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For and Against: A Debater and Extempore's Handbook
This book supplies excellent, easily understood arguments for and against topical points. Incredibly useful it covers hundreds of different topics. It is concise, wonderfully detailed, readable, and has numerous solid arguments on each side of a topic.

Brand new and designed to give quick good arguments to parliamentary debaters and extemporaneous speakers at every academic level. Topics in the book were included because of how frequently they appear in debate and forensic questions and resolutions!

$19.95, Paperback, app. 229 pages (March 2002)

Sample Topics:
Should the U.S. build an ABM system?; protecting aboriginal groups; AIDS drugs to Africa, economic effects of anti-trust laws, bilingual education, campaign finance reform, car safety, debt relief for LDCs, defense spending, economic growth versus environmental protection, educational vouchers, hate crimes, human rights, juvenile court standards, legal driving age, mass media, government medical policies, national security, nationalism, nuclear proliferation, rich vs. poor, parliamentary vs. presidential government, right to counsel, Columbia civil war, Cuban embargo, political extremism, population control, protecting privacy, religious fundamentalism, sexual stereotypes, privatizing social security, school sports, stem cell research, terrorism, trade...
CDE DEBATE HANDBOOKS
FOR 2002-2003: MENTAL HEALTH CARE
EXCLUSIVE NEGATIVE BLOCKS ON:

TOPICALITY
Federal government
Substantially
Public
Health services
Mental
Health care

INHERENCY
A.D.A.
Medicaid
States
Court precedents
PHS
Dept. of Health
A.M.A.
Insurance

HARM
Suicide
Crime
Death penalty
Economic loss
Trauma
Pain
Pedophilia
Learning disorders
Alzheimer's
Civil rights
Homelessness
Education

JUSTIFICATION
Public
Federal
Increase
Mental

COUNTERPLANS
Interstate compacts
NGOs
Charity & Religion
States

KRITIKS
Science
Medical
disccourse
Reason
Statism
Normativity
Utilitarianism
bodielism

Visit the CDE WEB SITE today
FREE L.D. Blocks
FREE Blocks
FREE web links
www.cdedebate.com

- Handbook set $69
- Kritik, 4th ed. $39
- Affirmative Cases $44
- Really Big Theory Book Block $45
- Internet Research Book $47
- Team Debate Package $209
- Topic Debate Video $49

Mail to: CDE, P.O. Box Z, Taos, NM 87571
505-751-0514 e-mail: bennett@laplaza.org

Name ___________________________
Mailing Address ___________________________
Is public speaking really worth it?

Amy Brocious, Certified Financial Planner
Lincoln Financial Group producer - Northeast Region

There was a time in my life when I hated speaking in front of a group. Because of what I went through each time I gave a speech, I wasn't sure it was worth it. My palms would get sweaty, my heart would race, my neck would get red and my voice would shake. I was sure everyone present had an opinion of me and it wasn't a good one. Since then, when I have to do something I'm not sure I can do or want to do, I ask myself a question. "Is what I want to achieve worth the work and stress to obtain it?"

In most cases, the answer is yes. In fact, I find that successful people in any field are willing to do things that others are not willing to do - and that makes all the difference. Alas, this was true of public speaking as well.

Finding the value in public speaking

It has taken some time, but I now realize the value of public speaking. I am currently the President of the National Association of Insurance and Financial Advisors of Baltimore. It is an association of 400 members who are professionals in the financial services industry. I think it is fair to say that the membership represents the most successful, talented and prosperous financial advisors in the Baltimore area.

I "went through the chairs" of my association after being a member and leading up various committees for ten years. This means I had to serve in every officer position, going from secretary/treasurer, vice president, president elect, and finally, president. It is amazing therefore, that I conveniently didn't notice how much public speaking I would have to do as president. Had I known, I may not have chosen to be elected.

Getting over the fear

It was truly frightening to realize that I would have to lead each meeting with a report on items pertinent to the association. Our year runs from July 1 through June 30 of the following year and our meetings run September through May. It didn't help that my first meeting of the year was held on September 20, 2001. That was nine days after the September 11 tragedy. Talk about feeling insignificant and unimportant! There wasn't much I could say that day that was of interest. We all wanted to be watching CNN.

Becoming a leader

I have learned something about being a leader. I have come to believe my speech experience taught me to be a leader without even realizing it. I have faced a lot of challenges since taking office. We have to constantly fight apathy among the financial advisors in town who don't want to get involved. We have some important legislative issues that have to be dealt with. There is a need to consistently provide educational and professional training for our members. The board of directors had to update our bylaws this year. Most importantly, I had to be able to communicate to members and the community the importance of the association and what we represent. I gained valuable experience for this role through my speech and debate training.

In my opinion, National Forensic League provides fertile ground for growing leaders and public speaking is definitely worth it!
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SEPTEMBER:
National Tournament Results.

---

**NATIONAL TOURNAMENT EXTEMPORE AREAS**

**PER/ASPA/UNITED STATES EXTEMPORE**

- Education and Issues of Youth
- Social Welfare and Health
- America's War on Terrorism
- Constitutional Issues
- Military and Defense
- Media, Sports and Leisure
- Science and the Environment
- Labor, Trade and the Economy
- Politics and Politicians
- State and Local Issues
- American Foreign Affairs and Policies
- Public Affairs and Public Service

**PUBLIC EMPLOYEES ROUNDTABLE EXTEMPORANEOUS COMMENTARY**

- Entertainment
  - 9/11
  - American Literature
  - Names in the News
  - Local and State Issues
  - The Supreme Court
  - Science, Technology, and Health Care
  - The World's Troubles Spots
  - Religion and Society
  - America's 21st Century Challenges

**SCHWAN'S FOREIGN EXTEMPORE**

- American Foreign Policies
- The International War on Terrorism
- Europe
- Global Issues
- Middle East
- Africa
- Central and South America
- Russia and former Soviet Republics
- Asia and the Indian Subcontinent
- Mexico, Canada and Caribbean
- International Agencies
- China and Japan

---

**Tournament Schedule Posted May 15 @ nflonline.org**

Queen City Nationals

Registration Hotel: Renaissance Suites
House Hotel: Marriott Executive Park
Senate Hotel: Airport Sheraton
Super Congress Hotel: Airport Sheraton

Lincoln Financial Group/NFL Nationals L/D Topic

**R:** Laws which protect citizens from themselves are justified.

**2002 National Storytelling Topic Area:**

**Ghost Stories**

The Rostrum provides an open forum for the forensic community. The opinions expressed by contributors to the Rostrum are their own and not necessarily the opinions of the National Forensic League, its officers or members. The National Forensic League does not recommend or endorse advertised products and services unless offered directly from the NFL office.
Frances Berger has coached students to 20 National Tournaments, one of whom attended four Nationals. She coached a 2nd place Debate team, six finalists, five semifinalists, an Outstanding Representative and a Superior Senator. Under her direction Miami Palmetto has participated in 771 rounds of competition at Nationals. Palmetto won the District Trophy twice and the Leading Chapter Award three times. Frances served as District Chair three years and as co-chair of the L/D Topic Committee. Her children, Amy and Charley, were NFL members. Frances earned a third diamond but was one of the highest point coaches in the nation.

Gary Harmon has coached for over 25 years and has earned NFL’s fifth diamond award. He has coached students to 19 National Tournaments, including a Champion Senator in 1988 and several President Officers. Salina Central earned the Leading Chapter Award three times; Sweeptakes Plaque twice, the Tournament Trophy twice and is a contender for the Karl E. Mundt National Congress Trophy. Gary has served as Director of the John C. Stevens National Congress for the past ten years. In addition to being a Congress Leader, Gary is a superior debate coach who has consistently qualified teams to State and Nationals.

Randy Pierce, our excellent host at the 1998 National Tournament, has earned five diamonds. Randy coached six students to Super Congress and five were elected President Officers. Pattonville earned the Senator Karl E. Mundt National Student Congress Trophy in 1998. Randy’s squads have earned the Leading Chapter Award four times; District Plaque seven times and District Trophy twice. Mr. Pierce has earned the Distinguished Service Key and the Distinguished Service Plaque fourth honors. Randy has coached over 90 students to 25 National Tournaments and has served as a National Official.

Sr. Mary Raimonde FDC has earned the Triple Diamond Award and has coached students to 16 National Tournaments. Her students have placed second in Girl’s Extemp and in the finals of Dramatic Interpretation. She has coached several National speech semifinalists and a Superior Senator. Sister served five terms as District Chair. Under her direction St. Joseph Hill earned the Leading Chapter Award twice and the District Tournament Trophy twice. At the NCFL Grand Tournament Sister has coached an Extemp Champion. Sister has worked in the National Tab Room and currently conducts the Extemp Commentary draw at Nationals.

Margaret Riley coach at Academy of the Holy Names has been a Master teacher and coach for over 60 years. She established the Academy chapter in April of 1969 and for over 32 years she and her girls have defined excellence at both the New York State and National Tournaments. Margaret’s students have qualified in Extemp, Oratory, DI III and Congress. Although Academy is a small school by New York standards, Margaret has touched hundreds of lives, earned a second diamond, accepted a Leading Chapter Award, won the District Trophy, and now has been inducted into the NFL Hall of Fame.

CLASS OF 2002
Whitman National Debate Institute

July 21 - August 1, 2002 (2 week session)
July 21 - August 7, 2002 (3 week session)

hosted by Whitman College, home of NINE 2001 CEDA and NPDA elimination teams

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

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

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

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

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

Policy Debate

You experience top-notch instruction in the arguments, theory, and strategies you need to win on the 2002-2003 mental health programs high school topic.
- Ideas for cases, disadvantages, counterplans, etc.
- Intense analysis of the wording of the 2002-2003 topic
- Lectures on kritiks, counterplans, strategies, performativity, and rebuttals.

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

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

LD Debate

You receive an outstanding, well-rounded training in Lincoln-Douglas debate to make you nationally and regionally competitive. You'll be part of intensive discussions on:
- Arguments to use for criteria, values, contentions, and philosophies.
- Key aspects of the 2003 NFL LD topics.
- Lectures on judge adaptation, rebuttals, innovative strategies that win.

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

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

LD and Policy

Want more information?

E-mail Jim Hanson at hansonjh@whitman.edu

www.whitman.edu/offices_departments/rhetoric/camp/
Individual Events Textbooks
- Intercollegiate Individual Events Textbook
- Breaking Down Barriers: How to do Individual Events
  BOTH ARE NEW! They provide specific tips, examples, and ideas for all
  IEs—extemporaneous speaking, oratory, interpretation events, etc.

LD Debate Textbooks
- Assistant Coach for LD Debate
- Breaking Down Barriers: How to Debate
- The LD Prepbook NEW! Helps LD debaters prepare step by step on the
- The Dictionary of Debate and Argument NEW! An outstanding resource
  with hundreds of LD, policy, and parliamentary debate terms defined, given
  examples, and shown how they are used in sentences.

Policy Debate Textbooks
- Assistant Coach for Policy Debate
- Breaking Down Barriers: How to Debate
- The Mental Health Policy Prepbook
- The Dictionary of Debate and Argument NEW! An outstanding resource
  with hundreds of policy, LD, and parliamentary debate terms defined, given
  examples, and shown how they are used in sentences.

Visit www.wcdebate.com

From West Coast to you!
Quality you have come to expect, now for all of forensics!
On-line and printable Order Form available at the web site
West Coast Publishing

Extemp, Parli, Student Congress
- E-News Almanac and E-News supplements
  THIS IS A NEW PRODUCT! Providing a comprehensive review of key issues, news figures, and countries plus updates on the latest news events, these products give your students materials to learn from and use in rounds.

LD Debate Evidence
- Brand New Volume 9 Philosopher and Value Handbook
- NFL LD Topic Supplements
- Texas UIL LD Topics Supplements
- California LD Topic Supplements

Policy Debate Evidence
- The Affirmative Handbook
- The Negative Handbook
- The Kriuk Handbook
- The Fall Supplement Handbook
- The E-mail supplements
- Theory Handbooks Volumes 1, 2 and 3
- The Mental Health Policy Prepbook

Visit www.wcdebate.com

From West Coast to you!
Quality you have come to expect, now for all of forensics!

On-line and printable Order Form available at the web site
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools is putting the finishing touches on its preparations for our Queen City Nationals. The entire Charlotte community is excited at the prospect of playing host to some of the most articulate students in the nation. I am personally hoping that the competitors, coaches, parents and friends of debate will experience the Southern hospitality and cultural diversity for which Charlotte has become famous.

Like most Charloteans, I am a transplant. My parents moved to North Carolina from California and I came to visit. Like many others, I was enchanted by the city's beauty and by the energy that surrounds its educational and cultural communities. I decided to extend my stay for a year. I am now in my eighteenth year, and will probably stick around for the nineteenth.

I am fortunate to work for a school district that supports and encourages academic competition. Debate was selected as our charter project for Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools. Accordingly, every high school has a debate program and we are working to expand those programs.

Hosting Nationals gives us an opportunity to showcase an activity that has long-term benefits that reach far beyond the scope of high school competition. Speech and debate provides students with an understanding of the importance of voice. As we teach advocacy, we are also teaching the need for objective analysis of social, political, and value systems. A democracy cannot survive without the voices of powerful advocates raised in defense of justice and equality.

All events require some analysis of these systems. For example, before an interpreter can understand the motivations of the characters he or she portrays, he must understand the realities that inform that character's motives. The voice of the interpreter is as powerful as that of the orator or the debater.

In June the Charlotte community will have an opportunity to hear young people who are creative, articulate, and well informed. They will hear students who have been taught to carefully weigh both sides of an issue, to come to grips with issues that threaten to destroy a world that is becoming increasingly complex, to find truth in literature. It is a rare privilege to entertain such students, their coaches, their parents and their friends.

Barbara Miller, Host
Welcome to

Queen City Nationals

South Mecklenburg

South Mecklenburg

E. E. Waddell

E. E. Waddell

E. E. Waddell
SECURITY FORM

Please Read Carefully and Return

Due to the heightened national security alert, participants in this year's national tournament will be issued identification cards at registration. In order to process these cards, please send two passport-sized pictures attached to a copy of this form for each contestant, coach, chaperone or judge from your school. These are to be sent by May 1, 2002, to:

Ted Pearson, Security
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
Walton Plaza
700 E. Stonewall Street,
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202

Please complete the following information for each participant:

Name ___________________________ School ___________________________

City/State ________________________ School Phone ( ) ___________________

Please put a check in the appropriate box:

Contestant _____ Coach _____ Chaperone _____ Judge _____

Please list the name of your Charlotte hotel:

______________________________

THIS FORM IS A REQUIREMENT FOR ENTRY

ALAMO CAR RENTAL

RATES

Effective Dates: June 8 thru 29, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Chev Metro</td>
<td>$30/day</td>
<td>$109/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compact</td>
<td>Chevrolet Cavalier</td>
<td>$32/day</td>
<td>$119/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midsize</td>
<td>Pontiac Grand Am</td>
<td>$34/day</td>
<td>$135/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullsize</td>
<td>Buick Century</td>
<td>$36/day</td>
<td>$155/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert</td>
<td>Chev Cavalier</td>
<td>$49/day</td>
<td>$199/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium</td>
<td>Buick LeSabre</td>
<td>$49/day</td>
<td>$199/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minivan</td>
<td>Chevrolet Astro</td>
<td>$49/day</td>
<td>$209/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury</td>
<td>Buick Park Ave</td>
<td>$59/day</td>
<td>$249/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Or similar vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedures

*Alamo provides a twenty-four hour, toll free reservations telephone number (1-800-732-3232). Convention callers simply provide their ID number and Rate Code to receive their guaranteed rates.

Group ID Number

[To receive Alamo's special group rates, attendees may call our toll free 24-hour reservation number, 1-800-732-3232 and request the following: Group I.D. Number #378110 Plan Code GR]
Bannockburn Travel is proud to support the National Forensic League, as it has for several years. Some of our travel management services offered are:

- Special discounted airfare contracts with American Airlines, Delta, & US Air
- Group travel & meeting planning services
- Knowledgeable destination specialists to assist you with all your leisure travel needs
- 24-hour emergency service
- Personalized & friendly service

Contact our Group & Meeting Services Department at
847-948-9111 or 800-227-1908
When greeting begins — press 3 — for Group Department

Bannockburn Travel Management, Inc.
2101 Waukegan Road • Suite 300 • Bannockburn, Illinois 60015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotel Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AmeriSuites - Airport</td>
<td>2450 Oak Lake Boulevard, Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>$59 E/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(704) 423-9931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AmeriSuites - Arrowood</td>
<td>7605 East Point Boulevard, Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>$59 E/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(704) 522-8400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AmeriSuites - Coliseum</td>
<td>4119 S. Tryon Boulevard, Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>$55 Double Suites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(704) 351-8555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Marriott Executive Park</td>
<td>5700 Westpark Drive, Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>$98 D/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(704) 524-9010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-800-228-9290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarion Hotel</td>
<td>321 W. Woodlawn Road, Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>$69.95 D/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(704) 523-1400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Inn Executive Park</td>
<td>3822 Westpark Drive, Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>$59.95 D/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(704) 525-2626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Suites Pineville</td>
<td>10415 Centrum Parkway, Pineville, NC</td>
<td>$59 Q/Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(704) 540-0009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(704) 540-0559 (fax)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtyard by Marriott-Arrowood</td>
<td>800 Arrowood Road, Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>$51 D/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(704) 527-5055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-800-321-2211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embassy Suites Hotel</td>
<td>4800 S. Tryon Street, Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>$99 D/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(704) 527-8400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(704) 527-4383 (fax)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-800-362-2779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HOTEL RATES

(All rates subject to 12.5% tax)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotel Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone Numbers</th>
<th>Rate (D/D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Inn - I-77 Tyvola</td>
<td>440 Griffis Road</td>
<td>(704) 525-0747, 1-800-426-7866</td>
<td>$67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilton Charlotte &amp; Towers (Downtown)</td>
<td>222 E. Third Street</td>
<td>(704) 377-1500, 1-800-HILTON</td>
<td>$88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Inn Express</td>
<td>982 Le射er Drive</td>
<td>(704) 341-1190, (704) 341-1189 (fax)</td>
<td>$62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Inn Woodlawn</td>
<td>212 Woodlawn Road</td>
<td>(704) 525-5350, 1-800-847-7829</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyatt Charlotte @ Southpark</td>
<td>3501 Carnegie Boulevard</td>
<td>(704) 554-1234, (704) 556-7605 (fax)</td>
<td>$95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Charlotte Suites Hotel</td>
<td>2800 Coliseum Centre Drive</td>
<td>(704) 357-1614</td>
<td>$99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheraton Charlotte Airport Hotel</td>
<td>3515 S. I-85 @ Billy Graham Parkway</td>
<td>(704) 392-1200</td>
<td>$79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Park Suite Hotel</td>
<td>6300 Morrison Boulevard</td>
<td>(704) 364-2400, 1-800-647-8463</td>
<td>$99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Deluxe one-bedroom suite
- $89 (2) Queen beds, Deluxe one-bedroom King Suite
- $169 Deluxe two-bedroom suite
Resolved: that the United States federal government should substantially increase public health services for mental health care in the United States.

Victory Briefs—long known for its LD, extemp, and policy materials—is proud to present its materials for the 2002-2003 policy debate topic.

Policy Case Areas — Book 1
This 350-page plus book explores several case areas in depth, including a case area overview, a TAC extension evidence, and negative evidence. Areas include: mental health care for prisons, for foster children, for the DOD, for victims of rape/domestic violence, as a part of Medicare, and for non-drug ADD treatment. For example:
- "In the most public of professions, criminals often experience mental health problems. Due to an oversight by officials, those who are mentally ill often are left untreated and commit worse crimes, injuring others and themselves. Ask the USFG to take responsibility!"
- "In the present system, Medicare coverage for mental health services is limited in scope and in coverage. This case seeks to rectify this gap in the safety net and explore the issues of poverty and age."

Policy Case Areas — Book 2
Areas include: eating disorders, Native Americans, employee benefits, missile silos, post-partum depression, and the homeless. For example:
- "The highest killer of all mental health problems is devastating. Eating disorders hide behind the mask of a diet or perfectionism."
- "Failure to provide adequate mental health care for the homeless overweights other stop-gap anti-poverty efforts and is locking the terminally poor into a cycle of poverty. Despite some recent federal action, only across-the-board federal reform of HCH programs can hope to break this cycle of homelessness."

Negative Positions — Book 1
This book (over 350 pages in length) includes counterplans (courts and states) disadvantages (for courts, congress, federalism, economy), topicality, and comprehensive policy links.

Negative Positions — Book 2
This book (250+ pages) focuses on some of the more important critiques: critical legal studies, feminist jurisprudence, Foucault, and ageism. For example:
- "Popular conceptions of the mentally healthy and the mentally unhealthy are social constructions that are used by the dominant (government, upper class) to oppress the periphery (in this case, the "crazies"). Humans should stop judging others on perceived mental health—it is a standard that can only be used to strengthen the elite."

victorybriefs policy

Who are we? We are some of the most successful ex-high school and current college debaters, as well as some of the most successful policy debate coaches. Victory Briefs has assembled an all-star team of writers:

Eddie Ahn A former debater for the Green Hill School of Dallas, Eddie placed in multiple elimination rounds including Valley, St. Mary's, Texas, and Harvard. 2001 TTA State top speaker.

Thad Blank NDT First Round Debater, CEDA State Quarterfinalist, 2nd time NW CEDA Champs Champion, 2002 Northwestern Finalist

Ben Coulter is the debate coach at Stanford University. While a debater at Baylor University, he and his partner were awarded a First Round At-Large bid to the NDT and competed in the elimination rounds, making it to the Octofinals.

Doug Dennis is a policy coach at St. Thomas Academy, MN

Kevin Kneupper is a sophomore at Wake Forest University (octo at Kentucky, octo Northwestern quarters Georgia State)

Chris McFarlane is a senior and captain of the University of Southern California debate team where he received two first round invitations to compete at the NDT. He attended Notre Dame High School where he competed in elimination rounds of virtually every major tournament including MBA, the Glenbrooks, and the TOCs.

Jason Peterson Assistant coach at USC and Darnell High School; 2006 NDT quarter-finalist. Teaching at Michigan Debate Institute.

Shaw Powers is a rising senior at the University of Georgia, and has qualified for the NDT every year he has competed in college. Shaw placed second at the UC-Fullerton college tournament in 2001.

Eli Rosenbaum is a first-year student at Harvard. He debated at the Georgetown Day School in Washington, D.C., where he cleared at the 2001 TOC, was 2nd speaker at the Glenbrooks, 5th speaker at St. Mark's, and the winner of Lexington. He reached the 2nd elimination round of most major national tournaments.

Nicole Anne Serrano poised to be one of the best debators on the NDT/CEDA circuit in the 2002-2003 season. Serrano has been in late elimination rounds of the most difficult national tournaments. Serrano is also one of the most successful high school assistant coaches, coaching four national champions including NFL, CFL, and the TOC.

Justin Skarb CSU Fullerton

Marissa Silber USC debate squad; four-year debater from Glenbrook North; 4th place NFL Nationals in Policy Debate (2000)

Jason Stone Director of Debate at Univ. Central Oklahoma

James Thomas A rising sophomore at the University of West Georgia, James debated for Pace Academy in Georgia, winning the class AA state championship twice and the All-state championship. James won the Lexington and GDS tournaments (top speaker at GDS) and was in the finals of the Harvard tournament.

Nate Trible started debating in 7th grade for the Head-Royce School. Nate cleared at most of the major national high school tournaments. Nate was 2nd speaker at the USC tournament, 1st and 2nd speaker at Stanford, and was in the finals of Stanford. He currently debates for the University of Redlands.
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Policy Debate

Resolution: that the United States federal government should substantially increase public health services for mental health care in the United States.

Policy Case Areas—Book 1
- download version $50
- hardcopy version $60

This book (over 380 pages in length) is packed with affirmative and negative analysis and evidence. Areas explored include: mental health care in prisons, foster care, violence, and domestic violence; in connection with medicare, in connection with the DOD, and for AIDID.

Policy Case Areas—Book 2
- download version $50
- hardcopy version $60

Areas explored include: mental health care for eating disorders, for Native Americans, for persons who work at risk, those who work at risk, and risk to the homeless. (Over 390 pages in length.)

Negative Positions—Book 1
- download version $50
- hardcopy version $60

This book (over 30 pages in length) is packed with counterpoints (facts and states), benefits, and comprehensive policy links.

Negative Positions—Book 2
- download version $40
- hardcopy version $50

This book (over 260 pages in length) is packed with counterpoints (facts and states), benefits, and comprehensive policy links.

**SPECIAL PACKAGE DEAL
ORDER THE SET OF ALL FOUR POLICY BOOKS AND SAVE OVER 10%**
- download version $170
- hardcopy version $240

How to Policy Debate Handbook
“Mastering Championship Debate”
- download version $35
- hardcopy version $46

1. Order more than $250 at a time, and receive 10% off your order.
2. Please remember that Victory Briefs are copyrighted material, and should not be copied.
3. You can get more information, and order online, at www.victorybriefs.com.
4. Mail this order to: Victory Briefs, 1144 Yale St. #3, Santa Monica, CA 90403.
5. Questions? Contact us at info@victorybriefs.com, (310) 453-1681, or fax us at (208) 248-9801.

Lincoln-Douglas Debate

NFL Topic Handbooks (download)
- NFL1 (Sep/Dec): av. R/16/02
- NFL2 (Nov/Dec): av. T/16/02
- NFL3 (Jan/Feb): av. 2/16/02
- NFL4 (Mar/Apr): av. 3/17/02
- NFLNATS av. 5/2003

NFL Topic Handbooks (hardcopy)
- NFL1 (Sep/Dec): av. R/16/02
- NFL2 (Nov/Dec): av. T/16/02
- NFL3 (Jan/Feb): av. 2/16/02
- NFL4 (Mar/Apr): av. 3/17/02

How to LD Debate (download) $55
How to LD Debate (hardcopy) $69

Value Handbook 1 (download) $22
Value Handbook 1 (hardcopy) $36
Value Handbook 2 (download) $25
Value Handbook 2 (hardcopy) $39
Value Handbook 3 (download) $25
Value Handbook 3 (hardcopy) $39

**SPECIAL PACKAGE DEAL
ORDER THE COMPLETE VALUE HANDBOOK SET (VOLS. 1, 2 & 3) AND SAVE NEARLY 20%**
- download version $160
- hardcopy version $175

Criteria Handbook (download) $50
Criteria Handbook (hardcopy) $56
Philosopher’s Guide (download) $50
Philosopher’s Guide (hardcopy) $56

This handbook covers the key philosophers that every LD debater needs to know: Rawls, John Stuart Mill, Immanuel Kant, John Locke, and others. The book focuses on the key areas of each debate (and evidence), and how you argue and apply the philosopher in a debate round.

1. Order more than $250 at a time, and receive 10% off your order.
2. Please remember that Victory Briefs are copyrighted material, and should not be copied.
3. If you would like to order classroom sets, or make special arrangements, please contact us.
4. You can get more information, and order online, at www.victorybriefs.com.
5. Mail this order to: Victory Briefs, 1144 Yale St. #3, Santa Monica, CA 90403.
6. Questions? Contact us at info@victorybriefs.com, (310) 453-1681, or fax us at (208) 248-9801.

Extemp

Economics for Extempers
- download version $25
- hardcopy version $31

Often one of the most interesting topics for an extemp. It is the economy: both domestic and foreign. This handbook is designed to teach the extemp. all of the basic economic principles they need to understand, and to explain in a more advanced manner how to add depth to their arguments/statistics specific.

How to Extemp (download) $51
How to Extemp (hardcopy) $96

Advanced Extemp
- download version $20
- hardcopy version $24

This book by Chris Kratoch, a two-time College Nat’l Champion, reveals the strategies and techniques necessary for any appearance of extemp. to take it to the championship level.

US Exttemp Briefs
- download version $25
- hardcopy version $29

Published in 2000, these innovative, unique handbooks (one for U.S. and one for foreign) provide the background and historical information that extempers can use to understand their knowledge of current events. By teaching extempers about certain areas, the goal is to give a better understanding and to enable a more insightful analysis of current news. This book is not outdated (and thus unlike the debate handbooks), but teaches students how to approach certain current events areas.

For more information, or to purchase these books, and for free samples, please visit www.victorybriefs.com.
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10% discount if order over $250

CA Residents add 8% sales tax
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Introduce and Improve
Debate Skills!

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

An introduction to contemporary basic debate for beginning and intermediate debaters

- Revised and streamlined to include the most useful, current information, this text focuses on policy debate with chapters on Lincoln-Douglas debate, Student Congress, mock trial, and parliamentary debate.
- Examples and graphics explain:
  - debate history, theory, and ethics
  - debate formats
  - research sources, including electronic
  - argumentation
  - rebuttals
  - defense
  - the judging process
- A Teacher's Manual includes activities, grading strategies, utilizes and answer keys, and much more!

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

- The most complete introduction available on preparing for and participating in the Lincoln-Douglas (L-D) debate format, this text features short, well-designed chapters to move students through L-D analysis, case construction, and case defense procedures.
- Students will learn about:
  - L-D theory
  - The difference between L-D debate and policy debate
  - values and how to choose research value topics
  - preparing cases
  - developing rebuttal strategies
  - improving delivery skills
- A Teacher's Manual features activities, additional Lincoln-Douglas topics, tests, quizzes and answer keys, and much more!

Clark Publishing
Perfection Learning® Corporation

Call or visit our Web site today for a FREE catalog!
phone: (800) 831-4190  •  fax: (800) 543-2745  •  web: perfectionlearning.com
How to Institutionalize a Debate Class in Your School

Democratic education and tradition are reinforced through debate. At its best, debate is a rigorous and passionate discussion about social change and how it is achieved. Through the debate process, students research an important social issue ensuring that they are well-versed in current events and governmental decision-making. Debates provide experiences that prove to students that they should not be intimidated by the rhetoric of expertise that surrounds decision-making in our society, thereby connecting them to public life and the responsibilities of citizenship.

That is what we do. Teaching debate is a task

essential to maintaining an effective democracy. However, not everyone understands this. When this message is understood, students will benefit, debate teams will receive greater support, coaches will find themselves acknowledged and respected for their work, and debate will permeate the culture of a school.

This article is a resource for advocating for a debate class in your school and district. In most schools, the debate coach cannot just decide to teach debate as a class. To secure a space for debate in the school's curriculum, advocates must turn their powers of persuasion to their principal. This is easier said than done. For example, a principal might acknowledge the potential utility of a class, but insist that the school schedule is already full. A group of coaches, debaters, and parents must convince the principal that a debate class is a vital way to support the debate team, the debate coach, and the school as a whole.

Although it requires work, there's no group better suited to conduct an advocacy campaign to communicate the importance of a debate class. Efforts to institutionalize debate classes in our country's high schools cannot succeed with YOU. You have the best understanding of the importance of debate in your school. You are in every corner of the United States. You can reach out to principals throughout the country and convince them of the importance of debate.

This article presents a series of "talking points" that coaches and other advocates for debate can use when encouraging school administrators to add a debate class to their school's curriculum. For the past five years, Urban Debate Leagues (UDLs) have worked with teachers to build sustainable debate programs in our nation's urban public schools - and many UDL coaches have successfully lobbied for debate classes at their schools. This guide draws from interviews with UDL coaches, administrators, and alumni from across the country. We are indebted to these UDL participants for sharing their thoughtful efforts with us.

A DEBATE CLASS BENEFITS THE DEBATE TEAM

A class gets students involved in debate that might otherwise never join the team, and provides students with the support they need to keep debating once they have joined. An UDL alumni who works with the Tuscaloosa Debate League points out that in Tuscaloosa, the schools with a debate class "usually have the biggest participation." A debate class:

- Ensures that students with after-school conflicts have the opportunity to benefit from debate.

After-school work and family commitments are a significant barrier to participation in debate. A New York City coach explains, "most of these kids have jobs or take care of their brothers and sisters after school and can't come to debate after school." An Atlanta UDL alumni concurs, stating, "if we didn't have the [debate] class we would have to practice after school and most people work after school." Another coach from New York City emphasizes, "a lot of these kids have jobs and baby-sitting chores... But if there's a class, [they] can be there."

A class allows students with these conflicts to participate in debate. As one coach emphasizes, "We couldn't have [built this team] without having the class. It would have been a completely different team. It wouldn't have been the same kids." Another coach agrees, adding that when students start to debate in a class, "they have a chance to get hooked, and once they're hooked, they start making different arrangements [like] working different days or getting someone else to care for the kids."
2001 Staff included:
**Ross Smith**, Dir. Of Workshops and WFU Debate Coach
**John Katsulas**, Dir. Of Debate at Boston College
**Tim O'Donnell**, Dir. Of Debate at Mary Washington University (VA)
**Stefan Bauschard**, "Mr. Hitchhiker" and debate coach at Boston College
**Kim Shanahan**, Debate Coach at Hays High School (KS)
**Justin Green**, Debate Coach at Dallas Jesuit (TX)
**Eric Truett**, former coach at Edison HS (VA) and WFU, currently in law school
**Wes Lotz**, former WFU debater
**Wake Forest Graduate Debate Assistants, Jarrod Atchison, Jason Mika & Rae Lynn Schwartz.**
Assisted by current WFU debaters in labs and dorm.
**Virginia Bannigan**, Adm. Director, Adm. Asst. for WFU Debate

Join the Wake Debate tradition for Summer 2002!

**For: Summer 2002**

**WFU Summer Debate Workshop**
PO Box 7324, Reynolda Sta.
Winston-Salem, NC 27109
(336) 758.4848
bannigva@wfu.edu

Unique, small, educationally sound size: The three-week workshop is limited to 120 students. The Policy Project is limited to 64 students: large enough for diversity, interest, practice, and productive sharing. No one gets "lost in the shuffle" -- group effort, friendship, and teamwork is developed across the workshop. Labs have no more than 16 students, working with two full-time coaches: allowing close, personal attention. Our curricular model emphasizes interactive learning and discussion. We have small classes for many of the kinds of subjects like theory and speaker positions that other workshops relegate to mass lectures. Our curriculum is rigorous and challenging, but we do everything possible to involve the students in a dialogue, to get them to think with us. We seek motivated students with whom we can share our passion for policy debate.

Our workshops maximize a student's opportunity to work closely with all of our faculty. The three-week workshop labs are tracked according to experience, but students get to work with other instructors in theory seminars, skills classes, and practice rounds. The Policy Project is not tracked. Our philosophy is that everyone at that level deserves the best we can offer. Research is always shared among the labs; the entire workshop functions as a team to produce the finest set of relevant evidence of any workshop. We have special affirmative and negative research groups, seminars in theory, forums on issues of interest, at least 8 practice debates prior to the tournament and a well balanced, limited set of lectures. By sharing evidence and pooling our vast coaching expertise, we are also able to find time for more qualitative practice debating than most other workshops. Thus the slogan, "We put debate back into the debate workshop!"
Summer Debate Workshop:  
June 15-July 3

Policy Project:  
July 5-July 30

Policy Analysis Seminar:  
June 28- (merge with PP)

Fast Track:  
June 21- (merge with PP)

WFU Debate Workshops

We offer 4 different levels of workshops to allow students to attend the “best match” for their experience & skills:
The Summer Debate Workshop has a curriculum designed to meet the needs of novice to advanced students. All interested students are welcome to attend the SDW.
The Policy Project is designed for more advanced debaters and has a competitive entrance process. We seek students who have solid debate experiences and want to build upon that base to get to the next level.
The Policy Analysis Seminar is an extra week before (and leading into the Policy Project) to explore specific topics, readings, and discuss their impact.
The Fast Track is an extra two weeks (leading into the Policy Project) of intensive study and debate practice with Ross Smith and another faculty member.

Mission Statement: Debate is the thoughtful expression of focused ideas. As educators, we commit ourselves to emphasizing individualized instruction, original thought, and creative expression. We teach students skills and concepts that will enrich their debate and academic experiences. We recognize the fundamental importance of an in-depth knowledge of the issues generated by academic debate topics. We view competition as a fun and useful educational tool, not as an end in itself.

Special points of interest:
- Air-conditioned dorms and classrooms!
- Refrigerator and microwave in every dorm room!
- Excellent, totally up-to-date research facilities!
- Faculty coaches at national-level high school and college programs!
- Maximum 8:1 student: teacher ratio!
• Increases the number of students who debate because it helps include students from all academic backgrounds.

A debate class helps make debate an activity for all students, not just the best students or those who join every after-school activity. A coach from New York City emphasizes that his debate classes include students from all backgrounds. Another coach from Newark, New Jersey describes the same phenomenon at her school. If debate were after school, she says, it would attract the “group of kids that come to every after-school” activity. Because debate is taught as a class, her team does not attract only those students. In her words, “It’s not the best students on this team. It’s the kids who happen to be put in the debate class. And some of them are the best students and some of them are really not. But, they’re involved in the activity and they stay involved. Once they come to a debate, they get hooked.”

• Helps students build a relationship with their coach, making them more likely to stay on the team.

When a coach teaches a debate class, he gives the coach a daily venue to see and build relationships with their debaters. A coach from Newark, New Jersey observes that although he started the year with students from the entire building, by the middle of the year “after the weeding out process, the students that were most excited about [debate] were the students in my own classes.” When students have a strong relationship with their coach and regular times to work on debate during the school day, they are more likely to stick around.

• Provides incentives for participation in tournaments.

Grade incentives are a useful tool for encouraging participation in tournaments, especially for novice debaters who might be reluctant to give competitive debate a try. One Atlanta UDL alumnus remembers how his coach convinced him to attend his first tournaments. He recalls, “we were basically plucked from class and told to go.” Over ten years later, he is still actively involved in debate and fondly remembers the class. A coach from New York explains that grade incentives were very effective in her class. On her team, “anybody who comes [to the first tournament] gets an automatic passing grade on the first markup period,” and then, she says, “the whole class is there.”

A DEBATE CLASS DEMONSTRATES SUPPORT FOR THE COACH

Debate coaches are not only the heart and soul of the debate team - they also provide an important service to the school as a whole. Administrators would be well-served to support and reward these dedicated teachers. A debate class:

• Shows acknowledgment for the efforts of the coach.

Adding a debate class to the school curriculum is a tangible way in which administrators can demonstrate institutional support for the debate team and the hard work of the coaches. Coaches are generally overworked and under-compensated. A coach from Newark, New Jersey observes that coaching entails working weekends, attending to administrative details, coaching arguments, and running practices in addition to all the usual responsibilities of a teacher.

A class awards, recognizes, and compensates a teacher for the long hours they already invest in the team. Although coaches will “never be compensated” what they deserve, a class makes coaching debate a more appealing option to a teacher not currently involved with the activity.

• Gives coaches time to work with their debaters during the school day.

The everyday responsibilities of a teacher leave little time to do extra things like coach debate. Sue Lowrie of the Southern California UDL explains that teachers, “don’t have enough prep time. They have 30 to 40 students in every class. That means that during the course of a day, they have somewhere in the range of 200 to 250 students coming through that are turning in papers that they have to grade. It’s just an insane amount of stuff that [teachers] have to deal with.”

A debate class alleviates some of this burden. An English teacher, for example, instead of teaching five English classes would teach four English classes and one debate class. According to a teacher from Detroit, a class gives a coach “a break from teaching 35 kids English and correcting all those papers” and allows the coach to work on debate during that time. The class gives a coach a time in the day when she can meet with her debate team.

A DEBATE CLASS ENHANCES THE CURRICULUM

Debate is more than just an extracurricular – it is a rigorous academic activity. A debate class can help a school meet its educational goals and enhance the overall curriculum. A debate class:

• Enriches the academic environment of the school.

We know that debate improves academic achievement. Participation in debate teaches students public speaking, persuasion, argument construction, and communication skills indispensable to young people in search of their voices. Debate also teaches students the pragmatics of library research, electronic information retrieval, policy evaluation, and critical thinking. Debate transposes the excitement and intensity of an athletic contest onto a rigorous academic exercise. Research indicates that high school debate students receive higher grades than comparable students involved in any other extracurricular activity. Debaters graduate from high school as motivated and intellectually curious young adults, and are also more likely to pursue a post-secondary education.

The debate class benefits the school by increasing the number of students who have access to debate. Even large debate teams only reach between 30-50 students. In three sections of a debate course with 30 students each, another 90 students are reached. This magnifies the benefits that debate imparts on a school. George Ziegmueller, a professor who works with the Detroit UDL, Wayne State University also points out that debate classes bring debate to schools that “run a debate class but don’t have a competitive debate program.”

• Requires rigorous academic work that warrants course credit.

Tournaments, library research, practice speeches, and strategy sessions – a debater often completes as much academic work for debate as he or she does for any high school class. The debate curriculum includes substantial work in public presentation and
argumentation, but also in the content area of the resolution. John Meany, a debate coach from Claremont College who works with the Southern California UDL, explains that the work required for debate "would meet class requirements if students were studying Economics, History, Philosophy, International Relations or any of the issues that come up in debate research and argumentation."

- Helps students meet school educational standards

When advocating for a debate class, it is important to understand the mission that guides your principal's and school's decision-making. The call for standards increasingly shapes how administrators make decisions. To ensure that a debate class has a place in your school's curriculum, talk about how a debate class can help your school meet its particular educational goals. For example, the following is an excerpt from a letter drafted by New York UDL teachers on behalf of debate:

"English standards measure student performance in skills that debate coaches have been teaching students all along, including listening comprehension, reading comprehension, policy analysis, and oral persuasion... Math standards measure student performance in logical argumentation and sequential analysis, yet another set of skills taught by debate."

We hope that you will find these talking points useful as you work with the administration of your school to make debate an integral part of your school's curriculum. Debate teams and coaches are invaluable assets to our nation's schools. The addition of a debate class to the school curriculum not only supports the debate team and its coach; it also weaves democratic values and education more fully into the fabric of the school.

---

1 Direct quotations are taken from interviews conducted by the authors with teachers, staff, and alumni from UDLs in New York City, Newark, New Jersey, Southern California, Detroit, and Atlanta. Full transcriptions of the interviews are on file with the authors.

2 Letter on File with Authors

---
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FORENSICS

Compete in College Forensics

Join the nationally competitive speech team at Eastern New Mexico University and participate in CEDA and NDT debate, and 11 individual events.

Travel is concentrated in the Rocky Mountain region (Arizona, Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming) and the midwestern states of Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma and Texas.

For information about the program, scholarships, and the academic program offered by the University, contact Anthony B. Schroeder
A.Schroeder@enmu.edu

1-800-FOR-ENMU

Eastern New Mexico University

Department of Communicative Arts and Sciences
ENMU Station 3 * Portales, N.M. 88130
What have we got?

- A comprehensive institute that offers top-notch instruction in Interpretation, Extemporaneous Speaking, Oratory, Lincoln-Douglas, and Student Congress

- Alumni who consistently are in elimination rounds at every major tournament

- Instructors from across the country who are simply the best at what they do...come learn from Tony Figliola, Dave Kraft, Fr. John Sawicki, Kandi King, Lisa Miller, John Buettler and so many more

- Oh, and you get all of this in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida at a full-service hotel

We’ve Got It All!

Florida Forensic Institute
July 26-August 9
For more info and registration go to www.forensics2000.com
So... figure this one out...

why?

did one group of students win every one
of the following awards over the past four years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NFL National Qualifier</th>
<th>NFL National Qualifier</th>
<th>Emory Champion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest Champion</td>
<td>Blue Key Champion</td>
<td>Harvard and Emory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 6 at NFL &amp; CFL Nationals</td>
<td>5 of 6 Top Spots at Yale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPenn Finalist</td>
<td>Harvard National Champion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestian Champion</td>
<td>NFL Super Sessionist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

multi-state championships  NFL National Champion
and the reigning NFL National Champion

the answer is simple:
they all attended the

FLORIDA FORENSIC INSTITUTE

why? FFI!

The New L-D Lab at the Florida Forensic Institute

- Directed by Kandi King of Texas
- Nationally Known Lab Assistants
- Outstanding Guest Lecturers
- Emphasis on Philosophy
- Style and Delivery Workshops

Novice, JV, & Varsity Divisions
Fully Critiqued Practice Rounds

www.forensics2000.com
Coaches...
Veterans & Novices...
Do You Want...?

- Interp Coaching techniques from one of the best Interp Coaches ever...Tony Figliola
- Extensive materials, including cuttings, classroom materials, and other sources
- Exttemp Content & Style Lectures from a truly brilliant source...Fr. John Sawicki
- Extensive current events analysis that you can pass on to students in the classroom
- Oratory content, style, and topic analysis, with classroom curriculum materials
- Student Congress curriculum and teaching techniques
- Team management, scheduling, budgeting, fundraising, and other logistical tips
- Live and Video taped performance examples from the students who have won it all
- Individualized needs met based on your level of experience
- Expansion or Refinement of your coaching repertoire
- Housing in a full service hotel
- The surroundings of Fort Lauderdale, South Beach, and the Atlantic Ocean
- All this and more in a ONE WEEK FORMAT, while you earn

THREE GRADUATE CREDIT HOURS
(Credit hours are applicable to re-certification and/or master's degree coursework)

This experience is guaranteed to help you develop your professional skills and make you a better coach, provided in a very friendly, enjoyable format.

The 2002 National Coaching Institute

And...the fees are reasonable. The NCI will provide all necessary documentation to support funding requests from your school or school district. Financial aid is available for coaches who do not receive school funding.

For more information, or to email your questions, please visit

www.forensics2000.com
Some Do Not's for Oratorical Clarity

by
Wayne C. Mannebach

Part Two: Equivocation, Superficial Resemblance, and Faulty Syntax

Learn What Not to Do!

As mentioned previously in "Some Do Not's for Oratorical Clarity - Part One: Verbosity, Over-Conciseness, and Profundity" (Rostrum 7 [March 2002, 42-43, 46-47]), perhaps the most practical way to improve oratorical effectiveness is to focus on those features which compete with clarity. In other words, by knowing what not to do, the orator can focus on what should be done. This article stresses equivocation, superficial resemblance, and faulty syntax.

...... Numerous reasons account for oratorical ineffectiveness, and equivocation, superficial resemblance, and faulty syntax are among the most notorious.

Don't Equivocate!

Shortly before being killed in combat, Shakespeare's Macbeth said to Macduff, "And be these juggling fiends no more believed That poster with us in a double sense. That keep the word of promise to our ear, And break it to our hope." (Macbeth VII, viii.). Macbeth was talking about one of the major reasons why some orators are unsuccessful, namely that they equivocate; they assign intentionally or unintentionally two or more meanings to a particular word. The audience then becomes confused because of the unknown change in meaning.

For instance, a college orator argued that "the United World Federalists have many prominent members. Some of their past members are Washington, Adams, and Hamilton. In the names of these great fathers of our country, I urge you to support the United World Federalists!" In the first sentence, the word Federalists refers to a federation of various countries. In the second sentence, the orator implied the word Federalists. However, the meaning of the implied word does not apply to a federation of countries, but to a federation of American States. The orator equivocated.

A university debater opposed to miners' demands for more money and fewer working hours argued, "It is ridiculous for miners to want more money for only 32 hours of weekly labor. Why, whenever a cave-in occurs, they willingly work for 48 straight hours to free their entombed buddies." The debater assumed that the miners should work long hours all of the time because they work long hours some of the time. In the first sentence, work refers to labor for private financial gain, whereas in the second sentence, work refers to labor voluntarily conducted to save human life. The debater equivocated.

A high school debater argued that "the United States demands that nations should reduce their nuclear stockpiles. All right! The United States is a nation, so the United States, too, should reduce its stockpiles." In the first sentence, the United States refers to the President and certain advisors, whereas in the second sentence, the United States refers to the fifty States. Also, in the first sentence, nations refers to nations considered jointly or collectively, whereas in the second sentence, nation refers to an individual nation. The debater equivocated.

Sometimes equivocation occurs because of the sound of the word. Consider, for example, the American professor who had been invited to lecture at a Japanese university. Visiting the campus before his scheduled time to speak, the professor was impressed by the size and unity of the school. In the introduction to his lecture, the professor intended to express admiration for the university by saying, "What a whole is your university!" Some "anti-establishment" students immediately applauded, for they thought the university was a hole and liked the way the professor agreed with them. The professor didn't agree; he hadn't agreed. Obviously equivocation broke down communication.

Reporting on her recent tour of England, a college student described her presence at a speech delivered by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons. She said: "On the floor stood the Prime Minister; behind him sat members of the Cabinet; in front of him sat members of the opposition; and in tiers around him sat the other House members." "In tears?" asked a classmate of the speaker. "Yes, in tiers," replied the speaker. Had the speaker, during the preparation of her speech, realized the possible confusion resulting from the pronunciation or sound of the word tiers, she might have said, "By tiers, I mean TIERS, not TEARS." The speaker failed to recognize the possibility of equivocation and, thus, communication broke down.
The Liberty Debate Institute is a summer workshop open to high school students of all experience levels. It is sponsored by Liberty University and the Liberty University Debate Team. It is designed for beginning students who want to learn how to debate in the classroom or in competition, as well as for intermediate and advanced (junior varsity and varsity) debaters who want to sharpen their debating skills and knowledge while getting a head start on preparing for the competitive debate season.
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The word *speech* was troublesome for most students in a university General Semantics seminar. Their instructor told them to find any fault in the following passage: "The Provençal speech became a highly developed literary language. Cicero's *First Catiline* is a model political speech. The actor Garrick learned the brilliant new twenty-line speech in five minutes between acts. Speech Correction is a richly rewarding career for anyone interested in speech development."

Most students failed to recognize the equivocation of *speech* in the first sentence. *Speech* means *dialect*. In the second sentence, *speech* means *oration*. In the third sentence, *speech* means *part of an actor's spoken role*. In the last sentence, the first *speech* means the *rehabilitation or correction of abnormal oral utterance*, and the second *speech* means *oral utterance*.

Another way to appreciate the possibility that words change in meaning is to examine a dictionary. For instance, a brief glance at a dictionary reveals that the word *bag* can stand for a purse, a suitcase, a sack for carrying groceries, a cow's udder, a baseball base, the amount of game killed, a swelling or bulging in sari, an unattractive female, a career, taking the entire blame for a misdeed ("He was left holding the bag."); and being first to take the initiative ("He bagged it.")

Another word that clearly reveals high probability for equivocation is *break*. For illustration, *break* means:

1. To smash ("The bottle broke into many pieces.")
2. To infringe ("Jacob's been broken the law.")
3. To dissolve ("China's government broke off friendly relations with university students.")
4. To fracture ("The star receiver broke his leg while catching a pass for the winning touchdown.")
5. To interrupt regularity ("The sirens broke the evening's usual silence.")
6. To put an end to ("The homerun broke the tie.")
7. To discover a system ("Central Intelligence broke the enemy's code.")
8. To remove a part from a collection ("What? You want me to break up a set of seven pieces to sell you this single piece? No, thank you!")
9. To exchange for ("I broke a twenty-dollar bill to get four five-dollar ones.")
10. To penetrate ("The stone skipped three times, breaking the water's stillness.")
11. To escape from captivity ("The reporter discovered that at midnight three men will attempt to break out of Lawson Prison.")
12. To better a score ("In her last attempt she broke the record for the long jump.")
13. To disclose through speech ("At dinner Charles broke the news of our vacation to Hawaii.")
14. To solve ("Scotland Yard broke the terrorist's case in two days.")
15. To rupture ("I broke a blood vessel playing football.")
16. To ruin financially ("Last evening a professional gambler broke the Sands Casino.")
17. To wean down one's spirit ("Some Inquisitionists used torture to break their prisoners.")
18. To impair or weaken power ("Hashimoto used his arm to break the vicious karate blow aimed at his head.")
19. To train to obedience ("I plan to break the stallion by next Tuesday.")
20. To release a story for publication ("Our editor will break the story in tomorrow's newspaper.")
21. To scatter balls ("In billiards I like to break."")
22. To throw a curve ("The opposing pitcher struck out Joe by breaking the ball to the left.")
23. To win over an opponent's serve ("Sue won the tennis tournament mainly because she broke her opponent's serves.")
24. To unfold a flag ("The Captain broke colors at 6:00 a.m."")
25. To prove the falsity of something ("The police broke his alibi by proving that he was not home when the crime occurred.")
26. To initiate a plan or campaign ("Yesterday, church administrators broke ground for the new school.")
27. To begin suddenly ("Yesterday, war broke out in the Middle East.")
28. To dash for some place ("After evading three tacklers, the halfback broke for the goal-line.")
29. To appear suddenly ("After swimming in the lake, she broke out in a severe rash.")
30. To be overwhelmed with sorrow ("Queen Dido felt her heart break when Aeneas said he no longer loved her.")

Of course, the above examples fail to reveal all of the meanings of the word *break*, but they are reason to support v. Welby's contention in *What Is Meaning* that "there is, strictly speaking, no such thing as the sense of a word, but only the sense in which it is used." In other works, orators and other public speakers should not assume that a word has only one meaning, and that the same meaning will be generated each time the word appears. Equivocation is a powerful obstacle to effective communication.

**DON'T EMPLOY SUPERFICIAL RESEMBLANCES!**

Montaigne (Essays II, xxxvii) said that "easily doth the world deceive itself in things it desireth or feign would have come to pass." The English language contains numerous words that have *near*ly, but not *exactly*, the same denotation. For instance, the following words on the left were used by students in debate and forensic activities in Japan and the United States, and the words on the right are what the students should have used according to their intended thoughts.

1. ACCEPT (to receive, believe, or take what is offered)
2. ADAPT (to adjust or change to fit)
3. ADDICTED TO (to bad habit)
4. ADVICE (recommendation)
5. AFFECT (to influence)
6. AGGRAVATE (to make worse)
7. ALLUDE (to refer indirectly)
8. ALLUSION (to refer indirectly)
9. AMEND (to alter)
10. AMONG (refers to more than two in a group)
11. AMORAL (means neither morally right nor morally wrong)
12. AMOUNT (for bulk measurement)
13. BESIDE (near to; nearby)
14. BORROW (to receive a loan)
15. CAN (shows ability)
16. CENSOR (to ban)
17. CHARACTER (one's real nature)
18. CLIMACTIC (very high point)
19. COMPLIMENT (to complete)
20. DEPRECATE (to protest against)
21. EXCEPT (to exclude; other than)
22. ADOPT (to select and treat as one's own)
23. SUBJECT TO (an influence)
24. ADVISE (to recommend)
25. EFFECT (to bring about)
26. ANDROGY (to imitate)
27. ELUDE (to elude)
28. ILLUSION (deceptive appearance)
29. EMEND (to correct)
30. BETWEEN (to refer to only two individuals)
31. IMMORAL (means morally wrong in conflict with traditional values)
32. NUMBER (for counting separate units)
33. BESIDES (other than; in addition to)
34. LEND (to extend a loan)
35. MAY (shows possibility)
36. CENSURE (to reprehend)
37. REPUTATION (one's socially given image)
38. CLIMATIC (climate; weather; state)
39. COMPLIMENT (to offer praise)
40. DEPREDATE (to commit or pillage)
Distanted (anxious)
ELICIT (to bring out)
EMICT (famous, prominent)
ETHOS (an individual's character)
EXCEPTIONAL (very different)
FARTH (refers to distance)
GENIUS (exceptional intellect)
GUIDE (direction; cunning)
HUMAN (belonging to mankind)
IGNORANT (uninformed)
IMPLY (to express indirectly)
INEXHAUSTIBLE (endless)
LATER (after a period of time)
LAY (to put down)
LEARN (to receive instruction)
LEAVE (to abandon)
MAD (insane)
PHYSICAL (refers to material things)
QUITE (completely)

UNINTERESTED (apathetic)
ILLEGIT (unlawful)
IMMEDIATE (ready to occur)
ETHICS (a system of theory of morality)
EXCEPTIONAL (exceptional)
FURTHER (refers to degree)
GENIUS (rare or kind)
GUIDE (remove)
HUMANIZE (having compassion)
STUPID (lacking ordinary intelligence)
INFECT (to make sick from diseases)
INDRESSABLE (cannot be dressed)
LATTER (the last thing mentioned)
LIFE (to live)
TEACH (to give instruction)
LET (to permit)
ANGER (ill feelings toward someone)
FISCAL (relating to financial matters)
QUIET (silence)

In short, orators who employ superficial resemblances are analogous with Mrs. Malaprop in Richard Brinsley Sheri dan's play, The Rivals. The following passage (I, ii) typifies Mrs. Malaprop's use of language. The words in parentheses are what she meant to utilize. Indeed, communication was not effective.

Observe me, Sir Anthony. I would by no means wish a daughter of mine to be a prodigy (prodigy) of learning; I don't think so much learning becomes a woman; for instance, I would never let her muddle with Greek or Hebrew or algebra (geometry) or fluids (functions) or paroxysms (parabolas) or such inflammatory branches of learning—would not it be necessary for her to handle any of your mathematical, astronomical, dialectical (dialectical) instruments. But, Sir Anthony, I would send her, at nine years old, to a boarding school, in order to let her learn a little ingenuity (ingeniousness) and artifice (artistry). Then, Sir Anthony, she should have a superficial (superficial) knowledge in accounts; and as she grew up, I would have her instructed in geometry (geometry), that she might have something of the contagious (contiguous) countries; but above all, Sir Anthony, she should be mistress of orthography (orthography) that she might not misspell and mispronounce so shamefully as girls usually do.

DON'T VIOLATE SYNTAX!

Syntax is the manner in which words are assembled to convey thought. When the words say what the speaker intends, then the syntax has integrity. Much communication breaks down because of faulty syntax. For instance, when utilizing a former parishioner, a clergyman concluded by saying, "Such was the end of our dear friend at the premature age of thirty-six." The sentence construction does not make sense. How could the parishioner's age be premature? The clergyman should have said, "Such was the premature death of our dear friend at the age of thirty-six."

A college orator once asked, "Do you ever take a walk at night? I very often do and enjoy looking up at the dark sky alone with millions of twinkling stars." The student's syntax shows that the dark sky was alone with millions of twinkling stars. She meant to say, "Do you ever take a walk at night? I very often do by myself and enjoy looking up at the dark sky filled with millions of twinkling stars."

While describing Spring, a high school student stated, "During Spring, people get a new feeling. They clean their household. Clothes begin to appear on the outside line and they ride down the street with the car windows open." The faulty syntax has the clothes going for a ride and the street having its car windows open. The student should have said, for instance, "During Spring, people clean their households, hang clothes on the outside line, and drive cars with the windows open."

In an essay on beauty, a high school student stated, "Beauty can be found walking through a forest listening to the sounds of the animals." It appears that beauty was walking through the forest and that the forest was listening to the animals' sounds. The student should have said, for instance, "I find beauty when I walk through a forest and attentively listen to the animals' sounds."

Many errors of syntax occurred in a college class on the Anglo-Saxon epic, Beowulf. For instance, one student reported that "while sleeping the demon tore the Danes to pieces." It appears that the demon was sleeping while the Danes tore the demon apart. The student meant to say, "While the Danes were sleeping, the demon tore them apart."

Another student said that "Beowulf became the people's god because he slew the monster without weapons." It appears that the monster had no weapons but Beowulf did. The student meant to say, "Without the use of weapons, Beowulf slew the monster." In other words, the student meant that Beowulf handily killed the monster.

Still, another student said that "Beowulf tells of the people he slaughtered became a hero among the people." Does the sentence mean that Beowulf became a hero because of the people he once slaughtered, or because of his telling of the slaughter? The student meant to say, "To become a hero among the people, Beowulf told them about the people he slaughtered."

The following ad appeared in a high school student newspaper: "For sale, German police dog: eats anything; very fond of children." It appears that one of the dog's favorite meals was children. The ad should have said, for instance, "For sale, German police dog that likes children and will eat anything the family eats."

A college student in Tokyo reported that "in Tokyo, two infants had fatal falls from the rooftop and from a window of apartment buildings." Did both infants fall from the rooftop and again from a window of at least two apartment buildings? The student should have said, "In Tokyo, two infants had fatal falls from separate apartment buildings. One infant fell from a rooftop, and the other fell from a window." The last sentence is longer, but much clearer than the original remark.

Lack of syntactical integrity may be amusing, but it prevents clear thought and, thus, undermines effective communication. A grammar book can be a valuable aid during oratorical composition.

CONCLUSION

Numerous reasons account for oratorical ineffectiveness, and equivocation, superficial resemblance, and faulty syntax are among the most notorious. Orators would be wise to avoid such errors and, instead, adhere to Ludwig Wittgenstein's contention in Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus, namely that "Everything that can be thought at all can be thought clearly. Everything that can be said can be said clearly." Clarity of expression can be difficult, but its attainment is worth all effort.

(Doctor Wayne C. 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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The Emory National Debate Institute has been contributing to the education of high school debaters for twenty-six years. The curriculum is steeped in the most fundamental aspects of debate: presentation, research, and critical thinking. An excellent combination of traditional argument and debate theory and an emphasis on current debate practice makes the Emory National Debate Institute one of the most successful 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.
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Excellent staff student ratio: The Institute offers debaters the opportunity to work with one senior level instructor accompanied by at least one active college debater in small lab groups of 10 to 20 students.

Flexible curriculum: The Institute has always provided students a wide variety of instruction suitable to their 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.
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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.
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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 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.
AN INTRODUCTION TO THE 2002-2003 MENTAL HEALTH RESOLUTION

by David M. Cheshier

The new policy debate resolution requires the affirmative to defend expanded federal public health services for the mentally ill (Resolved: that the United States federal government should substantially increase public health services for mental health care in the United States), and the literature relating to this issue is extensive. What follows is only a partial introduction to the range of possible arguments which may arise.

Mental disorders affect a large number of Americans. The earliest large scale epidemiological studies include an often cited estimate made by the 1960s Midtown Manhattan Study, which concluded that roughly twenty percent of Americans suffer from serious mental illness, and that only twenty percent of the population is free of mental dysfunction. The most comprehensive national research on the issue was done during the Carter Administration: the ECA (Epidemiological Catchment Area) study confirmed earlier findings that twenty percent have an active mental disorder. Phobias (14 percent) and alcohol abuse (9 percent) were the most frequently occurring illnesses. The National Comorbidity Survey (NCS), conducted during the 1990s, found higher illness levels, including a finding that in the previous year a full 29 percent reported a mental disorder. Of respondents reporting a disorder in the previous year, only twenty percent had sought treatment.

The terms "public health services" and "mental health care" are very broad, and affirmatives will have the freedom to tailor proposals addressing everything from drug and alcohol abuse and addiction,
Alzheimer's treatment, civil commitment law, nursing home care, and homelessness. Whether the term "public health services" includes support for medical or pharmacological research, as opposed to the mere provision of care, is an open question, and there is a definitional support for both the narrower and broader points of view. Controversy may also arise over the question of whether the plan may properly require the federal government to induce private sector support (e.g., by manipulating managed care or HMO regulations) — although the resolution seems to permit an increase by indirect regulation or mandate, some may see such proposals as topically only by effect.

Although the federal government has played a significant role in the mental health area since 1946, when it created the National Institute for Mental Health (NIMH), most mental health care services are provided locally, with active state government involvement. This creates the unfortunate but likely possibility that our debates will be overrun by the following strategy: the state counterplan, a Bush/politics disadvantage (unique to the plan's advocacy of federal action), and some version of a Foucault/Szasz critique (more on them shortly) or net widening disadvantage (both of which would likely be less onerous objections to decentralized state or local action than the plan). I'd consider such an outcome unfortunate because the federalism issues implicated in the public health area are relatively uninteresting (though not unimportant), and yet once raised the debate is almost guaranteed to veer away from the public policy issues raised by the too-often ignored problem of mental illness. And presuming they will often face such a strategy, affirmative teams will probably in turn veer toward plans necessarily requiring federal action (ERISA reform, changes in the administration of mental health care services in veterans hospitals, changing public health services on native lands) — again, despite the importance of these issues, the effect might be an almost total sidestepping of the broader mental and public health issues.

Still, because hope springs eternal, let's review the broader and quite fascinating history of America's management of mental health and its problems. After that I'll quickly review some of the possible affirmative and negative argument possibilities, including some of the central critical positions which will be widely and rightly explored this year.

America's Public Health Commitments to the Mentally Ill: Some Background

Publicly provided mental health care services have mostly been considered a safety net, mainly aimed at those who because of poverty or isolation are uninsured. Ranging from early efforts to house or incarcerate the mentally ill to the range of community health services available today, the debate over mental health care has often centered on the question of "containment"; that is, whether mentally ill individuals should be institutionalized or treated in the community. To some extent this reflects the deep history of mental health care — in the Middle Ages the mentally ill suffered extreme neglect, and although conditions improved in the Enlightenment, the preferred solution tended to be the creation of large and impersonal institutions.

The first American hospital dedicated to the care of mentally ill patients was the Pennsylvania Hospital, founded in 1752. Benjamin Rush and others advocated "moral treatment," based on the view that small hospitals characterized by close doctor-patient contact could achieve real progress in reducing the severity of mental disorder. By the time Dorothea Dix led her reform efforts almost a century later, an elaborate network of private and charitable mental asylums covered the nation. Dix sparked the first American debate over which level of government should bear principle responsibility for the mentally ill. She argued the federal government should undertake leadership, and following her lobbying efforts, the Congress in 1854 passed a law that would have undertaken federal control. But President Franklin Pierce vetoed the law, arguing the states were better suited to the provision of public health. Consequently, Dix turned her efforts to the states, and as a result the American system remains state-dominated.

By the 1950's and 60's, concern was aroused about the quality of care available in most mental health institutions, and the resulting debates produced pressures culminating in the near-total deinstitutionalization of America's mental hospital system. Even more important than quality of care concerns was increasing reliance on newly developed drugs, whose use sharply reduced the size of the patient population for whom permanent institutionalization seemed necessary. Since the development of new tranquilizers in the early 1950's, psychiatry has become increasingly dependent on the prescription of apparent "wonder drugs" that have shown sometimes amazing success in ameliorating the symptoms of severe mental impairment. All these historical factors culminated in the work of the congressional Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health (appointed by President Eisenhower, findings reported to President Kennedy), which recommended a shift to community-based care. The community mental health centers (CMHC's) created by the 1963 federal legislation are designed to provide comprehensive and integrated care in the least restrictive environment possible.

The CMHC system, which remains in place today, undertakes a wider range of services than have ever been fully funded. CMHCs exist to provide hospitalization alternatives and permit treatment in a patient's natural environment where possible. In the 1980s, the Reagan Administration reversed CMHC funding to the states as block grants, and as a result many states have curtailed core mental health services. Some CMHCs have been dismantled. This is so despite the ongoing federal commitment to more than a half dozen block grant health care initiatives, including about a quarter billion dollars for mental health care support, and more than a billion dollars annually for substance abuse services.

In 1965, the federal government created the Medicare and Medicaid public health programs. Both provide fee-for-service health care benefits. Medicare provides support for the health care needs of the elderly and disabled, and Medicaid, a part of the Social Security system, is a federal-state matching entitlement program for the poor. In the years since, both programs have provided major support for persons dealing with mental illness. For example, mentally ill individuals under the age of 65 are eligible for Medicare Part A benefits (which cover in- and out-patient hospital care) if their condition has qualified them for more general disability support.

But as important as these changes in federal budgetary support are developments in the private sector, now regulated by federal action. The HMO Act of 1973 allowed doctors to organize health maintenance organizations to compete with insurance plans. Then, a year later, Congress passed the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA), which gives employers incentives to self-insure health care. Both had profound effects on the mental health area. The HMO law does not force plans to provide comprehensive psychiatric care, and as a result the precedent was set for health
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plans to minimally (at best) cover impairment resulting from mental illness. Some states reacted to this by passing so-called "parity" laws, which require health care providers to add in mental health coverage. But in many cases, ERISA nullifies these state efforts, since the basement-level mandates of the federal law have constitutional primacy over state action (the so-called preemption doctrine).

The Clinton Administration worked to solve this problem, and in 1996 the President signed a law, which took effect in January 1998, requiring employer-sponsored plans offering mental health care coverage to have the same annual and lifetime coverage limits for mental illness treatment as for other medical services. Unfortunately, though, this legislation expired September 30, 2001.

The Politics of Mental Health Services
Part of the reason mental health services are under-supported is because the mentally ill are a relatively uninfluential constituency, and because there is a legislative perception that enabling broader levels of mental health support would create unending financial demands on the federal government. As a result, the history of Presidential involvement in the mental health care debate has been sporadic, and mainly focused on paying lip service to the very difficult challenges faced by the mentally ill and their families. Several political spouses have made mental health care an issue of personal priority, including First Lady Rosalynn Carter during the Jimmy Carter presidency, and Tipper Gore during the Clinton years. But beyond the occasional mention of mental health concerns in a State of the Union speech, or the convening of this or that White House Task Force, little has been accomplished in the way of major, presidentially-led initiatives, since the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations oversaw the implementation of the community mental health system.

Proposals to spend money on mental health care tend to be unpopular, perhaps because of the stigma we continue to attach to mental illness. Although we don't tend to think of mental illness as contagious or the fault of bad parenting, views that used to be common, a mental illness persists which prefers to discount mental impairment as not true illness. There remains a tendency to see mental illness as the fault of the victim. Another problem is that it can be hard to document the "payoff" of investments in mental health care — unlike cancer research, for instance, where one can clearly show improvements in care and survival rates, in the mental health area it can sometimes be hard to quantify the benefits of cost-intensive therapies.

All this is complicated by the fact that, too often, the mental health care dollars allocated do not end up following the patient. That is, more than half of legislated money goes into mental hospital support, even though they only serve a small percentage of the mentally ill. Thus, even if support can be rallied for expanded public health services, it is unlikely to be politically sustainable for programs focused on decentralized care models.

The record and positions of the Bush Administration on mental health issues are hard to gauge. The President has taken several opportunities to express his support for efforts to improve the plight of the mentally ill. He recently appointed Philip Mangano to coordinate federal homelessness policy, a move which was applauded by mental health advocates since Mangano has expressed support for the necessity of bundling mental health services together with broader homelessness support efforts. But when Senators Paul Wellstone and Pete Domenici proposed bipartisan legislation to re-enact and expand the provisions of the 1996 "parity" law, the Administration opposed it under pressure from conservative Republicans (who voted against it in a near block), business groups and insurance companies, who argued that adding to the total health care cost burden was not a good idea given softness in the economy. Even here, though, the Bush Administration did not express unqualified opposition to the proposal — the President was said to support it, just not at the present time. Whether this is a rhetorical strategy to divert attention from mental health issues or a sincerely held position given the other important issues on the President's agenda remains to be seen.

Does Mental Illness Really Exist? Introducing Critical Considerations
For anyone who has ever interacted with a loved one suffering from the effects of profound depression, addictive substance abuse, delusional psychosis, paranoid schizophrenia, or other debilitating mental illness, it may seem odd to even raise the issue of whether mental illness is real or socially constructed. But despite the undeniable trauma imposed by genuine illness, the historical fact remains that labeling someone "crazy" or "nuts" is an often-used instrument of state or social control. In the worst periods of Soviet dictatorship, dissenting intellectuals were incarcerated in mental asylums — their disagreement with the prevailing orthodoxy "proved" they must be insane. In the American context, women who were too assertive were often diagnosed as "hysterical," a term which for a long time had clinical significance. Until 1973, a homosexual orientation was officially considered a mental disorder, a diagnosis which led to widespread social stigma and the sometimes outlandish treatment regimen of electroshock therapy.

If a culture can label its critics "mentally ill," it has won an important victory in the quest for total social control. The trick is that once a person is identified as "crazy," everything she or he says can be dismissed as further evidence of the illness, even if it is perfectly reasonable or sane. Of course, the reverse is true too: sometimes the most difficult to diagnose mental illnesses are those pathologies exhibited by people who on the surface seem very normal. But who gets to define what is "normal" anyway? Who's to say whether a certain person's predisposition to aggressive behavior reflects a disordered mental state or simply his or her upbringing, or passion, or victimization?

Some social theorists argue the oppressive historical uses to which mental treatment have been put justify caution when it comes to expanding the government's role in providing mental health care services. And it's important to understand how this criticism holds up even in societies which are reasonably open, tolerant of disagreement, and committed to a basic philosophy of "live and let live." In the United States, for instance, the net of social control may be insidiously widened not out of a desire or conspiracy for authoritarianism, but for the best and even purest humanitarian reasons. Step by step, rule by rule, regulations expand in the name of "protecting innocent kids" or "keeping the insane from hurting themselves." Or loving parents who simply cannot see another alternative tearfully turn their children over to institutions of total control, like boot camps or reform schools or juvenile institutions. Critics of such practices claim that, despite good intentions, the incarcerated still end up losing their liberty and fundamental autonomy rights, often robbed of their essential dignity as human beings.
Michel Foucault (1926-1984) is often associated with such a view, and rightfully so given his books Birth of the Clinic and Madness and Civilization, and his lifelong efforts to use extreme institutions of social control (the prison, the asylum, to mention just two) as a lens through which to see the broader workings of mainstream culture. At the risk of greatly oversimplifying Foucault's complicated life's work, one of his principle commitments was to the idea that you could learn a lot about a society by seeing who it defines as "abnormal" and "deviant," and who is censored in the process. Foucault also spent some time working through a critique of Sigmund Freud, whose development of psychoanalytic theory long undergraded mental health treatment in western nations. In contrast to Freud, who thought of the human psyche as a discoverable reality discernible through theoretical refinement, Foucault emphasized the subjective nature of the psyche. In his view, there is no such thing as a "mind" independent of the broader social practices that discipline and deliver, including psychiatric procedures created to "examine" it. Depending on the specifics of the affirmative plan, Foucault's criticisms of mental health establishments can serve as the basis for a critical examination of the affirmative's advocacy.

Because Foucault's work is relatively familiar to high school debaters and coaches, and because I've discussed his project at greater length in a previous column (December 1999, written on the education topic). I want to also briefly introduce the perspective of Thomas Szasz, who has been the leading advocate of the idea that "mental illness" is a social construction from the field of psychiatry.

Szasz has long been a vocal critic of the entire field of psychiatry. His position has consistently centered on a critique of the medicalization of mental health care, which in his view results in the sheer concoction of illnesses. The discourse of "illness" presents an all-too-easy device for psychiatrists simply looking for a way to frame and penalize unacceptable (or often, simply unusual) behavior. His recent work, which includes several volumes produced in the last five years, expands this criticism to the manner by which drug therapies are increasingly used to dope up the different. One of the lines most often quoted from his early work is that "mental illness is a rational response to an insane situation." It is probably important to stress from the outset that Szasz does not oppose psychotherapy when it is freely and voluntarily undertaken.

Whether Szasz's argument about the socially constructed nature of mental illness is generalizable to all apparent cases of mental dysfunction or not, he is unquestionably right to call attention to the many ways in which mental illness is stigmatized. One way Szasz introduces this issue is by stressing what he calls the "operational semantics" of illness. His point is that the meaning of a word should be understood by the associations it produces. If two words produce the same reaction, they can be said to share a meaning. Let's say I tell you that a certain person is evil, and then ask you a couple questions: Would you hire this person to work for you? Would you like this person to be your friend? Would you like this person to marry someone in your family? Would you want this person to live next door? Now imagine I've told you the person is mentally ill, and ask the same questions. It is likely your answers will be the same, since our culture fosters negative views of the mentally ill. A disturbing survey conducted recently by the National Mental Health Association found that 71 percent of Americans see mental illness as evidence of a character weakness.

In the sociological tradition, some have long argued that this semantic stigma surrounding mental illness produces a circular labeling phenomenon. Thomas Schiell, for example, is associated with the view that it is the social reaction to those labeled ill, and not something intrinsically disordered in the "patient," that is the real crux of the mental illness situation. While Schiell's work has been heavily criticized as offering too-total an account of mental illness, he has refined his position many times over the years and continues to defend the basic labeling hypothesis.

The mental health care field is often caricatured, undoubtedly as a result of the excesses practiced by 1950s and 60s-era institutions, and their portrayal in popular films like "One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest." Mental health care is obviously very different today than it was then. Despite that fact, a number of critics attack what they see as the dominating "medical model" which they say still characterizes mental health care services. The "medical model" is essentially authoritarian, where the doctor orders this or that treatment, and the patient is expected to comply. At the other end of the scale some advocate a "consumer empowerment" model, but there are dangers and benefits in both extremes. Although the medical model can sound awful, for example, there are undeniably extreme situations where medical care may have to be imposed on severely ill patients who have apparently lost the cognitive capacity to safeguard their own best interests.

One of the inherent problems relating to all this has to do with the difficulty in clearly defining mental illness. Some advocate a diagnostic approach (a person is mentally ill if their symptoms match the specified characteristics listed in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, the so-called DSM), while others prefer a more functional interpretation (a person is mentally ill if they are institutionalized or are using mental health care services). The considerable definitional ambiguity has not been much clarified by legislation targeting services to the "severely" mentally ill, although it seems a reasonable enough distinction to limit services to those whose mental impairment is so considerable they are unable to function.

Some Major Affirmative Case Areas

A range of landmark proposals have been made to improve and increase the provision of public health services to the mentally ill. For the sake of basic clarity, I've divided these proposals into plans designed to improve the treatment available for specific populations, plans designed to address specific illnesses, and broader structural changes imagined to address systemic failings in the public health system.

Proposals targeted at specific populations. The population receiving the most attention in the general mental health literature is children, and this is so for several reasons. Many argue the current system for providing mental health care badly fails children who suffer from serious emotional disturbance. Families are often ill-equipped to deal with the most challenging childhood mental problems, and because services are often dispersed among juvenile justice, foster care, and substance abuse programs, many ill children fall through the cracks. Or, when agencies like the court and justice systems or schools attempt to consolidate services, the attention mainly goes to the most troubled kids, again leaving many others unaided. The literature documenting abuses and failures in the foster care system is extensive and often shocking. And a number of scholars have become more vocal in criticizing the manner by which medi-
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cation (for conditions like “attention deficit disorder”) is becoming the first treatment option for troubled kids. A number of reforms might be undertaken in the school setting, where considerable resources are presently expended to mainstream children with mental disabilities into the broader educational environment.

Attention is also concentrated on that small percentage of the mentally ill who engage in criminally dangerous behavior. The science (or some might say non-science) of predicting dangerousness complicates efforts to reduce the effects of violent outbursts. Still, the research does show that if an individual commits a violent act during a psychotic episode, they are at a high risk of repeat violence when the next episode strikes. And the public safety issues lead some to argue for regulations that would better require such individuals to take prescribed medication, or better coordinate law enforcement response so that once arrested, such persons can be more humanely treated.

A growing literature addresses the unique mental health needs of certain ethnic, racial, and sexual orientation populations. Attention has been drawn to the complicated ways in which cultural, economic, and racial stereotyping implicates mental health care. While there is no definitive evidence that members of any particular ethnic or racial group suffer a higher prevalence of mental illness, the research consistently shows that individuals from racial and ethnic minorities are underserved by psychiatric practice. This has been true, of course, for a long time. In 1958 a major Connecticut study done by Hollingshead and Redlich found that persons with severe mental diseases were concentrated in the poorest socioeconomic classes, and also that treatment tended to be controlled by social class. Other research has shown that minorities tend to seek professional care less frequently than other groups, and that when they do they often receive treatment that is inappropriate or needlessly severe or intrusive. The evidence is compelling that suicide rates are considerably higher for gay teens than for their straight counterparts. These factors and others require mental health providers to possess what some refer to as “cultural competence,” including a respectful regard for differences across and within populations, and range of programs have been proposed to produce such sensitivity.

A disproportionate number of the homeless are mentally ill. In part, this is true because the deinstitutionalization moves of the 1960s, and simultaneous urban renewal efforts (which often had the unforeseen consequence of removing housing for the mentally ill poor), left many ill persons to fend for themselves on the streets. Studies of the American homeless population consistently show that anywhere from one-quarter to one-half suffer from a serious mental illness, and those numbers may underestimate the actual occurrence of mental illness, since they exclude personality disorders.

Proposals targeted at specific diseases or conditions. Although mental illness is relatively uncommon among the elderly (contrary to the stereotypes), some of the mental illness conditions afflicting mostly older Americans are very serious, and pose major challenges to the public health system. Chief among these is Alzheimer’s disease, which produces a gradual wasting away of mental function, to the extent that total, around-the-clock care is required. A range of proposals would expand research into the causes of Alzheimer’s (the cause remains unknown), or expand federal support for home health care or assisted living arrangements.

The range of other specific disorders which might justify expanded public health services is wide, and might include everything from expanded treatment support for those dealing with substance addiction, pornography compulsion, pedophilia, or those tempted to commit suicide.

Structural reform proposals. In the past several years, under public pressure to contain costs in the federal government’s major health care programs, a series of reforms have been proposed. Some of these would have considerable significance for the provision of mental health services. The most important such reform was made in the early 1980s, when the Health Care Financing Administration granted a waiver for the first Medicaid managed care demonstration project. Since then, many other states have asked for waivers, which allow Medicaid recipients to be enrolled in state-controlled managed care programs. These managed care programs have occasionally included mental health programs. By the mid-1990s managed care programs, which are designed to bid down the costs of providing health care for the poor, enrolled about a third of Medicaid beneficiaries. This number is likely to increase further as cost pressures continue to plague federal entitlement programs.

When a state receives a so-called “1915(b)” waiver from the federal government, as the vast majority have done (although only a few states have actually implemented the programs modifications allowed by their waivers), it is usually granted to allow a state to restrict a Medicaid patient’s ability to pick her or his own doctor (the federal rules require total patient freedom of choice; managed care, by definition, saves money by negotiating care with certain specific doctor groups and requiring that patients only use those groups). During the Clinton years, the main argument centered on the nature of the waiver: Clinton was willing to grant waivers to accomplish cost savings, but also usually insisted that the financial savings be reinvested back into the program, so more people could be made eligible for coverage or more health care services provided to existing enrollees. So far, these initiatives have not expanded mental health care services; in fact, in 1994 the National Association of Community Health Centers went to court to stop the waiver process, arguing that their practitioners were not being adequately consulted.

The sometimes technical arguments surrounding the Medicaid waiver process have produced a range of proposals to better deal with mental health issues. Some advocate a full integration of mental health into the existing Medicaid system, while others argue for a stand-alone mental health initiative that would consolidate all available programs. When the Clinton health care task force was designing its proposals in the early 1990s, they recommended that “mental and substance abuse services should be mainstreamed into a single health care system.” Such consolidation will prove difficult because mental health care funding is scattered across jurisdictions (federal, state, county, local) and programs (corrections, juvenile justice, education and especially disability education, and housing). There is also debate over whether mental health services would be best delivered through an HMO-type system or a mental health care managed care operation. And other questions arise: Should the federal government foot the bill for mental health care? Or should it simply assume a share of the financial risk for providing services (by cost-sharing with the states, for instance)? Or should it contract out health care provision to private vendors? And should funding be consolidated into one program that covers everything from mental retardation
assistance to psychotropic drugs?

Another proposal would redesign federal oversight of HMOs for the purpose of expanding mental health care services. Section 1302 of the HMO Act allows HMOs to sharply limit the mental health care services they provide, and has been widely interpreted as allowing HMOs to limit services to only those suffering from acute and short-term mental health crises. The unfortunate consequence, of course, is that persons suffering from long-term, chronic conditions often receive little or no treatment from their health maintenance organization. Meanwhile, HMOs often refuse to pay for psychotropic drugs, which are increasingly helpful in reducing symptomatic behaviors. Some states are just now evaluating demonstration project data to see how adding mental health care requirements would affect HMOs.

Considerable attention is dedicated to the possibility of mental illness prevention, this despite the still-emerging state of the research in the prevention area. While there is the possibility that genetic discoveries may someday enable the prevention of conditions like early-onset Alzheimer's or Huntington's chorea, knowledge in even these heavily studied areas is still at the formative stage. Advocates of prevention strategies tend to favor enhanced support for options like community support and psychosocial rehabilitation — such combinations of rehabilitation and clinical treatment have documented track records of success. After major reports in the 1970s by the Committee on Prevention of Mental Disorders and the NIMH, and following well organized advocacy efforts by the National Prevention Coalition (organized by the National Mental Health Association), recommendations for funding increases have gained a more respectful hearing in Washington.

Legal reform proposals. Some of the most hotly argued proposals for changing mental health law may not provide affirmative planning possibilities, since such changes may not directly increase public health services. Still, the legal literature on mental health will invariably affect our debates on the topic.

Those who debated on the privacy topic will recall the literature focused on medical records privacy, a major issue in the mental health care area as well. Obviously the possibility that one's psychiatric records might become public can serve as a real deterrent to seeking necessary care in the first place. The issue is complicated to some extent by the trade-off necessity, widely perceived by mental health practitioners, to guarantee what is called "continuity of care," so that treatments can be tracked over time. As you may know, the medical records debate has recently been reactivated by the decision of the Bush Administration to scale back broad protections for medical records privacy enacted in the last days of the Clinton Administration.

Many other important legal issues affect the mental health care area. In fact, mental health law has traditionally been dominated by issues like civil commitment (the process where a person is institutionalized against his or her will), the right to treatment or to refuse it, all of which center on balancing the interests of state and individual. But since the 1960s, when the civil rights movement turned its attention to the provision of mental health care, litigation brought on behalf of the institutionalized has dramatically expanded legal protections for the rights of the mentally ill.

Civil commitment law has undergone considerable reform in almost every jurisdiction. It used to be the case that a judge could indefinitely commit a person to a state institution on a finding of mental illness, even if the finding was not made by a psychiatrist. Now a person can typically be committed only based on a double finding, first a diagnosis of mental illness and second a finding that the individual poses a danger to self or others. Commitment laws today also typically require a judge's finding before long-term commitment can be imposed — although civil commitment proceedings are still less protective than criminal trials, this fact has much improved the essential fairness of the commitment process, since it automatically allows for the normal protections, a right to trial by jury, a right to confront witnesses. The major continuing exception to these procedural protections involves children. A double set of standards for children and adults continues to pervade the regulation of civil commitment, especially in the aftermath of Parham v. J.R., a 1979 U.S. Supreme Court case which ruled children may be admitted against their will on the application of their parents. The manner by which children are civilly committed is the source of extensive criticism, and a fertile ground for topical action.

The courts have also expanded the protected rights of patients who wish to refuse treatment. In the typical medical environment, the right to refuse medical therapies is strongly protected, but in the mental health area, where the patient's ability to make informed decisions may be impaired, protection has been tougher to accomplish. Over the years, however, protections have steadily expanded, and in every jurisdiction there is a presumption that the patient is competent to make treatment decisions for himself if he is un� proven otherwise. Litigation also continues to explore the extent to which a person has a right to treatment.

Arguing Against Expanded Public Health Services

The most common objection to expanding mental health care services is financial, since mental health care can be very expensive and quite lengthy in duration. In fact, because governmental programs have never even attempted to fully fund mental health care, we have no idea how high the costs would soar. Many economists have expressed the concern that even apparently innocuous programs like those which would require insurance "parity" might cause health costs to skyrocket thanks to the heightened demand for services that would result. Some are also frankly worried that mental health services are easily exploited by those "worried well" who might flood into service systems at any hint of mental dysfunction.

The nation already expends a considerable amount on mental health care (public financing along in this area accounts for about 5 percent of annual American gross domestic product). And the Wall Street Journal recently estimated that untreated mental illness costs American businesses $70 billion every year in lost productivity. There are some who argue, therefore, that a more effective system would actually produce cost savings (the same argument one often hears for why preventative health care will prevent much more expensive treatment down the road), but such savings are hard to quantify and may never actually justify
long term reductions in budget outlays.

Given the current situation, where mental health protections are chronically underfunded, many sources have written of the risk that new initiatives might simply trade off with acute care for the severely ill. While proposals to “carve out” new protections, so they do not specifically compete, are advocated to deal with this issue, such proposals may only serve to further fragment the delivery of mental health services. On the other hand, while consolidating all mental health programs into a single service sector would help solve the problems of the current two-tiered system (one for the working middle class and wealthier, another for the poor and disabled), such consolidation would present an easy target for budget cutters.

Expanded services also require an expanded pool of mental health care generalists. This is a real difficulty because professional training programs tend to spend little time training individuals to accurately diagnose mental illness (apart from at the individual doctor’s level of specialization), and research has documented a disappointing level of empathy for the mentally ill among primary care physicians.

The fast-growing movements organized around the mental health issue may provide some ground for negative argumentation. The National Alliance for the Mentally Ill is active politically, and they and other organizations have mobilized a considerable network for consumer activism. Perhaps one could argue that the plan ends up co-opting the efforts of grassroots activism, to the detriment of treatment alternatives that safeguard the dignity of the patient.

Some thoughts on the issue of federalism and state counterplanning: The federal debate in the health care area is not as clearcut as in, say, the area of education, because over the years funding sources and the provision of mental health care services have become more jurisdictionally interconnected. In the 1950’s, the federal government mainly stayed out of mental health care services, apart from those provided in VA hospitals. Meanwhile, state and local governments ran psychiatric hospitals. Since then, though, the federal, state, and local sectors have produced overlapping areas of responsibility. And while states still pay the largest portion of mental health care outlays, their share as a percentage of overall allocations is dropping fast (less because of federal expansion than because of privatization and managed care arrangements). About a quarter of state expenditures on mental health care are carried out under the Medicaid program, which of course is characterized by heavy federal rulemaking. And under the terms of the 1986 Comprehensive State Mental Health Planning Act, major and sweeping planning requirements were imposed on the states in the mental health care area by the federal government.

Because states are increasingly contracting out mental health care services to the private sector, the case for state control of these programs is less compelling from a federalism point of view than before (after all, would it really be any different for the federal government to manage privatization?). Because non-Medicaid mental health dollars are now wholly block granted to the states, with fairly wide latitude for how they are spent, teams will need to adapt to the federalism and state counterpart solvency evidence to the particular context of the block granting process.

The Mental Health Public Policy Literature

Here are some books which provide a good starting point on the topic:

Albee, George, and Thomas Gullotta (eds.). Primary Prevention Works (Thous-

and Oaks, Cal.: Sage, 1997).


Javier, Rafael and William Herron (eds.). Personality Development and Psycho-


Levine, Murray and David Perkins. Principles of Community Psychiatry: Perspec-


Mechanic, David. Mental Health and Social Policy: The Emergence of Managed Care, 4E (Needham Heights, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, 1999).

Meton, Gary, Philip Lyons, and Willis Spaulding. No Place to Go: The Civil Commitment of Minors (Lincoln, Neb.: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1998).


Watkins, Ted and James Callicott (eds.). Mental Health Policy and Practice
For introductions to Thomas Szasz and the “social construction,” “labeling” and “net widening” debates in which he has been influential, see:


Vatz, Richard and Lee Weinberg (eds.). Thomas Szasz: Primary Values and Major Controversies (Prometheus Press, 1982).

For introductions to Michel Foucault and the implications of his and other postmodern/poststructuralist work for mental health care services, see:


Many research journals focus on public health and mental health care, including Law and Human Behavior; Psychology, Public Policy, and Law; the Journal of Psychiatry and Law; and the International Journal of Law and Psychiatry. Obviously the World Wide Web includes hundreds of additional information sources, and Lexis-Nexis catalogs much of the relevant newspaper and law review literature (be careful not to assume that the medical law journals are all available via Lexis-Nexis, since they are not).

©David M. Cheshier

(David M. Cheshier is Assistant Professor of Communication and Director of Debate at Georgia State University. His column appears monthly in the Rostrum.)
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**Jon Sharp** is a debate coach at the University of Southern California, formerly of West Georgia College, and was an NDT Debater at Emory University. Teams coached by Jon have received first round bids to the NDT for the last 7 years in a row. In his senior year of debating he won the Harvard and West Georgia tournaments, and the Dartmouth Round Robin. He and his partner were ranked #3 in the nation going into the 1994 NDT. He was top speaker at the Pittsburgh, Louisville, and Heart of America tournaments, and in his senior year cleared to late elimination rounds at both the NDT policy debate national championships and CEDA debate nationals. This will mark his 13th year of teaching summer debate institutes.

For an Application see our website, www.snfi.org, or the February issue of the Rostrum!

**Stanford National Forensic Institute**

555 Bryant St., #599, Palo Alto, CA 94301

call us at (650) 723-9086
The Stanford Debate Society presents the

Stanford National Forensic Institute

Lincoln-Douglas Program: July 30 - August 12, 2002

Outstanding features of the 2002 Lincoln-Douglas portion of the SNFI:

*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. In the past three years nearly 100% of participant have rated the overall program quality a 9 or 10 out of 10!

*Incomparable staff*: This year's 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
Noah Grabowicz, Stanford debater

Allison Pickett, U of North Carolina
Mazin Shafi, RL Turner
Jessica Dean, Boston University
Jon Gegenheimer, Woodson School
Michael Ososky, Stanford Debater

Three Week Program: The outstanding highlight of this program 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 between the two programs, for a total of three intensive weeks!

Stanford Advanced Seminar: An exclusive SNFI workshop dedicated to in-depth issue examination. This seminar will be taught by some of the top instructors from the SNFI staff. Ideal for students with previous institute experience; open to all experienced students returning to SNFI for a second or third year, and others by application.

The Regents Program is intended for graduating Seniors and college or university students interested in working at one of the nation's most prestigious speech and debate institutes. Regent's time is divided between administrative tasks and working in labs. Regents are provided room, board, and a compensatory stipend. Please direct application inquiries or questions to SNFIREgents@aol.com

For an application see our website, www.snfi.org, or the February issue of the Rostrum.

Important SNFI LD Information

Two Week Program: July 30 - August 12, $1,525
Three Week Program: July 30 - August 19, $2,345
Third Week Only: August 12 - August 19, $950

Additional $85 application fee required for all programs.

For additional information and applications contact us at

SNFI, 555 Bryant Street, #599, Palo Alto, CA 94301
(650) 723-9086 • snfi@mail.com
The Stanford Debate Society presents the
Stanford National Forensic Institute
Individual Events Program: July 30 - August 12, 2002

Dramatic Interpretation...Humorous Interpretation
Oratory...Extemporaneous...Impromptu...Expository
Thematic Interpretation...Prose...Poetry...Duo Interpretation

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 30th 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.

Morris Block is a champion events coach from Riverdale HS in Louisiana. He has coached champions in most events, and students to late elimination rounds of most of the nation's major events tournaments, including NFL nationals. He has coached 4 students to finals of NFL nationals in interp events.

Other great SNFI events staff include Rajiv Batra of Leland HS / UC Berkeley, and Adam Swensek of Boston University. More staff will be added, depending on enrollment.

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.

"To say that the SNFI improved my competitive skills is an understatement. With the powerful combination of an experienced staff and limitless opportunity for research and study, this program offers the very best chance for success in forensics."

- Andrew Swan, previous SNFI Individual Events camp participant

Resident cost: $1,525 (room & board) / Commuter cost $1,195 (includes lunch/dinner only)
An additional application fee of $85 is required
For additional information: call (650) 723-9086
SNFI, 555 Bryant Street, #599, Palo Alto, CA 94301
Stanford National Forensic Institute
Policy Debate Programs

3 Week Program July 28 - August 17  4 Week Program: July 28 - August 24

The Stanford National Forensic Institute offers a unique national caliber program 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.

The 3 Week Program: The 3 Week curriculum balances improving students debate technique, through expertly critiqued practice rounds, with in-depth discussion of debate theory and the topic for the year. Students will work with each other and the faculty on research and argument construction to create a full set of evidence available to all SNFI students. Students may also apply to the Swing Lab, a special program within the larger 3 Week session. The Swing Lab program is designed to provide a continuation of participants prior camp experience with an advanced peer group and the finest instructors. To be eligible to apply students must have previously attended at least one previous debate institute during the summer of 2002.

The 4 Week Program: The 4 Week Program is fully integrated with the 3 Week Program, but adds an additional week, which focuses primarily on technique and practice rounds. Students are guaranteed to get 17 fully critiqued practice rounds in the final week, which effectively means that participants will have the equivalent of a semester or more of experience by the start of the school year! 4 Week students are welcome to apply to special programs, such as the Swing Lab, for the first three weeks of the camp.

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

Matthew Fraser, SNFI Director
Russ Falconer, UC Berkeley
Dan Salamon, UC Berkeley
Chris MacFarlane, USC (CA)
Casey Kelly, Wake Forest
Stacey Nathan, UC Berkeley
Jen Johnson, Bay Area UDL
Robert Thomas, 4th Week Director
Anne Marie Todd, USC (CA)
Gerard Grigsby, Harker School
Sarah Holbrook, West Georgia
Jon Sharp, USC (CA)
John Hines, U. of North Texas
Erin White, Georgetown
Dave Arnett, UC Berkeley
Randy Luskey, UC Berkeley
Abe Newman, UC Berkeley
Judy Butler, formerly Emory
Takis Makridis, Arizona State
Erik Holland, USC (CA)
Carrie Reilly, U. of Pennsylvania

For an Application see our website, www.snfi.org, or the February issue of the Rostrum!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Week Program</th>
<th>Dates &amp; Prices</th>
<th>4 Week Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 28 - August 17</td>
<td>$2,055</td>
<td>July 28 - August 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prices include housing for the duration of the program, 3 meals a day on most days of the program, tuition and all required materials. A commuter option is available. An additional $85 enrollment fee is required upon application.

For more information write to
Stanford Debate Society • 555 Bryant Street #599 • Palo Alto, CA 94301
phone: 650-723-9086 • fax: 510-548-0212 • email: snfi@mail.com
The National Forensic Consortium presents the

NATIONAL DEBATE INSTITUTE, D.C.

HELD AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK

Policy Debate: July 1 - July 19, 2002

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. The NDI-DC has a hand-picked staff of the best instructors in the nation, and the program curricula have been carefully developed and successfully implemented over the last 10 years.

- **30-ROUND POLICY DEBATE PROGRAM:** No other program in the country offers students the opportunity to improve as quickly and extensively: each student is guaranteed the opportunity for 30 full-length debates with extensive post-round critiques. Such concentrated and directed practice allows students to make improvements in argumentative sophistication and technical proficiency that normally take a semester or longer. The staff is carefully selected to provide a balance between high school coaches, assistant coaches, and current college debaters, and the 4:1 student-staff ratio ensures that each student will receive individualized feedback from every instructor. Initially confirmed instructors include: **Jake Foster,** Northwestern University debater and winner of this year's Harvard, Wake Forest, and USC tournaments; **Gerard Grigsby,** currently coaching at the Harker School and formerly at Head Royce; **Nathan Haratani,** Berkeley Debater and winner of this year's UNI and Pepperdine tournaments; **Mikaela Rozen-Soltar,** assistant coach at the Blake School; **Beth Schuler,** debater at Whitman College; and **Steve Stein,** coach of Chattahoochee High School (GA).

- **POLICY DEBATE IMMERSION PROGRAM:** Randy Luskey, winner of the 2001 Copeland award for the top college debate team in the nation, and **Sarah Holbrook,** two-time CEDA national champion, will lead an accelerated lab with a focus on teaching the skills and concepts needed to make the transition to higher-level debate. The curriculum features in-depth topic analysis, advanced theory seminars, rigorous technique drills, intensive evidence production, and a special focus on in-round decision-making. The lab will provide a comprehensive blueprint of advanced debate strategy, preparation, and execution, allowing students to model their approach to debate on that of two extraordinary debaters. Sarah, who will be available throughout the program, and Randy, who will be available during the first portion of the camp, will be joined by an additional lab leader - look for staff updates in upcoming issues of the Rostrum.

- **EXPERIENCED PROGRAM DIRECTION:** The director is **Russ Falconer,** currently the assistant debate coach at the University of California at Berkeley, formerly a debater and coach at Emory University and Highland Park (TX) HS. This is his second year as director.

Special Offer: $50 rebate for all applications received, with enrollment fee, by April 1st.

Costs (which include tuition, housing, a breakfast allotment, lunch and dinner throughout the program, and all program materials and evidence):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immersion CX Program</th>
<th>30-round CX program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,875 resident, $995 commuter</td>
<td>$1,975 resident, 1,095 commuter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An additional $85 enrollment fee is required upon application.

For more information or an application: NDI-DC
510.548.4800
1678 Shattuck Ave., #305
Berkeley, CA. 94709

NFCinDC2002@aol.com
Applications are also available in the March issue of the Rostrum.
The National Forensic Consortium Presents the

**N.F.C. LINCOLN DOUGLAS PROGRAMS**

**The University of Maryland, College Park**
July 1 - July 15, 2002

**The University of California at Berkeley**
June 14 - June 29, 2002

**The University of California at Berkeley**
June 14 - June 21, 2002

Each NFC Lincoln Douglas program offers an intensive curriculum, taught by an experienced faculty of former championship debaters and veteran coaches who have led students to late elimination rounds at competitive national tournaments. The programs are carefully planned to provide balance between philosophical/theoretical instruction and rhetorical practice through speech seminars and practice debates. The curriculum is also structured to include both concepts from moral and political philosophy that are directly relevant to the year’s topics as well as introductions to more general material that thoroughly ground the students’ preparation in the history of ideas. Plus, the faculty’s extensive teaching experience enables them to adjust to the needs and interests of students of a wide range of styles and abilities. The curriculum features:

- Philosophy Discussions
- Theory Seminars
- Analytical Technique Workshops
- Expertly Critiqued Practice Debates
- Advanced Casing Strategies
- Rebuttal and Cross-Examination Drills

**The California National Debate Institute** gives students access to the resources of the nation’s finest public university, including a library housing over 9 million volumes. The LD curriculum emphasizes argument theory, logic, and analysis skills that will instill students with the capability to self-coach and generate quality arguments; the one-week program is perfect for students looking to get a head-start before attending a major LD summer program. The program director is Anthony Berryhill of Stanford University.

**The National Debate Institute-D.C.** is located 15 minutes from the Capitol in suburban College Park and features a comprehensive curriculum of theory and technique in combination with a balanced emphasis on pracitums and original research. The lecture schedule offers exhaustive treatments of the philosophic concepts that are integral to competitive success in LD debate. The program will be directed by Jon Gegenheimer of Georgetown University.

"I loved the intensity and attention to development of our skills - you've got to be serious about debate and willing to put in the work. The CX drills and 1AR drills were really helpful. I was very satisfied with the level of communication and help!"

-Stephanie Brockman, NFC-LD 2001

---

**Special Offer for Early Applications!**

Submit your application & enrollment fee by April 1st & receive a $50 rebate on camp tuition.

**PROGRAM COSTS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Commuter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NDI-DC</td>
<td>$1,450</td>
<td>$695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNDI 2 week program</td>
<td>$1,450</td>
<td>$785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNDI 1 week program</td>
<td>$735</td>
<td>$460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An additional $85 enrollment fee is required upon application.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION OR AN APPLICATION:**

- [www.educationunlimited.com](http://www.educationunlimited.com)
- [debate@educationunlimited.com](mailto:debate@educationunlimited.com)
- 1678 Shattuck Ave., #305
- 510.548.4800
- Berkeley, CA 94709

Applications are also available in the March issue of The Rostrum.
The California National Debate Institute is a national caliber two-week summer forensics program located in Berkeley, California. The CNDI is an independent program held in the residence hall facilities of the University of California at Berkeley. The CNDI provides serious debate students with 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 Robert Thomas, formerly of Bainbridge HS and Emory University; Mr. Thomas has been directing camps for 9 years.

• Policy Debate: The policy debate program offers intensive instruction for students of all levels of experience and skill. Students will receive topic and theory lectures, numerous critiqued debates with rebuttal reworks, small-group seminars, and access to the best evidence researched at other NFC camps. Strictly limited lab size ensures personal attention from an elite staff who have been carefully selected for both their knowledge of debate and their multiple years of experience as lab-leaders. This year's initially confirmed staff includes: Judy Butler, 17 year veteran instructor; Russ Falconer, UC Berkeley assistant coach; Gerard Grigsby, coach at the Harker School; Jen Johnson, director of the Bay Area UDL; and Jon Sharp, assistant coach at USC. Costs: $1,450 for residents, $785 for commuters.

• The Mentors Program: This two week program, now entering its fifth year, is open only to advanced debaters who are recommended by their coaches. Students in this program are mentored by Randy Luskey, 2001 Copeland award winner, and Sarah Holbrook, two-time CEDA national champion. The students also have the opportunity to be mentors themselves to younger students at the camp. In lab, students will receive advanced instruction on the intricacies of complicated arguments, the tools of exhaustive research, and the fundamentals of debate theory, and as mentors the students will solidify their own mastery of debate by teaching it to others. Costs: $1,325 for residents, $700 for commuters.

• One Week Program: This special CNDI program, which runs from June 22-29, is designed to be a shortened version of the regular CNDI curriculum. The lab features in-depth topic analysis, extensive explorations of debate theory, affirmative and negative argument construction, practice rounds, seminars, and lectures. This lab will give participants a strategic perspective on researching the topic as well as the theoretical clout to put it all into action. Costs: $735 for residents, $460 for commuters.

Special Offer For Early Applications!
Submit your application and enrollment fee by April 1st and receive a $50 rebate on camp tuition.

For more information or an application, please call 510.548.4800 or e-mail debate@educationunlimited.com. Applications are also available in the March 2002 issue of The Rostrum.
The NFC Presents
The Berkeley Mentors Lab 2002

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

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

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

Mentors will also have access to the other staff at the CNDI camp. Initially confirmed staff include: Judy Butler, a veteran of over 40 camps; Russ Falconer, Berkeley assistant coach and assistant coach of the 2000 NDT champions at Emory University; Gerard Grigsby, assistant coach at the Harker School; Jen Johnson, one of the highest rated instructors at the Stanford debate camp and director of the Bay Area Urban Debate League; and Robert Thomas, the California National Debate Institute director and one of the most experienced instructors in the nation. The Mentors lab is open only to very advanced debaters. This highly selective program will accept very few individuals to participate in the lab. If you would like to apply, please fill out and return the application below.

---

**Mentors Application**

Name: ____________________________

Address: __________________________

Phone: ____________________________ Email: ____________________________

School: ____________________________ Coach’s Name: ____________________________

Year of Graduation: __________ Number of Years Debating: __________

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

---

On the back of this form indicate tournaments attended and record for the past two years. At least one recommendation from a coach, former lab leader, or former Mentor is required. Send form to CNDI - Mentors; 1678 Shattuck Ave. #305; Berkeley, CA 94709. For more information: call 510-548-4800; email debate@educationunlimited.com; on the web www. educationunlimited.com.
May 2002

3RD ANNUAL HARKER ROUND ROBIN

On Saturday, September 28 and Sunday, September 29, Harker High School will host the 3rd Annual Harker Round Robin - a national debate tournament that offers Varsity and Junior Varsity Lincoln-Douglas and Varsity and Junior Varsity Policy divisions.

Harker High School is located in San Jose, California, just 10 minutes from nearby San Jose International Airport and 35 minutes from San Francisco International. We offer a competitive tournament, free lunch, and a fine set of awards, viz., speaker awards for both LD and Policy debaters, elimination round trophies, and sweepstakes (1st, 2nd, and 3rd).

We are pleased to offer the Town Suites by Marriott (next door to our campus) as our tournament hotel. A block of suites has been reserved for the tournament.

**Last year’s Sweepstakes Winners:**
- 1ST PLACE: Leland High School
- 2ND PLACE: Saratoga High School

**Last year’s Varsity Debate Winners:**
- Monta Vista High School
defeated Lynbrook High School

To request a formal, written invitation, please contact Matthew Brandstetter, Ed.D., Director of Harker Speech and Debate, (408)345-9235, or e-mail matthewb@harker.org.

Once again, we look forward to seeing you on the West Coast this fall - we will do everything we can to accommodate you and your students.
WMD411 @ www.nti.org

The authoritative on-line source for the 2001-2002 National High School Policy Debate Topic

Resolved: That the United States federal government should establish a foreign policy significantly limiting the use of weapons of mass destruction.

Before you stand resolved...

Before you argue for or against a plan...

Because you want to win the debate...

Go to WMD411 at www.nti.org

Fast facts at your fingertips.

WMD411 features:

- Over 100 pages of original text written by nonproliferation experts;
- A chronology covering over 500 historical events from 1987 to 2001;
- Over 800 relevant references and links in the bibliography;
- Full text of treaties, agreements, and policy papers; and
- Exclusive articles written by top scholars especially for debaters.

*The Nuclear Threat Initiative, a charitable organization co-chaired by Ted Turner and Sam Nunn, is a co-sponsor of the 2001-2002 National Forensic League Policy Debate and is offering WMD411 - which is available on nti.org at no cost - to support student learning about the global threats from nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. WMD 411 was created for NTI by the Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies.*
The Global Challenge of Reducing the Threats from Weapons of Mass Destruction

Good morning. I want to thank John Rennie and Scientific American for sponsoring this public discussion of the trade-offs between security and civil liberty. Ever since the advent of electronic commerce and the invention of ever more sophisticated techniques of surveillance, the debate between security and liberty has been simmering. September 11 and its aftermath brought it to a boil.

I speak to you today as President of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, a charitable organization, co-chaired by former U.S. Senator Sam Nunn and CNN founder Ted Turner. Our mission is to help reduce toward zero the threat from nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. Civil liberties are not part of our mission explicitly, but implicitly, they are.

"Our highest priority is keeping weapons of mass destruction out of terrorist hands."

After all, we're not just engaged in an effort to reduce a threat from something, we're working to reduce a threat to something - not just a threat to life, but a threat to a way of life.

As the people in this forum understand very well, our best hope is not to find the right answer, but to find the right balance. The search for a balance between security and liberty will never be a settled affair. It is an endless process of adaptation and adjustment because a properly designed security system is one that will provide both an effective defense of our lives and our liberties. We have to identify an arrangement that maximizes our share of both values, and goes as fast as possible to make sure one is not emphasized at too great a cost to the other. That precise balance will always be subject to debate. It is the quality of that debate that will determine how skillfully we strike the balance. And as we engage that debate in this important conference and elsewhere, we have to avoid falling into the old trap where people simply take sides and press for less of what makes them more nervous - either government intrusions or terrorist threats. This approach blinds one side to the legitimate concerns of the other, and puts more focus on "who's winning" rather than on what's at stake.

The best balance between security and liberty can never be achieved unless we all understand what's at stake, and design our actions on a clear understanding of the threats.

Indeed, one of America's great defenders of civil liberties, Justice William Brennan once said that striking the right balance between liberty and security requires, and I quote: "an intimate familiarity with the national security threats that tests their bases in fact, explores their relation to the exercise of civil freedoms, and probes the limits of their compass." This "intimate familiarity" of which Brennan speaks is a necessary analytic predicate to the design of a defense system that gets our priorities right and strikes the right balance between providing for our security and protecting our civil liberties.

The best possible defense against the full range of threats must start with an objective, comprehensive national security estimate that assesses each risk, ranks each threat, computes every cost, and confronts the full range of dangers in a way that defends against one without making us more vulnerable to another. From this analysis can be constructed a broad based strategy and measured defense - one that would allow us to direct the most resources to prevent threats that are the most immediate, the most likely, and the most potentially devastating. In the absence of an infinite budget, relative risk analysis must be the beginning point in shaping our strategy and allocating our resources - to defend our citizens at home and abroad.

Such a plan is essential not only for an informed debate of security spending and priorities, but also essential to the defense of civil liberties - as it gives the government the knowledge it needs in striking the right balance between security and civil liberties, and it gives the public the knowledge it needs to evaluate the balance. Of course, this knowledge also would enable an informed public to force change in any improvidently designed system.

For me, the need for such a plan is both compelling...
and urgent. Yet today it does not exist. I suggest that the defenders of security and the defenders of civil liberties have common interest in seeing to it that one is devised. In this, NTI can use your help. The creation of such a risk-based security plan is something we have advocated from the inception of our initiative.

From where we sit, we are convinced that any reasonable risk analysis will rank the threat from nuclear, chemical and biological weapons as our greatest threat – nothing else comes close. If we fail – from lack of resources or lack of attention or lack of proper emphasis – to protect our society from a terrorist attack with a weapon of mass destruction, we risk not only a catastrophic loss of life but also a catastrophic shift in the balance between security and liberty with grave implications for present and future generations. That is the core of the common ground between advocates of security and advocates of civil liberties. Our first line of defense against weapons of mass destruction is also our first line of defense against the loss of civil liberties – and that is to make sure weapons of mass destruction never fall into terrorist hands.

The Greatest Threat:

**Terrorist Use of Nuclear, Biological or Chemical Weapons.**

What changed on September 11 was not the terrorist threat, but our awareness of it and our resolve to do something about it. The greatest shock was perhaps not even the sheer loss of life, which was staggering, but the murderous intent behind it. We know now that the terrorist capacity for killing is limited only by the power of their weapons. The question is whether we must prepare for terrorism or for attacks with weapons of mass destruction. Those two threats are not separate, but interrelated and reinforcing, and if joined together, become our worst nightmare. So we are now engaged in a new arms race; a race between those who seek to acquire weapons of mass destruction and those who seek to deny them. The outcome of this race will determine security in the 21st Century.

How real is the danger? Many Americans are now aware that Osama bin Laden has said acquiring weapons of mass destruction is “a religious duty.” Few understand how far bin Laden has come in pursuing his so-called duty. According to recent reports,

In January, the U.S. uncovered rudimentary diagrams of nuclear weapons at a suspected safe house for Al Qaeda in Kabul.

The U.S. also uncovered documents confirming that Al Qaeda was exploring ways to make low-grade, nuclear devices – so-called “dirty bombs”.

And materials that could be used to make such a device were found in an underground Al Qaeda base near Kandahar in South Afghanistan.

The U.S. recovered other documents that include details of a biological and chemical weapons program along with a memo, apparently written by bin Laden’s number two, saying: “the destructive power of these weapons is no less than that of nuclear weapons.”

We need to remind ourselves that these are only the documents they left behind. We don’t know what they took with them.

We not only know that terrorists are seeking weapons of mass destruction. We also know where they are looking:

Ten years ago, the Soviet Union broke apart, leaving as its legacy more than 20,000 strategic nuclear warheads, and enough highly-enriched uranium and plutonium to make 40,000-60,000 more, stored in over 250 buildings at more than 50 sites distributed throughout the Russian Federation across 11 time zones.

Russia today also possesses thousands of tactical nuclear weapons, some small enough to fit in a backpack, and others powerful enough to destroy a small city. These weapons have never been the subject of arms control regimes and are largely unaccounted for. We simply don’t know how many there are, where they are or how secure they are.

Russia also has 40,000 metric tons of chemical weapons awaiting disposition; an elaborate bioweapons apparatus, and tens of thousands of scientists who know how to make weapons and missiles, but no longer have secure jobs or secure futures.

Over the last decade, Russia’s dysfunctional economy and eroded security systems have undercut controls on these weapons, materials, and know-how – and increased the risk that they could flow to terrorist groups or hostile forces. Things have improved under a concerted, decade-long program of U.S.-Russian cooperative threat reduction – but both sides know we have a long way to go.

And the vulnerabilities reach beyond Russia. Forty-three nations have research reactors fueled by highly-enriched uranium—the raw material of nuclear terrorism. Global inventories of separated plutonium derived from the spent fuel of civilian nuclear reactors total more than 200 metric tons and are growing daily. We have more confidence about the security of the plutonium than we do of the highly enriched uranium. But to put these numbers in perspective: it would take only pounds of this material to make a nuclear device capable of devastating much of Manhattan or to lay waste to a mid-sized city – like, for example, Washington, D.C.

We have developed international standards to govern the security of materials in transit from state to state. Yet, there are no international standards or requirements for the physical protection of nuclear material within a state. Nations are free to select whatever level of security they may choose. That may have been an acceptable balance between sovereign rights and the obligation states have to each other in a bygone era. It is no longer an acceptable or rational “state of affairs.” The worldwide system of security for nuclear materials is no stronger than the system of security at the weakest, worst-defended site, which in many cases is nothing more than an underpaid, unarmed guard sitting inside a chain-link fence. Clearly, we must do better and to do better will require a much higher-level commitment of diplomatic initiative and resources by the international community.

Nuclear theft is more than a worry; it’s a reality. The International Atomic Energy Agency’s illicit trafficking database records
Regent Program – July 20-August 3
Our flagship policy program, the Regent program has had alumni qualify to elimination rounds at every major national tournament, including the TOC, NFL, and NCFL. The program also has had outstanding success with novice and beginning debaters. Regent participants leave campus with every piece of evidence photocopied at MUDI from all policy debate programs!
Resident: $899  Commuter: $599

Scholastic Program – July 20-July 27
The more affordable counterpart to the Regent program, Scholastics will work with Regents during their week on campus. When they leave they receive all evidence compiled by all Scholastics and Regents up to the point of their departure.
Resident: $599  Commuter: $399

Lincoln-Douglas Program – July 20-August 28
Students get a balance of philosophy and practical skills. Our coaching staff has produced national circuit and state debate champions. Learn from a proven curriculum that has been modeled by other institutes.
Resident: $425  Commuter: $625

Debaters from our program have enjoyed great success including:
- Mississippi State Champions: Nov, JV, Varsity Champions of East Grand Rapids, MI Elimination Rounds at NFL Nationals; CPL Nationals; TOC, KY; Glenbrook, IL; Iowa Caucus; New Trier, IL; Greenhill, TX; Emory, GA;
- many more!

Our 2001 Faculty Partially Included:
- Tom Noonan, Marquette Univ. High School
- Doug Robidoux, Univ. of Wisconsin-Oshkosh
- Kevin Thom, Marquette Univ. High School

DI prides itself on its open educational philosophy. Every participant has access to all faculty members and each participant leaves with a complete set of evidence from all labs. We never exceed the 6:1 lab ratio and provide excellent dorm supervision.

Our Information Contact:
- Marquette University College of Communication at 414-288-5500 or
- Inman, Director of Debate at debateteam@marquette.edu or
- Visit www.summerdebate.com/mudi
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Online Evidence Database

The Leading Product for Policy Debate Research Just Got Better—
Wake Forest’s Debater’s Research Guide, the Michigan Blue Book, Harvard Debate Impacts, and other major handbooks, consolidated in a single database with a super new, user-friendly search engine that is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week. This database will be updated frequently throughout the year with case cards, disadvantage updates, and new evidence for sophisticated krn/sk strategies.

The Same Great LD Product You’ve Come to Expect—
Roger Solt of the University of Kentucky will continue to produce high quality analysis, strategic advice and evidence on each Lincoln-Douglas topic throughout the year.

Premium Services

Converse online with the country’s leading debate coaches, including David Heidt, Dallas Perkins, Elizabeth Rogers, and Ross Smith. Some of the many topics for discussion include conditionality, state counterplans, politics, and Foucault. Listen to lectures from some of the country’s leading debate institutes, including Dartmouth, Michigan and Wake Forest. You may lose your lecture notes, but you’ll never lose the lecture.

Subscribe Today

Subscribe now to take advantage of the most comprehensive evidence database on the web and receive free access to many premium services. A yearly subscription is only $239 per school and includes unlimited access to the database, as well as the premium services. Free access to premium services is limited to the first 500 subscribers. Service availability begins on July 1, 2002.

Contact us today to subscribe:

On the website at: www.planetdebate.com
Via email at: sales@planetdebate.com
Via fax at: 617-876-1360
Via Snail Mail at: Harvard Debate, 490 Adams Mail Facility, Cambridge, MA 02138

Free Services

Tournament results, tournament invitations, scouting information, and much more are available for all users. Register today to be eligible to receive free subscription-based services as well as a number of other evidence prizes and become a part of a growing community of users.

A Project of Harvard Debate
www.planetdebate.com
16 thefts involving plutonium or enriched uranium. Sixteen cases is a disturbing number, but it also may not tell us what we really need to know: what percentage of the actual thefts do we uncover? Is it close to one hundred percent—or closer to one percent?

And this disturbing story gets even more disturbing. Biological weapons, as Al Qaeda now knows, can also present a grave risk. Secretary Rumsfeld said in his confirmation hearings: "I would rank bioterrorism quite high in terms of threat ... it does not take a genius to create agents that are enormously powerful, and they can be done in mobile facilities, in small facilities."

Hundreds of labs and repositories around the world sell biological agents for legitimate research—and some of the same substances used in legitimate research can be turned into weapons. In addition, the massive biological weapons program of the former Soviet Union remains a threat. At its peak, the program employed 70,000 scientists and technicians in more than fifty locations, and made tons of smallpox and other deadly pathogens. Today, we believe the bioweapons materials have largely been destroyed. We believe this; we don't know this. We do know the deadly recipes remain—as do more than 700 scientists who have been officially classified as security risks. And tighter security today can't fully protect us from the impact of poor security in the past. As one Russian official said some years ago of Soviet smallpox stocks: "There were plenty of opportunities for staff members to walk away with an ampule." We also know now that the top biological defense labs in the United States had the same porous approach to security. One microbiologist recently told the Washington Post: "I could have lifted vials of anything, and they never would have been missed."

And those are just the dangers from our past. The bioweapons threat from the future may prove to be even more difficult to contain or counter. Rapid advances in bio science, bio technology, genomic research and bio medicine are overcoming historic barriers to the weaponization of generally available pathogens and agents. Indeed the bioweapons threat may prove to be the greatest danger we face in the future. Of course, having a future assumes we deal effectively with the present danger.

**Our highest priority: keeping weapons of mass destruction out of terrorist hands.**

In providing for the Nation's security, we have to put first things first. And our first priority, our first line of defense, must be to deny the world's most dangerous people and their state sponsors access to the world's most dangerous weapons. This is the most effective way to defend ourselves against "catastrophic terrorism."

Nearly six months before September 11, in his first major speech as co-chair of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, former Senator Sam Nunn asked: "Is keeping nuclear, biological and chemical weapons out of the hands of rogue nations and terrorists a priority or is it an afterthought? If it's an afterthought, after what?"

Two months after September 11, President Bush appeared at a joint White House press conference with President Putin, said, and I quote: "Our highest priority is to keep terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction." A Scientific American/NTI poll conducted last month found that nearly three-quarters of Americans surveyed agreed.

And these polling numbers preceded last week's Washington Post report that heightened security concerns about Al Qaeda's focus on weapons of mass destruction have led the Bush Administration to activate "contingency plans to maintain a cadre of senior federal managers in underground bunkers away from Washington." The Post also reports that following a late October briefing, the President ordered his national security team "to give nuclear terrorism priority over every other threat to the United States."

However, keeping the world's most dangerous weapons out of the hands of the world's most dangerous people is not yet a budget priority. The President's budget priorities should reflect his stated priorities—and they do not. There is still a dangerous lag between the President's words, and our dollars and our deeds. The total threat reduction programs at the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy and the Department of State focused on Russia's proliferation vulnerabilities are proposed in the President's budget for fiscal year 2003 at roughly the same levels appropriated last year after adjusting for inflation. And those aggregate numbers conceal cuts in some of the more vital programs designed to secure weapons materials and stem the spread of weapons know-how. The explanation for these cuts—put forth in the budget document—is that the Administration cannot efficiently spend the dollars it already has in materials security and in Russia's nuclear cities. This argument is unpersuasive, and implies a business-as-usual approach to an increasingly urgent, time-sensitive threat.

An NTI/Scientific American poll completed a few weeks ago determined that fewer than half of those surveyed believed the government was doing enough to protect Americans from weapons of mass destruction. When informed about the security risks in the former Soviet Union, the number saying the government was doing enough dropped to slightly more than a quarter. These polling numbers reflect the intuition and inherent good sense of the American people. Our government is not doing enough, the Russian government is not doing enough to address these vulnerabilities, nor are our friends in Europe or Japan.

Can we fix our spending priorities so the greatest dangers we face draw our greatest investments? Yes. But it will take time, which is a depleting commodity in the arms race of the 21st Century. And it will take an informed public to provide the political will and political reward necessary for the type of sustained commitment required to get the job done. It's not enough to have a public informed of the threat. We need a public informed on what's being done, and what ought to be done. We will need the voice and the support of the people in this room to strengthen our first line of defense.

**A common agenda: supporting a global coalition against catastrophic terrorism.**

Getting our spending priorities right is but one piece of a larger mosaic. To counter the threat from catastrophic terrorism, we will need an unprecedented level of international security co-
operation and cooperation between the public and private sectors.

President Bush and President Putin will meet in Moscow this spring. This is their opportunity to define a new security framework, one that has real meat on the bones.

To address the threat from catastrophic terrorism, we need a multi-layered global coalition, with Russia and the United States joined together as lead partners. No effective effort is possible without Russian-U.S. participation and cooperation. Nor will any U.S.-Russian cooperative effort be truly effective without the participation of other nations.

The U.S. and Russia, as stewards of the world’s greatest arsenals, should commit to making sure our weapons and materials are safe, secure, and accounted for, with reciprocal monitoring sufficient to assure each other and the rest of the world that this is the case. President Putin and President Bush can also accelerate U.S.-Russian cooperation on biological weapons defense.

But this is only a beginning. Russia and the U.S. should bring together all nations in a broad-based cooperative alliance. NTI Board member Senator Richard Lugar has made clear the challenge: “We have to make sure that every nation with nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons capacity, accounts for what it has, secures what it has, and pledges that no other nation or group will be allowed access.”

Such an effort will require a system of inventory accounting and accountability absent in today’s world. It will require cooperation on interdiction and consequence management if controls fail. And, importantly, it will require the participation of nations not today joined in mutual treaty commitments on these matters. In short, it will necessitate a much higher level of international security cooperation than the world has ever known.

We require a comparable level of cooperation between the public and private sectors, and within the private sector, if we are to make the world safer from the threat from catastrophic terrorism. This is particularly needed to address the risks associated with chemical and biological terrorism. Chemical and biological materials and technologies are mostly in the hands of industry and university researchers. Responsible members of these communities must be the authors, the implementers, and the enforcers of normative standards for scientific practice and requirements for the safe transfer and handling of dangerous pathogens and materials. Failing that, university researchers and industry risk a governmental response that may put in jeopardy the very mechanisms on which we depend to create effective defenses or to advance the human condition.

No one knows infallibly the precise degree of security called for in restricting access to dangerous pathogens, or the right level of caution in publishing the results of laboratory experiments with germs or agents that can be weaponized. The right result will require case-by-case judgment that is beyond the ability of even the most carefully drawn regulation. It can’t be assumed that there are just two levels of secrecy — either fully classified or fully open. There must be some level in between — let’s call it “common sense security.” Common sense cannot be mandated by regulation. It must be developed as a behavioral norm and enforced by peers.

This means it is vital for scientific researchers not just to oppose a plan put forward by others, but to propose one of their own — it is imperative to keep initiative and control in the hands of those who best understand the damage improper regulation could do to scientific research. Here, as in the case of security and civil liberties, a balance must be found. I have been privileged to serve as Chairman of the Laboratory Operations Board, which oversees our National Laboratories, and also as member of the Commission on Science and Security. I believe you can have both excellent science and excellent security. To do so, however, the scientists in our national laboratories must “buy in” to the program, exercise reasonable judgment, and make the program work. In dealing with the chemical and biological threat, no less is required of our Nation’s research universities and the science community. Any doubt or resistance should be put to rest by a June 1999 memo discovered by the Wall Street Journal on the hard-drive of a computer left in Kabul by Al-Qaeda. It recommended that the Al-Qaeda biological weapons program seek cover and talent in educational institutions, which the memo said “allow easy access to specialists, which will greatly benefit us in the first stage, God willing.”

As in the case of the threat from nuclear weapons, measures that will deter or prevent terrorist access to dangerous biological or chemical materials or know-how are the most cost-effective short-term means to counter threats to public health and social order. We need to protect against this danger in part by strengthening intelligence gathering against such threats, but also by providing peaceful research opportunities to scientists in the former Soviet Union. And here, as is the case in addressing Russia’s nuclear vulnerabilities, we are not doing nearly enough to strengthen our first line of defense. Let me be clear, this statement and my earlier remarks are not a criticism of the President’s priorities. He has charted the right course but the bureaucratic troops have not yet followed his lead — and they must for our future’s sake.

Conclusion

So let me summarize. Al Qaeda has established a loosely affiliated network of terrorists on every continent, including our own. These terrorists have made clear they are seeking weapons of mass destruction. The materials and know-how they need are spread around the world in abundant and poorly-secured supply.

This is an obvious threat to our security, and a corresponding threat to our civil liberties. September 11 has already sparked new encroachments into our civil liberties, and many fear this is just the first wave of the post-9/11 world. The public is understandably conflicted about this. The NTI/Scientific American poll I cited earlier showed that more than three-quarters of those surveyed fear an attack with weapons of mass destruction. Yet an almost equal number of those surveyed expressed worry over the loss of individual freedoms. The way out of this apparent contradiction is not to sacrifice security for liberty or vice versa. As I said earlier, the path forward is to understand the threat so well, and tailor a risk-based response so well constructed, that it achieves a reasoned and accepted balance between security and civil liberty. We can do this, if the defenders of security and the defenders of civil liberty keep in mind what’s at stake and work to a common purpose.
Throughout history, great invasions into civil liberties have been sparked by attacks on the nation. President Lincoln suspended the writ of habeas corpus during the Civil War; the Espionage Act — passed during World War I — led to prosecution of Americans for opposing the draft or stating religious objections to the war; World War II saw the internment of Japanese Americans, which ultimately led to payment of reparations. We should learn from this history. The greatest losses in civil liberties throughout history have been precipitated by an attack. Consequently, the best preservation of civil liberties is prevention of new attacks. If we find it difficult after September 11 to bring reason into the debate over the sacrifice of civil liberties, imagine the difficulty after a terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon, or a nerve agent, or a deadly contagious virus. Not only would emotion then call for a dramatic tightening of security at great cost in civil liberties, but reason itself would have a strong argument for an immediate, perhaps irreversible shift in the balance between liberty and security.

It should be our common bond to avoid that day of reckoning. And that common bond grows out of common sense: we cannot protect ourselves piecemeal. No single approach can serve our country or save what we most want preserved — whether it is civil liberties, national security, or unfettered scientific research. We cannot focus only on what's most important to us individually, because it's all important to us collectively, and it's all at risk. Either we act to preserve each part of it, or we might lose all of it.

As I close these remarks, I am reminded of the exchange between two of our founding fathers at a time of great danger. John Hancock reportedly said: “We must be unanimous. There must be no pulling different ways. We must all hang together.” To which Ben Franklin answered: “Yes, we must, indeed, all hang together, or most assuredly we shall all hang separately.” This is truly a time to “hang together,” to emphasize what unites us and work for the defense of the nation while preserving the values we hold most dear. Thank you very much.

(Charles B. Curtis, President and Chief Operating Officer of the Nuclear Threat Initiative presented this speech at the Scientific American Summit on Privacy, Security and Safety: Preserving an Open Society in an Age of Terrorism on March 6, 2002.)
International Summer Speech and Debate Institute
JULY 2002 DUINO, ITALY

LOCATION
The Institute will be held at the United World College of the Adriatic campus, which is located on cliffs overlooking the beautiful Adriatic. In addition to the formal sessions, the campus offers opportunities for swimming, kayaking, and other outdoor activities. Site seeing visits to nearby cities such as Venice, Bologna, Ljubljana and Trieste will be offered.

SESSION 1 JULY 1-14TH
Lincoln-Douglas Debate & Speech
The L-D workshop will be for students wishing to work on 2002-2003 NFL debate topics. The Speech workshop will offer instruction in Humorous and Dramatic Interpretation, Original Oratory, and Extemporaneous Speaking (including in-depth topic analysis). Students can cross-register in speech and debate.
Price: $1,400 USD

SESSION 2 JULY 16-23RD
Lincoln-Douglas
This L.D workshop will also be for students wishing to work on 2002-2003 NFL debate topics. This workshop will be held in conjunction with a World Schools Debating Workshop for international competition as well as a Parliamentary Debate Workshop.
Price: $1,000 USD
Program Director:
Eric Di Michele
(212) 288-1100, ext. 101
edimichele@regis-nyc.org

*Special Discount for Sessions 1 and 2 - $2,200

These prices include room, board, research materials, a "survival" Italian course, two excursions per session and pick up and drop off from the Trieste airport or train station. If students arrive at another airport in Italy, help can be arranged to get to Duino, but they are responsible for the cost. Students are also responsible for their own airline tickets to and from Italy.

ALSO OFFERED DURING SESSION 2:

SESSION 2 JULY 16-23RD
World Schools Debating Format
This workshop will focus on the World Schools Debating format. The workshop will be for students interested in the annual World School Debating Championship and the unique debate format used at that event.
Price: $1,000 USD
Program Director:
Trevor Sether	
trevor@squareeye.com

SESSION 2 JULY 16-23RD
Parliamentary Debate Format
An eight-day workshop which will focus on Parliamentary debate.
Price: $1,000 USD
Program Director:
John Meany
john.meany@claremontmckenna.edu
STAFF

Eric Di Michele: Program Director. He has been the speech & debate coach at Regis High School in New York City for twenty years. His teams have won the New York State Forensics Championship ten times. He has reached NFL nationals twice. His students have won the NFL National Championship in Forensics. Over half of his students have been national finalists in extemp. He was the co-chair of the NFL Lincoln-Douglas Debate Writing Committee for five years. He is the co-chair of the NFL Lincoln-Douglas Debate Reading Committee for five years. As a consultant with the Open Society Institute, he has taught speech & debate seminars in over fifteen countries—now over 10,000. He is also the author of Middle Eastern Studies and Contemporary Social & Political Issues. He hopes this summer's stay in Italy will revive his childhood history.

Lydia Esslinger: former head forensics coach at Spotswood High School in Long Island, NY, has extensive experience in all areas of speech and debate. She has coached over twenty-five New York State champions, and her students have taken first place at major invitational tournaments, such as Harvard and Emory. Her students have advanced to semis and finals in every event at NFL nationals. NFL achievements include seminals and finalists in every event at nationals; a 2nd place in Congress; and the current national champion in Dramatic Interpretation. Mrs. Esslinger is a member of the University of Kentucky, the NFL at American University, and the NFL at American University. Her past seven summers have been spent teaching debate, extemp, impromptu and eastern and central Europe, as a senior consultant to the Open Society Institute. She has also conducted workshops in Hungary and Ukraine. An NFL 4-diamond coach, she is also president of the Long Island Forensics Association. In her day job, Mrs. Esslinger teaches AP English, coaches acting, and has directed more than twenty main stage musicals.

Hee-Sun Hong: a Lincoln-Douglas Debater and debater at Bronx High School of Science and serves as captain of the 1-D squad. Her achievements include first place at the Barkley Forum and the Tournament of Champions 1-D. She has served as a consultant and instructor of debate at the Open Society Institute's International Debate Camp in Latvia. She has served for nine years as Director of College Counseling at Regis High School.

Trevor Sather: has been involved in the World Schools Debating Championships since 1997, in every possible capacity, as both a competitor for England, as a judge (Chief Adjudicator, South Africa 2001), as a coach (twice reaching the Final), and as tournament Director (London 1999). He is England's representative on the World Schools Debating Council. From 1997-99 he was Head of the ESI Centre for Speech and Debate and has run public speaking and debate workshops in the UK, US, Asia, Portugal, Netherlands, Australia, South Africa, Belgium and several other countries. He is also the Director of "Pro & Cons: A Debater's Handbook" (1991) and is also the author of "Debate Education in Eastern Europe." His area of expertise is specializing in non-profit chemist.

Marcin Zaleski: who will be on staff for sessions 1 and 2, obtained his International Baccalaureate at the United World College in Diane, Italy. In 1996, he became the coordinator of the Polish debate program and also wrote a book about debate. As a consultant for the Open Society Institute, he conducted training. In 1999, he was elected the President of the Board of Directors of the International Debate Education Association (IDEA). He is also the co-founder of the International Debating Training Institute. He speaks Polish, English, Italian and Russian. As an accomplished debater, Marcin will be teaching debate and survival Italian.

Additional Staff will be announced in the spring at our website: www.idebate.org

For further information contact:

Eric Di Michele
(212) 288-1001 ext. 101
edmichele@regis-nyc.org

Nina Watkins
IDEA-AILO Wire Street
NY, NY 10019
(212) 548-0885
nwatkins@somny.org

Applications available at www.idebate.org
Your Debate Program’s Public Face:

While debate tournament preparation tends to receive most of a program’s attention, your speech and debate program at some time or other will leave the safety of the tournament environment to face a real public: an audience. To showcase your debate skills, to address a timely issue, or to reach out to those beyond your immediate membership, you rely on public debates as the “public face” of your program. The question is, are your members prepared for public debates? When a conventional debate resolution is replaced by a controversy of immediate and tangible concern...when an opponent advancing predictable positions is replaced by committed adversary with an actual stake in the outcome...when a solitary and specialized judge is replaced by a large, living and breathing audience...the situation requires adaptation and specific efforts to tailor your arguments and your style to your audience, your opponents, and the situation. The Towson International Debate Institute: Public Debate Track is designed for students (both high school or college), teachers, and members of public advocacy organizations. The institute focuses on the skills you need to successfully organize and execute a public debate that leaves audiences interested and informed, challenged and entertained. The institute will feature:

- A chance to work with participants from all over the world (95 students and teachers from Europe are already slated to attend).
- An 8:1 participant-to-staff ratio featuring an internationally known faculty: Ken Broda-Bahm (Towson University Speech & Debate Program Director and co-author of upcoming book, Advocacy and Argument: A Practical Handbook for Public Debates), Daniela Kempf (Political Communication Specialist and co-author of upcoming book, Advocacy and Argument: A Practical Handbook for Public Debates), Arben Maalik (Leading trainer, Programi i Debait, Albania), Gordon Mitchell (Director of the William Pitt Debating Union and organizer of the National Debate-In), Maxwell Schnurer (Director of the Marist College Public Debate and Outreach Program, Marist, NY, USA), Eron Veliu (Director of Youth Programs, Balkan Youthlink), and over a dozen other experienced public debaters and trainers.
- A special presentation by Robert B. Barnett, a Washington, D.C. lawyer with the firm of Williams & Connolly, who has served as debate coach and “sparing partner” for Bill Clinton, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Joseph Lieberman, Michael Dukakis, Geraldine Ferraro, and others in the context to general election political debates. Senator Lieberman has called Mr. Barnett “the Cal Ripkin of debate preparation”.
- A specialized curriculum developed by the International Debate Education Association (IDEA) in association with a project funded by the Open Society Institute (OSI) and the U.S. Department of State Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.
- Eight days of sessions on innovative topics including “Formats for public debate,” “Debating for the camera or the microphone,” “Analyzing audiences, situations, and opponents,” “Rhetorical reasoning: creating arguments and refutations which resonate.”
- Comprehensive and hands-on practice in speaking, arguing, questioning, and refuting in a public context: working one on one and in small groups of 12 to 15.
- Media training and experience on a real soundstage and in front of a camera.
- An opportunity to develop your own public debate concept from project planning to debate completion.
- The experience of completing live-audience debates as part of the Baltimore Public Debate Festival which will occur at the end of the institute.

Fees: Eight days of sessions. Nine nights of food and dbl-occupancy lodging all for only $600. (Commuter option only $250, single occupancy only $750).

For more information or an application, contact Ken Broda-Bahm at 410-704-2886, Kbrodabahm@towson.edu or visit www.towson.edu/seeyi.

Every organization that hosts public debates should have at least some members who are specifically trained in the art of adapting forensic skills to a large audience. Your image depends on it.
MILESTONES FROM A BUSY YEAR

Ohio

Arlene Ackerman retired as Director of the Ohio State Speech League after 16 years of accomplishment. NFL Hall of Fame member Arlene coached the DI National Champion 1971. The Ohio State Drama Award was named in her honor.

North Dakota

Lindsay Littlefield, daughter of North Dakota Roughrider District Chair Dr. Robert Littlefield and top NFL point student in 1999 was recently named a Truman Scholar.

Wyoming

Former NFL Champion coach Ron Krikac appeared on E! Network's celeb pro-
file of Kelsay Grammer (Frasier). Ron has appeared on Frasier, an event he calls his 15
seconds of Fame! Kelsay was Ron's student at Pinecrest (FL) and a national finalist.

California

Andara Macdonald won the "K-12 Model Curriculum Award" from the Western Speech Association.

Vermont

NFL's new national tournament "director of computer operations" Dr. "Tuna" Snider met with the Prime Minister of Korea and keynoted the Korean College Debate Championships.

Michigan

Former NFL interper at Portage Northern (MI) Pam Marsden, was the producer of the hit movie Dinosaur. Pam graduated with 266 points in 1974.

Idaho

Idaho Chair and National Official Leora Hansen inducted in the Idaho High School Activities Association Hall of Fame.

California

Raquel Welch, 1960's Hollywood Goddess, was a student member of NFL in La Jolla (CA). She participated at district with a cutting from "Medea" by Euripides.

Tennessee

Billy Tate reports that Richard Speight Jr., former MBA NFL member is now on the TV show "The Agency." Richard appeared recently in two commercials shown during the Super Bowl.

Wisconsin

Jim Cupeland's Marquette H.S. (WI) national finalist Cary Pfeffer now anchor of News 5, Phoenix.

Tennessee

The male lead in Britney Spears new movie "Crossroads" is Anson Mount. He was coached by Glenda Sullivan at Dickson County H.S. (TN) to nationals in 1991. Anson also has movies still to be released with Robert DeNiro ("City By the Sea") and Christopher Walken ("Pool Hall Jumbles"). One Tennessee coach used the article about him in the March Seventeen to inspire her team, "Girls, this is why you should do forensics," she said, showing them his photo...Ruby Krider elected to Tennessee Teachers Hall of Fame, reports Dr. Jane Eldridge.

Louisiana

Josette Surratt, Father Turlings Catholic H.S. (LA) was named Lafayette Education Foundation's High School Teacher of the Year. Josette was nominated by her stu-
dents and their parents and fellow teachers. One letter described her as "a unique combi-
nation of Mother Duck, Pied Piper, Drill Sergeant, and Master Magician." Another wrote "our accomplishments, our failures, our struggles and pain are hers as well."

California

Hall of Fame Coach at Richmond-Kennedy H.S. (CA), David Dansky, was the subject of a huge article in Classic Toy Trains. David's train collection is one of the best in the world. Again this year David has donated money for a cake for the coaches at nationals. The cake will be Abraham Lincoln's favorite (see page 34)

Kansas

Diana B. Carlin, former NFL Debate Coach at Topeka H.S. (KS) was appointed to a committee to search for a new football coach at the University of Kansas last fall. Hall of Fame Kansas Roger Brannan accused her of moving closer to the other NFL by mixing into college football.

Pennsylvania

Retired forensic coach Mary Furlong from Delone Catholic High in McSherrystown (PA) now serving on the National Steering Committee on Debate in Zambia.

North Carolina

Professor Alan Louden and his championship Wake Forest Debate team held a "National Debate In" after 9/11 to help the public deal with issues raised by the tragedy. Over 60 American college debate programs also held public debates.

NFL

Extrem quote of the year: "War is God's way of teaching Americans geography". Ambrose Bierce
ACADEMIC ALL AMERICANS
(through March 15, 2002)

ALABAMA
Decatur
Kathryn Tucker

ALASKA
Haines
Luke Hedrick

ARIZONA
Red Mountain
Antonio J. Moorehead

CALIFORNIA
San Gabriel
Pearline Kyi
St. Ignatius College Prep
Edmond Lau
Juan R. McKinney
Beverly See

COLOMBIA
Columbine
Peter J. Henderson
Longmont
Nathan Hovestol
Logan Stortz
Moffat County
Amanda Breen
Niwot
Christine Rohde
Overland
Constantine Viderman
Pine Creek
Layla Oesper
Pueblo Centennial
Regina Caputo
Matthew Mientka

COLORADO
University

ILLINOIS
Heyworth
Jon Massman

INDIANA
Evansville-North
Emily Angle
Emily Kendall
Randy Waters

KANSAS
Bishop Miege
Rachel Struby
Buhler
Brookyn Bridge
Scot Rose
Little River
Andrew Wilcox
Lyons
Haley Johansen
Ashley Kelley
Moundridge
Nick W. Kreibiel
Jesse Nathan
David J. Stueky
Remington
Jarrett Bariel
Topeka
Laura Adams
Katherine Gatinghouse
Courtney L. Self
Emily J. Wallace
Valle Center
Timothy J. Harder

KENTUCKY
Dorville
Geoffrey Barton

MINNESOTA
Coon Rapids
Nicole J. Brunsvoild
Eagan
Maya A. Babu
South St. Paul
Sudha Rajan

MISSOURI
Fort Osage
Jane Anne Belmore
Tabera Siddiqui
Dustin Sullivan
Independence-
Chrisman
Jack Henry-Roads
Kansas City-Oak Park
Matt Apple
Nevada
Chelsea Bessey
Kevin Ozkal
Oak Park
Trevor Alexander
Erik C. Smith
Ozark
Shanda Lawson
Park Hill South
Matt Hampton
West Kauble
Brian Ralls
Patonville
Matt Fuller
Seneca
Caleb Gallemore
The Barstow School
Emily Durwood
Craig McPherson
Willow Springs
Jennifer D. Heimers

MONTANA
Great Falls-Russell
C. Rhiannon
Graybull
Travis R. Kavulla

NEBRASKA
Hastings Sr.
Ben Keele
North Platte
Matthew L. Hagert

NEW JERSEY
Randolph
Michael Griffin

NEW YORK
Christian Brothers
Academy
Pamela M. Barrett

NORTH DAKOTA
Walpekon
Curtis Jefferson

OHIO
North Canton Hoover
Raghav Chopra
Olmsted Falls
Christopher Malow

OKLAHOMA
Alva
Brett Cunningham
Frank Evans
Norman North
Chris Scapierlanda

OREGON
North Eugene
Chris Habliston

PITTSBURGH
North Allegheny Sr.
Michael Vater
Scranton
Richard J. Powell

SOUTH CAROLINA
Bob Jones Academy
Brett R. Kenyon

SOUTH DAKOTA
Aberdeen Central
Laura Sindorn
Groton
Tessa Hempel
Morgan McNickle
Dustin Shley
Emily Sippe
Spearfish
Chelsea Brennan
Washington
Tyson Helder

TENNESSEE
Nashville-Overton
Kristin Taylor

TEXAS
Brazoswood
Brandon Mack
Friendswood
Tiffany Chu
McNeil
Bobby Moreno
Brian Schroeder
Silva Magna
Kate Amber
Michelle Conroy
Emiliano Rodriguez

UTAH
 Beaver
Joseph A. Kannell
Grunsner
Tadd Dietz
Hunter
Robert Cummings
Jordan
Bryan Brown
Aaron Herget
Patrick Y. Lague
Michael Shackelford
Layton Christian Academy
Drew Walden
Logan
Benjamin D. Holdaway

WASHINGTON
Auburn Sr.
Andrew O'Connell

WISCONSIN
Sheboygan North
Jeri Brunette

WYOMING
Rawlins
Sukanya Chandra
Seth T. Ellisworth
Meera Sridharan
Dear Coaches and Debaters:

I'm pleased to invite your squad to join us for our 10th year as we begin preparing for the 2002-2003 debate season. We're more confident than ever that our resources will serve you the entire year - our offerings include topic specific and generic resources for Policy and Lincoln Douglas debaters produced by an unmatched staff of recognized experts.

Policy debaters will find a slew of traditional favorites highlighted by the Wake Forest Debaters' Research Guide and Stefan Bauschard's Hitchhiker's Companion to the 2002-2003 CX Debate Topic - along with the insight of Kentucky's Roger Solt in his Topic Kritiks and extensive line of theory resources. The new Classic Debate branch - under the experienced leadership of Catholic University Varsity Debate Coach Steve Mancuso - features your old favorites retitled in the new line: Classic Debate: Capitol Evidence, Classic Debate Disadvantages, Classic Debate Counterplans, and more.

Lincoln Douglas debaters will find a library created especially for them - featuring Scott Robinson - Univ. of Texas at Dallas - and his insight presented in LD Positions and as featured commentator in the popular Paradigm LD Topic Analysis. This special selection is anchored by the six volumes of Roger Solt's Handbooks of Moral and Political Philosophy - they're popular with all LD debaters.

All in all - we'll offer around 80 titles - with a few surprises coming - crafted by experts in the debate game and designed specifically to help you win more rounds. Your Paradigm Research professionals have always delivered the finest pre- and post- transaction service anywhere - that tradition is the foundation on which the exceptional research in our library is built. It's this match - this perfect chemistry - that's allowed Paradigm Research to thrive - to be your choice for great debate research - delivered on time every time.

Our entire staff is looking forward to working with you in your quest to make your debate team the best it can be. If I can be of assistance, I hope you'll call or email.

In the meantime, and on behalf of the entire Paradigm team, we wish you a happy and successful season.

Jeff Rutledge, President

Call or email for a FREE CATALOG today!
Toll-free 800-837-9973
www.oneparadigm.com
service@oneparadigm.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>HS Name</th>
<th>Student Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Phoenix Central HS</td>
<td>Jessie Martin</td>
<td>Brian Schon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Arroyo Grande HS</td>
<td>Michael Dorsi</td>
<td>Kyle Kimball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fontana HS</td>
<td>Frank Ramirez</td>
<td>Adrian Zaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gabrielino HS</td>
<td>Leonardo Ong</td>
<td>Rudy Tieu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Logan HS</td>
<td>David Kuei</td>
<td>Kellie Cowan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Costa Canyon HS</td>
<td>Aaron Sabas</td>
<td>Valerie Serrin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Reina HS</td>
<td>Laura Perry</td>
<td>Rollin Hu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leland HS</td>
<td>Timothy Grinsell</td>
<td>Steven Dhilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyola HS</td>
<td>Schurr HS</td>
<td>Jamie Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modesto Beyer HS</td>
<td>Yucaipa HS</td>
<td>Steven Dhillon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Canon City HS</td>
<td>Chris McConkey</td>
<td>James Frazier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delta HS</td>
<td>Daniel Frazer</td>
<td>Jenna Birkhold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fruita Monumenti HS</td>
<td>Jenna Birkold</td>
<td>Nathan Hale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mullen HS</td>
<td>Jeremiah Hartley</td>
<td>Thomas Hendrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palisade HS</td>
<td>Pueblo Centennial HS</td>
<td>Matthew Mientha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Archbishop Curley Notre Dame</td>
<td>Jules Bruno</td>
<td>Jude Volek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bronx HS Of Science</td>
<td>Hialeah HS</td>
<td>Chico Caraballo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lely HS</td>
<td>Megan Beck</td>
<td>Michael Krop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Krop HS</td>
<td>Yaniv Adar</td>
<td>Pina Crest School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pine Crest School</td>
<td>Adam Malt</td>
<td>(continued to page 65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Gainesville HS</td>
<td>Allen Fox</td>
<td>Texys Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Hillcrest HS</td>
<td>David Swenson</td>
<td>Scott County HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>Brebeuf Jesuit HS</td>
<td>Alexander Murphy-Nakhnikian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Wayne South Side HS</td>
<td>Lucas Martin</td>
<td>Emily Truesdell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hamilton Heights HS</td>
<td>Kate Cochrin</td>
<td>Mackenzie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Porte HS</td>
<td>Adam Plais</td>
<td>Brian Dinkel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logansport HS</td>
<td>T. K. Kallhoff</td>
<td>Brian Kosinski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Munster HS</td>
<td>T. K. Kallhoff</td>
<td>Ari Mirza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northfield HS</td>
<td>Nick Adams</td>
<td>Becky Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plymouth HS</td>
<td>Amy Kelley</td>
<td>Nathaniel Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Basehor Linwood HS</td>
<td>Dan Rundus</td>
<td>Nick Tussky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bishop Miege HS</td>
<td>Nick Tussky</td>
<td>Jessica Vandyke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carey Valley HS</td>
<td>T. K. Kallhoff</td>
<td>Jared Zuckerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chaparral HS</td>
<td>T. K. Kallhoff</td>
<td>Katie Tipton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Derby HS</td>
<td>Kyle Steams</td>
<td>Nick Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Kindred HS</td>
<td>Katie Tipton</td>
<td>Garden City HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Scott HS</td>
<td>Nick Adams</td>
<td>Melanie Goss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haven HS</td>
<td>Lindsey Miller</td>
<td>Newton HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newton HS</td>
<td>Clint Barker</td>
<td>Olathe South HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pittsburg HS</td>
<td>Shandy Soleimani</td>
<td>Shandy Soleimani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shawnee Mission East HS</td>
<td>Angela Meyer</td>
<td>Ethan Sigler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shawnee Mission West HS</td>
<td>Jared Zuckerman</td>
<td>Paul Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sunnyside Academy</td>
<td>Stewart Davis</td>
<td>Hope Gardner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topeka Seaman HS</td>
<td>Adriana Harsh</td>
<td>Rachel Guy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wichita East HS</td>
<td>Mitchell Graham</td>
<td>Paige Hendrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wichita Northeast Magnet HS</td>
<td>Tom Ikenwood</td>
<td>Britton Jobe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Needham HS</td>
<td>Peter Myers</td>
<td>Daniel Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Duxbury Glenclonal HS</td>
<td>Eric Butz</td>
<td>Matthewa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highland Park Sr HS</td>
<td>Mandi Kreumheimer</td>
<td>Eric Butz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moorhead HS</td>
<td>Brian Chisholm</td>
<td>Morgan Hulien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needham HS</td>
<td>John Langdale</td>
<td>John Langdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Francis HS</td>
<td>Francis Jackula</td>
<td>John Langdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Aurora HS</td>
<td>John Hammond</td>
<td>Independence Chrisman HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bolivar R 1 HS</td>
<td>Ashley Phillips</td>
<td>Independence Fort Osage HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clayton Sr HS</td>
<td>Navene Muthu</td>
<td>Joel Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independence Fort Osage HS</td>
<td>Tohono Oodjigii</td>
<td>John Hammond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independence Fort Osage HS</td>
<td>John Hammond</td>
<td>Independence Fort Osage HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kickapoo HS</td>
<td>Natalie Aldrich</td>
<td>Christine Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ladue Horton Watkins HS</td>
<td>Andrew Walsh</td>
<td>Brandi Richards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lea's Summit HS</td>
<td>Ian Busher</td>
<td>Jamie Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberty Sr HS</td>
<td>Learnie Jordan</td>
<td>Jamie Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marquette HS</td>
<td>Natalie Aldrich</td>
<td>Jamie Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Menomon HS</td>
<td>Natalie Aldrich</td>
<td>Jamie Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neosho HS</td>
<td>Natalie Aldrich</td>
<td>Jamie Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Bozeman HS</td>
<td>Ryan Bruiger</td>
<td>(continued to page 65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Eyre Sr HS</td>
<td>Susanne Graves</td>
<td>(continued to page 65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Fargo North</td>
<td>Diya Agarwal</td>
<td>Ben Keanie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fargo Shanley HS</td>
<td>David Thoreson</td>
<td>George Oberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washburn HS</td>
<td>Lynette J. Holzsche</td>
<td>Phaedra Yunker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Hastings Senior HS</td>
<td>Ben Keanie</td>
<td>George Oberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln East HS</td>
<td>Christopher Tildall</td>
<td>George Oberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norfolk HS</td>
<td>Aaron Davis</td>
<td>George Oberg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued to page 65)
Heart of America
Summer Debate Institutes
at Kansas State University

Policy Debate Institutes

Rookiecat Workshop
Lab Leader – Tom Grice
Assist. Coach, Topeka High School
July 7-13, 2002

Powercat Institute
Lab Leader – Ed Trimmer
Coach, Winfield High School
July 7-27, 2002

Wildcat Workshop
Lab Leader – Ken Troyer
Coach, Lyons High School
July 7-13, 2002

Wildcat Institute
Lab Leader – Steve Wood
Coach, Lawrence High & Free State High Schools
July 7-20, 2002

An institute for high school debaters taught by high school coaches. Squad leaders will be former outstanding high school and college debaters.

The right blend of high school & college!

Coaches Policy Topic Clinic
Topic Lecturers:
Vickie Fellers, Wichita East High School
Chris Riffer, Blue Valley High School
July 7-10, 2002

Coaches Policy Workshop
Instructors:
Gary Harmon, Salina Central High School
Ed Trimmer, Winfield High School
Steve Wood, Lawrence & Free State High School
July 14-20, 2002

Lincoln Douglas Debate & Student Congress
For Students & Coaches
Lab Leader – Harold Keller “Mr. Congress”
July 14-27, 2002

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

info@ksu.edu

Heart of America Debate Institutes
Division of Continuing Education
Kansas State University
13 College Court Building
Manhattan, KS 66506
**DISTRICT TOURNAMENT RESULTS**

**Maine**
- DUO: Brian Seigle and Lindsey Siegel, Edward Little
  - OO: Jon Danne and Maranook Community School
  - USA: Thomas H. Lewtiny
  - FX: Jacob/Parkins, Lewiston
  - DT: Emily Moers, Poland Regional

**Hillsboro**
- DUO: Emily L. Lengue, Edward Little
  - OO: Sara Ruy, Dirigo
  - USA: Bob Sh, Bangor
  - FX: Plaques - Lewiston
  - DT: Trophy - Thornton Academy

**North Coast**
- DUO: Dan Gray and Peter C. Zovis, St. Edward
  - OO: Ravi Maha and Karl Handler, St. Ignatius

**DUO**: Ashley Carpenese and Devon Lynch-Huggins, Magnificat
- OO: Brandon Cox and Jaron Hurley, Gilmour Academy

**Ohio**
- DUO: Satya Desai, Beavercreek
  - OO: Robert Haung, University School

**FX**:otted Myer, Hawkins School
- DT: Ahni Gho, Midpark

**DI**: Steven McGovney, St. Ignatius
- FX: Grey, Edinon

**DI**: Ryan Mann, Rocky River
- DT: Brandon Cox, Gilmour Academy

- OO: Monica McC, Gilmour Academy
  - Jason Wu, Orange
  - David Kopych, Hawkins School
  - Plaques - Gilmour Academy
  - Trophy - St. Ignatius

**Northern Ohio**
- DUO: Brian Risley and Sean Philbin, Youngstown
  - OO: Dan Gegg and Matt Henn, Austintown-Fitch
  - USA: Quinn Wells, Youngstown

**FX**: Brady Beatty, Youngstown
- DT: Bradley Wells, Western Reserve

**DI**: Mark Bork, Youngstown
- DT: Amy Reynolds, Austintown-Fitch

**DI**: Alex Kassler, Youngstown
- DT: James Johnston, Poland

**FX**: Kyle Mettler, Howland
- DT: Game Explorer, Austintown-Fitch

**DI**: Dustin Starn, Niles McKinley
- DX: Roy Clue, Youngstown

**LD**: Matt Decker, Youngstown
- DT: Luke Howard, Howland

**Plaque**: Howland
- Trophy: Howland

**East Ohio**
- DUO: Brian Jones and Jason Spital, Cocola Rapids
  - Washington
  - OO: Brian Jones and Jason Spital, Cocola Rapids
  - USA: Ryan Overton and Post Kick, Iowa City West

**OQ**: Julie Kineke and A.J. Robinson, Iowa City West
- FO: Garnet Keating, Iowa City West
- FX: Shawn Knezich, West Milwaukee

**DI**: Kyle Oster, Iowa City West
- FO: Todd Keeler, Iowa City West

**Central Ohio**
- DUO: Nick Kanelli, Iowa City West
  - Kathleen Henson, Iowa City West
  - OO: Ben Johson, Muncie

**FX**: Jurez, Iowa City West
- Trophy - Davenport Central

**Eastern Ohio**
- DUO: James Anand and Brian Yeung, Wooster
  - Drew Swirbul and Nicholas Roussey, Jackson

**DI**: Matt Meier and Anthony Marino, Perry
- Patrick A. Turner and Lauren Hatfield, Massillon
- Washington

**FX**: Mike Murph and Sam 2, U9s, Westerville

**OO**: Nathaniel Furr, Carrollton
- Kathleen E. Gans, Canton Central
  - HS Career - 106

**USX**: Mike Broda, Wooster
- Jennifer Skeels, Perry

**FX**: Raghu Cappete, North Canton Hoover
- Sanjay Banerjee, Canton Central HS Career 3rd

**DI**: Anthony Barrow, Perry
- Gia M. Villans, Perry
- Shanel N. Moore, Massillon

**OO**: John J. Marino, Perry
- Jake Conley, Wadsworth
- Lauren M. Carley, Massillon

**FX**: Andrew Rittner, Wadsworth
- Kendell Oyler, Wooster
- Joshua Marcin, Firestone

**Plaque** - Wooster
- Trophy - Wooster

**Rushmore**
- DUO: Jeff Billinton and Suzanne Smith, Sioux Falls Lincoln
  - James Irwin and Christopher L. Timmerman, Sioux Falls Lincoln
  - Joan Trenier and Candace Searles, Rapid City

**OO**: Ralph R. Hanson, Sioux Falls Lincoln
- Suzanne Smith, Sioux Falls Lincoln

**USX**: Nicole Heuerman, Sioux Falls Roosevelt
- Vanessa C. Riemenschneider, Vermillion

**FX**: Brennan Bibb, Rapid City
- Joel Schmolz, Sioux Falls Roosevelt

**DI**: Amanda Melehan, Sioux Falls Roosevelt

**DI**: Jessica Kahn, Sioux Falls Lincoln
- Chase Michelena, Brandon Valley

**LD**: Adam Hoyer, Sioux Falls Washington
- Victoria Ziemer, Sioux Falls Lincoln

**FX**: Sioux Falls Lincoln

**DI**: Trophies - Sioux Falls Lincoln

**Western Ohio**
- DUO: Askay Tukte and Nathaniel J. Lee, Dayton
  - Matt Hoy and Matt Wies, St. John's

**FX**: Chris Giesler and Billy Cuffing, Middletown
- Jill Bushmike and Robert McComber, Wauseon

**DI**: Caroline Jackson, Kettering Fairmont
- Melissa Gerber, Piqua

**OO**: Hannah L. Napier, Upper Arlington
- Morgan Modrak, Streetsboro

**USX**: Nazih J. Kain, Dayton
- Brent Steck, Carman-Ainsworth

**FX**: Joy Robinson, Dayton
- Lisa Schlerger, Findlay

**DI**: Beth D. Stalling, Dayton
- Kathleen A. Crisp, Centerville

**OO**: Monica Jones, Sylvania Northview
- Rashkia Payne, Upper Arlington

**USX**: Plaque - Dayton

**FX**: Trophy - Elon

**Florida Panther**
- DUO: Andrew Rowland and Amy Foster, Wellington

**FD**: Flexing Ford and Melanie Foster, Trinity Prep School

**DI**: Rachel Bennett and Julie Brown, Trinity Prep School

**OO**: Matt Kozerski, Daysool School of the Arts
- Dorothy A. Friggin, Celebration School

**USX**: Rocelle A. Nitch, Daysool School of the Arts
- T. J. McNabb, Trinity Prep School

**DI**: Travis Miller, Trinity Prep School
- Margaret Ford, Trinity Prep School

**OO**: Andrew Herig, Trinity Prep School
- Jordan Syverson, Trinity Prep School

**USX**: Patrick Prey, Trinity Prep School
- Trophy - Trinity Prep School

**Montana**
- DUO: Rhyan Gabryl and Tyler Paul, Great Falls
  - Jonnae Tufte and Alex Morgan, Bozeman
  - Eric Peterson and Health JANKE, Great Falls

**RUSSEL**
- Eileen Conners and Ashley Murray, Billings Senior

**OO**: Kyle Ziegler and David Middendorf, Billings West

**USX**: Kendall Langford, Billings West
- Pat U. Shillman, Billings West

**FX**: Chase Roenbush, Great Falls

**DI**: Shew Craft, Flathead
- Sundown Garren, Butte

**USX**: Kevin Manning, Bozeman
- Sam Utzig, Billings West

**DI**: Danny Brown, Bozeman
- Natasha Gustavson, Missoula Sentinel

**OO**: Travis Kruzel, Great Falls
- Laura Raymond, Bozeman

**USX**: Trophy - Great Falls
- Russell: Trophy: Great Falls Russell

**Hoosier Heartland**
- DI: Tyler Janowicz and Danny Rosenthal, West Lafayette
  - Michael Knight and Melody Berry, Evansville Reitz

**OO**: Gaylon L. Belcher and James, Olathe Heights
- Sam Hartwell and Cole Horton, Evansville Reitz

**USX**: Nicholas Ramierz, Evansville Reitz
- Emily Richardson, Logansport

**FO**: Connor Cameron, Connersville Sr.
- John Lender, Park Tudor School

**FX**: Michael Knight, Evansville Reitz
- Melody Berry, Evansville Reitz

**DI**: Courtney Wright, Evansville Reitz
- Emma F. Adams, Ben Davis

**OO**: Nicholas Ramierz, Evansville Reitz
- Jeni L. Goodwin, Logansport

**USX**: Geier & Robles, Ben Davis
- Brian E. Thiel, Ben Davis

**DI**: Evansville Reitz
- Trophy - Logansport

**Indiana**
- DUO: Nate Broxton and Zach Hoffmann, Evansville Central
  - Jonathan T. Thomas and Glen A. Powell, Evansville North

**OO**: Josh Grammer and Paul Guggelein, Indpls North Central

**USX**: Shasta Anderson and Ben Hurley, Muncie
- Jessica Dalworth and Greg Mose, Muncie

**FX**: Brian McQuinnie, Lawrence North
- Catherine Stahl, Lafayette Jefferson

**DI**: Tyler Clark, Kokomo
- John Glennon, Indpls North Central

**USX**: Amy Reilly, Evansville Central
- Need NSH, Evansville Central

**OO**: Jeff Spence, Carmel
- Jessica Edwall, Muncie

**DI**: Ben House, Muncie
- Jonn Stegg, Indpls North Central

**USX**: Julie Yang, Carmel
- Alexander Murphy, LaPorte
- Boston Sports, Indpls North Central

**OO**: Plaques - Indpls North Central
- Trophy - Indpls North Central

**Pennsylvania**
- DUO: Dan Invern and Heather Schmukler, Greater Latrobe
  - Andrea Invern and Carly Hahn, Greater Latrobe

**OO**: Sheryl W. Weisner and David Wayne, Ballardville
- Janice Batty and Jason McCullough, Derry Area

**USX**: Matt White, Trinity
- Lindsey S. Snyder, Rockford

**DI**: Dan Invern, Greater Latrobe
- Samuel Landers, Trinity

**OO**: Meredith Somers, Trinity
- Darin Cordaro, Ballardville

**USX**: Dave Salon, Ballardville
- Kimberly L. Jackow, McKeesport Area

**OO**: Jonathan Klamernak, Belle Vernon Area
- Sam Fox, Belle Vernon Area

**DI**: Greater Latrobe
- Trophy - Rockwood

**Sundance**
- DUO: Ashley A. Anderson and Laura K. Kozary, Jordan
  - Alixan Carter and Tyler C. Pigeon, Alto

**OO**: Ashley A. Anderson and Bryan Bennett, Jordan

**USX**: Kris KedROWSKI, Pleasant Grove
- Kays J. Rhea, Pleasant Grove

**DI**: Carl R. Edwards, Hillcrest
- Steven Davis, Pleasant Grove

**DI**: Lucy K. Gosier, Jordan
- Andy Adams, Beverly

**DI**: Kim A. Moore, Jordan

**USX**: E. C. Anderson, Pleasant Grove

**DI**: Kim A. Moore, Jordan
- Daniel Christiansen, Alto

**USX**: Plaques - Jordan
- Trophy - Green

**Puget Sound**
- DUO: Peter Campbell and Matt Schaefer, Severne
  - Ross Richardson and Matt Pohan, Mount Vernon

**USX**: Jessica L. Beckett and Brian White, North Kitsap

**OO**: Kristin Corbit and Justin Hurst, Kennewick

**USX**: Andrew M. McDaid, Thomas Jefferson
- Lauren E. Wallace, Thomas Jefferson
SQUIRREL-KILLERS

2002-2003 ORDER FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY DEBATE SUBSCRIPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Subscription—AFF CASEBOOK, 1ST NEG BRIEFS, 2ND NEG BRIEFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$22 for printed copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$72 for computer copy (diskette or e-mail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18 each additional printed copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Subscription plus 6 issues UPDATE BRIEFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$22 for printed copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$108 for computer copy (diskette or e-mail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$57 each additional printed copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Subscription plus 4 issues UPDATE BRIEFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$109 for printed copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$56 for computer copy (diskette or e-mail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$51 each additional printed copy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY DEBATE ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SQUIRREL-KILLERS: AFF CASEBOOK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Publication: May 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 pages of AFF CASES and EXTENSION BRIEFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$27 for printed copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10 for computer copy (diskette or e-mail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5 each additional printed copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orders of 6 or more, ALL copies are $5 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQUIRREL-KILLERS: 1ST NEG BRIEFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Publication: August 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 pages of FIRST NEGATIVE BRIEFS (3 Vol.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25 for printed copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10 for computer copy (diskette or e-mail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6 each additional printed copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orders of 6 or more, ALL copies are $6 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQUIRREL-KILLERS: 2ND NEG BRIEFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Publication: August 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 pages of SECOND NEGATIVE BRIEFS (3 Vol.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25 for printed copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10 for computer copy (diskette or e-mail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6 each additional printed copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orders of 6 or more, ALL copies are $6 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQUIRREL-KILLERS: UPDATE BRIEFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pages of NEGATIVE BRIEFS per issue. Emphasizes latest evidence against cases requested as the season progresses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 issues option. Dates of Publication: Oct 1; Nov 1; Dec 1; Jan 1; Feb 1; Mar 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40 for printed copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15 for computer copy (diskette or e-mail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9 each additional printed copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orders of 4 or more, ALL copies are $9 each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SQUIRREL-KILLERS NOW AVAILABLE BY E-MAIL |

All 8 Squirrel-Killers publications by e-mail to computer (ISM-compatible, Macintosh, etc.), mainframe, mainframe retrieval. NO WAITING. PRINTED COPIES OR DISKETTES TO BE DOWNLOADED TO SYSTEM (especially valuable for Cross-ex Briefs and for Lincoln-Douglas Briefs). Customer can edit them as they see fit. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALSO AVAILABLE ON DISKETTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same briefs available in printed copy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer can edit briefs (re-arrange, add, delete evidence and/or questionnaires, etc.), then print THEIR INDIVIDUALIZED BRIEFS. No more cutting and pasting!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINCOLN-Douglas BRIEFS (NFL TOPICS ONLY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45 pages of AFFIRMATIVE &amp; NEGATIVE BRIEFS per topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90 for printed copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$65 for computer copy (diskette or e-mail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60 each additional printed copy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SEP-OCT Topic: Date of Publication: Aug. 26 |
| $20 for printed copy |
| $10 for computer copy (diskette or e-mail) |
| $10 each additional printed copy |
| (on orders of 4 or more, ALL copies are $10 each) |

| NOV-DEC Topic: Date of Publication: Oct. 15 |
| $20 for printed copy |
| $10 for computer copy (diskette or e-mail) |
| $10 each additional printed copy |
| (on orders of 4 or more, ALL copies are $10 each) |

| JAN-FEB Topic: Date of Publication: Dec. 15 |
| $20 for printed copy |
| $10 for computer copy (diskette or e-mail) |
| $10 each additional printed copy |
| (on orders of 4 or more, ALL copies are $10 each) |

| MAR-APR Topic: Date of Publication: Feb. 15 |
| $20 for printed copy |
| $16 for computer copy (diskette or e-mail) |
| $10 each additional printed copy |

| MAR-APR Topic: Date of Publication: Feb. 15 |
| $20 for printed copy |
| $16 for computer copy (diskette or e-mail) |
| $10 each additional printed copy |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE COMPUTER/HARD COPY COMBO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this situation, the printed copy is the extra copy (not test copy). Thus, the pricing would be as follows for the COMPUTER/HARD COPY Combo:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Policy Subscription: $110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Policy + 4-month Updates: $165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Policy + 4-month Updates: $147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln-Douglas Subscription: $104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S-K QUALITY UNCHANGED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 25 years of dependable service, bringing you the best in accurate, reliable evidence: All evidence is connected, no glitches, no omissions from any sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full resource suggestions on each topic of evidence, primarily from professional journals, government documents, and other sources not readily available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEEDY DELIVERY: all orders filled within 24 hours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NAME |
| ADDRESS |
| CITY, STATE, ZIP |
| E-MAIL ADDRESS (if applicable) |
| I am a student at High School. |
| Charge to Visa/MasterCard Number |
| Expiration Date |

S-K PUBLICATIONS
PO Box 8173
Wichita KS 67208-0173
PHONE 316-685-3201
FAX 316-685-6550
debate@squirrelkillers.com
http://www.squirrelkillers.com
21 July-3 August 2002

28th Annual Samford University Summer Forensics Institute

Lincoln-Douglas Debate Division: Samford hosts the nation's longest-running Lincoln-Douglas workshop. The program is designed for students who are entering into debate or transitioning to the varsity level. In addition to providing a primer on the fundamentals of moral philosophy, the L-D Institute also seeks to develop fundamental skills such as flowing, briefing and casing. The Lincoln-Douglas workshop is directed by Pat Bailey (Homewood H.S., AL).

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, in writing a disadvantage and a critique, and taken part in at least eight practice debates. First year students learn how to flow and cover the fundamentals of debate. Policy debate labs will be directed by Michael Janas, Ph.D. (Samford University), Ben Coulter, MA (Samford University), Ben Osborne (Vestavia Hills H.S., AL, and MTSU) and Heidi Hamilton, Ph.D. (Augustana College). This year we are happy to add Ryan Galloway, Ph.D. (University of Georgia) to the staff.

Teacher's Institute: This year we are pleased to continue with our teacher's institute. Designed for new teachers or those that find themselves in charge of a program for the first time, Skip Coulter (Mountain Brook Jr. H.S. and Samford University) will conduct a workshop on the fundamentals of debate coaching. While we can not make you a champion coach in your first year, we can help orient you to the bewildering world of high school forensics. At a starting price of $200, we will help strengthen your confidence as you enter the forensics classroom for the first time.

Cost: $985.00. 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 will be directed by William Tate (Montgomery Bell Academy, TN). Financial aid is available for students with demonstrated need.

For more information:

Michael Janas, Ph.D.
Director of Debate
Samford University
Birmingham, AL. 35229
(205) 726-2509
mjjanas@samford.edu

come join us...

www.samford.edu

experienced staff  study in the spirit of excellence
intelligent students
NDT-Books Presents the Prescription for Debating Mental Health Care in the United States

Seven comprehensive casebooks plus cd-rom and midseason update. Five casebooks cover the breadth of the topic, one covers Kritiks and one covers disadvantages

Casebook #1: Mental Health Care in the United States
The case for and against an increase in public health services including an examination of mental health vs. physical health, insurance parity, harms, costs, etc. This book provides the basis for affirmative & negative topic positions.

Casebook #2: Specific Mental Health Disorders
This book examines the case for and against increasing public health services for illnesses such as bipolar disorders, depression, eating and anorexia disorders, conduct disorder, attention deficit/hyperactivity, suicide, schizophrenia, etc.

Casebook #3: Violence & Drug Abuse
This book examines the case for and against increasing public health services in the areas of family violence, spousal abuse, codependence, child abuse, fetal-alcohol syndrome, prenatal care, use of illegal drugs and alcoholism.

Casebook #4: Homelessness, Law Enforcement & Terrorism
This book examines mental health issues related to homelessness, law enforcement issues related to mental health disorders, and the impact that terrorism has had on the mental health of U.S. citizens including children.

Casebook #5: Stress As a Mental Health Factor
This book examines the case for and against increasing public health services for stress-related mental health problems. Cases include workplace stress, childhood stress, stress in education and schools, diet and stress, etc.

Casebook #6 The Complete Kritik Book on Mental Health
This book develops comprehensive kritiks on mental health including Foucault, feminism, language, church & state, and physical health vs. mental health.

Casebook #7 Disadvantages on Increased Public Health Services
A comprehensive development of the major disadvantages related to increasing public health services for mental health care including budget deficits, spending tradeoffs, federalism, Bush credibility, Big Brother invasion of privacy, etc.

Each casebook contains over 100 pages of briefed arguments on both sides of the topic

Order all seven casebooks and receive the complete cd-rom containing all books plus the free December update

**********ORDER BLANK: Send to NDT-Books, P.O.Box 1194 Emporia, Kansas 66801**********

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Casebook #1 $35</th>
<th>Casebook #6 $35</th>
<th>Casebook #2 $35</th>
<th>Casebook #7 $35</th>
<th>CD-Rom All 7 Casebooks $130</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casebook #3 $35</td>
<td>Casebook #7 $35</td>
<td>Special (All casebooks + CD-Rom) $215</td>
<td>&amp; December email update</td>
<td>$215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name ___________________________ School ___________________________ Address ___________________________
City __________ State __________ Zip __________ Email ___________________________

Cash or Check ____________________ Pay or go to website to use all credit cards on PayPal (easy to use)

http://ntbooks.com
Fax # 1 (620) 342-8663
Midwest Debate Institute

Rockhurst College, Kansas City MO

Beginning and advanced seminars help students develop research, listening and speaking skills that will be of lifelong benefit. Emphasis is placed on original research. All briefs will be developed by students from original research created during the institute.

Midwest students have consistently been successful in regional and national competition: 1st in Congress, 1st in Original Oratory, 2nd in CX Debate and 9th in CX Debate.

Students will return to their schools with a broad subject-matter background on the topic as well as improved understanding of the skills and techniques necessary for successful high school debating.

July 15 - 26, 2002

Tuition: $450
Housing/Meals: $350
NO HIDDEN COSTS!

Deadline: June 20, 2002
Staffed exclusively by high school debate coaches.

Open to Coaches!
Scholarships available!

Additional Information:
Ms. Carla L. Brown, Director
Midwest Debate Institute
PO Box 51
Greenwood, MO 64034
Phone (816) 350-9277
Fax (816) 350-9377
YOU'VE QUALIFIED FOR NATIONALS
NOW WHAT?
STUDY THE CHAMPIONS

NFL'S GREATEST HITS

Watch the first and second place winners in individual events and
the final rounds of LD debate. These tapes will improve your performance.
Each tape is $49.95.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume IV</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>VB 1015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best of Original Oratory 1992-1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of U. S. Extemp 1992-1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of Foreign Extemp 1992-1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of Lincoln-Douglas Debate 1993-1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume III</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>VB 1010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best of U. S. Extemp 1989-1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of Foreign Extemp 1989-1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of Lincoln-Douglas Debate 1989-1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of Lincoln-Douglas Debate 1991-1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume II</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>VB 1006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best of Original Oratory 1986-1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of U. S. Extemp 1986-1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of Foreign Extemp 1986-1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of Lincoln-Douglas Debate 1987-1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume I</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>VB 1001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best of Original Oratory 1983-1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of U. S. Extemp 1983-1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of Foreign Extemp 1983-1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of Lincoln-Douglas Debate 1983-1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of Lincoln-Douglas Debate 1985-1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STANDARD SHIPPING IS US MAIL LIBRARY RATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE/DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$49.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$49.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$49.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$49.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S &amp; H Add 12% TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name: ________________________________
Shipping Address: ______________________
City __________________ State __________ Zip __________

Payment OR Purchase Order must be enclosed. No Credit Cards!

DALE PUBLISHING INC.
P.O. BOX 51
GREENWOOD, MISSOURI 64034
"Quality Materials since 1935"
Congress Honors

North Dakota Roughrider

House 1
- O. Kevin Richardson, Yankton, South Dakota
- S. Tony Sanford, Yankton, South Dakota
- P. Tim Walz, Brainerd, Minnesota
- P. Jared Huffman, Rick River

Montana

House 1
- C. Kay Haws, Bozeman, Montana
- S. Jon Tester, Missoula, Montana
- S. Steve Daines, Butte, Montana
- P. Steve Daines, Bozeman, Montana

South Dakota

House 1
- O. Mike Rounds, Yankton, South Dakota
- S. James Lange, Pierre, South Dakota
- P. Tim Walz, Minneapolis, Minnesota
- P. Tim Walz, St. Paul, Minnesota

Kentucky

House 1
- S. Rand Paul, Bowling Green, Kentucky
- S. John Yarmuth, Louisville, Kentucky
- P. Charles Booker, Louisville, Kentucky
- P. James Beshear, Frankfort, Kentucky

Mississippi

House 1
- D. Lee Baxam, Oxford, Mississippi
- S. Cindy Hyde-Smith, Jackson, Mississippi
- P. Ben Cardin, Baltimore, Maryland
- P. James Foreman, Gadsden, Alabama

North Carolina

House 1
- S. Thom Tillis, Greensboro, North Carolina
- S. Max Baucus, Chapel Hill, North Carolina
- P. Chuck Grassley, Des Moines, Iowa
- P. Sherrod Brown, Columbus, Ohio

North Dakota

House 1
- O. Kevin Cramer, Fargo, North Dakota
- S. Steve Daines, Butte, Montana
- P. Steve Daines, Bozeman, Montana

Ohio

House 1
- O. Steve Smith, Cincinnati, Ohio
- S. Sherrod Brown, Columbus, Ohio
- P. Rob Portman, Cincinnati, Ohio
- P. Jim Jordan, Westerville, Ohio

Oklahoma

House 1
- O. Kevin Cramer, Bismarck, North Dakota
- S. Steve Daines, Butte, Montana
- P. Steve Daines, Bozeman, Montana

Pennsylvania

House 1
- O. William Esty, New Haven, Connecticut
- S. Tina Orwall, Bellingham, Washington
- P. James Inhofe, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

South Carolina

House 1
- O. Tim Scott, SC
- S. Lindsey Graham, SC
- P. Tim Scott, SC

South Dakota

House 1
- O. Mike Rounds, Yankton, South Dakota
- S. Jon Tester, Missoula, Montana
- P. Steve Daines, Butte, Montana

Tennessee

House 1
- O. Phil Roe, Bristol, Tennessee
- S. Marsha Blackburn, Chattanooga, Tennessee
- P. Marsha Blackburn, Chattanooga, Tennessee

Texas

House 1
- O. Dan Boren, Norman, Oklahoma
- S. Kay Hagan, Charlotte, North Carolina
- P. Kay Hagan, Charlotte, North Carolina

Virginia

House 1
- O. Gerry Connolly, Annandale, Virginia
- S. Tim Kaine, Fairfax, Virginia
- P. Tim Kaine, Fairfax, Virginia

Washington

House 1
- O. Jason Chaffetz, Salt Lake City, Utah
- S. Mike Lee, Salt Lake City, Utah
- P. Mike Lee, Salt Lake City, Utah

West Virginia

House 1
- O. Jim Justice, Charleston, West Virginia
- S. Joe Manchin, Charleston, West Virginia
- P. Joe Manchin, Charleston, West Virginia

Wisconsin

House 1
- O. Ron Kind, La Crosse, Wisconsin
- S. Tammy Baldwin, Madison, Wisconsin
- P. Tammy Baldwin, Madison, Wisconsin

Wyoming

House 1
- O. Liz Cheney, Jackson, Wyoming
- S. Mike Enzi, Laramie, Wyoming
- P. Mike Enzi, Laramie, Wyoming
Teaching and Coaching Position Beginning August 2002

Lakewood High School
Lakewood, Colorado

-International School*
-International Baccalaureate Program*
-Co-curricular Honors Debate and Forensics program with a forty-year history of National and State recognition in Debate, Public Speaking, and Interpretation.*
-Excellent administrative and community support.*

Please direct inquiries with resume and objectives to:

GNDavis@attbi.com

G N Davis, Lakewood High School
9700 West 8th Avenue
Lakewood, CO 80215
SummerDebate.com
America’s Online Debate Institute

Last year, over 70 people from 16 different states experienced the greatest institute faculty ever assembled for a fraction of the price of a traditional institute! Now there’s no excuse not to learn at a summer institute!

Due to the success of our opening year, we are now offering 5 programs!

Flagship Programs:
Policy Program – Our full theory and topic policy program features lectures and online discussions with our outstanding faculty, lab leaders, and other participants. Cost: $299
Lincoln-Douglas Program – Our full theory and topic Lincoln-Douglas program features lectures and online discussions with our outstanding faculty, lab leaders, and other participants. This program also features research, sites and information for EVERY potential topic for the upcoming school year. Last year, the topic lectures alone exceeded 130 pages of information! Cost: $249

New Programs!!
Policy Topic Track – Access to all of the topic specific text lectures with e-mail support and web interaction with other participants. Cost: $199
Policy Theory Track – Access to all of the policy debate theory text lectures with e-mail support and web interaction with other participants. Cost: $149
Lincoln-Douglas Topic Track – Access to information, research and sites on EVERY potential topic for the upcoming school year. Cost: $149

Visit us at www.summerdebate.com!
Alice Schleicher has been working for the National Forensic League since April of 1969. Alice says NFL has been a big part of her life. “It was the best thing that ever happened to me!” When asked what she liked best about her job, she said, “There isn’t a thing I didn’t like. I tremendously enjoyed my work and I was never bored.” Mr. Jacob always said, “If you have an honest job, work hard, you will do well with NFL.

She says Mr. Jacob was an easy man to work for. He was very good at planning a National Tournament. During the time Alice worked for Mr. Jacob, he did not want the NFL to have more than 300 contestants at a National Tournament, now it has successfully grown to over 2300.

When Alice began, she had a typewriter and an adding machine. In 1984, computers were introduced to the NFL office, which made the work easier and more efficient.

Alice takes pride in making sure the degree cards, membership cards and school certificates are accurate and forwarded to the correct schools. In Alice’s day degree cards used to be different colors for each degree with separate seals for each colored degree card. This is one of many changes Alice has seen over the years along with the increased membership growth, currently the online recording and change in leadership which included Lester Tacker, Dennis Winfield and Jim Copeland.

It is Alice’s hope that the NFL continues to not only grow in quantity but also continue to meet the goals and dreams of Bruno E. Jacob; his vision of NFL, students and coaches.

When asked, what are your plans for retirement...Alice stated, after 34 years at NFL it was a hard decision, but Alice doesn’t plan on slowing down any. (Maybe, just maybe, we’ll see her occasionally in the office to help out during busy times).

With hubby, Darwin, it is their hope to visit their oldest son in Denver (CO), continue attending concerts conducted by their youngest son at the University in Champaign (IL) (who is getting married this year) and spend time with their married daughter who lives locally. Also, Alice’s twin granddaughters play a very important role in Alice and Darwin’s life, and friends and family are always welcomed at their home.

Alice, we’ll miss you at NFL! You have been a joy to work with and an inspiration. Only the best to a very dedicated lady.

Alice & Darwin’s PT Cruiser

---

### Director of Forensics - The Westminster Schools

Due to a retirement, The Westminster Schools, Atlanta, Georgia, seeks an experienced director to administer its nationally recognized forensics program, including Policy, Lincoln Douglas, and Individual Events, beginning August, 2002-2003 school year. Responsibilities include coaching junior high debate, novice high school policy debate, extemporaneous speaking, original oratory, and co-coaching Lincoln Douglas debate. Duties also include overseeing budgets, travel arrangements (statewide and national), and registration; coordination of student billing; hosting at least two tournaments each year; and management of coaching staff. Teaching sections in major discipline, such as history, as well as a communication course at the junior high level a possibility. Masters Degree Preferred. Competitive salary based on degree and experience and excellent benefits. Westminster Schools is an Equal Opportunities Employer.

Please send your curriculum vita to Sandra Curtis, Dean of Faculty and Academics; The Westminster Schools; 1424 West Paces Ferry Road, NW; Atlanta, Georgia 30327, or e-mail to sandracurtis@westminster.net.
Virginia Association of Speech and Debate Coaches

FORENSIC INSTITUTE

Virginia Wesleyan College
Virginia Beach-Norfolk, VA

July 22 - 26

STUDENTS:
One Event in Interpretation
or Public Address

COACHES/TEACHERS:
3 HOURS CREDIT AVAILABLE

Out-of-state students and
coaches may arrive on Saturday,
July 20, after 4:00 PM.

Distinguished Staff Members:
Bob Kelly, Chesterton High School, coach of numerous NFL finalists
Joe Wycoff, NFL national champion in both oratory and interp
Nancy Haga, Longwood College, professor emeritus
Carolyn Keane, former Chesterton HS champion coach, Portland, Oregon
Bentley Anderson, Virginia Wesleyan College, professor of theater and communications

The purpose of the VASDC is to bring together high school students and coaches
for the promotion of competitive speech. This summer, champion coaches and
faculty join to provide a champion experience.

For more information and an application, please contact either of us:
Mary Sue Crommelin
mcsrommel@vbcps.k12.va.us.net
(757) 496-6711, ext. 46

Nancy Haga
nhaga@kinex.net
(434) 392-5671
ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S FAVORITE CAKE

1 cup butter
2 cups sugar
1 cup milk
3 cups flour (cake or pastry)
2 tsp. baking powder (double acting)
2 tsp. vanilla
1 cup chopped blanched almonds
1/4 tsp. salt
6 egg whites

Cream butter and sugar lightly. Sift flour and baking powder together and add alternately with milk (to the first mixture). Add well-floured nuts, then vanilla. Fold in stiffly beaten white of eggs, to which salt has been added. Bake in three layers (9" or 8" pans) in a 350° oven. Can also be made as a sheet cake.

Ice with boiled icing, to which add 1-2 cups candied pineapple and cherries chopped fine.

www.TheLincolnMuseum.org

SPEECH COACH

Albuquerque Academy, a private co-educational day school for grades 6-12, seeks an individual to teach English and to direct our speech program. For this permanent, full-time position which begins in August of 2002, we are looking for an individual with significant experience in three areas: teaching writing, teaching literature, and coaching students in competitive speech events.

For the past fifteen years, the Academy's speech team has enjoyed much success both at the local and national levels, and we would like our next coach to maintain this tradition of excellence. In addition to coaching, the individual we choose will teach three full-year English classes and a one-semester elective entitled "Effective Speaking."

Interested parties should send a letter and resume AS SOON AS POSSIBLE to:
Kevin E. Hall,
Interim English Department Chair
Albuquerque Academy
6400 Wyoming Blvd., NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
Phone: (505) 828-3283
E-mail: hall@aa.edu

Equal Opportunity Employer

Debate and Research Resources from...

Big Sky Debate

Big Sky Debate is pleased to unveil its 2002-2003 debate research product line! Teams from across the country turned to Big Sky Debate for well-researched and affordable resources this past season. Our 2002-2003 catalog includes:

- Policy Debate Research Series...Our resources include three volumes of complete, ready-to-use positions, and evidence to start or supplement your independent research efforts. We also hold research and printing until after the summer institutes to respond to creative affirmative positions.
- Big Sky Debate UPDATE...Our twice-monthly newsletter is simply the best value in debate research. Our request-ready research staff makes this resource among the most responsive in the country.
- Lincoln-Douglas Research Series...Our fresh approach to Lincoln-Douglas Debate has been called "the best on this topic" and "really issue-oriented." We don't sell you rehashed philosophy backfiles, but fresh research, cut just hours after the topic released.

Call (406) 495-0246 or go online for more information or a product catalog.
http://www.bigskydebate.com or email orders@bigskydebate.com

"Maybe where there's clarity of air, there's clarity of thought." --Chet Huntley
Debate is a Mind Field
Better be prepared

Consider This:
...a summer camp for debaters in a scenic Rocky Mountain youth hostel, staffed by adults committed to young people, education, and debate in that order,
...a high staff to student ratio and an individual needs focus to maximize each students’ skill development,
...a camp with fresh cooked meals, and recreation outings that include white water rafting, rock climbing, and day trips to Crested Butte.
...maximum attention to speaking and in-round mechanics.

The Pitkin Youth Hostel in Pitkin Colorado is a historic hotel in a tiny community nestled in the Rocky Mountains. We will only accept 35 students on a first come, first served, basis.

Team Debate: June 30th through July 14th $949/student $1695/team
Lincoln-Douglas: July 1st through July 12th $795/student

Fees include everything, except for some recreation; all lodging, meals, snacks, beverages, the camp t-shirt, supplies and resources will be included. Value Debaters will receive an extensive database of article text pertinent to all possible NFL topics over the next calendar year, and team debate will, of course, receive thousands of cards. There will be a limited number of scholarships available.

Coaches: Staff positions are available. Lodging and Meals in return for a few hours a day, coaching, cooking, or supervision.

Contact: Walter Willis: mindfielddebate@yahoo.com or 281-382-1161

(continued from page 68)

NEW JERSEY
Selon Hal Prep School Chris Brophy

NEW YORK
Chaminade HS Peter Petarco
Christian Brothers Academy Benjamin Seymour

OHIO
Copley HS Lyndsey Straight
Gilmour Academy Brittany Jaris
Youngstown Boardman HS David Lanzal

OKLAHOMA
Bartlesville HS Tim Yang
Norman HS Sarah Weiss

OREGON
Forest Grove HS Adam Cowan

 PENNSYLVANIA
Baldwin HS Ann Huang
Bethlehem Area HS Sarah Fox

TEXAS
Amarillo HS Jamie Gianoutsos
Bryan HS Sarah Sithu
Trinity HS Michael Trynosky
Trinity Wash HS Meggin Rutherford

SOUTH DAKOTA
Aberdeen Central HS Brady Shelbourn
Deuel School Lindsay Kjensad
Groton HS Dustin Schley
Mitchell HS Kranna Anderson
Rapid City Stevens HS Jesse Jensen
Sioux Falls Roosevelt HS Matt Kenyon

VERMILLION HS
Varsha Ramarkrishna
Elizabeth Singel

WATERTOWN HS
Darin Gelly
Micah Sharp

YANKTON HS
Dunya Cope
Elizabeth Hunhoff

TENNESSEE
Hunters Lane HS James Clark
Adam Stenberg

TAYLOR HS
Kathryn Puente

TERRELL HS
Kathleen P. Cober III

UTAH
Cottonwood HS Stephanie Blossom
Jordan HS Nikki Florence

WASHINGTON
Central Valley HS Doug Johnson
Gonzaga Prep HS Jordan Barnes
Victor McFarland

WYOMING
Casper Natrona County HS
Angela Granum
Cheyenne Central HS
Sara Degroot
Cheyenne East HS
Issac Camargo

Cheyenne East HS
Jeff Pope
Jackson Hole HS
Kristin Walker

Rawlins HS
Sukanta Chandra
The official emblem of the National Junior Forensic League consists of a circle enclosing crossed gavels behind a speaker's podium. The initials NJFL appears on the podium. The name of the society encircles the podium and gavels. This emblem is black in color with raised letters in bronze. This pin can be purchased for any student(s) who are member(s) of the NJFL, grades 6, 7, and 8. If you order 20 or more of these pins you will be given a 10% discount on the cost of the order. The official coach emblem of the National Forensic League consists of a circle enclosing crossed gavels behind a speaker's podium. The word "COACH" appears on the podium. The name of the society encircles the podium and gavels. This emblem is black in color with raised letters in antique silver finish, unlike the student pin which is bronze. Student Service and Honor Plaques are perfect for chapter officers, tournament helpers, deserving students, parents, and principal. The NJFL seal is inscribed in black on gold tone plate. The words "Student Forensic Service Award" appear on the student plaque. The Honor plaque is just the emblem with room to engrave. These distinctive NJFL gifts say "Thank you for your Support" and "Congratulations for a Job Well Done."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Student Pins:</th>
<th></th>
<th>@ $5.00 each</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Coach Pins:</td>
<td></td>
<td>@ $8.00 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Student Service Plaques</td>
<td></td>
<td>@ $7.00 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Honor Plaques</td>
<td></td>
<td>@ $7.00 each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cost: 

-10%: (Only if 20 or more of student pins purchased)

Shipping and Handling: $6.00

Total Enclosed: $ __________

Please Ship To:

Name: ________________________________

School: ______________________________

Address: ______________________________

City: ________________________________

State: __________________ Zip: ______

Phone: __________________ Fax: ______

E-Mail: ____________________________

Send Orders Prepaid to:
National Junior Forensic League
P. O. Box 38
125 Watson Street
Ripon, WI 54971-0038
Phone: 920-748-6206
Fax: 920-748-9478

The initials NJFL appears on the podium. The name of society encircles the podium and gavels. This emblem is black in color with raised letters in bronze. The word "COACH" appears on the podium and gavels. This emblem is black in color with raised letters in antique silver finish, unlike the student pin which is antique bronze.
Mountain Brook Jr. High, AL.

Summary: An honors assembly was held recognizing eighth grade students who were active in the National Junior Forensic League. Students received certificates of recognition.

The following students were recognized: Katherine Weatherly, 25 points; Anna Catherine Roberson, 25 points; Natalie Holloway, 25 points; Noah Larsen, 25 points; Rachel Numberg, 25 points; Catherine Tucker, 25 points; Karish Dow, 25 points; Anne Elliott, 25 points; Brandon Benson, 26 points; Lindsey Hart, 27 points; Katherine Miller, 27 points; Justin Lamb, 30 points; Janet Cao, 30 points; Jackson Vaughan, 32 points; Eric Funderburg, 34 points; Grant Rafield, 44 points; Matthew Lukens, 54 points; Katy Lalor, 66 points; Joseph Kain, 75 points; George Elliott, 75 points; Spencer Smith, 77 points; and student with highest score, Casey Raymond with a total of 81 points.

Details/Comments: Coach Skip Coulter stated at the assembly that "One of the largest and most prestigious honoraries has been the National Forensic League, an organization that recognizes success in speaking and debate. Presidents, Senators, entertainers, and great business and professional people have looked back on their National Forensic League days with pride."

Alabama

Los Altos Middle School, CA

Activity Report written by 8th Grade Speech Kid, Chris Shurtleff

Summary: At Los Altos Middle School, the Speech Kids have been unquestionably the busiest people on campus. From preparing league tournaments, hosting the entire league which consists of up to 15 schools, running the nutrition sales on the grounds, doing one-act plays for the enjoyment of the student body, and supervising running a school wide Holiday Boutique before winter break. The most important activity of the Los Altos Speech Kid was organizing the speech program for the Pleasant Valley District, extending the art of speaking to future debaters and orators of a young age.

For the past 18 years, Los Altos has run a series of tournaments for the children of younger ages in the district. The Speech Kids are in charge of coordinating the tournament, participating in coaching the participants prior to the event, in addition to doing actual judging along with other volunteers. A series of assemblies are organized and performed by Speech Kids in an attempt to grab the attention of possible participants and their schools. Everyone in the club is involved in pulling it all together to make an enriching experience for everybody involved.

Accomplishments: The competitions provide a fun, wholesome experience, while also presenting to the speakers valuable opportunities to make friends and gain knowledge and expertise in the field of speaking. Every participant has equal chance to win, not facing a biased judge in any way. Awareness is spread to all those present, including parents, siblings of the speaker, and of course the students speaking.

The Speech Kids play an active role during the year. All tournaments are hosted at the Los Altos Middle School. Student competition is scheduled based on grade. The three lower grade tournaments are held on three consecutive days, separated by a number of weeks of scheduled dates of the higher grade tournaments. The primary age group tournaments "celebrate" learning a speech. All these students receive a congratulatory ribbon. Speech Kids play a responsible role as coordinators in contacting schools to participate (between eight and twelve schools participate in any one tournament) and delegating Speech Kids to perform assemblies. The Speech Kid coordinators prepare the trainers responsible for training judges and extra coaches for the tournament. Monologues are written by the Speech Kids in addition to preparing for competition. Finally, at the tournament, Speech Kids serve as a directory and verbal encouragement to the competitors.

Details/Comments: The whole experience provides life development and mental enrichment in addition to a fun outlet of creative energy for the whole family.
Monte Vista Middle School, CA

**Summary:** Monte Vista is a member of the Camino Real Speech League. The league involves public and private schools in Los Angeles and Ventura Counties. This year the league hosted four tournaments and the Championship tournament is being held at Pasadena City College on May 4, under the direction of PCC staff member, Crystal Watson.

Monte Vista offers Public Speech as a part of their Drama program. The after school Performing Arts Club, which involves 6th, 7th and 8th graders, encourages other students to be involved in public speaking. "With Speech being part of our Drama program, we have involved students that might not have thought of public speech as "their thing". Students have enjoyed our tournaments as well as participating in the preparations for our plays. This year we have presented, "Macbeth", the Musical Comedy from Bad Wolf Press and "Way, Way Up South", an old time Melodrama," reports speech coach Mrs. Craig.

Play practice: Sean Colletti (King Duncan), in rehearsal for his solo, 'I'm a Heck of a King'. Singing backup are his sons Malcolm and Donalbain, Ian Pollack and Randall Bocerra.

The CRSL league awards trophies, medals, and certificates throughout the year to students. The NJFL's program of awarding points and participation certificates has added another layer of recognition to Monte Vista;s program. The combination of awards has made the school's program richer and more students are becoming involved.

**Accomplishments:** The Monte Vista students who attended the second National Speech Tournament in Ohio had a great time. Two of those students are still attending Monte Vista, Angela Henderson, an 8th grader who took 4th place in Humorous was named 'Most Versatile Speaker' for the season. Kevin Bocerra, a 7th grader, tried new categories at each competition. Angela and Kevin's dual team presentation of "Scream Eagles" took 1st place at the CRSL October Tournament.

Monte Vista Team at the January 2002 Tournament
Fourth from left, Angela Henderson, Club President

**Details/Comments:** Speech is a natural avenue for communication within the district. All elementary schools participate in grades K - 2 and 3 - 5 speech tournaments. The district has committed itself to the Arts.

The Monte Vista Speech Kids were invited to El Discanso this January to read stories to grades K-3 at their annual "Pajama Night". Seven NJFL speakers dressed in their PJs to delight and perform.

A local chapter of AAUW invited Monte Vista Speech Kids to be presenters at their fundraiser. Lauryn Gabby and Kristin Moore took on the role of Patty Reed, a 12-year old girl from the Donner Party. They dressed in costume and spoke to parents and children involved in the McDonald Fundraiser. All their activities raised money to support the AAUW's women in History Program that is presented in all of the schools.

Total membership, 10. Chapter President, Angela Henderson; Chapter Advisor, Ms. Pat Craig.

California

Brentwood Middle School, CO

**Summary:** This is the first year Brentwood Middle School has had a Junior Forensic League team. The team organized in October, 2001 has approximately twenty 6th, 7th, and 8th grade members.

**Accomplishments:** On February 26, the students demonstrated their speaking skills at a public performance and ice cream social. Parents, friends, family and Brentwood staff attended, enjoying an evening of laughter and stirred emotions. The evening was an accomplishment and it gave the students practice before their first tournament.

On March 2, Brentwood hosted a Middle School Tournament with four schools attending. Competition included humorous interp, dramatic interp, poetry, duo interp, impromptu and original oratory. Local high school NFL chapters provided organizational assistance and judges. The dedication and assistance by the high school NFL chapters in helping develop the Junior High Program has been greatly appreciated.
Brentwood Middle School continued

Details/Comments: Currently in northern Colorado, there are only a handful of middle schools involved in forensics. The Brentwood School District has committed to establishing programs in all middle schools.

"As forensics at the junior level gains momentum, we hope students will have greater opportunities to participate in speaking events. This year, we started small and developed a strong program, next year we are setting our sights on the junior nationals.

"We are very proud of the students here at Brentwood Middle School; they have taken on a challenge this year being the first team and have met this challenge with courage, determination, and have gained respect from their peers and staff."

Ice Cream Social Team
Back Row (left to right): Mrs. Pollard, David Ericson, Cheri Blessing, Hunter Hall, Laura Engel, Hilary Mekelburg, Melissa Gattis, Alicia Farrell, Mr. Dalehall, Shannon Anderson, Eric Hill, Ishi Omofoja. Front Row (left to right): Brittany Lenstrom, Niki Malwitz, Allie Paxton, Matthew Dowgin & Gage DeMillo

David Ericson (left) and Hunter Hall (right)

Alicia Farrell (left) and Shannon Anderson (right)

Cheri Blessing
Hilary Mekelburg

Ishi Omofoja (left) and Niki Malwitz (right)

Cheri Blessing (left) and Brittany Lenstrom (right)

Eria Hill (right) and Gage DeMillo (left)

Matthew Dowgin
Laura Engel

Chrissy Rubnich
Allie Paxton

Melissa Gattis

Colorado
**CHAPTER ACTIVITY REPORT**

**Hopwood, Saipan**

**Summary:** This year the Hopwood Speech Team concentrated on speech competitions. They competed at five different tournaments consisting of over 25 schools and 500 competitors. The Hopwood Speech team did a presentation with over 1200 students attending. This increased interest and awareness of NJFL.

**Accomplishments:** The previous year started out with three active members. This year that number grew to over 14 active members and looking forward to an even bigger group next year.

Every competition the team placed very well. Most recently two of the members, Sean and Rosemarie took 1st place in their event at regionals. Students attended Guam’s first NJFL competition off the island.

A video camera with digital access was purchased through money raised by local fundraisers.

**Details/Comments:** Total Chapter Membership, 6. Chapter President, RoseMarie Wakit, Chapter Advisers, Ms. Melody Page and Ms. Cherlynn Cabreira. *Submitted May, 2001*

![Hopwood NJFL Students](image)

**Canterbury Middle School, IN**

**Summary:** The Canterbury Middle School chapter attended five meets, gave seven chapels, and held an end-of-the-year banquet.

**Accomplishments:** Chapter membership this year totalled 55. Chapter President, Erica Tunis, Chapter Adviser, LeaAnne Bernstein.

**Details/Comments:** “With fifth graders in the middle school, we wish our active 5th graders could be members. Some of them won 1st place ribbons in meets this year.” *Submitted May, 2001*

**St. Jude School, IN**

**Summary:** Despite students active schedules with Spell Bowl, Academic Olympics and the Midwest Talent Search, the St. Jude Middle School team competed in seven out of ten meets.

**Accomplishments:** The St. Jude team finished third at the first meet held in November at Canterbury. For a novice group, this was very enlightening. At Brebeuf, the team competed in the Catholic School Division, finishing second, and fifth overall. At Eastwood, only the "new team" of 6th and 7th grade students competed, finishing second. Year 2002 spelled the team’s greatest success with a 1st at Perry Meridian. A week later at Howe Academy, the team finished 2nd in the county and overall divisions. February resulted in 5th place at Carmel. Four of the team members competed at Roncalli High School Quest for Excellence finishing with 1st and 3rd in drama; 1st and 3rd in original oratory. On March 8, the speech students competed in the Optimist Oratorical Contest. $500 was awarded to the top male and top female. Two of St. Jude’s students claimed both checks and another student finished third. The two top winners will now proceed to the next division, both competing for $1,500 scholarships. The St. Jude team cannot be measured by finishes, but rather how successful they have been in recruiting new membership among the neighboring schools. Lending a hand to begin Middle School speech teams locally has given the students a real sense of accomplishment. Peer coaching has encouraged others to get involved.

**Details/Comments:** This year thirty-one of the thirty-eight team members were NJFL members. During the year, seven new students joined the team. The goal for next year is 100% NJFL membership. Beginning next school year, the local schools plan to compete frequently, beginning as early as late September. The year will end with a recognition banquet, honoring students in each category with a special reward.

**Stanley Clark School, IN**

**Summary:** The Stanley Clark School Speech team hosted one meet and attended four others. A banquet was held at the end of the season. Eighth grade officers took on more responsibility. The officers helped organize and set up the tournament. At times NJFL students coached the 6th graders.

**Accomplishments:** The four tournaments attended were successful. The team placed first at all tournaments (Columbia Middle School, Brebeuf Preparatory, Lincoln Jr. High and Memorial Park.

**Foreign**
Indiana

Trinity Catholic Junior HS, KS

Summary: Chapter speech projects included: Beginning Duet Acting, Presidential Speech, Historical Presentations, Human vs. Monkey Intelligence Debate, Radio Advertising, Spot Recordings and Announcements.

Accomplishments: This year's major accomplishments: Start-up of a school radio station, "Hearing Your Voice"; Public Speaking Presentations, Forensics Awareness

Details/Comments: The NJFL program helped in building positive promotions of debate, forensics and Congress. "While enjoying a great atmosphere, young students picked up on many of the little things that make a solid team."

Chapter membership totalled twenty-six. Chapter President, Kristen Skolaut, Chapter Advisor, Kevin Hedrick. (Submitted June, 2001)

Kansas

Milton Academy Middle School, MA

Summary: The Milton Academy Speech Team created an instructional video for middle school speech events. They attended two tournaments as a middle school team and several members competed at varsity tournaments. The Middle School Speech Team Gala was June 1, 2001.

Accomplishments: The team took 1st place in Sweepstakes at Nashoba Brooks held in November, 2000 and 1st place in Sweepstakes at Milton Academy's Foley Invitational held April 29.

Details/Comments: Chapter Membership totalled 27. Chapter Officers, Susie Stone and Adam Walker. Chapter Advisors, Deborah Simon and Jenny McNeil. (Submitted May, 2001)

Shrewsbury Middle School, MA

Summary: The Shrewsbury Middle School Speech Team attended two tournaments. The first tournament was the annual Mardi Gras Carnival Tournament hosted by Shrewsbury's High School. The second was the Foley Tournament for middle schoolers, hosted by Milton Academy in Milton, MA.

Three Shrewsbury Middle School students participated with the high school team in doing a presentation at a local retirement home.

Accomplishments: This was the first year as a middle school speech team, "felt like a true team." There are twenty-three "chartered" members which includes four sixth graders.

The first taste of competition was at the high school tournament, competing for the first time against high school students. Everyone made it through their rounds of competition. At the sec-

Massachusetts

Jones Middle School, MS

Summary: The students from Jones Middle School grades 7 through 8 presented oral book reports in English class. Seventh grade students presented their county projects of Mississippi. Eighth graders presented their U.S. History projects. The goal of the 7th and 8th graders was to do two oral presentations with photography and a Reading Fair.

Accomplishments: Several Jones Middle School students entered the Junior Beta competition in Biloxi. Jessica Boyd placed 2nd in the state. Five students competed in speech competitions throughout the year. Three of the students competed on a regular basis.

Details/Comments: "We hope to continue building more interest." Total Chapter Membership, four. Chapter President, Jessica Boyd, Chapter Advisor, Anita Boyd. (Submitted May, 2001)
Middle School of Poplarville, MS

**Summary:** "The Morning Massage" is broadcasted over the school intercom each morning which includes the Pledge of Allegiance and inspirational pieces. The NJFL Middle School students served as "teachers" for a Thanksgiving simulation for a Kindergarten class. Also the Middle School team presented the "Flip Side" skit (student pairs gave monologues on opposing views of various situations that middle school students are typically confronted with. Also, the NJFL team participated in various classroom and community speaking activities.

**Accomplishments:** "Flip Side" was presented to the student body. A web site was developed.

**Details/Comments:** Chapter membership totals 17. Chapter President: April Van Cleve and Chapter Advisor is Cynthia Russell. (Submitted June, 2001)

## Mississippi

**Bueker Middle School, MO**

**Summary:** The Bueker Middle School Speech team meets once a month from October through December and extra times when preparing for contests. In addition to a regular Speech Club, Bueker Middle School has quarterly and semester speech classes.

**Accomplishments:** The Speech Team is involved in the following: weekend Speech Tournaments, the Woodsmen Oratory contest, one act plays presented to 5th grade students, and a full-length play presented to the public.

**Details/Comments:** Chapter Membership totals 8. Chapter President is Christina Foreman, Chapter Advisor is Jan Backes. (Submitted May, 2001)

**Pembroke Hill Middle School, MO**

**Summary:** In March the Pembroke Hill Middle School NJFL students attended the Barstow Middle School Tournament. In addition, yearly, Pembroke Hill Middle School conducted their own in-school speech tournament.

**Accomplishments:** As a new chapter, Pembroke’s major accomplishment was growing to 30 members in the first year.

**Details/Comments:** Total Chapter membership, 30. Chapter Advisor, Mike Hill. (Submitted May, 2001)

## New York

**Missouri**

**Farmsworth Middle School, NY**

**Summary:** During the 2001-2002 school year, Farmsworth Middle School student participation in speech and debate activities has grown tremendously. When chartered in 1999, Farmsworth had eleven members, currently they have 37 members. It is our hope that they will surpass that number in the new season coming.

Twenty-five eighth grade students participated in training in policy debate and conducted an in-school tournament. The topic was chosen to reflect current events, and students researched and learned about the issues of privacy versus security, an especially debatable topic with the recent passage of the Patriot Bill. Trophies were awarded to the three top teams after two rounds. Teams debated the affirmative position in one round, and the negative in the next.

**Accomplishments:** Sixty 6th and 7th grade students began training in policy debate in the fall. The numbers have dropped somewhat, but approximately forty students are still actively participating and are preparing for an in-school debate tournament in April. To qualify for the tournament, each student gave an individual persuasive speech to the coach. In recruiting judges, we realized a need for training them, and developed a judging manual and a ballot that is on a rubric-type scale.

**Details/Comments:** We have modified the policy debate format somewhat for middle school students, allowing four to five students on a team instead of the usual two member teams. This gives our students more support as they research and less speaking responsibility during the debate tournament.

**Farmsworth Middle School Debate Team**

**John Griffin Middle School, NC**

**Summary:** The John Griffin Middle School Forensic Team has 17 members who competed in six events: Dramatic and Humorous Interpretation, Duo Interpretation, Storytelling, Original Oratory, and Extemporaneous Speaking. Three team members earned more than 100 points and were awarded the NJFL plaque. Eighth grader Kaitlin Naccum earned 160 points, more than any student in the school’s history.

**Accomplishments:** Students competed in one festival and three tournaments, placing 2nd twice and 1st twice in team sweepstakes. Team members also performed at "Extra-Curricular Night" for rising sixth graders and participated in Storytelling at the library festival sponsored by the school media center. A second year in a row, team members produced a daily live news show containing national, local, and school news. Students added a "Community Leaders" component to this year’s broadcasts, inviting state and local leaders for interviews including Senator Tony Rand, Lt. General Dan K. McNeil, Commanding General of Ft. Bragg, Mayor Marshall Pitts and Sheriff Earl Butler. These opportunities encour-
CHAPTER ACTIVITY REPORT

John Griffin Middle School students

age students to hone their interviewing skills and learn more about their local leaders.

Details/Comments: Seventh grader, Jocelyn Crane sums up the team's philosophy best, "Since I joined forensics, I have become more confident in myself. I can speak in front of people and know that I will do well. I am very glad I joined because I have learned a lot. I am not afraid to voice my opinion."

North Carolina

Gilmour Academy Middle School, OH

Summary: The Gilmour Academy Speech Team had an active season including students serving as readers at Mass, doing announcements in convocation, presenting speeches to the entire school body, doing socratic seminars, and class presentations of poetry, varied class speeches and also group presentations.

Accomplishments: The Gilmour Academy Speech Team competed against high school teams at numerous tournaments in both Policy and Oratorical Interpretation.


Ohio

Ardmore Middle School, OK

Summary: This year actually started in Ohio in June. The Ardmore Middle School Speech team traveled over 1200 miles to compete in the NJFL National Junior High School Speech Tournament. The team finished 6th overall and earned several trophies. This was a great experience for students as well as administrators who made the trip.

Accomplishments: This summer is going to be great for the team as they will be hosting the tournament with over 400 entries already confirmed.

The team has competed in six tournaments so far taking first at three of them and second place at three additional tournaments. Three more tournaments are planned for this year before Nationals in June. The team has an 11-week off time in which they are in the process of play rehearsal. This year's production is Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs. Six productions will be presented over a two-day period.

Details/Comments: Team Captain Ally Roberts said that, "being an member of NJFL is great!" It allowed her to attend nationals last year and win! "By competing it is neat to be able to earn additional degrees for speech activities." Team Coach and Advisor Anson Shuman said that "Since we have joined NJFL, a lot of good things have happened to us. It brought the community together in supporting the AMS Speech Program. The community supported them financially with over $12,000 dollars raised last year.

Once again, through the communities financial support, they will be able to host nationals this year. The NJFL program has helped doubled the drama class size. It is truly a win win program."

Mounds Middle School, OK

Summary: Mounds Middle School began the year with two previous members. By early November the chapter had added two seventh graders. Team members read the school bulletin daily, performed on a regular basis including a Christmas program at the Elementary School, and competed in two interscholastic tournaments.

Accomplishments: In early November, the team competed at the Muskogee Little Nationals Tournament in Muskogee, (OK) and in late November early December the team competed at the Oologah High School tournament where they came in 2nd, the NJFL members won several medals.

Details/Comments: Team members assisted in running the large interscholastic speech tournament at Mounds in mid-November. Members competed in numerous individual events as well as debate. By the end of the semester, membership in the chapter totalled six. (Chapter Activity Report received December, 2001)
<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>209</td>
<td>Watertown</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>Three Trails</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Blue Valley North</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Rushmore</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Sioux Falls Lincoln</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Heart of America</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>Independence Truman</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>California Coast</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>Leland</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Bronx HS of Science</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Show Me</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Blue Springs South</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Florida Manatee</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Nova</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>East Kansas</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Shawnee Mission East</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Northern Ohio</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>Howland</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>New England</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Illini</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Downers Grove South</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Northwest Indiana</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Sunflower</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Wichita East</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>West Kansas</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Hutchinson</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>San Fran Bay</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>James Logan</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Kansas Flint-Hills</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Washburn Rural</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Flathead County</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>Central Minnesota</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Apple Valley</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Hole in the Wall</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Cheyenne Central</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>South Kansas</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Millard North</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain South</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Wheat Ridge</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Eastern Ohio</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>Southern Minnesota</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Eagan</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>South Texas</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Houston Bellaire</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Carver Truman</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Neosho</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Florida Sunshine</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Sarasota Riverview</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Eastern Washington</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Gonzaga Prep</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Northern Illinois</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Glenbrook North</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Great Salt Lake</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Salt Lake City West</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>East Los Angeles</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Gabriellino</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Eastern Missouri</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Pattonville</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>North Coast</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Gilmour Academy</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Northern Lights</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Moorhead</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>West Oklahoma</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Norman HS North</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>+38</td>
<td>Golden Desert</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Green Valley</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Redlands</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Northern Wisconsin</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Appleton East</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>North East Indiana</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Chesterton</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>Ozark</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Kickapoo</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Centennial</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Hillcrest</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>Carolina West</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Myers Park</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>West Los Angeles</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Loyola</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>East Texas</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Jersey Village</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Deep South</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>The Montgomery Academy</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>Florida Panther</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Trinity Prop School</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>South Oregon</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Roseburg Sr.</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Cherry Creek</td>
<td>361</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>-4</td>
<td>Hoosier Heartland</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Ben Davis</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Ridge</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>Hoosier Crossroads</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Ind'ples North Central</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Utah Wasatch</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Sky View</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>Sundance</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>Greater Illinois</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Belleville East</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>North Dakota Roughrider</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Fargo Shanley</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Colorado Grande</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Albuquerque Academy</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>+30</td>
<td>Chesapeake</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Pueblo Centennial</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>New York State</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Calvert Hall College</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Nebraska South</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Monticello</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Western Ohio</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Lincoln East</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>West Iowa</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Dayton Oakwood</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>+26</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Ankeny Senior</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Lone Star</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Wind River</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Plano Sr.</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Casper Natrona County</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain North</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Bethel Park</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>Valley Forge</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Greeley Central</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Truman</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>Western Washington</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Greater Latrobe</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>Big Valley</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Gig Harbor</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Georgia Northern Mountain</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Modesto Beyer</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>North Oregon</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Chattahoochee</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>Southern Wisconsin</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Gresham Barlow</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>North Texas Longhorns</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>East Oklahoma</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Creekview</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>Central Texas</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Bishop Kelley</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Ronald Reagan</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>Sagebrush</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Mars Hill Bible School</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Tall Cotton</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Portage Northern</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Amarillo</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>Heart of Texas</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Rowan County Sr.</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>East Iowa</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>Georgia Southern Peach</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Iowa City West</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Gulf Coast</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Thomas County Central</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Gregory Portland</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>-48</td>
<td>South Florida</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Hattiesburg</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>Tarheel East</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Michael Krop</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>West Texas</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Massey Hill Classical</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Puget Sound</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Kamiak</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>UL</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Wheeling Park</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Capitol Valley</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Blackburg</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Rio Americano</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Iroquois</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Kamehameha Schools</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Pacific Islands</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Christian Brothers Academy</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Belk Theater: Finals and Awards

Queen City Skyline
THE 2002 CAPITOL CLASSIC DEBATE INSTITUTE
Washington, D.C.

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

THE WASHINGTON GROUP
A Four-Week Select Institute Designed Exclusively for Advanced Debaters
JULY 7 – AUG. 3

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

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

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

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

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

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

CHRIS LUNDBERG, Liberty University. Received three first round bids to the N.D.T. Coach of the 2000 N.D.T. Champions. Has taught at Emory, Dartmouth, Michigan and Kentucky institutes.**

JOHN RAINS, Emory University. Top Speaker at the 2001 Wake Forest Tournament. Finished second at CEDA Nationals and was a first round bid to the N.D.T. in 2001. Taught at the Emory Workshop.**

JACKIE SWiatek, Northwestern. Has advanced to the elimination rounds of almost every national level tournament. She has taught at The Championship Group, the University of Southern California and Northwestern University.***

KENDA CUNNINGHAM, University of North Texas. Top Speaker at the 2001 Dartmouth Round Robin. Eliminated rounds at the N.D.T. and C.E.D.A. nationals for three straight years. Taught at Dartmouth Debate Institute.*

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


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

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

Apply online at http://debate.cua.edu
"I love to dig up the question by the roots and hold it up and dry it before the fires of the mind."
— Abraham Lincoln

Think your opinion doesn’t matter? Talk to a few NFL members. They’re living proof that words can change lives. Over the years, National Forensic League members have gone on to become U.S. presidents, Supreme Court justices, CEOs, and other influential thinkers. So can you. And Lincoln Financial Group wants to help. That’s why we’re a proud sponsor of the NFL, A&E’s BIOGRAPHY® Project for Schools, and other educational programs for young people. To find out more about the National Forensic League, call 920-748-6206. And see how far you can go, when you have the power to make people listen.

Clear solutions in a complex world
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