, as Dr. Glass notes, seems to be utterly absurd. The point of policy debate (need it be said) is to analyze policy. What use (even if it does make logical sense) is it to say that the affirmative has to talk about policy (they have to be topical) and then to say that the only issues that matter are political ones? Similarly from the opposite side, what sense does it make for an affirmative to advocate a policy (that the federal government should do) and then say that fiat doesn’t exist in order to escape a discussion of the political implications of it? Seems to me to be an artificial distinction.

It also seems, however, that such a recognition of the absurdity of these claims allows us to develop a new forum for kritik. Fiat seems wholly irrelevant — the point of the kritik is that the affirmative would be a bad idea. The affirmative’s job is thus to prove that it would be a good idea. Suddenly — <gasp> — we’re debating LINKS to the kritik!

**The Alternative and Notions of Change**

Perhaps the biggest problem I’ve seen in kritik debating (on both sides) is that no one either utilizes the notion of the alternative or debates the kritik in terms of the alternative. In this sense, the argument is that the performance of the kritik actually creates change. That is NOT to say that endorsing the kritik endorses change (although that is certainly a viable concept) but instead to say that by running the kritik, the negative team actually creates change within the round. This concept will serve in a moment to illustrate why a permutation is nonsensical.

The point is that voting negative endorses the de-struction (removal of the structure) established by the IAC. The affirmative is responsible for defending their structure that they have established. The point is that political change is misconceived. We understand change solely in terms of the political, and we un-
understand the political solely in terms of the
government. Foucault’s ultimate point is
that the government is not a privileged struc-
ture. To the contrary, the government exists
solely on cultural terms — it exists because
we want it to exist, it continues because we
keep sending people to make it continue.

The point, then, is that the political
can mean more than the government. If the
government is merely a result of culture,
then why can’t we change the government
by changing culture?

Permutations
So why can’t we do the affirmative at
the same time?

Well hopefully, there will be a link to
the kritik. What’s the point of doing the af-
nimative if the link proves that the plan is a
bad idea? Beyond this, the manner in which
permutations are traditionally structured
makes them necessarily intrinsic permuta-
tions (as well as severance). First, the per-
mutation severs out of the IAC framework
that it establishes. The kritik argument is
that the plan means nothing without the
framework upon which it is based — the
rest of the IAC. Those things are things
which have been said and done. The affir-
mative doesn’t just get to forget about them.
Second, The permutation tends to come in
the form that “well we link, let’s just change
that so we don’t!” In other words, the affir-
mative could say academic achievement
should be increased, the negative says aca-
demic achievement is bad. Why does the
affirmative get to say, “OK make academic
achievement good”? Seems to be the very
definition of intrinsicness and why it is ab-
usive. If there’s a specific link to the plan,
why does a permutation let you just ignore
it?

False Advocacy
So certainly there can be the accusa-
tion sometimes that the permutation is a
false advocacy. What does that mean? Dr.
Glass frames it in terms of exclusion — that
the kritik says that the affirmative isn’t al-
lowed to agree. I think that this ignores the
terms of the link. The links prove that is
impossible for the affirmative to advocate
the same thing as the negative — at least
with any consistency.

Further, what does criticism mean if
the affirmative is also making arguments
about why criticism is a flawed concept?
This seems to be a personal contradiction,
not one that is forced.

Finally, given the negative’s argument
with the alternative about how voting affir-
mative reconstructs the framework that the
negative is de-structuring, why does it make
any sense to vote affirmative unless the af-
nimative justifies its structure?

Beyond these theoretical issues of
kritikting, there are three specific areas that
Dr. Glass addresses that I feel need re-
sponse.

Problem/Solution
Heidegger and Foucault both address
the notion of the Problem/Solution mindset
(a familiar phrase for those familiar with
Spanas) — but in a way that is distinct from
most people’s understanding of the issue.
The point is not that we cannot identify
problems and then search for solutions. The
point is that the way we generally do that is
a myth — when we separate the two we
simply ignore the manner in which we start
with the solution and then work toward a
problem as a justification. The problem/sol-
ution mindset is not one of political re-
ponses, but one of the order of things.

Liberation and the Ability to Speak
Paramount in Foucault’s kritik of power
is the notion that no one possesses
power — it is not a matter of having it or
lacking it. Power is exercised. It is not taken,
it is used. To say that power is possessed
traps people who don’t have power in a dis-
cussive prison box — they are powerless
and thus do not have the power to resist.
Foucault’s argument comes in response to
this notion. Foucault believes that personal
resistance is the only way to create change
without reifying the disciplinary system that
is so coercive and dangerous to begin with.

Foucault’s point is that there is not one
silence, but many silences (History of
Sexuality), and that liberation is defined by
the ability to regulate and manipulate these
silences in favor of the dominant discourse.
Liberation is not simply a matter of thinking
out — that is the repressive hypothesis.
Foucault says that while we think we have
been repressed, the actuality of the matter
is that we have been regulated — discourses
have created schemes of regulation that are
productive rather than silencing. Instead of
silencing sexuality, we have produced new
forms of discourse such as homophobia.
Foucault’s point is that speaking out has
empirically only trapped us further. The idea
is that through kritik we can develop new
forms of resistance.

The Question of Rights
This resistance certainly at some point
involves the question of rights and repre-
sentation in the law as well as legal equal-
ity. Dr. Glass says that “it is simply the case
that Foucault believed in rights, and believed
in the possibility of governmental change
— he even participated in demonstrations,
and argued for governmental changes
which increased individual liberty.” Such an
observation is astute, but ignores
Foucault’s stated purpose in these dem-
slractions, as well as his conflicting inter-
est. Further, it ignores Foucault’s position-
ing as well as for what issues he was dem-
strating. To quote David Halperin, “Fou-
cault felt able to advance proposals because
he could do so not on the strength of some
antecedently established authority but on
the basis of personal experience, communal
participation, and a situated knowledge
which he shared with his interlocutors. Far
from prescribing courses of action... Fou-
cault was describing and reflecting on de-
velopments in gay culture that he saw al-
ready taking place around him.” (Saint
Foucault: Toward a Gay Hagiography, p100).

The point seems distinct from the idea that
Foucault simply supported the notion of
rights. In fact, Foucault has been quoted
numerous times discussing the concept of
rights in relation to the subject — the point
that he came to ultimately is that support-
ing the notion of rights is in conflict with
the notions of the subject, but as he is able
to engage in the personal de-struction of
the subject (identity politics) at the same
time he is able to support rights, he is able
to support specific forms of legal equality.

That does NOT translate directly to
meaning that all rights and all movements
are acceptable immediately. The point is that
we have to engage in forms of identity polit-
ics and avoid speaking for others. Identity
politics ultimately means allowing people
to define themselves rather than trying to
define people through categories.

Foucault does not believe that such a
thing as governmental change exists. To
Foucault, the government is nothing more
than a centralized position upon which dis-
courses circulate. The government is not a
privileged position of power, it is a reflec-
tion of culture. To create governmental
change, a fundamental step is the realiza-
tion of identity politics — individual cul-
tural change that translates to new legal re-
alities.

These ideas are intended to promote
discussion and a move to a new under-
standing of critical debate theory. None of
my references or argumentation above
(Haig to page 60)
The Stanford Debate Society presents the
Stanford National Forensic Institute

Individual Events Program: July 31 - August 13, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dramatic Interpretation</th>
<th>Humorous Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oratory</td>
<td>Extemporaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impromptu</td>
<td>Expository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Interpretation</td>
<td>Prose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>Duo Interpretation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SNFI Individual Events program offers a comprehensive program which accounts for regional differences in style, content, and judging. Students will have the opportunity to work with coaches and national champions from around the nation. The Institute is designed to provide a strong technical foundation in an enjoyable atmosphere, students at all levels of experience will be accommodated.

Outstanding staff includes:

**Josette Surratt** is in her 29th year of teaching, and is currently at Teurlings Catholic High School. She has qualified 90 students to the NCFL and 20 students to the NFL nationals in her last six years of coaching. She has coached state champions in every event.

**Adam Lauriden** attends Harvard University, and went to Bellarmine College Prep for High School. Adam was the 1997 national champion in domestic extemp, and a two-time California State Champion.

**David Kraft** coaches speech at Holy Ghost Preparatory School in Philadelphia. He has coached two national champions in HI, and two finalists in duo. He is also a published playwright, and one of his plays recently was used to win first place in duo at CFL nationals, and another play made octos at NFL nationals.

**The Two Track System of Placement** allows advanced students to focus on specific events at an accelerated pace, while also ensuring that the beginning to intermediate level students advance at a more relaxed pace while participating in and learning about a variety of different events. This ensures that upper level competitors leave camp prepared to immediately step into high level tournament competition. Seminars are designed to cater directly to areas of student interest. Workshops are provided to instruct new competitors in basic speaking techniques, and novice workshops meet the needs of both new competitors and those solely interested in improving general speaking skills without the intention of later competition.

**Team Instruction** provides students who are involved in a recently formed Forensics team basic techniques on student coaching. We teach students of all levels how to coach themselves during the course of the year to maximize their competitive experience and success. The research facilities unique to the Stanford campus provide an excellent resource for the creation of a comprehensive script library. Institute staff has on hand hundreds of scripts both to assist student, and to serve as example material. Resource packets are provided specifically for this group.

"I had never competed before the Institute and now I am taking home First Place awards! I learned a lot while making friends for life. I’ll be back!!"

- Loan Pham, previous SNFI Individual Events camp participant

**Resident cost:** $1,375 / **Commuter cost** $750

An additional application fee of $75 is required

**For additional information:** call (650) 723-9086
SNFI, 555 Bryant St., #599, Palo Alto, CA 94301
The Stanford Debate Society presents the Summer 2000

Stanford National Forensic Institute

CX Program: July 25 - August 13  
LD / Events: July 31 - August 13
Extended-week program for both CX and LD: August 13 - 20

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 5 weeks of comprehensive instruction.

SUPERIOR FACULTY: The majority of primary faculty will be current and former high school and collegiate coaches of national repute. Last year's faculty included (and most will return for Summer 2000):

Hajir Ardebili, UC Berkeley Law  
Russ Falconer, Emory  
Jon Miller, U of Redlands  
Dan Fitzmier, Emory  
Jon Dunn, Stanford Debater  
Michael Major, formerly CPS  
Byron Arthur, Stuart Hall  
Jonathan Alston, Newark  
Josette Surrat, New Orleans

Robert Thomas, Emory  
Anne-Marie Todd, USC  
Ryan Mills, College Prep School  
Byrdie Renik, Columbia U  
Jon Sharp, W. Georgia College  
Jessica Dean, Boston U  
Hetal Doshi, Emory  
Leah Halvorson, Reed College  
Aaron Timmons, Greenhill

Dave Arnett, UC Berkeley  
Randy Lusky, El Cerrito HS  
Abe Newman, UC Berkeley  
Jessica Clarke, Whitman  
Tina Valkanoff, Northwestern  
Adam Lauridsen, Harvard U  
Nick Coburn-Palo, Hopkins  
Michael Edwards, Princeton  
Matthew Fraser, SNFI Director

*listed affiliations are for identification purposes only. The institutions noted are where 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, available in March.

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 an experienced 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  
$1,725 resident plan  
$895 commuter plan  
$850 Aug 13 - 20 CX extended week

LD and Events  
$1,375 resident plan  
$775 commuter plan  
$850 Aug 13 - 20 LD swing lab

Given the nature and quality of the 2000 program the cost is quite low. This program, both in faculty composition and in 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 and some materials. An additional $75 application fee is required upon application to the SNFI.

TO APPLY  
&/or INQUIRE: Stanford Debate Society - SNFI  
(650) 723-9086  
e-mail: snfi@mail.com  
555 Bryant St., #599  
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Scholarships in the form of need-based aid are available.
The Stanford Debate Society presents the

Stanford National Forensic Institute

Lincoln-Douglas Program: July 31 - August 13, 2000

Outstanding features of the 2000 Lincoln-Douglas portion of the SNFI:

1) **14 fully critiqued practice rounds**: most camps offer a practice tournament at the end of the camp which may offer only four rounds of total experience. At SNFI, your students will **not** be sent home with a pile of notes on philosophy and a stack of student researched evidence with minimal visible improvement in their debate skills. Your students will receive practice rounds built into the daily schedule. Their progress is monitored so that their development is assured!

2) **Incomparable staff**: The 2000 staff includes:

   **Program Director**: Dr. Michael Major, formerly of College Prep School

   **Lab Instructors**:
   
   Jonathan Alston, Newark Science
   Michael Arton, New Orleans Jesuit
   Michelle Coody, St. James
   Hetal Doshi, Emory University
   Jon Geggenheimer, Woodson School
   Adam Lauridsen, Havard
   Aaron Timmons, Greenhill School
   Byron Arthur, Stuart Hall School
   Nick Coburn-Palo, Hopkins
   Jessica Dean, Boston University
   Michael Edwards, Princeton
   Leah Halvorson, Reed College
   Michael Osofsky, Stanford Debater

3) **Extended Week Option**: The outstanding highlight of this option will be an extra 20 fully critiqued practice rounds. Students attending other camps during the summer can avail themselves of this one week experience or students in the regular camp can extend their stay for a total of 34 practice rounds!

   *For many LD debaters the regular camp combined with the "extended week" option provides the equivalent of a full semester of competitive LD debate experience, or more, in just 3 weeks (up to 35 critiqued rounds)!*

---

**Important Information**

SNFI LD Institute: July 31 - August 13
Resident Program: $1,375
Commuter program: $750

LD Third week Option: August 13-20
Third Week Resident Program Cost: $850

For additional information and applications contact us at

SNFI, 555 Bryant St., #599, Palo Alto, CA 94301
(650) 723-9086
Stanford National Forensic Institute

CX Program: July 25 - August 13, 2000 "The SNFI Swing Lab Program"

The SNFI Swing Lab Program is a preparatory program available for policy debate students. To be eligible, students must be varsity level and must have previously attended at least one rigorous debate institute during the Summer of 2000. The Swing Lab Program is held at Stanford University, one of the world’s premier research institutions. Faculty include some of the most respected debate educators, the curriculum is rigorous and carefully executed, and students receive more debates that are expertly critiqued than any other program of similar quality. The Swing Lab Program has a phenomenal track record: the 1994 through 1999 graduates “cleared” at most national circuit tournaments, including Greenhill, St. Mark’s, the Glenbrooks, Redlands, MBA, Lexington, Berkeley, Stanford, Emory and NFL nationals. Swing lab participants have won 1st place recently at USC, Berkeley, MBA, Stanford, Lexington, and have twice won the Glenbrooks and the TOC.

THE PROGRAM

Expertly Critiqued Debates. Swing Lab scholars will participate in a rigorous series of at least a dozen practice debates beginning on the second day of the camp, with an emphasis on stop-and-go and rebuttal rework debates.

Research, Evidence and Topic Inquiry. The Swing Lab program provides intensive instruction in research, argument construction, and advanced level technique. The kernels of arguments which are produced by other institutes will be used as a starting point. These arguments will be used by program participants to construct entire detailed positions which will include second and third level extension blocks, new cases, novel disadvantages, kritiks, counterplans, and in-depth case negative attacks.

Advanced Theory. Swing Lab Scholars are assumed to have mastered the basics of debate theory. This foundation will be used to construct sophisticated and comprehensive positions. Scholars will be immersed in advanced theory through special seminars that offer unique and rival views on a variety of issues including flat, competition, intrinsicsness, permutations, kritiks, presumption, extra-topicality, the nature of policy topics, and many other issues from the cutting edge of current theoretical discourse.

THE PRIMARY FACULTY

Dan Fitzmier is a debate coach at the renowned Emory University debate program. He was also a nationally ranked NDT debater at Emory University. Among his successes were first speaker and first place at the Heart of America Tournament, and he was one of the debaters who closed out CEDA nationals for Emory University in 1998. During his coaching career his teams have cleared to late elimination rounds at every major national tournament, and in the last two years at Emory his teams have won outright ten major college tournaments. In high school Dan was top speaker at the TOC. Dan is returning to the SNFI and the Swing Lab for the third year,
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DAVID GLASS'S RESPONSE TO HAIG

Mr. Haig misstates the central arguments of my essay, and then pronounces the misstated arguments unpersuading.

My actual arguments are:

1. Critiques are inherently contradictory with Foucault (not with debate), because debaters use them to "win." I go to some lengths to illustrate severe tensions between Foucault's writings and the way he is referenced in the Policy Debate Discourse. To say Critiques are inherently contradictory with "debate" is nonsensical. The last paragraph of my original essay makes this position quite clear.

Nothing in Mr. Haig's fleshed-out discussion contradicts my (cited) contention that Foucault explicitly rejects a silencing of opposing discourses. Further, Mr. Haig has no citations to back up his claim that a purpose of Foucault's criticalism is to "de-construct". (Deconstruct, yes, understand, yes, destroy or silence, no).

As for Mr. Haig's quibbling with my labelling of Foucault as a historian (he says "many would find dispute in the claim that he was a historian"), say for example Gary Gutting's book: Michel Foucault's archaeology of scientifc reason , pg 1: "He [Foucault] can be regarded as a philosopher, a social historian, a literary analyst, a social and political critic; each of these perspectives focuses on something integral to his achievement. But his intellectual metier, through which he develops all his ideas about philosophy is the history of thought. With one exception, all his major books are histories of aspects of Western thought, and the exception (AK) is a methodical reflection on this historical work. Foucault's choice of title for his chair at the College de France was entirely appropriate: Professor of the History of Systems of Thought."

Given that Foucault called himself a historian, I feel pretty secure in the labelling.

2. I just reread my essay, and could not find Mr. Haig number two argument in there anywhere.

3. The Foucault and Heidegger critiques are used to criticize humanism, they critique constructed acts geared at solving a problem; this constructed act is, however, no different than the construction of the critique itself, geared to win a policy debate round. (Note that this argument is totally distinct from that written as Mr. Haig's number 3).

4. Critiques aren't unique. This argument was correctly stated.

5. Critiques aren't "competitive", which ultimately becomes a means for excluding the affirmative team, an artificial exclusion which is used simply to maintain separate ground for the negative, that they might win (Mr. Haig states this as "establishing a regime of truth"), again, this was not part of the argument.

Missed from Mr. Haig's list is the most important point in the essay, that there exists an overarching "Policy Debate Discourse", and that actions taken and arguments made within this Discourse have particular purposes which must be understood, dissected, and exposed.

Furthermore:

If Mr. Haig is correct that the negative does not have to prove the affirmative's framework as wrong, then this is already an affirmative argument against the Foucault critique, since the most popular link is that the affirmative's framework is wrong.

If, as Mr. Haig states, the critique is a "process of exploring those contingencies and exposing them", then it should not be a voting issue. We should simply pronounce the contingencies exposed, and move on, with that understanding.

Mr. Haig states that "if we can illustrate what is wrong with a policy, the natural step that follows is not to accept that policy as a solution." That depends. If, by advancing, the critique, the Negative is committing this same "wrong" act, then the critique would become a reason to reject the Affirmative, rather than the Negative (since the Negative is the only team which is arguing that this is grounds for rejection). If the thing labelled as "wrong" with the policy is not unique; if that thing would not go away whether or not the policy existed, then this is an additional reason why there is no "natural" step towards rejection.

Mr. Haig states that "endorsing the kritik does not mean endorsing some sort of new replacement framework that would represent a new regime of truth". But I'm asking the reader to be aware that the Critique functions within the Policy Debate Discourse identically to the way a policy proposal functions as an action of states, as a means to an end, as an example of Bio-power. As such, endorsing the Critique as a reason to reject the Affirmative is both hypocritical and dishonest, since it selectively ignores the framework under which the Critique is advanced, as part of the Policy Debate Discourse.

Mr. Haig states that "the importance of this view is in understanding that Foucault does not find the concept of rejection problematic." Sorry, but this simply is false. And there's no citation to prove it true. And there is a citation to prove it false (see my essay).

It is important to highlight that the next section of Mr. Haig's rebuttal is titled "Leaving Foucault Behind", since that is clearly his real agenda. But the entire point of my piece was to embrace what Foucault actually said, and use Foucault to Criticize the Critique. I have no intention of leaving Foucault.

It is ironic that, in this section "Leaving Foucault Behind", Mr. Haig states that the point is to "recreate or to develop." This can be restated as Mr. Haig admitting that he's basically making stuff up. This is a link to the Foucault Critique of the Use of the Critique in the Policy Debate Discourse. It's clear that the criticule basically does not care what Foucault actually said, he's just concerned with being able to use an argument to win. If Foucault is inconvenient, then just "recreate or develop" what he said. Let's this seem harsh, just re-read Mr. Haig's further elaboration. That seems to mean that rather than refusing the kritik because of potential problems we should work to develop beyond these problems. It seems to me that a large part of that process means using Foucault's theories to move beyond Foucault. Indeed, that is Mr. Haig's process. If there was ever a better link to a Foucault counter-critique, I'd like to hear it.

Just one more quote from this section, "It seems impossible to divorce argument from agenda." That's my argument, that the agenda of the Critique is the link to Foucault.

As to the question of uniqueness: I challenge any debaters, people who run critiques and those who don't, to re-read Mr. Haig's (slavery) example in his section on Uniqueness, as to why uniqueness shouldn't matter... Now, aren't you more (Glass to page 60)
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DEBATING PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP DISADVANTAGES:
WHAT DOES THE ACADEMIC LITERATURE PROVE?
by David M. Cheshire

The Clinton disadvantage is the most popular policy argument on this year's education topic, as it was last year, and until Bill Clinton vacates the office next January (at which point we'll shift to arguing Bush or Gore popularity/focus/agenda links) this brand of political process position is likely to dominate the circuit. The availability of up-to-the-minute database evidence has increased our collective reliance on presidential popularity/focus/capital arguments, since efficient update work can produce timely impact and brink stories, not to mention late breaking horserace assessments.

Concerns about the widespread use of the Clinton argument are by now well known, but apart from some limited efforts to craft theoretical objections, few inroads have been made against its use or success. In the abstract I think most judges agree the most defensible explanations of likely fiat mechanisms can provide compelling affirmative link takeouts, but these have proven hard to win in practice, since negative teams who specialize in Clinton have developed a laundry list of defenses. The fiat debate (A: "Fiat takes out the link-Congress won't backlash to itself!"); N: "Fiat assumes minimal means, which leaves room for the link") has become something of a yes/no contest where few debaters are understandably willing to invest the rhetorical energy necessary to make their position compelling.

Another problem with the Clinton disadvantage, apparently well understood in the abstract but rarely decisive in practice, has to do with the often strained internal link story defended by the negative. If there is a connection between presidential unpopularity effects following a policy fight, there is rightful skepticism about the strength of the spillover to other major legislative contests. But as any observer knows, these objections also tend to carry little weight against the disadvantage. When internal link attacks are offered, a few cards from Bond and Fleisher (the now dated evidence asserting such a spillover) usually suffice.

In this essay I introduce some of the recent academic work on presidential power, especially on factors able to predict successful presidential leadership in the legislative arena. To a large and surprising degree this work has not been greatly utilized by the debate community, maybe because it seems too heavily theoretical, too easily trumped by yesterday's assessment of the horserace. But my suggestion is that a closer reading of the proliferating work on the American presidency can substantially strengthen the affirmative's hand when it comes to undermining the internal link claims of the disadvantage, at least as commonly argued, because I aim to direct you to these literatures. I've footnoted my claims more fully than normal; these notes give some indication of the available work, old and new.

Dr. David M. Cheshire

A Quick Introduction to the Presidential Leadership Scholarship

If you've been debating Clinton a lot recently, you might naturally assume the major determinant of presidential success in the legislative arena is popularity, or the more amorphous concept of accumulated political capital. But the literature on presidential success does not emphasize the popularity issue, or even political capital, and many of the standard works do not even seriously consider these issues in a manner that would be recognizable to policy debaters.

Consider three widely cited and relatively recent works on presidential success. One, by Marvin Olasky, emphasizes how presidential success mainly derives from a given president's capacity for moral leadership. Olasky believes the articulation of what he calls "moral vision" is the best predictor of capable political leadership. Another recent book by Robert Shogan makes much the same point. Or consider Philip Abbott's interesting application of literary theory to presidential power. One prominent theory of literary success, advanced some time ago by Harold Bloom, argues that great writers succeed by triumphing over the "anxiety of influence." That is, they overcome the legacy of the great writers who precede them, in the process producing genuinely unique work, made possible by a willful misreading of their mentors. Abbott explores whether the same argument explains presidential success, and defends an argument that the historically great presidents succeeded by reacting to their strong predecessors.

From the vantage point of presidential popularity scenarios, these accounts are interesting precisely because they omit day to day dynamics, and the ups and downs of public approval. Such work is typical in the sense that in accounting for leadership, it tends to credit longer term historical or characterological factors over the short term tactical variables which so dominate policy debates.

This has been true since the most influential accounts of presidential success were first written. The most cited work, by Richard Neustadt (which first appeared in 1960), equates presidential power with the power to persuade, but is not dominated by arguments over public opinion control. And this is true of other major works in the field, such as book by Richard Pious and Edward Corwin, both of which emphasize the president's managerial competence as the major predictor of success.

By contrast to how presidential success is argued in typical debate rounds, academic research tends either to emphasize the institutional circumstances of leadership (e.g., does it occur in a time of crisis?) or the personal traits of the men who have served as president. For example, Clinton Rossiter's 1956 book used characterological analysis to divide presidents into two categories, "earth movers" and "earth smoothers." The great presidents were "movers" who made things happen. Erwin Hargroove used a similar strategy of classification, categorizing presidents as either leaders of "action" (like the Roosevelts, Wilson, and Johnson) or of "restraint" (such as Hoover or Eisenhower). More recently James David Barber's typology of presidential character has exerted an influence on
the academic debate, but here again the traits Barber singles out are those of disposition rather than perceived approval by the Congress or public.8

Institutional accounts vie with characterological theories; among the first and most influential of these was produced by Theodore Lowi. Lowi, in part responding to Barber but still influenced by work stressing the effects of a president's personal characteristics, nonetheless judged personal characteristics are dwarfed by "the tremendous historical forces lodged in the laws, traditions, and commitments of institutions.9" Contemporary work based in rational choice theory has tended to emphasize how members of Congress make their decisions out of perceived self-interest more than out of deference to party leaders or presidents; that is, they will give a president what he wants only when they believe it advances their own purposes.10 In a more general sense, among the most impressive recent attempts to study all the available data on the complicated relationship between president and Congress, and organize findings around a comprehensive appreciation of the institutional complexities of the office, was produced last year by Steven Shull and Thomas Shaw.11

Given this range of scholarly approaches, what then is the role of public approval, presidential agenda setting, and political capital in determining legislative success? And how might our debates be improved by taking account of such research?

Public Approval and Presidential Success

Much of the research on presidential leadership and approval ratings is anecdotal, for despite the wealth of available polling data, it can be difficult to draw generalizations regarding the relationship between popularity and success. A number of books offer very careful historical accounts about specific presidential administrations, but careful model construction has been difficult to accomplish. At the extremes one can easily reach common sense conclusions about the relationship: overwhelmingly popular presidents are more likely to achieve their goals that hated ones. In this vein the most common quotes come from Abraham Lincoln - "Public sentiment is everything. With public sentiment nothing can fail; without it, nothing can succeed" - and Woodrow Wilson - "Let him once win the admiration and confidence of the country, and no other single force can withstand him,

no combination of forces will easily overpower him."

For many years debaters have quoted work by George Edwards, who has argued that "the greatest source of influence for the president is public approval."11 Edwards found his strongest evidence in an apparent correlation between public approval ratings and presidential influence with members of Congress, findings often cited despite Edwards' own plain skepticism on the matter. In fact, Edwards' subtle argument is often lost in the give-and-take of policy debate. An example of this (which has more to do with how evidence is introduced in Clinton debates than any flaw in Edwards' work) is how affirmative evidence denying a popularity effect is often answered with "perception" evidence; that is, disadvantage defenders often read evidence saying if members of Congress perceive a president as popular, they're more likely to go along with his agenda, whether his power is real or not. While the insight is commonsensical enough, it takes only a moment's reflection to see that if such an effect exists, it should be showing up in the studies; thus if the studies show no effect, those results trump perception claims.

There are other problems with the claims of a popularity-to-legislation connection. One is the impossibility of proving that a bump of, say, five percentage points in the president's approval ratings translates to a specified increase in the odds of legislative passage. Compounding this is the fact that almost all scholars of the presidency agree approval is not a precondition or guarantor of success. As Plaschke once put it, "over time, the attempt merely to please, unaccompanied by initiative and accomplishment, is likely to boomerang. In practice, a President may be popular without being prestigious."13 We might also recall the cautionary tale of Bill Clinton, who continued to enjoy historically high second term approval ratings while struggling mightily to secure passage of his still-ambitious policy agenda.

One important implication of the public approval research is that the likelihood of presidential success is less a function of a given program's popularity than of a president's salesmanship skills. Thus, our conventional method of explaining the approval disadvantage link ("Federal sex education mandates are unpopular. Thus having Clinton fight for congressional sex ed approval will undermine his approval; Clinton needs his popularity to secure WTO admission") misconstrues the research, by ignoring a president's personal ability to shape the debate, adapt to the political climate, modify his proposals given nascent opposition, or deflect criticism by distancing himself from the most unpopular aspects of his proposals.14

Another factor to be considered is the extent to which members of Congress connect a president's general approval ratings with a perception that his support is based on his policies. As Barbara Sinclair has noted, "the purposive behavior framework predicts that only when members read the president's popularity as resting, at least in part, upon their constituents' support for his policy proposals is this popularity likely to significantly increase congressional support."15 This has implications for many policy debate rounds: it implies popularity is not likely to have much issue-to-issue crossover effect, and so-called context variables (the time of the term when debate occurs, the political balance in Congress, etc.) are likely to carry more weight than simple approval, even when connected to particular policy controversies.16 It also implies that if members of Congress believe public support is being orchestrated by a president (as opposed to reflecting a genuine groundswell of outrage), they are less likely to be moved to action, and may even backlash by attempting their own information campaigns.

These implications are confirmed by studies which downplay the influence of public opinion on congressional decisionmaking. A study carried out by Jeffrey Cohen found popular presidents are not significantly more successful in controlling the public agenda than less popular ones, and presidential efforts to impact opinion on particular issues produce gains that tend to fade fast.18 A more recent Cohen essay speculates that the Congress might well respond to public opinion in setting its agenda, but admits "no such study exists."19 In addition, there is strong evidence that popularity effects are very constrained under circumstances where government is divided (some point to the Democratic Congress' immunity to Bush's post-Gulf War popularity as evidence of this). The research also emphasizes the extent to which popularity effects lag; that is, a loss of popularity (or for that matter, a quick gain) takes time to percolate through the system. The standard 2NR story, which often says something like "voting for this unpopular plan today will derail WTO tomorrow" is simply
Presidential Agenda-Setting

The president, of course, wields considerable influence over the national agenda. One of the most cited books on this point remains Paul Light's *The President's Agenda*, which appeared in 1984. Light's basic premise is that the most important strategy for securing presidential power is successful control of the decision-making agenda. There is a certain logic in the view that, following Light's argument, a president will succeed or fail to the extent he creates an agenda and prioritizes his wish list to take full effect of the political situation.

As debated, the agenda-setting argument tends to undergo a not-so-subtle transformation. Presidential agenda-setting is often described this way by negatives: "Passage of policy Q is at the top of the president's agenda today. But here comes the plan, and passing it will require the president to divert his energy from policy Q advocacy. He will have to divert his valuable time away from policy Q and toward plan passage, thus a trade off link." But this argument is a significant distortion of the agenda-setting research, which emphasizes not the relative placement of one agenda item over or under another, but the timetable of presidential action. Paul Light argued that the basis of presidential success was speed in the first year of the term, when presidents can exploit their so-called "honeymoon" to advance pet programs more easily. Light claimed if a president failed to act decisively during the start of either of his terms, his programs would likely be overwhelmed by other unavoidable institutional forces (divided and fragmented government, inevitable media souring on presidential leadership, entrenched battle lines, and so on).

Indeed, if all it took to derail important initiatives was competition from other proposals, presidential power would be inevitably eviscerated, from day one of the president's term. After all, every day's newspaper conveys major new developments domestic and international which, if only temporarily, bump the president's priorities off the nightly news. Even when the chief executive devotes complete attention to one issue, as President Clinton did in March with his tour of South Asia, he is unlikely to successfully control the public opinion or political agenda (Clinton's visit, for example, was largely overshadowed by the Pope's tour of the Middle East, and to some extent by Clinton's own announcement of a last minute meeting with Syrian leader Hafez al-Assad).

A president's ability to control or set the agenda is also a function of which party controls the Congress. When the president's party is in control, he is better able to coordinate the legislative agenda with the leadership. But, as in the current circumstances, the government is divided, a president's agenda is forced to contend with competing opposition proposals.

Presidential Political Capital

Anyone with experience debating the Clinton disadvantage knows the popularity of the so-called "winners win" argument. Advanced several times over the past few years by Norman Ornstein, the claim is that presidents benefit from legislative passage even if the substance of the law is unpopular simply by enjoying the afterglow of a victory. Defeat taints a leader, reveals his Achilles' heel, thereby making subsequent victory less likely; victory, by contrast, makes leaders seem more intimidating to their opponents, and by enhancing presidential stature winning makes it easier to force agreement on opponents who mainly respect raw political power. "Winners win" is the logical extension of understanding that presidents have at their disposal a certain amount of "political capital," the resources required to get their way. These resources include chits (favors owed them by their colleagues), quid pro quo agreements (where a president gets something in return for giving up something else), the perception of power that comes from favorable approval ratings or good media coverage, and also the simple perception of success. The "winners win" claim usefully calls our attention to how such political capital is not static but can change over time, increasing and decreasing as the public's and Congress' impressions are altered over time.

The winners win position is also, of course, vulnerable on many fronts. It does not assume the peculiar dynamics of an election year, during which opponents are unlikely to be awed even by impressive displays of presidential suasion. Nor does it assume, Ornstein to the contrary, a context of divided government. Republicans controlling Congress are less likely to be awed by Clinton success than angered by it; the likely outcome of Democratic presidential success is reinvigorated opposition, not cowering concessions down the road. And the winners win claim is simplistic, in the sense that winning does not inevitably start a snowball effect of guaranteed future success (nor for that matter does a single loss necessarily set the end of a presidency into motion); wins and losses are inevitable regardless of the office's occupant, and the effect of a win or loss on subsequent outcomes is easily exaggerated.

The political capital issue is another one easier to see in the extreme than at the margins. The insight that President Carter spread his available political capital too thin by overloading the Congress with initiatives (and declaring them all his highest priority) has now become conventional wisdom. But to what extent is presidential success a function of changes in political capital? Put more specifically, to what extent does adding one new proposal to the agenda subvert a president's influence? Interestingly, the most cited defense of presidential capital, offered by Paul Light, offers a broad definition of the concept that does include popularity, but which also defines it as a function of the number of partisan seats in Congress and the extent of the original electoral margin. These are variables over which a president, regardless of his skills, has little influence. If capital is a function of relatively unchanging environmental constraints, we might reasonably infer that political capital changes at the margin will tend to matter very little.

Arguing the Media Manipulation

Internal Links

As Theodore Roosevelt so memorably put it, the United States presidency affords its occupant with a singular power to persuade, to make use of the "bully pulpit" to advance his causes, or as Ronald Reagan put it, to "go over the heads" of Congress and directly to the American people for support. This fact has induced many affirmative teams to argue against the Clinton internal link by stressing the president's institutional advantages in framing and controlling the national debate. The White House staff is increasingly organized to direct the country's conversation. Some affirmatives use this fact to argue the president can never really suffer from his actions; he will invariably find a way to spin the issue, blame his adversaries, or salvage victory even from defeat.

But, as with the relationship between high poll numbers and successful leadership, the media relationship is more complicated than our debating usually recognized. We know that a president's failure to effectively use the media will complicate his efforts to see his initiatives, but it does (Chesher to page 60)
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TEACHING EXCELLENCE AT IOWA!
CONSOLATION STORYTELLING AT NATIONALS

Why?
A second consolation contest was needed. The large and increasing numbers entering impromptu were making the contest difficult to complete in one day. Although many popular contests could have been chosen, two criteria had to be met:

1) Since this is a consolation event, entered only after elimination in one (or two) main events and one (or two) supplemental events, the new event must require limited or no preparation. Events which required either research or writing were unsuitable. No contestant concentrating on a main event or supplemental event will have time to prepare for a consolation event.

2) The new event should have an interp bias since the current consolation event, impromptu, has a public address bias. Interp contestants will now have an interp consolation event.

3) Hence - Storytelling

What Storytelling is not:
1) It is not story reading. There is no script or book. NFL has a contest in Prose reading already.

2) It is not children's literature, although one year the theme might be children's stories. Other types of story telling occur in our society. Recall Alberto Rios storytelling at the Phoenix Nationals, the National Storytelling Festival and even the National Liar's Contest.

3) It is not drama. The Presentation of characters is not banned but the focus will be on communication of a narrative.

4) It is not original fiction made up by the contestant.

5) It is not Improvisation.

What Storytelling is:
1) The retelling of single narrative incident. Think of yourself telling a group of friends your favorite ghost story or golf anecdote or debate war story or Greek myth or urban legend.

2) The extempose (no notes or props) re-creation of a story one has previously read (not memorized) or heard. (i.e. Secretary Jim Copeland grew up in Michigan where his relatives told him the tales of Paul Bunyan and Babe the Ox. Jim can still retell those tales today - 50 years later)

3) Each year there will be a central theme for storytelling.
   Possible Areas:
   Myths and Legends from past times.
   Ghost tales around the Campfire
   Urban Legends
   Children's Stories, etc.

This year's Storytelling theme at the 2000 NW Rose Nationals will be Native American and Western Legends and Stories.

Preparation for Storytelling:
A student will prepare by:
1) Selecting a story within the theme
2) Reading it
3) Writing a brief introduction
4) Retelling it in 4 minutes w/o notes
5) Practice retelling it.

Rules:
1) A single published, printed story, anecdote, tale, myth or legend must be retold without notes or props.

2) The maximum time is 4 minutes, but the story may be briefer without penalty. Any introduction must be included within the 4 minute time limit.

3) The student may not tell a story s/he used previously in any NFL district and/or national tournament.

4) The delivery must be extempore, not read. No book or script may be used. The story may be delivered standing or seated.

5) Gestures and pantomime may be used with restraint. Characterization may be used, but the focus must be on the narrative.

6) The retelling must be true to the original tale. The contestant may not add original material or materially change the content of the story.

Judge Ballot:
The art of storytelling is to create a mood wherein a spoken narrative transports the audience to the time and place of the story being recounted.

A story teller is a narrator - not an actor or actress - and although gestures, pantomime, movement, and characterization are not barred, they must be used with restraint.

The focus of the presentation must be on the narrative, with the teller acting as an unobtrusive presenter and not a performer. The teller must clearly grasp and convey the meaning of the tale.

The judge should rate highly the mechanics of superior speaking: fluency, vocal variety, articulation, eye contact, gesture.

The presentation should be extempore, not read. No book or script may be used. The storyteller may speak standing or seated. No props or visual aids may be used.

"When the teller has been successful in bringing the tale to life, the telling will seem entirely natural, almost effortless"
Policy Debate Extended Week Program
Inquire about our LD extended week program too!
August 13 - August 20

The idea behind the policy extended week is simple. Debaters improve most by debating - especially when challenged by experienced critics in a stop-and-go format, redoing rebuttals, and receiving extensive feedback after the round. This program offers all this and more. Students are guaranteed to get 17 fully critiqued practice rounds in just one week, and since the program is near the end of the summer, participants have the advantage of extensively debating a topic that has evolved over the course of the summer institute season. These 17 guaranteed rounds effectively make the extended week program equivalent to as many as three start of the year tournaments - a big advantage for participants when tournaments do begin. This program is staffed by some of the top instructors from the regular SNFI policy camp.

**Typical Daily Schedule.** Most days will follow this basic format (with breaks for lunch and dinner):

- **9:00 AM - 12:00 PM** Round 1, morning round
- **1:00 PM - 3:00 PM** rebuttal redos/ topic seminars or independent research
- **3:00 PM - 5:30 PM** Round 2, afternoon round
- **7:00 PM - 9:30 PM** Round 3, evening round
- **9:30 PM- 11:30 PM** Movie or recreation time

**Nationally Renowned Faculty.** The practice rounds will be adjudicated by experienced critics who will give valuable advice and guidance on improving your debate skills. All of the staff for the extended-week program have a wealth of success at both the high school/collegiate level, and include top-flight current and former collegiate competitors. Directing the program is Robert Thomas, formerly of Bainbridge Island HS, Emory University, and Woodward Academy. Initially confirmed faculty include Dan Fitzmier of Emory University, Sarah Holbrook of West Georgia College, Abe Newman of UC Berkeley, and others of the SNFI policy debate program staff - check us out on the web for updates!

**Accelerated Learning Environment.** Includes 17 critiqued debates in this exclusive program to help students get the equivalent of a semester of debate experience and actual improvement during the course of the camp. The program also features topic/theory seminars and rebuttal rework exercises, all designed to teach mastery of superior technique at all levels. Students learn in a relaxed atmosphere, more akin to a graduate seminar or retreat than a traditional debate camp.

**Program Prerequisites.** Students should attend the regular Stanford Policy Debate Forensic Institute. Students who have previously attended a different policy camp of sufficient rigor the same summer will also be considered for admission, as will all previous year’s attendees of the the SNFI policy debate camp.

Check out the SNFI web-page at www.educationunlimited.com for staffing updates for the extended week program, or contact our offices!

Costs (which includes housing, lunch and dinner throughout the program, and a standard program materials/ briefs and evidence packet). Students not continuing from the regular SNFI may wish to purchase the supplemental evidence packet from the camp (about $85):

**Extended week CX program** $850 (rm, board, tuition), commuters $525

No additional $75 enrollment fee is required upon application for those applicants continuing from the regular SNFI policy debate program.

SNFI, 555 Bryant Street, #599  Palo Alto, CA 94301
The National Forensic Consortium presents the

Austin National LD Debate Institute

Regular LD Session: July 2-15  One-Week LD Session: July 2-9

The Austin National LD Institute offers a national-caliber program with great instructors at a cost comparable to local camps. The camp has a variety of outstanding features, and has a history of preparing students for all levels of competition: local, regional, and national circuit.

The 2000 faculty includes:
Nick Coburn-Palo of Hopkins High School and Jessica Dean of Boston University. Both of these instructors specialize in teaching philosophy and advanced techniques of LD debate. Instruction is available for students from beginning to advanced level.

And here are what some previous ANDI LD camp participants thought:
"All of the philosophical lectures and discussions were awesome! I was really pleased with the level of instruction. Our lab leader was very dedicated to providing us with a good experience, and the level of intensity was extremely high. I would definitely recommend this camp!"
Addie Frieweaver, previous program participant

"I would recommend this camp to other students because it was tons of fun and I learned a lot. The work was hard, and the intensity was high, but wasn't overwhelming... The staff did a good job explaining things and made it easy to ask questions. The quality of instruction, level of intensity, and student to staff ratio were all a '10'..."
Alison Campbell, previous program participant

"I learned a lot and feel I've improved tremendously. I liked the emphasis on research... I felt the best features of this camp were the friendliness of the staff, their dedication to our intellectual and spiritual growth, and the free bumper stickers! The level of preparation of my lab leaders, their knowledge and skill level, and their commitment to providing a quality experience were all 10 out of 10..."
Will Orloff, previous program participant

"I would recommend this camp because it's affordable with the same qualities as more expensive camps. I really enjoyed the counselors... the instructors were experienced, but were also people that students could relate to..."
Viviana Gonzalez, previous program participant

For a brochure contact:  NFC ANDI LD Camp Fees :

1678 Shattuck Ave, #305  $535 for the one-week, or
Berkeley, CA 94709  $825 for the full program, or
call: 510-548-4800  plus a $75 application fee.

Listed fees include tuition, room and a meal plan.
The National Forensic Consortium presents the

Austin National Debate Institute

**CX Main Session: July 2 - July 18**
**LD Main Session: July 2 - July 15**

The Austin National Debate Institute seeks to provide students access to a national-caliber faculty at an incomparably low cost. The ANDI is an independent program which offers both **Policy and Lincoln-Douglas debate**, taught by some of the finest and most respected forensics educators in the country. The ANDI provides a true national level program, with options for policy debate or LD debate programs or for one-week primer sessions in either type of debate.

**Fabulous Learning Environment**

- **Great location.** The ANDI is located in Austin, Texas, an exciting city known for its cosmopolitan atmosphere and quality libraries. Students are housed in a secure facility which is one of the finest residence halls in Austin. Housing is of the highest quality, with comfortable, climate controlled double rooms, many of which have a separate living area and kitchen facilities.

- **Educational emphasis.** The ANDI programs focus on the teaching of debate skills and techniques in combination with a proper emphasis on preparation and original research. The program is designed to accommodate students at the beginning and advanced levels, with separate labs and primary instructors for beginners. All essential camp evidence and materials, including over a thousand pages of briefs produced at the camp by policy debate students, are included absolutely free of additional charges. Policy students will graduate prepared to tackle the 2000 policy topic, while the LD students will be prepared to debate likely national topics.

- **Numerous special program features.** These include enrollment caps to ensure student access to ALL the top faculty; an incredible faculty-student ratio of around 1:7; special theory seminars, lectures and guest lecturers; multiple critiqued debates; rebuttal reworks and strategy training; and much more! The program as a whole emphasizes learning through doing, with all students working with a variety of faculty on basic and advanced skills such as argument preparation, strategizing, extension of positions, and foundational theories of debating and delivery. Policy debate students will also receive access to the best evidence produced at the NFC camps!

- **Top quality national-circuit faculty.** The ANDI faculty is composed of some of the finest coaches and debaters in the nation. Students will have the opportunity to learn from a supportive and experienced staff. A glance at the qualifications of the ANDI staff will reveal the depth and quality of what is every summer debate program's most important asset, its teaching staff. ANDI compares favorably with any other program in this and every regard!

**Carefully Structured Schedules**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>CX Schedule</th>
<th>LD Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-9:00</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-10:30</td>
<td>Topic Lecture</td>
<td>Value Analysis Practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-12:00</td>
<td>Aff Case Construction</td>
<td>Seminars on Strategizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon-1:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-3:30</td>
<td>Library work</td>
<td>Case preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-5:00</td>
<td>Theory seminar</td>
<td>Practice debate w/ critique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00-8:00</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:30</td>
<td>Lab session</td>
<td>Delivery drills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Commuter checkout</td>
<td>Commuter checkout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-10:00</td>
<td>Topic preparation</td>
<td>Aff case work session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-12:00</td>
<td>Recreation &amp; relaxation</td>
<td>Recreation &amp; relaxation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midnight</td>
<td>Lights out</td>
<td>Lights out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fees: $995 for CX, $825 LD, $535 1-week plus $75 application fee. For info contact: NFC 1678 Shattuck Ave, #305 Berkeley, CA 94709 or call: 510-548-4800
The National Forensic Consortium presents

NATIONAL DEBATE INSTITUTE, D.C.

HELD AT GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY

Policy Debate Programs: July 2 - July 20

The National Debate Institute, D.C. offers an exciting opportunity for students to attend a national caliber debate institute at a cost competitive with the fees of most regional camps. Students receive instruction from some of the nation's finest debate teachers, including respected high school and college coaches, as well as some of the nation's most successful current and former collegiate debaters.

- **NATIONALLY RENOWNED FACULTY.** Outstanding coaches with proven track-records of success at both the high school/collegiate level, and top-flight current and former collegiate competitors.

- **RIGOROUS CURRICULUM.** A carefully crafted schedule developed and refined over the years at NFC camps. Classes are intensive, designed for the dedicated student of debate who wishes to maximize personal improvement.

- **SUPERIOR FACILITIES, LOCATION AND RESOURCES.** Students have access to the vast educational resources of the nation's capital, its abundance of libraries and think-tanks, and get to experience the city's cultural and entertainment attractions while on fully-supervised excursions. Program pricing includes lunch and dinner throughout the program, and all evidence produced at the camp for policy debaters! Remember to compare complete costs when pricing other camps.

- **TARGETED LEARNING** for both national circuit debaters and regional competitors. Classes utilize a variety of mutually reinforcing techniques, including fast-paced lectures, affirmative and negative labs, theory and practice seminars, and individualized consultations.

- **ACCELERATED LEARNING ENVIRONMENT.** Includes over a dozen critiqued debates in the standard program as well as repeated argument drills and rebuttal rework exercises, all designed to teach mastery of superior technique at all levels.

- **INTENSIVE 30-ROUND POLICY DEBATE OPTION.** For students who feel they need a camp experience heavily weighted toward practice and technique instruction. Students in this special focus lab will spend a portion of each day learning theory, cutting originals, and putting together positions, and then will debate an average of two rounds a day (fully critiqued with reworks) for the duration of the camp. Look for an update on the outstanding staff for this special program in upcoming issues of the Rostrum!

- **EXPERIENCED PROGRAM DIRECTION.** The director is Dan Fitzmier, debate coach at Emory University. His college teams have closed out or won 10 major tournaments in the last two years. As a college debater he won the Heart of America, and closed out CEDA nationals with another Emory team. While in high school he was top speaker at the TOC his senior year. While coaching at Pace Academy his teams cleared to elimination rounds at most major tournaments.

---

Costs (which includes housing, lunch and dinner throughout the program, and all program materials/briefs and evidence):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular CX Program</th>
<th>30-round plus CX program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,450 (rm, board, tuition)</td>
<td>$1,675 (rm, board, tuition)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An additional $75 enrollment fee is required upon application.

For more information: NFC

on the web at: www.educationunlimited.com (510) 548-4800

1678 Shattuck Ave., #305
Berkeley, CA 94709

NATIONAL FORENSIC CONSORTIUM

NFC
AN NFC EXCLUSIVE SPECIAL PROGRAM

NATIONAL DEBATE INSTITUTE, D.C. 30-ROUND CX LAB
at George Mason University July 2 - July 20

The National Debate Institute, D.C. 30-round CX lab is built around one important premise: for many students of debate, practice rounds with in-depth critiques by quality instructors are the single most efficient path to improving as quickly as possible. The normal quota of rounds at three-week national caliber camps tends to be 6 to 12 rounds by the time a camp is done. While this provides a solid introduction to the topic, and a chance to practice many of the skills you are being taught, it is simply not enough practice to create real mastery of new techniques and critical core of the topic arguments. The NDI-D.C. 30-round CX lab solves this problem by providing an incredible 1 to 4 ratio of staff to students. Students will average two debates a day for the duration of the camp, while still receiving access to theory seminars, lectures, research sessions, and topic analysis discussions. This cutting edge program features:

- NATIONALLY RENOWNED FACULTY. Outstanding coaches with proven track-records of success at both the high school collegiate level, and top-flight current and former collegiate competitors. The faculty includes UC Berkeley coach Dave Arnett, Ryan Mills of the College Preparatory School, Russ Falconer of Emory University, Carrie Heilley formerly of Stuyvesant High School, and Lacy Martin and Erin White of the Georgetown Day School. This outstanding staff is exclusive to the NFC!

- RIGOROUS SCHEDULE. Most days will follow this basic format (with breaks for lunch and dinner):
  8:30 AM - 11:45 AM Lectures, seminars, topic prep
  1:15 PM - 2:30 PM Research, theory sessions
  2:30 PM - 5:15 PM Practice debate with rebuttal reworks and in-depth critiques
  6:30 PM - 9:30 PM Practice debate with rebuttal reworks and in-depth critiques

- ACCELERATED LEARNING ENVIRONMENT. Includes over 30 critiqued debates in this exclusive program to help students get the equivalent of a semester or more of debate experience and actual improvement during the course of the camp. The program also features repeated argument drills and rebuttal rework exercises, all designed to teach mastery of superior technique at all levels.

- EXPERIENCED PROGRAM DIRECTION. The NDI-D.C. 30-round CX lab directors are Dave Arnett and Russ Falconer. Dave is the coach at UC Berkeley, where this year he qualified two teams to the NDT. Dave has taught at the Austin, Emory and Stanford workshops.

Russ is a debate coach for Emory University, and as both a high school and college debater was widely regarded as one of the top competitors in the country.

COSTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident program</td>
<td>$1,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(room and board)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter program</td>
<td>$915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An additional $75 program fee is required with application

"I think the staff was excellent. They gave critiques that enabled us to improve faster than I have ever improved before!"

Justin Wales
1998 30-round participant

NFC, 1678 Shattuck Avenue, #305, Berkeley, California, 94709
Power Punch Debate Materials for 2000-2001

Name: ____________________________

School: __________________________

Address: __________________________

City/State/Zip: _____________________

Purchase Order #: __________________

CX Series for NFL & UIL Topic for 2000-2001, PRIVACY

___ Book #1 - First Negative $30.00

___ Book #2 - Second Negative $30.00

___ Book #3 - Affirmative $30.00

___ Book #4 - Post-Summer Camps $30.00

___ Book #5 - The Final Word $30.00

___ THE MOTHER LODE $130.00

All Five Issues on Policy Topic

Books 1-5 also available on CDROM or disc
– see web site for details!

___ Debate Theory Handbook $30.00

___ Beginner’s Handbook $25.00
  by Gregg Hartney

NFL Lincoln Douglas Series

___ All FOUR Issues $80.00

___ Sept./Oct. 2000 $20.00

___ Nov./Dec. 2000 $20.00

___ Jan./Feb. 2001 $20.00

___ March/April 2001 $20.00

NFL & UIL LD Series are also available via EMAIL
– see web site for details

UIL (Texas) Lincoln Douglas Series

___ Both Issues $40.00
  Fall, 2000 $20.00
  Spring, 2001 $20.00

___ POWERBOOK 2000 NEW* $30.00
  New for Lincoln Douglas!!

___ Lincoln Douglas Databook $30.00

___ The Philosopher Kings $30.00

___ Postage *************** $2.00 per Book

* ONLY Pre-paid orders may omit postage costs

TOTAL DUE ____________________

Power Punch Debate Briefs
PO Box 430
Norman OK 73070
Fax to 405-292-0039
Call 877-573-6740
DebateKing@aol.com
www.PowerPunch.com
ARIZONA

BAENA
AMY HERMALIK
DOBSON
RYAN BRITT
RIVER VALLEY
SARAH MORGAN
RED MOUNTAIN
NICHOLAS MILLS
GLOBE
MICHAEL MIDDLETON
ERIC FIKUS

CALIFORNIA

RIDGEVIEW
KOURTNEY D. FOSTER
RANCHO BUENA VISTA
TARA BEHAN
BELLARMINE COLLEGE PREP
KYLE WARNECKE
RAJAT SHATNAKAR
COLTON
MAGGIE M. FLATTERY
RAMY A. ABOULLOUD
REEDS
ERIK J. GORDENSON
MATTHEW RATHBUN
SAN GABRIEL
HRYN M. HIE
PEIRCE M. KAY
STOCKTON-LINCOLN
THEODORE WOLD
CLEVELAND
JOSE ZAJAC
JULIE MANDELSOHN
SARAH GARBER
MODESTO-BEYER
AARON KRUEGER
ALEX HANWAY
BRYAN ROWE
GINGER GONZAZA
JANRA RAJE
MATTHEW MICHELINI
ROBERT PARVIS
SARAH STEVENSON
STEPHEN SHAPER
ZACK KOPECKI
DANVILLE-MONTE VISTA
MICHAEL CAPUROSSO
CASA DE GUSTO
JESSICA HOUTS
ARROYO GRANDE
JUSTIN WHITAKER
SHERI KOAKES
MINA NASSEER

GALT

CHRISTOPHER FERGUSON
LOS ALAMITOS
DANIEL LINTON
JAMES LOGAN
GERRIT KELSAW
JAMES T. HARRIS
KYLE REYKAIIN
LAMONT J. OAKLEY
MARK S. WOODHEAD
NATHAN FEIEN
PAUL BALDO
ESPERANZA
IVAN CHEN
GABRIELINO
JILL HANHONG
MATTHIAS NAKATSUKI
ERIC CHEN
LA COSTA CAYON
ANDY OXMAN
JULIA CORMANO
FOOTHILL
ANDRE A. THORSON
GRANITE BAY
GINA BATESON

COLORADO

WHEAT RIDGE
DAVID HARPER
MATTHEW A. ZAMBRANO

INDIANS

NORTH CENTRAL
SARAH WILHITE
LOUGANSPORT
BRENDAN GRANGER
MELISSA GHARMAN
MUNSTER
NINA BILIMORIA
NORTHFIELD
BOBBY MCDONALD
BRANDY ADAMS
CHRISTA HOVAR
JASON PARKS
ST. BAVES
FORT WAYNE-NORTHROP
MELANIE BOYTON
PLYMOUTH
COURTNEY
ETHAN AX
MARGARET MILEY
PHILLIP KREIGBAUM
CONNELLSVILLE SR
ANDREW YEAGER

KANSAS

TRINITY
TODD M. JOHNSON
WICHITA-CHITA
BEN BRADLEY
KHABEELE SAYED
TOPMAL
ALEXANDER M. JOHNSON
BRANDON J. NAYLOR
BRIDGET H. NEWMAN
MEGAN R. HIE
MCPherson
HEATH STARR
JAMES BLEY
PETRUS
JON HALL
LAWRENCE
MICHAEL YLKER
PORT JEFFERSON
JAYSON LEEK
JETEN LAD
NATHAN MAGEE
HAVEN
JOSH BEAL
DERBY
KATIE MORPHAGE
GARDEN CITY
BRANDON GILLETTE
MIKE MCBRIDE
MAHATTAN
ERIC M. STEWART
GREGORY W. WATTS
EL DORADO
KENT McCOUSTION
SCOTT JOHNSON
WICHITA-CAMPUS
PATRICK A. YORK
SALINA-SOUTH
JAMES GASTON
JULIE QUACKENBUSH
CHAPARRAL
CHELLIE RAMER
STEPHANIE MOSS
FIELD KINDLEY
IVY M. PERKINS
REMINSTON
AARON DAVIS
JULIE A. PETERS
WASHBURN RURAL
COOPER M. WOOD
LAWRENCE J. JENSEN
BISHOP MIEGE
ANDREW STROBL
MATT SACCACCIO
NICOLE BORGSTADT
PHIL SPER
ROSSVILLE
AMY KELLER
GOODLAND
JAMES BRACE
KRISTEN MUNDAY

ANDOVER

BOBBY FUGIT
LYONS
ADAM MASON
LABELLE COUNTY
KIM GEORGE

LOUISIANA

BOLTON
IAN STANFORD
ST THOMAS MORE
VICTORIA BROUSSARD
ST. MARTIN'S EPISCOPAL
KELLY A. BRUZOLA

MASSACHUSETTS

NEEMAH
SARAH BURG

MAINE

ST DOMINIC REGIONAL
GREGORY BEAM

MICHIGAN

PORTAGE-NORTHERN
AMAN ANSARI

MINNESOTA

MANKATO WEST
RACHEL MILLER
MINNEAPOLIS SOUTH
JOANNA LAWLER
DILWORTH-GYLDEN
BROOKLYN CENTER
JESSICA NELSON
JOSH LANGSTON

MISSOURI

INDEPENDENCE-CHRISMAN
ANGIE ARNOLD
SMITH COTTON
ASHLEY NEWELL
ISAAC ALLEN
SPRINGFIELD CENTRAL
LESLEY INMAN
TYSON KOPP
LIBERTY SR
JAY BAYLOR
KANSAS CITY-
ROCKHURST
DAVID L. FINKE
EDWARD SHELTON
JAMES R. HUFF
JERRY J. SFARIS
ST JOSEPH CENTRAL
CHRISTY CULLOWAY
CLAYTON SR
ADAM HARRIS
NORTH KANSAS CITY
JULIE LIPPMAN
NEOSHO
DAVID MARIOTT
TIMOTHY KENNY
SPRINGFIELD-HILLCREST
DAN NAY
JENNIFER DAMRON
JOE KRAMER
JEFFERSON CITY
CARTER STEWART
SPRINGFIELD-GLENDALE
CLARK QUIEGLEY
MARSHALL
MATT GASS
INDEPENDENCE-TRUMAN
CHRIS MORE
EMILY SHUBKAGEL
JOE MARTIN

NEW MEXICO

FARMINGTON
DARRIC MATTHEWS
TAOS
LAC POTTER
ELDORADO
JASON LOPRESE
JENNIFER ROSSHELTHAL
TERI NELSON

NEVADA

CHAPARRAL
ROY MOAS
TOM ADAMS

(Quad Ruby Students continued in June, 2000 issue)
DISTRICT TOURNAMENT RESULTS

Northam Ohio
DUO —
Andrea Smidt and Taylor Velas, Youngstown-Utica
Jillian Donohue and Jessica Libert, Niles-Mckinley
John Morse and Don Roberts, Austintown-Fitch
GQ —
Mark Awad, Youngstown-Mooney
Jaimie MacDoagall, Austintown-Fitch
USX —
Danielle Gater, Austintown-Fitch
Abner Rubo, South Range
Diane Orlandis, Youngstown-Mooney
FX —
Gina Bublik, Youngstown-Mooney
Brian Katic, Youngstown-Boardman
DI —
Leslie Pachuck, Howland
Dana DeLeonro, Youngstown-Boardman
HI —
Mark Showna, Youngstown-Boardman
Ryan Clausun, Austintown-Fitch
LD —
Heidi LaClair, Canfield
Leo Moore, Warren-Kennedy
Rickey Przybysz, Youngstown-Boardman
TRIP — Youngstown-Mooney

Georgia Southern Peach
CX —
Bren Harris and Johnston Manor, Benjamin E. May
Christopher Warren and James Spanacek, Norwood
DUO —
William Adams and Beth Valley, Fayette County
Emily Kitts and Sarah Hallam, Lee County
GQ —
William Adams, Fayette County
Emil L. Deavers, Gymn Academy
USX —
Timothy S. Taylor, Warner Robins
Rayburn Erath, Thomas County Central
FX —
James Stansel, Norciside
DI —
Thomas Clevenson, Thomas County Central
Adams Bixby, Houson County
HI —
Holly Hill, Thomas County Central
Bark McKey, Thomas County Central
LD —
Avery Stiver, Lee County
Plaque — Carrollton
Trophy — Carrollton

Georgia Southern Peach

Montana
CX —
Ryan Berger and Kevin Rossmeister, Bozeman
Adam Weinhold and Sandy Newman, Bozeman
Emily Yankovich and Matthew Sigur, Skyview
DUO —
Tawny Carey and Seattle Yakubch, Skyview
Nash Meats and Patrick O’Conner, Bozeman
GQ —
B. G. Isler, Flathead Co
Paul Jenahi, Capital
USX —
Abra L. Beller, Butte
Urban Johnson, Great Falls
FX —
Bob Brock, Butte
Chandra Gots, Helena
DI —
Jaimie Puglise, Bozeman
Macon Herzig, Bozeman
HI —
A. J. Dyer, Billings-West
Dustin Dohng, Flathead Co
LD —
Christopher Fredericks, Flathead Co,
Brandon Anderson, Capital
Plaque — Bozeman
Trophy — Bozeman

Westcowl

Central Ohio

GQ —
Max Miller, Arnecky Sr.
Vill Fort Dodge
Sarah Gilland, Arnecky Sr.
Max Miller, Arnecky Sr.
Brian Garfield, West Des Moines-Dowling
Leah Herr, West Des Moines-Dowling
William J. Helmers, Arnecky Sr.
Raine Carson, Fort Dodge
HI —
Eric Wendreich, Arnecky
Kate Bori, Fort Dodge
LD —
Michelle Kelsey, Arnecky Sr.
Leah Herr, West Des Moines-Dowling
Amy Bopp, Dowling Community School
Kesey Malone, West Des Moines Valley
Plaque — West Des Moines-Dowling
Trophy — Carrollton

North Coast

CX —
Brett T. Prato and Matthew J. Schimo, St. Edward
Susan Devlin and Kenny Coleman, Gymn Academy
DUO —
Josh Law and Alex Coke, Shaler Heights
Joan Feast and Angelia Ho. Orange
USX —
Kathryn Harnett, Chagrin Falls
Stephanie L. Liu, Gymn Academy
FX —
Kelli Webb, Mentor
Hannah Geiman, Hawken
DI —
Maja Smith, Solon
Becca Clough, Rocky River
HI —
Emily Savage, Rocky River
Christopher Lukasik, Trinity
LD —
Marti Polinsky, Orange
Tad Borz, University School
Plaque — Gymn Academy
Trophy — Magnificat

Western Ohio

CX —
Lindon Babee and Matthew Wallace, DAYTON-CENTRAL
Liz Kitch and Tristan Sletten, Dayton-Oakwood
DUO —
Joel Goffin and Austin Harvey, Olentangy
Rebecca Weirn and Dan Cox, Dayton-Dowling
GQ —
Joel Goffin, Olentangy
USX —
Kelsie Hinkle, North Lafayette Academy
Jaiden Whittington, Toledo Whitmer
FX —
Kartik Venkatesh, Central
DI —
Meghan Mahoney, Central
Katie Beri, Notre Dame Academy
HI —
Joe Burns, Dayton-Oakwood
Susan Hilt, Notre Dame Academy
LD —
Jennifer A. Bird, Findlay
Samantha Daniel, Springfield-Southwest
Plaque — Dayton-Oakwood
Trophy — Springfield

Rim cities

CX —
Jason Skroban and Adam Zalmer, St. Louis-Louisville
Sven Larsen and Michelle Tomberg, Bethel
Brent Morphy and Derek Hafner, St. Louis-Louisville
DUO —
Colton Lee and Chilson Baker, Franklin Valley
Julie Hall and Amy Cross, St. Louis-O’Conner
GQ —
Michelle Tomberg, Bethel
Swen Larsen, Bethel
USX —
Kyle Devolter, Rapid City-Stevens
Scott Peterson, Sioux Falls-Rosebud
FX —
Jason Stober, Sioux Falls-Lincoln
Kristen R. White, Rapid City-Stevens
DI —
Lisa Nye, Sioux Falls-Lincoln
Jared Krych, Sioux Falls-Lincoln
HI —
Vanessa Hahn, Sioux Falls-Lincoln
Samantha Faw, Rapid City-Stevens
LD —
Matt Amos, Yankton
Lindsey Marquardt, Yankton
Plaque — Sioux Falls-Lincoln
Trophy — Yankton

Eastern Ohio

CX —
Pat Crum and Jon Hawer, Theological Roosevelt
Michael S. Fauquier and Ryan J. Hamilton, Louisville-Senior
DUO —
Jason Mikula and Drew Hall, Lake
Dawn Peterson and Heather Rayner, Carrollton
Mariana A. Tale and Elizabeth E. Lewis, Massillon-Washington
GQ —
Jerry Hodges, Perry
Tiffany Williams, Massillon-Washington
USX —
Dan Perhall, North Canton-Monroe
Seth Lint, Hudson
FX —
Barrett Forster, Wooster
Brian Hoffman, Wooster
DI —
Tania Fox, Carrollton
Alyssa Brown, Massillon-Washington
HI —
Mike Curry, Carrollton
Norelle L. Studds, Our Lady of the Elms
Jenny Kenny, Wooster
LD —
Lyndsey Straight, Coal
Joseph Baranzl, Canton-GlenOak HS Career
Kaitlyn Mitchell, Firestone
Plaque — Wooster
Trophy — Jackson

East Iowa

CX —
Eugene Lutzky and Ben Flas, Iowa City-West
Jacob Nelson and Brian Severson, Cedar Rapids-Washington
DUO —
Jannel Kray Harms and Rachel E. Heiden, Davenport Central
Riley G. Elliott and Shawn M. Staples, Davenport-West
GQ —
Riley G. Elliott, Davenport West
Max Garvey, Davenport Central
USX —
Dylar Shapour, Burlington Community
Emily Cook, Burlington Community
FX —
Ben Joffrion, Moline
DI —
Jennifer Schniede, Burlington Community
Audra Reinhart, Marshalltown
HI —
Daniel P.Sheridan, Davenport-West
Nathan Young, Davenport Central
LD —
Dylar Shapour, Burlington Community
Jacob Schup, Iowa City
Plaque — Davenport West
Trophy — Bettendorf

Western Washington

CX —
Pamela Gerd and Owen Rydman, Auburn Sr.
Mike Severson and Josh Evenson, Puget
DUO —
Darren Miller and Lee Phelps, Auburn River
DUO —
Ryan Kornman, Central Kitsap
Melissa Case, Federal Way
USX —
Brad Johnson, Federal Way
Andy Maloy, Central Kitsap
FX —
Bryan Russo, Federal Way
DI —
Sally White, Auburn Riverside
Esther Conlon, Federal Way
HI —
Chris Allen, Detour
Kemerson Cox, Federal Way
LD —
Melissa Case, Federal Way
Andrew O’Connell, Auburn Sr.
Plaque — Auburn Sr.
Trophy — Auburn Sr.

Tennessee

CX —
Coby Wells and Carli Smith, Alcoa Hill Bible
Eva M. Harris and Tamara Mueller, Mars Hill Bible
DUO —
John Cox and Drew Allen, Beechwood Academy
Vincent Portico and Avery Wise, Brentwood Academy
Andrew Causey and Josh Stilley, Brentwood Academy
GQ —
Theresa House, Collinette
Amelia J. Anderson, Clarksville-Northwest
USX —
Scott Gibson, Cookeville
Adam Johnson, Montgomery Bell Academy
FX —
Alexander Taylor, Cookeville
Theresa House, Collinette
DI —
Tyler Addams, Heritage Covenant School
Shane Hoffard, Henry County
Ivan Perez, Hamblen HS West
HI —
Ed Drewry, Hamblen HS West
Plaque — Portico, Brentwood Academy
LD —
James Stoud, Battle Ground Academy
Rob Walker, Brentwood
Plaque — Brentwood Academy
Trophy — Montgomery Bell Academy

Florida Maratee

CX —
Kevin Shatzkin and Morgan L. Weinbaum, Ft. Lauderdale
Melon Kozyra, Nova
USX —
Brannick Clippinger, St. Mark’s
DI —
Jason Lear, Hollywood Hills
Ramses V. Valenzuela, Nova
HI —
Felicia Robinson, Ft. Lauderdale
Jared Jones, South Plantation
HI —
Herndon Co., Nova
Joe Ross, Nova
Mila Bell, Nova
Plaque — Nova
Trophy — Nova

Colorado Grand

CX —
Jenna Birkhead and Eric Slatier, Fruit Monument
Regina Caputo and Maria Latoria, Pueblo-Central
DUO —
Aaron Jensen and Megan Bowell, Woodland Park
Daniel Lottmann and Jessica Smith, Montrose
GQ —
Mike Simek, Durango
Glitter Jacobson, Fruit Monument
USX —
Ian J. Samuel, Pueblo-Central
Roger Thenen, Canon City
FX —
Keith Cain, Montrose
Thomson Noah, Canon City
DI —
Kenneth Wilson, Delta
Melissa Lord, Ouray
Cyril Bowers, Pueblo-Central
2000 Privacy Handbooks

Secondary Education Affirmative Casebook
→ Over 8 fully scripted winning & useable affirmative cases
→ All evidence exceeds NFL documentation requirements
→ Debate theory explained with examples from current topic
→ Extension evidence on each argument
→ Answers to generic & case specific disads
→ On-point coaching advice – A DALE EXCLUSIVE!

Secondary Education 1st Negative Casebook
→ Well-developed "T" positions with explanation & extensions
→ Generic & case specific harm & inherency positions in block form
→ Counterplans directly relevant to topic with explanations & warnings about use.

Secondary Education 2nd Negative Casebook
→ Generic disads with shells & extension blocks
→ Card-form extensions for longer disads
→ Case specific link cards
→ Case specific & generic solvency blocks
→ 2NC/2NR strategies
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City/State/Zip</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Affirmative Casebook</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Negative Brief</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Negative Brief Book</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Service – All 3 Books!</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$$$Best Buy$$$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Announcing the first annual

Raptor High School Forensics Workshop

in the heart of the Rocky Mountains
at the College of Eastern Utah
• Price, Utah
Debate: July 17-30, 2000
IEs: July 20-30, 2000

We will be offering full-service labs in all divisions of Policy Debate, Lincoln-Douglas Debate and Individual Events, as well as a post camp tournament. We have assembled a top flight staff to work with the students, as well as an impressive series of guest lecturers to address the camp.

$475 for debate/$350 for IEs.
(One of the least expensive camps in the country).
Cost includes room and board
Less than two hours from SLC International Airport.
(We will pick you up & take you back to the airport).

• Staff of over 15 national champions
• Six collegiate director of forensics with over 80 scholarships available between them.
• Join us for a mile-high summer in a comfortable, academic climate.

Tentative staff:
Dean Gundlach
Director of CEU forensics with 10 national championships in four years as well as seven All-Americans.
Matt Stierman
Director of the University of Wyoming forensics and former national debate champion.
John Foy
Debate coach at the University of Wyoming and former national champion.
Joseph Carver
CEU debate coach. Five-time individual events national champion, two-time debate national champion and All-American.
Frank Lameinich
East High School (Salt Lake City, Utah) director of forensics; former director of Roland Hall-St. Marks (SLC); qualified multiple students for nationals in Lincoln-Douglas debate.
Darling Hall
Multiple national champion in IEs from Northern Arizona University.
Brandon Whearty
Limited prep and platform specialist from NAU.

Guest lecturers:
Greg Simmerly
Idaho State University director of forensics, former coach on national champion Southern Illinois University.

Todd Graham
SIU director of forensics, former coach of Northwestern State University, La.

Omar Guevara
Cal State University at Bakersfield director of forensics, former Iowa debater and NDT qualifier.

Terry West
Southern Utah University director of forensics; former director and national champion at Eastern Illinois University.

For more information or to reserve your spot at camp now contact Dean Gundlach:
phone 435.613.5668 • fax 435.613.4102 • email dgundlach@ceu.edu
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<tr>
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<td>e-mail</td>
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<td>copies</td>
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<td>(162) $</td>
</tr>
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<td>OR same items available individually:</td>
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<td></td>
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<tr>
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<td>copies</td>
<td>(11) $8</td>
<td>(15) $</td>
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<td>copies</td>
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<td>copies</td>
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<td>copies</td>
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<td>4-month Update Briefs (Oct-Jan)</td>
<td>copies</td>
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<td>(36) $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE (NFL TOPICS ONLY):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Subscription (all 4 topics)</td>
<td>copies</td>
<td>(76) $64</td>
<td>(100) $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR same items available individually</td>
<td>copies</td>
<td>(19) $16</td>
<td>(25) $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-Oct L-D topic</td>
<td>copies</td>
<td>(19) $16</td>
<td>(25) $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-Dec L-D topic</td>
<td>copies</td>
<td>(19) $16</td>
<td>(25) $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Feb L-D topic</td>
<td>copies</td>
<td>(19) $16</td>
<td>(25) $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-Apr L-D topic</td>
<td>copies</td>
<td>(19) $16</td>
<td>(25) $</td>
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<td>Basic + 6-month Update Briefs</td>
<td>copies</td>
<td>diskette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic + 6-month Update Briefs</td>
<td>copies</td>
<td>(110) $108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR same items available individually:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Casebook (May 15)</td>
<td>copies</td>
<td>(11) $8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Negative Briefs (Aug. 15)</td>
<td>copies</td>
<td>(34) $31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Negative Briefs (Aug. 15)</td>
<td>copies</td>
<td>(34) $31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-month Update Briefs (Oct-Mar)</td>
<td>copies</td>
<td>(39) $34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-month Update Briefs (Oct-Jan)</td>
<td>copies</td>
<td>(28) $24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Florida Sunshine
Senate 1
* O. Joesph Alexander-Hoepner, Hibusborough
* Mark Gordon, Pine View School
P Andy Peterson, Sarasota-RiverView
House 1
* O. David Kim, Hibusborough
* Skyler Wise, Pine View School
P John Dooley, Sarasota-RiverView
House 2
* O. Enid Fisher, Academy of the Holy Names
P Parker Penek, Academy of the Holy Names
House 3
* Sarah肺炎, Sarasota-RiverView
P Altha Bredage, Academy of the Holy Names
North Dakota Roughrider
Senate 1
* Kevin Vogel, Red River
S Robert Mack, Fargo-Shanley
P Brandon Donahue, Fargo-Shanley
P Nahoian Vison, Bismarck Public Schools
House 1
* Shawn Klaas, Fargo-South
* Laura Dugan, Fargo-Shanley
* Brady Littlefield, Fargo-Shanley
* Angolo Kubler, Fargo-Shanley
* Shawn Klaas, Fargo-South
Colorado Senator
* O. John J.M. Rief, Mullen
* Sarah Ray, Columbine
P Sarah Ray, Columbine
P Devon Hanna, Overland
House 1
* Stacey Peeples, Cherry Creek
S David Salado, Highlands Ranch
P Mike Selbst, Mullen
P Brian Suchen, Mullen
House 2
* David Goldman, Cherry Creek
S Kevin Kelly, Columbine
P Brenda Bautch, Cherry Creek
P Sean Kelly, Columbine
House 3
* Sergio R. Gonzalez, Columbine
S Paul Christopher, Overland
P Paul Christopher, Overland
P Meghan Callahan-Peters, Mullen
Hold in the Wall Senate
* O. Ryan Ford, Cheyenne-East, WY
S Justin Jones, Lied, SD
House 1
* Jessica Zeller, Sturgis-Brown
House 2
* Jason Shufflerberg, Cheyenne-East
Montana Senator
* Michael Groth, Flathead Co.
S Andrew Bisell, Flathead Co.
House 1
* Jon Thompson, Capital
S Annie Glover, Great Falls
House 2
* Val Martin, Butte
S Grant Hewitt, Flathead Co.
Utah-Wasatch Senator
* Mike Maquet, Layton
S Ed Stevenson, Ogden
P Clay Campbell, Mountain Crest
House 1
* Jacob Goldberg, Northridge
S Justin Fox, Layton
P Jacob Goldberg, Northridge
House 2
* Stacey Jepson, Mound Crest
S Kimball Allen, Northridge
P Stacey Jepson, Mound Crest
House 3
* Kyle Sedlitz, Layton
* Jayme Thomas, Davis
P Joseph Doncouse, Layton
Northern Lights Senator
* Roger Larson, Duluth-East
* Jesse Maisi, Moorhead
S James Schumann, Dilworth-Glyndon-Felton
P Daniel Olson, Moorhead
* Roger Larson, Duluth-East
House 1
* Andrew Grace, Duluth-East
* Ashley Haile, Walker
* Maryanne Anderson, Roosevelt
* Robin Wheeler, Walker
House 1A
* Ehren Bithner, Duluth-East
* Rebekah Tredil, Duluth-East
S Aaron Weir, Moorhead
P Knute Niv, Grand Rapids
P Jena Laramee, Grand Rapids
House II
* Thomas Reed, Moorhead
S Kishoff Smar, Moorhead
P Josh Langsite, Dilworth-Glynondon-Fenton
P Matt Broughton, Park Rapids
Colorado Grande Senator
* Jonathan Brown, Falls Lake
S Timothy Himerman, Canon City
P Timothy Himerman, Canon City
P Jessica Gibbon, Pueblo-Centennial
Senate 2
* Thomas Nash, Canon City
* Kyle Cheesman, Durango
P Thomas Nash, Canon City
* Tom Blynn, Pueblo-Centennial
House
* Rebecca Stump, Liberty
S Marsha Ayre, Sierras
P Rebecca Stump, Liberty
P David S. Booth, Canon City
House 2
* Jennifer Miller, Canon City
S Matthew Lva, Liberty
P Matthew Lva, Liberty
P Michael Jacobus, Arvada
House 3
* Steven Hunsaker, Canon City
S Juan S. Samuelson, Pueblo-Centennial
P Steven Hunsaker, Canon City
P Whitney Smith, Pueblo
Michigan Senator
* Arvith Korveman, Kalamaazoo Central
S Erich Nagengast, Portage-Central
Amy Ansaas, Portage-Washington
P Erich Nagengast, Portage-Central
House
* Nicole Green, Kalamaazoo Central
S Stellan Zimmerman, Portage-Valle
North East Indiana Senator
* Michael Podgesil, Chesterton
S Melanie Boydon, Fort Wayne-West瑁
P Christin Kershner, Columbia City
House 1
* Lindsay A. Clark, St. John
S Owen Suiter, Chesterton
P Jennifer Lefever,Columbia City
House 2
* Benjamin Borne, St. John
S Amear Zehner, Chesterton
P Brett Moock, Columbia City
Chesapeake Senator
* Terril Smith, Baltimore City College
S Joseph Watts, Caucasian College
P Brian Hollar, Catonsville
P Terril Smith, Baltimore City College
House 1
* Thomas Lantzas, Loyola
S Warren Jones, Baltimore City College
P Warren Jones, Baltimore City College
Sundance Senator
* Cheryl A. Christensen, Jordan
S Sam Peay, American Fork
House 1
* Amy Sullivan, Alta
S Aaron Hergel, Jordan
House 2
* Adam Jensen, Mountain View
P Patrick J. Laqua, Jordan
House 3
* Jonathan L, Leach, Jordan
S Al Hansen, Jordan
Eastern Missouri Senator
* Matthew Markward, Parkway-West
S Andrea Rockwell, Ritenour
P Matthew Markward, Parkway-West
House 1
* Amanda Hedeinger, Pattonville
S Michael Jeffcoat, Rose Bridge
P Amanda Hedeinger, Pattonville
House 2
* Zachary Rackov, Pattonville
S Mark Lande, Ladue Horton Watkins
P Zachary Rackov, Pattonville
House 2A
* Brad Baekler, Ladue Horton Watkins
S Robert LanWRitch, Pattonville
P Brad Baekler, Ladue Horton Watkins
House 4
* J. Fuller, Pattonville
S Will Sierrez, Columbia-Hickman
P Will Sierrez, Columbia-Hickman
Pennsylvania Senator
* Samuel Miller, Dunmore, Beaver
* Elizabeth Dye, Trinity
P Justin Weich, Trinity
House
* Allan Edwards, Greater Latrobe
S Natella Reit, Bellwood-Antis
P Amanda Crable, Uniontown
House 2
* George Grooplo, Trinity
* Richard Morris, Greater Latrobe
P James Fox, Greater Latrobe
West Iowa Senator
* Cameron Hawkey, Herkewar
* Herbert Hoover, Anamosa
P Kaor Moulton, Fort Dodge
P Jay Dugan, Ankeny
House 2
* Keith West, Ankeny
S Rachel Richardson, Sioux City-North
P Sean Boomer, Fort Dodge
P Justin Shapiro, Ankeny
House 3
* Tiffany Leonard, Ankeny
S Dave Daniels, Bishop Heidsieck
P Ben Xandri, Atlantic
House 4
* Kasey Martin, Ankeny
S Amanda Fos, Ankeny
P Brian Presser, Ankeny
P Joe Joesch, West Des Moines-Dowling
Heart of America Senator
* Joe Hendrick, Carrolton
S John Whitlock, Independence-Truman
P Joshua Hendrick, Carrolton
House
* Nathan Edwards, North Kansas City
S Evan Abbe, Kansas City-Oak Park
P A. J. Macho, Park Hill
House 2
* Brandon Swarford, Savannah
S Tyler Scott, Savannah
P Michael Cookman, Carrolton
House 3
* Ojas Allen, Smith Cotton
S Wade Thomas, Kansas City-Oak Park
P Abbas Allen, Smith Cotton
House 4
* Quinn O'Brien, North Kansas City
S Jill Dispenza, Park Hill
P Tomlynn Kupper, Kansas City-Oak Park
Hoosier South Senator
* Andrew Yeager, Connersville
* Chelsea Carrier, Connersville
P Rick Swim, Chryslar
House 1
* Carl Boesning, Connersville
S Evanth Hett, Evansville-Reitz
P Paul Musgrave, Evansville-Reitz
House 2
* Jamie Cales, Evansville-Reitz
S Dana Moore, Evansville-North
P Nick Mancke, Evansville-Reitz
Northern Illinois Senator
* Tom Clarke, Deerfield
S Elizabeth Remien, Glencoe-South
P Kevin Parker, Buffalo
House 1
* Karl Muth, Prospect
S Laila Leigh, Lake Forest
P Karl Muth, Prospect
House 2
* Nick Zawadzki, DeKalb
S Nick Zawadzki, DeKalb
P Nick Zawadzki, DeKalb
House 3
* Michelle Simmons, St. Ignatius
S Vivek Naranaraj, Aslib Stevenson
P Michelle Megan, Prospect
Central Minnesota Senator
* James B. Medof, Monticello
* Bill Baten, Coon Rapids
House 1
* Joshua Huang, Croka Pineview-Central
S Sean Sands, Apple Valley
Deep South Senator
* Jonathan Wall, Mountain Brook
* Andy Gallow, Altamaha School
P D. L.这样, Homewood
House 1
* Ben D. Tull, Homewood
S Jan Turnspeed, Saint James School
P Barnie Rowan, The Montgomery Academy
House 2
* E. L. Stern, Saint James School
S Rich McRoberts, Mountain Brook
P E. L. Stern, Saint James School
Louisiana Senator
* Anthony Berryhill, Newman School
S Luke Hill, St. Thomas More
P Sarah Roy, Labayette
P Luke Hill, St. Thomas More
House 1
* Meredith Clark, Lafayette
S Andre Pires, St. Thomas More
P Andre Pires, St. Thomas More
P Jean Lemaire, Lafayette
House 2
* Dominic Hoile, St. Martin’s Episcopal School
S Ami McElroy, Lafayette-Acadiana
P Dominic Hoile, St. Martin’s Episcopal School
P Amber McElroy, Lafayette-Acadiana
Idaho Senator
* Justin Edinger, Centennial
S Javed Cooke, Hillcrest
P Justin Edinger, Centennial
House 2
* Kevin Smith, Cienega
S Natalie M. Cook, Skyline
P Kevin Smith, Centennial
West Kansas Senator
* Ruth Ann French, Haven
S Neilson S. Walker, Hutchison
P Michael Moore, Hutchinson
House 1
* Debra Evers, Haven
S John McCray, Haven
House 2
* Ashley Chamber, Hutchinson
S Josh Carter, Chapparal
P John Baal, Haven
House 3
* James Bly, McPherson
P Arthur Gebbers, Chapparal
P Megan Becker, McPherson
Mississippi Senator
* Smith Leslie, Clinton
S Brian Griffin, St. Andrews Episcopal School
P Smith Leslie, Clinton
House 1
* Jeffrey Lewis, Clinton
S Jonathan Smoker, St. Andrews’ Episcopal School
P Ricky James, Hattiesburg
House 2
* Sange Goel, St. Andrews’ Episcopal School
S Jason Deichert, Waltham
P Jason Deichert, Waltham
East Iowa Senator
* Daniel Shroyer, Burlington
S Jenny Miller, Bettendorf
P Kristin Haisnit, Bettendorf
P Brian K. Gorden, Davenport-West
House 1
* Amanda Lassance, Walldorf
S Melissa Smith, Bettendorf
P Missy Riley, Davenport-North
P Susan C. Schwartz, Cedar-Centennial
House 2
* John A. Weaver, Davenport-West
S Christine A. Wolf, Davenport-Central
P Christopher R. Raap, Davenport-West
P Alan E. Theode, Davenport-West
From building a solid foundation for novice debaters, to providing the experienced debater with the tools to reach the pinnacle of debating success; Clark Publishing is the complete source for your debate curriculum! For more information visit our Internet web site at www.clarkpub.com or call us toll free at:

(800) 845-1916
(785) 862-0218
http://www.clarkpub.com/
custservice@clarkpub.com
(Chesher from page 41) not necessarily follow that the successful courting of media elites will produce success. We assume that as new media technologies proliferate, presidential efforts to use media outlets will intensify, but the historical record shows a surprisingly constant historical tendency for presidents to attempt media manipulation. We accept as true the idea that presidents must be preoccupied with their coverage, but tend to ignore the backlash which results when presidents end up looking less like leaders and more like performers. We tend to believe skills presidents will always find a way to frame their programs successfully, but underestimate the extent to which the intrinsic limits of the relevant mass medium can constrain such efforts (consider, for example,怎么 attempts to defend free trade are regularly subverted by the east of showing images of trade's downsides - child labor abuses, environmental damage, and the difficulty of visually showing trade's benefits, like lower prices and heightened productivity). And the idea that presidents need only roll out their spinmeisters to direct public opinion their way ignores the typical climate of tension pervading the media's relationship with national politicians.

It is tempting to overstate the benefits of what Jeffrey Tulis first called the "rhetorical presidency" for occupants of the office. It was this sentiment that led former Vice President Walter Mondale to claim the media had turned the presidency into the nation's "fire hydrant." Presidential scholar Mary Stuckey recently wrote that "the rhetorical presidency has created...a dramatic increase in public expectations...More resources mean heightened expectations, which require presidents to find more resources, which in turn raise expectations. The cycle is endlessly self-perpetuating, and is potentially dangerous for both presidents and for the system in which they are embedded." In short, the effects of intensive media coverage are mixed, and hardly unidirectional in the sense often claimed in Clinton disadvantage debates. As Cronin and Genovese put it, "television has both enlarged and shrunk the presidency." Our debates will more accurately reflect the state of the academic research to the extent they acknowledge these mixed effects. Negatives teams are on solid ground when they bolster their internal link by noting that unpopular positions taken by presidents tend to be "piled onto" by the press, an effect which can multiply the risk. But when either team stakes out a position implying that either supporters or opponents of a particular policy will find it easy to shape public reaction, they are sliding around on thin ice.

(Haig from page 31) should be construed as personal attacks. Hopefully the post will spur some sort of response and potentially even a discussion.

Asher Haig ahaig@warped-reality.com Greenhill Debate

"I am speaking the language of exile. This language...muffles a cry, it doesn't ever shout...Our present age is one of exile. How can we avoid sinking into the mire of common sense, if not by becoming a stranger one's own country, language, sex and identity?...Exile is a way of surviving in the face of the dead father...of stubbornly refusing to give in to the law of death." — Julia Kristeva

(Asher Haig debates for Greenhill School, Texas. His post to the CX-L LCX-I @ debate.net, is used by permission)

(Glass from page 37) convinced then ever as to why uniqueness is so critically important? Why on earth would you reject a case which reformed work conditions for slaves because of a criticism demonstrating that slavery was bad? Wouldn't that be even more of a reason TO endorse the affirmative? And where is the warrant in the sentence "A non-unique case turn still serves as an absolute (that is, absolute) solvency take-out with at least a risk of uniqueness"? If the case turn is not unique, it is not a turn. If it is absolutely not unique, then there is no risk of uniqueness. If the case turn proves that the affirmative doesn't solve, then it's an absolute Plan-Meet-Need argument, for which uniqueness is irrelevant.

Mr. Haig agrees on the absurdity of the fiat debate, and doesn't answer the testing rationale for the concept; the notion of change happening as a result of criticism would work doubly well for the permutation, because the affirmative would be the example of change within the context of the criticism. There would be no structure conceptualized by the affirmative, because the permutation would endorse the destruction of such a structure, while still doing some demonstrable good. The dichotomizing of the problem/solution mindset sets up a false distinction.

Finally, Mr. Haig's understanding of Foucault (see the section "Liberation and the Ability to Speak") nicely illustrates the silencing function of the Critique, within the Discourse of Policy Debate. The Critique is an instrument of regulation. It's advocacy is an appeal to silence. It's purpose is a grab for power. It's derivation is argument-forms which failed; it's purpose therefore is to succeed. The Critique is used to silence the affirmative, and is therefore precisely the sort of power-wielding that Foucault was thinking about.

(Dr. David Glass is a cancer researcher, published playwright and debate coach at Edgemont (NY, NC)
SEEKING DEBATE COACH

• Seeking speech communications certified teachers to instruct and coach debate in AAAAA High School Programs.

• Supportive District - Desires Coaches for Competitive Traveling Programs at Regional, State, and National levels.

• Teacher's salary based on degrees and experience, plus Supplemental Stipends for Coaching.

For additional information, contact: Diana Schumacher
NEISD Fine Arts Department
8961 Tesoro Drive
San Antonio, Texas 78217
Tel: (210) 804-7142 Fax: (210) 804-7146 Email: dschum@northeast.isd.tenet.edu

DEBATE VACANCY
COACH

Millard South High School, a 2000 student suburban high school in Omaha, Nebraska is seeking a debate teacher and coach for the 2000-2001 school year.

Millard South has a nationally recognized National Forensic League Chapter and annually has students qualifying for national tournaments. Millard South enjoys strong parent support in all of its student activities including debate. Students are required to complete a communication course as part of graduation requirements, which provides a strong foundation for the debate program.

Inquiries should be sent to: Personnel Office
Millard Public Schools
Don Stroh Administration Center
5605 So. 148th St.
Omaha, NE 68137

Full Time Language Arts
and Forensic Coach Position

Del Norte High School is located in a rural community on the northcoast of California near the Oregon border. The area is a beautiful, natural region ideal for those that love nature. However, nearest competitions for speech are distant.

The current coach has been in the position for thirty years and is getting ready to retire. The community, students, and administration are anxious for the program to continue. The current coach will be available to assist a new instructor.

Advantages:
* Full-time teaching position in language arts including speech
* Coaching stipend
* Paid assistant position
* School budget
* Strong community and administration support
* Traditional, competitive program
* Member of Sacramento Valley League, California High School Speech Association and National Forensic League

Please contact:
Richard Holley, Dir. of Personnel
Del Norte County Schools
301 W. Washington Blvd.
Crescent City, CA 95531
(707) 464-0242
(707) 464-0222
The 9th Annual
METROPOLITAN FORENSICS INSTITUTE

CLASSES & WORKSHOPS

| ORAL INTERP | Literature Selection
|             | How to Strategically Cut the Duo, Prose, Poetry
|             | Duo: Creative Chemistry
|             | Developing Dramatic Narration Skills
|             | Building a Character in Voice and Body
|             | Writing Powerful Introductions

| ORIGINAL ORATORY & DECLAMATION | Top Selection Strategies
|                                | Building Credibility as an Oratory Speaker
|                                | Emotional and Logical Appeals in Oratory Writing
|                                | Organizing the Oration
|                                | Delivery: Controlling the Voice and Body
|                                | Memorization Techniques
|                                | Using the Internet for Research
|                                | Integrating Humor

| I-D | Case Building Strategies
|     | Philosophical Argumentation Skills

| DEBATE | Effective Flow Techniques
|        | Winning Cross-Examination
|        | Dynamite Rebuttals
|        | Using Evidence to Win
|        | Affirm/Neg Construction

Teacher to student ratio is no more than 1:6.

The Institute will run from August 3-9, 2000. Instructional fees and overnight accommodations (in Seton Hall's newer dorms) cost $560 per student. Meals may be purchased on campus at a nominal fee. An instruction-only package is available for $390. Fees include all classes, workshops and Institute materials.

Questions concerning academic credit or Institute information may be directed to Professor Catherine Zizik at (973) 761-9759 or e-mail zizikcat@shu.edu.

SETON HALL UNIVERSITY
1856
400 South Orange Ave., South Orange New Jersey 07079 • www.shu.edu
The upshot for political process debates is a two-edged sword. At this late point in Bill Clinton's term, the connections between public approval, legislative success, agenda-setting, and media manipulation are most attenuated, and the disadvantage most contrived. But this conclusion also implies that, whoever our next president is, the popularity position will be especially viable during his honeymoon period. Debaters should offer arguments more carefully attuned to the rhythms of the presidential calendar.

Finally, our debates should more fully reflect the growing body of research on presidential leadership. The heavy emphasis on evidential recency has produced uninformative argument on the internal dynamics of popularity and agenda-setting. Just one example of this is the continuing reliance on some negative debaters on internal link evidence from Bond and Fleisher's 1990 book, where the more speculative sections and helpful anecdotes are quoted in apparent ignorance of the fact that the overall study finds no effect for presidential popularity on legislative support.
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NFL HONOR AWARDS

Honor Cords

Where allowed, these entwined silver and ruby cords may be worn with cap and gown at graduation ceremonies to signify the graduate has earned NFL membership. Silver is the color of the student key and Ruby the color of NFL’s highest degrees. New silver and ruby colors will not conflict with the cord colors of the National Honor Society.

Chenille Letters

Letter sweaters and jackets will never be the same! New silver and ruby NFL “letters” available in varsity (5”) and J.V. (3”) sizes. Show the jocks in your school that NFL scores!

Order Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduation Honor Cords</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twined</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Entwined (picture not shown)</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NFL Chenille “Letter” (large)</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NFL Chenille “Letter” (small)</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shipping/Handling (entire order)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ship To:

Name
School Name
Address
City State Zip+4
Phone E-mail

Send order form to:
National Forensic League
125 Watson St.
P.O. Box 38
Ripon, WI 54971-0038
or
Phone: 920-748-6206
Fax: 920-748-9478
nflsales@vbe.com
NOTRE DAME HIGH SCHOOL
13645 Riverside Drive • Sherman Oaks, California 91423-2494

DIRECTOR OF FORENSICS

FULL TIME POSITION

• Private Catholic School

• Nationally Recognized Program

• Student population 1,100

Contact: Jill K. Stewart, Vice Principal
Telephone: (818) 501-2300
E-Mail: stewart@ndhs.org

Assistant Speech and Debate Coach and Teaching Positions Available
Gettysburg (PA) Area High School

Full traveling program in the Valley Forge (NFL) District with outstanding forensics program and active Parent Booster Club already in place.

Teaching positions that may be available during the 2000-2001 school year include:

• Social Studies
• Physical Education
• Math/Physics
• Home Economics
• Technology Education

Salary Competitive

Send letter of interest to: Dr. David Mowery, Superintendent
Gettysburg Area School District
900 Biglerville Road
Gettysburg, PA 17325
-or-
Call (717) 334-6254, extension 1212
# NFL's Top 50 Districts

(as of April 2, 2000)

<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>Northern South Dakota</td>
<td>200.77</td>
<td>Watertown</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Rushmore</td>
<td>189.60</td>
<td>Sioux Falls-Lincoln</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Northern Ohio</td>
<td>183.72</td>
<td>Youngstown-Boardman</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Heart of America</td>
<td>182.77</td>
<td>Independence-Truman</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>East Kansas</td>
<td>162.15</td>
<td>Blue Valley Northwest</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>159.28</td>
<td>Bronx HS of Science</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Florida Manatee</td>
<td>157.54</td>
<td>Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Northwest Indiana</td>
<td>157.16</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Show Me</td>
<td>152.47</td>
<td>Blue Springs</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Florida Sunshine</td>
<td>150.75</td>
<td>Sarasota-Riverview</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>East Los Angeles</td>
<td>149.60</td>
<td>Gabrielson</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kansas Flint-Hills</td>
<td>145.00</td>
<td>Washburn Rural</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>South Kansas</td>
<td>141.27</td>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>San Fran Bay</td>
<td>138.64</td>
<td>James Logan</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Sunflower</td>
<td>138.41</td>
<td>Wichita-East</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>California Coast</td>
<td>133.33</td>
<td>Leland</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>West Kansas</td>
<td>132.40</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>128.55</td>
<td>Flathead Co.</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>Illini</td>
<td>128.08</td>
<td>Downers Grove-South</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Central Minnesota</td>
<td>125.56</td>
<td>Eastview</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Hole in the Wall</td>
<td>123.62</td>
<td>Cheyenne-East</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>122.85</td>
<td>Millard-North</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Northern Illinois</td>
<td>120.85</td>
<td>Glenbrook-North</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Eastern Ohio</td>
<td>117.30</td>
<td>Carrollton</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Carver-Truman</td>
<td>117.26</td>
<td>Neosho</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>+37</td>
<td>Southern Nevada</td>
<td>116.33</td>
<td>Green Valley</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>Hoosier Central</td>
<td>112.50</td>
<td>Ben Davis</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Eastern Washington</td>
<td>109.90</td>
<td>Gonzaga Prep</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>Northern Wisconsin</td>
<td>107.87</td>
<td>Appleton East</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>107.54</td>
<td>Sherman Oaks CES</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>106.14</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>North Coast</td>
<td>103.71</td>
<td>Gilmour Academy</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Hoosier South</td>
<td>103.66</td>
<td>Evansville-Reitz</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>101.38</td>
<td>Centennial</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>+19</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain-South</td>
<td>100.47</td>
<td>Wheat Ridge</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Eastern Missouri</td>
<td>100.22</td>
<td>Pattonville</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>+21</td>
<td>Southern Wisconsin</td>
<td>100.07</td>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>+21</td>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>99.80</td>
<td>Redlands</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>99.66</td>
<td>Cherry Creek</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>Western Washington</td>
<td>99.36</td>
<td>Auburn Sr.</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>Southern Minnesota</td>
<td>98.89</td>
<td>Edina</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>+22</td>
<td>Great Salt Lake</td>
<td>98.72</td>
<td>Lone Peak</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Utah-Wasatch</td>
<td>97.54</td>
<td>Layton</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>+26</td>
<td>Orange Blossom</td>
<td>97.09</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>East Texas</td>
<td>96.56</td>
<td>Dulles</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>96.10</td>
<td>Centennial</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>West Iowa</td>
<td>95.70</td>
<td>Ankeny Senior</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>New England</td>
<td>95.68</td>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Northern Lights</td>
<td>94.55</td>
<td>Moorhead</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>+22</td>
<td>West Oklahoma</td>
<td>94.04</td>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>239</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>-</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain-North</td>
<td>93.81</td>
<td>Greeley-Central</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>92.61</td>
<td>Eldorado</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td>Greater Illinois</td>
<td>89.41</td>
<td>Belleville-East</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>89.15</td>
<td>Bethel Park</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>Ozark</td>
<td>89.04</td>
<td>Springfield-Central</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>South Texas</td>
<td>89.00</td>
<td>Houston-Bellaire</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>Valley Forge</td>
<td>88.93</td>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>87.86</td>
<td>Mars Hill Bible School</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>Wind River</td>
<td>86.26</td>
<td>Worland</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>North East Indiana</td>
<td>85.68</td>
<td>Chesterton</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>Big Valley</td>
<td>84.25</td>
<td>Modesto-Beyer</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Nebraska South</td>
<td>84.25</td>
<td>Millard-South</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>Heart of Texas</td>
<td>83.70</td>
<td>Westlake</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>+16</td>
<td>New York State</td>
<td>83.30</td>
<td>Monticello</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Sundance</td>
<td>82.36</td>
<td>Alta</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>82.14</td>
<td>Portage-Central</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>North Oregon</td>
<td>81.53</td>
<td>Gresham-Barlow</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>Big Orange</td>
<td>81.44</td>
<td>Esperanza</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>Colorado Grande</td>
<td>81.26</td>
<td>Canon City</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>South Oregon</td>
<td>79.78</td>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>79.30</td>
<td>Bellwood-Antis</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Carolina West</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>Myers Park</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>75.82</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>Western Ohio</td>
<td>75.58</td>
<td>Dayton-Oakwood</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>+18</td>
<td>Sagebrush</td>
<td>75.33</td>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>East Oklahoma</td>
<td>75.22</td>
<td>Tulsa-Washington</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>Tall Cotton</td>
<td>74.53</td>
<td>Amarillo</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>74.27</td>
<td>Caddo Magnet</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>74.17</td>
<td>Montville</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Lone Star</td>
<td>74.10</td>
<td>Plano Sr.</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>Chesapeake</td>
<td>73.80</td>
<td>Calvert Hall College</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>North Dakota Roughrider</td>
<td>73.22</td>
<td>Fargo-Shanley</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>Deep South</td>
<td>72.75</td>
<td>Vestavia Hills</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>North Texas Longhorns</td>
<td>70.77</td>
<td>Marcus</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>66.12</td>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Georgia Northern Mountain</td>
<td>66.06</td>
<td>Westminster Schools</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>65.75</td>
<td>Blacksburg</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>65.33</td>
<td>Boone County</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>Central Texas</td>
<td>64.94</td>
<td>San Antonio-Churchill</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>East Iowa</td>
<td>64.88</td>
<td>Bettendorf</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>Gulf Coast</td>
<td>63.42</td>
<td>Gregory-Portland</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>61.42</td>
<td>Hattiesburg</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>Capitol Valley</td>
<td>60.36</td>
<td>Sacramento-Kennedy</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>Wheeling Park</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>South Florida</td>
<td>58.93</td>
<td>North Miami Beach</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>Georgia Southern Peach</td>
<td>57.73</td>
<td>Fayette County</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>Puget Sound</td>
<td>57.33</td>
<td>Kamiak</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Tarheel East</td>
<td>57.09</td>
<td>South View Sr.</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Iroquois</td>
<td>41.70</td>
<td>Mount Mercy Academy</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Patrick Henry</td>
<td>40.21</td>
<td>Madison County</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>39.06</td>
<td>Punahou School</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>West Texas</td>
<td>37.72</td>
<td>Montwood</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>George Washington</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Gallatin High School NFL Chapter in Gallatin, TN, coached by Kimberley L. Reed-Bracey, recently performed their third annual "Forensic Follies", a nonprofit show where team members showcase their talents for their parents, teachers, community leaders, and peers.
FORUM
debate and i.e.

August 5-13, 2000
University of San Diego

The one camp that you will walk away from with more than just evidence.

Benefits:

• Experts in the fields of Education, Foreign and Domestic Policy, Law, Philosophy, Theater, and Speech and Debate
• We specialize in personalized attention and individualized coaching. Student to Coach ratio 2/1
• Labs will be scheduled to promote both debate and individual event experience
• Research Labs will be held at USD Library and the USD Legal Research Center
• Forum Tournament - Awards Ceremony - Professional and Community Judges
• One year free subscription to Forensics Online www.forensicsonline.com
• Lodging and all meals included
• Group rates available

RSVP by May 1, 2000 (credit card needed to hold reservation)
Full payment due by June 1, 2000
Fee: Nine day total cost $500 (major credit cards accepted - tax write-off)

www.speechforum.org

For more information, contact Kourtney Kennedy (858) 689-8655 or e-mail forum@axnet.net
P.O. Box 26100 • San Diego, CA 92196-0100
The Debate and IE Forum is a non-profit organization
Great minds think out loud.

Discover the power of speech.

There's no telling just where it will take you. In fact, National Forensic League members learn to communicate and develop the skills they need to succeed in life. They learn to challenge the status quo and search for new ways of doing things with new frames of reference. That's what we teach you. Where you go with it is up to you.

Are you ready to get going? For more information about the National Forensic League, talk with other members or call us at 920.748.6206.