INSIDE:
The Arthur N. Rupe Foundation and Public Forum Debate

PLUS
“Jazzin’ It Up In KC”
June 13 - 18
CDE DEBATE HANDBOOKS 2010-2011: REDUCING OUR MILITARY PRESENCE

“The most thorough research material available.”
Butch Hamm, Ryle HS (Kentucky)

“Unique evidence and arguments unavailable elsewhere.” J. Prager, California

“I wouldn’t go a year without CDE.”
V. Zabel, Deer Creek

“Your CX blocks are great.” Tim Hughes, Belton HS

“So much more complete than all the other handbooks that I don’t see how they stay in business.” J. Dean, Texas

“These are the best handbooks I have ever seen.” Coach, Highland Park HS

“Of the 700 plus pages in your 3 books there wasn’t one thing we didn’t end up using; we discarded or gave our novices most of the handbooks we bought from other companies.” Jen Johnson, Florida

“Your generic blocks are really good. I get bothered by how much duplication all the other handbooks have, it’s like they’re all written by the same person.”
John Denton-Hill, Texas

- NATIONAL CAMP SURVEY ranks CDE Handbooks “the best in the nation.”
- Texas-based speech newsletter finds CDE Handbooks and Affirmative Cases Book the biggest, most complete, and best debate books available.
- The ROCKY MOUNTAIN EDUCATION Survey looked at CDE, Baylor, Paradigm, DRG, Squirrel Killers, West Coast, Michigan, Communican, and Harvard. They rank CDE best in every category except editing.

600+ pages, disadvantages on minorities, women, terrorism, economies of scale, national security, defense, sphere of influence, credibility, treaty obligations, person power, proliferation, and much more. And hundreds on topicality, harm attack blocks, harm turns on issues such as soft power and drug interdiction, incrementalism, trend blocks, kritiks from scare rhetoric to nuclearism, counterplans from consultation to IGOs and alternative agents

By e-mail or paper, 3 book set for $86 (or on CD with Affirmative Cases Book just $98).

ORDER FROM CDE, P.O. Box 1890, Taos NM 87571 www.cdedebate.com 575-751-0514
bennett@cdedebate.com
University of Texas
National Institute in Forensics

We invite you to join us for the 17th Annual UT National Institute in Forensics, and to come and see why UTNIF continues to be one of the largest and most accomplished summer forensics programs in the country.

www.utspeech.net
www.utdebatecamp.com

UTNIF Alumni


What will you spend your summer preparing for?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Events</td>
<td>June 22, 2010</td>
<td>July 6, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Events + Extension</td>
<td>June 22, 2010</td>
<td>July 10, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX Debate Session 1 (Marathon &amp; Experienced)</td>
<td>June 20, 2010</td>
<td>July 9, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX Debate Session 2 (Marathon &amp; Experienced)</td>
<td>July 12, 2010</td>
<td>July 31, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CX Debate Supersession/Survivors</td>
<td>June 20, 2010</td>
<td>July 31, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTNIF CX Novice</td>
<td>July 16, 2010</td>
<td>July 25, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln-Douglas Debate</td>
<td>July 12, 2010</td>
<td>July 25, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln-Douglas Debate + Extension</td>
<td>July 12, 2010</td>
<td>July 30, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIL Focus CX Minisession A</td>
<td>July 13, 2010</td>
<td>July 19, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIL Focus CX Minisession B</td>
<td>July 21, 2010</td>
<td>July 27, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UTNIF
Dept. of Communication Studies
1 University Station
Mall Code A1105
Austin, Texas 78712-1105

Phone: 512-471-1957
Fax: 512-232-1481

Email:
Speech: mrcox@mail.utexas.edu
Debate: jd.rollins@mail.utexas.edu

Rostrum
National Tournament Extemp Areas

United States Extemp List
• 2010 and 2012 Elections
• The American Economy: Economic Theory and Core Economic Policymaking
• American Foreign Policy: Theoretical Questions and Ongoing Foreign Engagements
• America: The Path from 2000 to 2010
• The American Judiciary: Nominations, Recent Cases, and Theoretical Approaches
• The Banking Crisis and American Business
• Education
• Energy and the Environment
• Health Care Reform
• National Defense and Homeland Security
• The Obama Administration
• State and Local Politics: Major Elections, Budgets, Welfare, and Immigration issues
• US Policies, Programs, and Regulatory Policy

International Extemp List
• Africa
• Canada, Mexico, and the Caribbean
• Central and South America
• China, Taiwan, Japan, and the Koreas
• Energy and the Environment
• Europe
• India, Pakistan, and SE Asia
• The International Community: The Transition from 2000 to 2010
• International Organizations & Global Challenges
• The Middle East
• Russia and Former USSR Satellite States
• US Foreign Policy: The Foreign Perspective
• The World Economy

Extemp Commentary List
• American Consumerism
• Corporations Versus the Rest of Us
• The Developing World
• Doctor Obama’s Prescription
• Education Reform: Plans, Promises, and Politics
• International Zones of Conflict
• Midterms in Just Months
• NFL Nationals Week in History
• R.I.P.: Obituaries Since NFL Nationals 2009
• United States of Anger and Demonization
Congratulations and Good Luck!

by Jason M. Jerista,
Lincoln Financial Group

Congratulations to everyone who participated in National Forensic League district tournaments and good luck to all National Tournament competitors!

Regardless of the judges’ scores, you should be proud of your involvement in the NFL. Your participation in the NFL is a significant step toward a bright future. The confidence you are gaining from speaking and debating will last a lifetime. By diligently researching, writing, and presenting your arguments, you are building critical skills that will help you in your future endeavors. We encourage you to continue working to hone your skills and find ways to leverage your unique abilities to improve your communities, your country, and your planet. After all, your experiences in the NFL will help you to become tomorrow’s leaders.

Please extend a special thanks to your dedicated coaches, family, and friends for their support of you and your participation in the NFL. Lincoln Financial is proud to support the NFL and we wish you all the best in the National Tournament.

Lincoln Financial Group®
CALL FOR LINCOLN DOUGLAS DEBATE TOPICS PRIOR TO MAY 15, 2010

The NFL LD Wording Committee meets during the National Tournament and does the selection and wording of topics for January through December of the following calendar year. The NFL LD Wording Committee requests topic suggestions from coaches and students. The quality of the end product is dependent on your submissions! Please e-mail suggestions to nfl@nflonline.org.

SUBMIT PUBLIC FORUM TOPIC IDEAS

To allow for maximum levels of creativity this year, please share your ideas for good Public Forum Debate resolutions with the National Topic Advisory Committee by e-mailing nfl@nflonline.org.

The 2010 IDEA/NJFL National Middle School Tournament will be hosted in Des Moines, Iowa, June 24-27

Now is a great time to reach out to your feeder schools and encourage them to become involved in the NJFL!

Promoting meaningful middle school participation is a great way to build your program and expose even more students to the life-changing potential of speech and debate.

Visit www.juniorforensicleague.org for more details.
The Arthur N. Rupe Foundation and Public Forum Debate

Promoting Your Forensic Program
by Steve Meadows

2010-11 Policy Topic: Debating US Foreign Military Presence
by Stefan Bauschard

From Terror to Title: Our Experience in Public Forum Debate
by Amanda and Emily Scherker

College Competitor Reflects Fondly on Public Forum Debate
by Jeremy D. Johnson

Middle School Forensics: Massachusetts Bridges the Gap
by Debbie Simon

2010 National Tournament Information

Why Do We Do Policy Debate?
by James M. Kellams

Academic All Americans

Donus D. Roberts Quad Ruby Coach Recognition

New Diamond Coaches

Standings Report

Welcome New Schools
Policy, LD, Public Forum

July 18 - August 6, 2010 (3 week Policy or LD Session)
July 18 – July 30, 2010 (2 week Policy or LD Session)
July 30 – August 6, 2010 (1 week Public Forum Session)

1. **Individual attention**
   4 to 1 staff to student ratio and the vast majority of your time will be spent in small labs with four to eight people, not in huge faceless lectures and oversized classrooms.

2. **Practice debates and drills**
   In policy debate, you do 5 drills and 10 debates during the first two weeks; 5 practice debates and a 5 round tournament during the third week. In LD and Public Forum, you do 2 debates almost each day of the camp culminating in tournaments.

3. **Evidence and Arguments for Success**
   Our staff research before the camp and you supplement staff research so you won't go home with a few paltry pieces of evidence and you won't spend endless hours as a research slave. You'll leave with at least 2,500 pages of policy, 1,000 pages of LD, and 300 pages of Public Forum materials. Each debater receives chosen prints of files plus electronic versions of all files.

4. **Beautiful location and housing**
   Whitman is located in southeast Washington State. Modern, comfortable classrooms feature fast wireless Internet access with multiple computers and an excellent library. Residence rooms are comfortable, showers are private, and the lounges bring people together for fun.

5. **Family feel with a great staff**
   People at our camp feel connected, not isolated. You’ll work with our fantastic staff: Andy Baker (NDT First Round), Ben Meiches (NFL National Champ), Nate Cohn (NDT First Round), Anjali Vats (NDT Octas), Luke Sanford (CEDA Quarters), Daniel Straus (CEDA Quarters), Mike Meredith (NPDA and CEDA Elims), Paul Montreiul (NDT First Round), James Culver (Semis, Berkeley), Joe Allen (TOC LD Quals), Brie Coyle (NPDA and NPTE Elims).

6. **Transportation to and from the airport**
   Whitman is easily accessed via plane or bus and we provide a shuttle to and from the Pasco and Walla Walla airports.

7. **Cost Effective**
   Compare prices. You will not find any camp that provides the individualized attention, quality of staff and instruction, and amenities we provide at anywhere near the price. See our web page for details.

ONLINE REGISTRATION, SEE OUR STAFF, AND MORE INFO AT:
www.whitman.edu/rhetoric/camp/
West Coast Publishing

THE ULTIMATE PACKAGE

- SAVE HUGE AMOUNTS OF MONEY
- It includes all 4 sets listed below

All West Coast products are electronic to lower your costs and to make them accessible at all times to you.

Policy Evidence Set

- *Aff and Neg Books* with Complete Affs, Disads, Counterplans, Kritiks, Topically arguments to get you going on the topic earlier than ever before.
- **Big September Update.** We will go beyond what the camps offer providing a broad array of strategies and arguments.
- **Evidence Updates each month** Hundreds of pages will be added during the year to provide debaters with the latest evidence and arguments. **AND YOU VOTE ON THE UPDATES YOU WANT.**
- **Theory Blocks** providing students with the arguments they need when they hit a theory challenge.

LD Evidence Set

- **NFL LDFiles** (50 to 60 pages with topic analysis, aff. and neg. evidence provided for each announced NFL LD topic)
- **UIL LDFiles** (50 to 60 pages with topic analysis, aff. and neg. evidence on each UIL LD topic)
- **PhilosopherFiles** (All of our West Coast Philosopher-Value Handbooks on a web page)
- **LDFiles** (includes over 120 previous West Coast LD Supplements on a web page)

Exttemp-Parli-Congress-PublicForum Set

- **NewsViews** featuring articles with the pros and cons on current issues. You receive 20 page updates every two weeks (Sept, Oct, Nov, Jan, Feb, Mar, and one in June). Learn and cite key arguments on current events to do well in Extemp.
- **ParliCongressFiles** provides hundreds of pages of cases and opposition strategies on the latest and recurring arguments with monthly updates. Great for Student Congress and Parliamentary Debate.
- **PublicForumFiles** offers for each Public Forum debate topic 20 pages including a topic analysis, affirming case and supporting evidence, negative arguments and evidence.

BDB Debate and IE Textbook and Online Training Set

- You access the Textbooks and Prebooks electronically and save huge amounts of money. You and ALL of your students may view and print the Textbooks and Prebooks.
- **Includes the Debate Textbooks.** They teach students step by step, with separate tests for POLICY-CX, LD, PARLI, AND PUBLIC FORUM, and include new examples, stories, and advanced tips.
- **Includes the Teacher Materials** with lesson plans, activities, syllabus, and lecture notes for debate and IEs.
- **Includes the Prebooks** that involve students in preparing cases, relating, and flowing using real evidence on this year’s POLICY-CX topic and great example LD and PUBLIC FORUM topics PLUS Parli instruction.
- **Includes the Dictionary of Forensics** with definitions, examples, and uses of terms from Policy, LD, Parli, Public Forum, Argumentation, Rhetoric, and Individual Events. A fantastic resource.
- **Includes the BDB IE Textbook** with 142 pages chock-full of step by step instructions, advanced tips, examples and more on extemp, impromptu, oratory, expository, interpretation and more IEs!
- **Now includes Online Videos, Example Speech and Debate Videos.** Learn with step by step lessons, streaming video with PowerPoint.

Visit www.wcdebate.com

On-line and printable Order Form available at the web site
# 2010-2011 ORDER FORM

**POLICY DEBATE (CROSS-X):** ($first copy/extra copies)

Choose one of three subscriptions: (on printed copies of 4 or more of the same item, all copies are at lower price)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRINTED COPY</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>E-MAIL</th>
<th>PRINT/CD</th>
<th>PRINT/E-MAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Subscription</td>
<td>___ copies ($90/$45)</td>
<td>___ $82</td>
<td>___ $74</td>
<td>___ $127</td>
<td>___ $119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR Basic + 6-mo. Updates</td>
<td>___ copies ($138/$69)</td>
<td>___ $124</td>
<td>___ $110</td>
<td>___ $193</td>
<td>___ $179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR Basic + 4-mo. Updates</td>
<td>___ copies ($122/$61)</td>
<td>___ $110</td>
<td>___ $98</td>
<td>___ $171</td>
<td>___ $159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE: same items available individually:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRINTED COPY</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>E-MAIL</th>
<th>PRINT/CD</th>
<th>PRINT/E-MAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aff. Casebook (May 15)</td>
<td>___ copies ($14/$7)</td>
<td>___ $12</td>
<td>___ $10</td>
<td>___ $19</td>
<td>___ $17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Negative Briefs (Jul 15)</td>
<td>___ copies ($38/$19)</td>
<td>___ $35</td>
<td>___ $32</td>
<td>___ $54</td>
<td>___ $51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Negative Briefs (Jul 15)</td>
<td>___ copies ($38/$19)</td>
<td>___ $35</td>
<td>___ $32</td>
<td>___ $54</td>
<td>___ $51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Update Briefs** (print & CD published MONTHLY, e-mail version published WEEKLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRINTED COPY</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>E-MAIL</th>
<th>PRINT/CD</th>
<th>PRINT/E-EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-month option (Sep-Feb)</td>
<td>___ copies ($48/$24)</td>
<td>___ $42</td>
<td>___ $36</td>
<td>___ $66</td>
<td>___ $60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-month option (Sep-Dec)</td>
<td>___ copies ($32/$16)</td>
<td>___ $28</td>
<td>___ $24</td>
<td>___ $44</td>
<td>___ $40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE (NFL TOPICS ONLY)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRINTED COPY</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>E-MAIL</th>
<th>PRINT/CD</th>
<th>PRINT/E-EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Subscription (all 4)</td>
<td>___ copies ($96/$48)</td>
<td>___ $84</td>
<td>___ $72</td>
<td>___ $132</td>
<td>___ $120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUBLIC FORUM DEBATE (NFL TOPICS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRINTED COPY</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>E-MAIL</th>
<th>PRINT/CD</th>
<th>PRINT/E-EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Subscription (all 8)</td>
<td>___ copies ($192/$96)</td>
<td>___ $168</td>
<td>___ $144</td>
<td>___ $264</td>
<td>___ $240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OR same items available individually:** (on printed copies of 4 or more of the same item, all copies are at lower price)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRINTED COPY</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>E-MAIL</th>
<th>PRINT/CD</th>
<th>PRINT/E-EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep-Oct L-D topic</td>
<td>___ copies ($24/$12)</td>
<td>___ $21</td>
<td>___ $18</td>
<td>___ $33</td>
<td>___ $30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-Dec L-D topic</td>
<td>___ copies ($24/$12)</td>
<td>___ $21</td>
<td>___ $18</td>
<td>___ $33</td>
<td>___ $30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Feb L-D topic</td>
<td>___ copies ($24/$12)</td>
<td>___ $21</td>
<td>___ $18</td>
<td>___ $33</td>
<td>___ $30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-Apr L-D topic</td>
<td>___ copies ($24/$12)</td>
<td>___ $21</td>
<td>___ $18</td>
<td>___ $33</td>
<td>___ $30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

**NAME**

**ADDRESS**

**CITY, STATE, ZIP**

**E-MAIL ADDRESS**

___ Charge to Visa/MasterCard # ____________________________ Exp Date _________

**S-K PUBLICATIONS**

**PO Box 8173**

**Wichita KS 67208-0173**

**PHONE 316-685-3201**

**FAX 316-685-6650**

**debate@squirrelkillers.com**

**http://www.squirrelkillers.com**

**Total**

**Plus 10% shipping and handling costs up to a maximum of $25, if payment does not accompany order (but no shipping or handling costs on e-mail orders). Credit extended to schools/coaches only.**
Simply Functional™ for Fun, Easy & Effective Fundraising...

How it Works...

The Simply Functional™ fundraising model is based upon an innovative web-based fundraising management process that is revolutionizing the fundraising industry. Everything is done quickly and for free online at www.FundraisingSF.com. You will be amazed at how simple and easy it is. Your fundraiser can be up and running in one day!

Simply Functional™ Step-by-Step Process

Step 1: You Sign Up at www.FundraisingSF.com
Step 2: You quickly and easily create your Campaign Web Page & Sales Flyer (with link to web page)
Step 3: Your members email the Sales Flyer — which has the link that takes Customers to your Web Page to make their purchase.
Step 4: The Customers order and pay on line.
Step 5: Simply Functional™ ships the product FedEx directly to your Customers.
Step 6: Simply Functional™ sends your group a check based upon your sales.

New products are introduced in three month waves. This allows your program to be continuous with a fresh product offering every quarter. As these new products are added each quarter, the previous ones will continue to be available for purchase/repurchase. Simply Functional™ Fundraising is unlike any other Fundraising Program in that your group will continue to raise revenue from purchases/repurchases of all of these products on an ongoing basis.

It is as simple as that!

The Benefits...

- No Inventory Purchases Required — Risk-free Fundraising!
- Delivers Higher Profit than Other Programs — $5.00 per sale!
- Healthy, Great-Tasting Products — Neighbors, friends & family are eager to buy!
- Website Tools are Free & Easy — Web Page, Sales Flyer & Email Templates!
- Web/Email Year-Around Fundraising — 24 hours a day, 365 days a year!
- Nation-Wide Fundraising — Customers order online and products shipped directly to them!
- Customers Pay Online — No handling of cash, checks or credit cards!
- Product Ships FedEx — Directly to the customer within 7 to 10 days! You do not hand deliver the product!
- Free freight for all product shipments!
- Ability to track sales, earnings and an order status any time online!
- “QuickC” monthly payment to your organization in one convenient check!
- Experienced staff to work with you, ensuring the success of your program!
- Unlike Any Other Fundraiser... You continue to collect from all re-orders without expending additional sales effort!

Let us show you how!

Learn More & Sign Up Today at ...
www.FundraisingSF.com

For more information please contact us at:
Email: asedlecky@SimplyFunctionalLLC.com
Phone: 770-855-3349

Simply Functional Fundraising is unique in offering only healthy, all natural products that are exceptionally rich in Omega 3 and Antioxidants.

We offer a selection of delicious products and flavors everyone is sure to love. The current products offered include sensational Salad Dressings, BBQ/Grilling Sauces, and Salsas.
In 2009, the Arthur N. Rupe Foundation provided a generous grant to the National Forensic League to promote Public Forum Debate across the country. In addition to sponsoring the Rupe Foundation Qualifying Series of Public Forum Topics in February, March, and April, the Rupe Foundation grant also created a research portal to provide the highest quality resources and exclusive interviews to the debate community and to the general public. To learn more, visit www.RupeScholars.org today!
How are YOU Giving Youth a Voice?

For thousands of years, mariners or seafarers gazed toward the heavens to guide them across vast oceans. On their voyages of discovery, many sought out the North Star, which remains relatively motionless, to guide them on their quest. Countless travelers have trusted the current star, Polaris, as the beacon of true North in the night sky.

In the modern era of Global Positioning Satellites and Google Maps, stargazing is rarely used as guide for travel. Yet, on voyages of intellectual discovery, we rely on the light of truth to guide us on our journey.

Visionary leaders and organizations, such as the Arthur N. Rupe Foundation, promote greater understanding through research, education, and debate. The organization believes that it is a citizenry girded in the armor of knowledge and trained in the art of debate that forms the core of universal freedom and true democracy.

The mission of the Foundation is to achieve positive social change by shining the light of truth on critical and controversial issues through the support of scholarly studies, education, research, and public debates, and by the dissemination of the results via a variety of media to all segments of the public.

As a supporter of the National Forensic League, the Arthur N. Rupe Foundation is shining a light of truth on the most important issues of the day by advancing Public Forum Debate. The primary goal of the Foundation’s sponsorship is to increase the popularity and prestige of Public Forum Debate. To this end, the Foundation offers resources to expand NFLtv.org and develop RupeScholars.org to make Public Forum Debate increasingly accessible to more students. This support provides the Public Forum community with a high-quality virtual library of educational resources to advance the debate on contemporary issues.

With hundreds of visitors to the sites each day, these Web sites provide a legacy for both organizations by ensuring that today’s debates and resources are available to future generations. Throughout the coming months, the NFL will continue to build RupeScholars.org into the premier Public Forum Debate Web site replete with additional expert interviews, scholarly research, lectures, and analysis from expert debate coaches, as well as videos of Public Forum rounds. The Web site will continue to serve as a resource for NFL member schools and students as well as for the community at large to learn more about the issues involved in each of our debates and get involved in debates in their area.

Additionally, the Foundation has substantially and generously increased the scholarship amounts for Public Forum Debate at the NFL National Speech & Debate Tournament. This June, members of the Arthur N. Rupe Foundation will be on hand in Kansas City, Missouri, to award more than $50,000 additional dollars to the top 14 Public Forum Debate teams in the nation. This is the first time in NFL history that so many teams have been awarded scholarship dollars in a single event. This year’s Public Forum champions will also receive the largest scholarship ever awarded to an individual or team. More than 400 Arthur N. Rupe Foundation Scholars will qualify to compete for these scholarships from a field of more than 4,000. The scholarship recipients will represent fewer than the top 1% of their field.

The Arthur N. Rupe Championship Public Forum Debate will be held Friday, June 18, at the KCI Expo Center with an audience of approximately 3,500 and live streamed on the RupeScholars.org site. Local and national media will be on hand to cover the debate and expert judges will be part of a blue-ribbon panel to adjudicate the championship round.

As sponsors and supporters of Public Forum Debate, the Arthur N. Rupe Foundation is bringing invaluable resources to thousands of US high school students in
every state and locality in the country. From New York City to Los Angeles, Miami to Minneapolis, and everywhere in between, hundreds of students are being honored as representatives of their local communities at the largest academic competition in the world. More than two-dozen students will receive additional resources to pursue higher education.

In partnership with the National Forensic League, the Arthur N. Rupe Foundation’s investment in today’s communities creates more civic engagement and citizen participation in the critical and controversial issues that face our country. The Foundation’s investment in today’s debaters strengthens our democracy and ensures the readiness of future leaders.

As was the case for ancient travelers, dark skies and murky waters often clouded their quest for new worlds. As we chart our future course to discover new ideas and new solutions to better society, we rely on the continued generosity, commitment, and dedication of the Arthur N. Rupe Foundation to help us cast the light of truth on issues shrouded in darkness.

HELP US GIVE YOUTH A VOICE!
Please send your tax-deductible donation to: Bruno E. Jacob Youth Leadership Fund, PO Box 38, Ripon, WI 54971
Or visit us online: www.nflonline.org/Giving/Bruno

---

### Leaders Academy Seeks Teacher in Seoul, South Korea

**Job Responsibilities**
1) Teach students forensics, social studies, and English. Design and manage curriculum for assigned courses.
2) Provide differentiated instruction to a variety of abilities and counsel students to find appropriate competitions.
3) Provide in-depth feedback and guidance to both students and parents about the progress of each student.

**Qualifications**
1) Bachelor’s Degree
2) Forensics experience & expertise
3) Humanities expertise

**Preferences**
1) Teaching certificate
2) Social studies background
3) 6+1 writing experience

**Contract**
1) Year-long contract
2) Salary based on qualifications
3) Housing included

Leaders Academy
Jaesok Building floors 3 & 4, 908-1 Daechi, Gangnam, Seoul, Korea
Phone: 82-2-562-9799

Applicants should send CV and cover letter to leadersdebate@gmail.com. Include "NFL Recruitment" in the subject heading.
University of Missouri-Kansas City
Summer Debate Institute 2010

Apply Online Today!
http://umkcsdi.com

Policy
3 Week Scholars
July 11-July 31
Commuter $900
Resident $1550

2 Week
July 18-July 31
Commuter $575
Resident $1075

Public Forum ★
1 & 2 Week Options
Check umkcsdi.com for details.

Lincoln-Douglas ★
1 & 2 Week Options
Check umkcsdi.com for details.

Features
★★ One hour of COLLEGE CREDIT included in camp fee.
(See Website for details- 2 and 3 week camps only)
★★ Evidence at the beginning of camp.
★★ Each student receives ALL evidence produced.

UMKC 2007 National Debate Tournament 2nd Place!

http://umkcsdi.com

Staff
We pride ourselves on hiring experienced, quality staff that ensure that you have an exceptional experience at UMKC Summer Debate Institute. Check our website under the staff link to see all the exciting additions for 2010.
CROSS-X FACULTY

Michael Antonucci  
Adrienne Brovero  
Daryl Burch  
Brian Manuel  
Patrick Waldinger

Georgetown University  
Mary Washington  
Capitol Debate  
Harvard-Lakeland  
Boston College

PUBLIC FORUM FACULTY

Jason Kline, Director  
Lynne Coyne  
Jay Rye

Myers Park High School  
Ridge School  
Montgomery Academy

TO ENROLL, GO TO WWW.CAPITOL-DEBATE.COM

For more information contact: Ronald Bratt, Director of Capitol Classic  
Phone: 443.538.4992  |  Email: bratt@capitol-debate.com
YOUTH VOICE ESSAY CONTEST

Share Your Opinion.
Get Published.
Win Cash.

Choose an essay topic, and take a position.
Support your position in a compelling essay.

Grand Prize → Apple iPad or $500 cash
Each essay topic winner → $50 Cash

Contrasting positions for each topic will be published in an upcoming book.
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SUMMER CAMPS

AT AUGSBURG

Minnesota Debate and Advocacy Workshop
June 27-July 17 (2- or 3-week sessions)
The Minnesota Debate and Advocacy Workshop is a non-profit, cooperative summer debate institute.

Medieval Minnesota
Session 1: July 18-24
Session 2: July 25-31
Medieval Minnesota is a unique summer learning experience that re-imagines life in the Middle Ages.

Summer Film Camp
July 11-17
July 18-24
The Summer Film Camp embraces the model of the “Hollywood” film and centers on the true film experience.

www.augsburg.edu/camps
Go online for information about scholarships and early registration discounts.
The Perfect Performance is committed to producing high quality cuttings, consulting, and curriculum tools for Forensics and Theatre Arts nationwide. We are a unique and reliable one stop shopping experience for students, who participate and compete in Forensics and Theatre Arts, and for teachers who coach: Dramatic / Humorous Interpretation, Duet / Duo Acting, and Original Oratory.

We are dedicated to assisting our clients in finding the perfect selection, structuring the perfect lesson plan for success, and bringing a fresh perspective to competitive speaking and theatrical events.

The Perfect Performance believes that “perfect practice” makes The Perfect Performance; and, that “success” is a by-product of hard work, dedication and possessing the right tools.
THE NEW YORK CITY INVITATIONAL
at
THE BRONX HIGH SCHOOL OF SCIENCE

October 15, 16, and 17, 2010

Registration opens at midnight on Sunday, August 1, 2010.

joyoftournaments.com/ny/bigbrxonx
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.

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

Zachary Prax is joining us for his fifth year as an instructor and his third as the Director of Individual Events with SNFI. A coach of seven years at Apple Valley High School in Minnesota, Zach coaches LD and Public Forum, student congress, and extemporaneous speaking. In extemporaneous speaking, he has coached students to the final round of the NFL National Tournament, the NCFL Grand National Tournament, and the Minnesota State Tournament, and to outrounds at the TOC of Extemp. In Congress, Zach’s students have appeared in the final round of Glenbrooks, Emory, and the NCFL Grand National Tournament.

With combined coaching experience of over 40 years - Sarah Rosenberg and Luis Cardenas have had students in hundreds of final rounds across the country. Their students have won DUO at CFL Nationals and have tied for 1st in DUO at NFL Nationals twice. They have had over 20 National Finalists and have won countless of State Champions in California, New York, Philadelphia and Florida. They have coached for Stuyvesant High School, Bronx High School of Science, Florida Forensic Institute, Bronx Prep, Holy Ghost Prep, San Marino High School, Cleveland High School and The PUC Schools.

Additional staffing are added as student enrollment and particular event interest dictates. Last year this resulted in staff including a former national champion in both extemp and collegiate parli debate to the extemp staff, for example, and a nationally competitive high school interp champion as well. High standards will be maintained for any staff which are added so as to insure the most positive possible experience for all attendees.

*Prices are tentative and subject to change.
Mine begins at Nova High School, with a woman I never met. Rhoda Radow coached at Nova High School for several decades; she fought to open the activity in Florida for all schools, and over the course of her career her students won more than 200 state titles. Ms. Radow retired in 1996, and passed away in 2005; many of you may have known her personally, and many more may know her name from the numerous awards and honors that bear her name.

Though I never met Ms. Radow, she had an enormous impact on my life. One of her students, Lisa Miller, took over for her at Nova High School in 1997, my freshman year of high school. I was one of Ms. Miller’s first students, and I was also her first NFL National Champion. To the extent that Ms. Radow inspired Ms. Miller to coach debate, she also influenced my decision to become a coach.

I first wanted to become a teacher in middle school, but it wasn’t until after I graduated high school that I knew I wanted to become a debate coach. The summer after I graduated I worked my first debate camp, and the experience was so rewarding that I knew I wanted to do it full time. Not incidentally, the director of my division at camp was Lisa Miller.

Coaches influence their students in many ways, and one of the most important is giving them a love for this activity. I couldn’t tell you exactly what Ms. Miller said or did ten years ago that led me to want to coach debate; I can tell you that she was always encouraging, always enthusiastic, and that I could tell how much she loved to coach. Whatever the specifics, the end result is the same: I have worked at summer camps for the last ten years, I have been an assistant coach at two schools, and this year I became the head coach at Evanston Township High School in Evanston, Illinois. I can say, without doubt, regret, or pretense, that I am doing what I dreamed I would be doing with my life.

Last month, a friend asked me (over Facebook, of course) if I was still “trapped in the world of debate.” I know that debate coaches and students can be self-deprecating at times, and that’s fine; but this attitude is too common. Students come to believe that speech and debate is something they do in high school, and then “get out.” Debate, though, is something that prepares us for life, and something of which we should all be proud to be a part. I answered that I recently became a head coach, and that I was happier than ever to be involved in the activity. And I am.

Part of what makes me so happy is feeling like I belong to a healthy community and, more specifically, to a sort of family—Ms. Radow, Ms. Miller, myself—though that’s barely half the picture. Other coaches with (or for) whom I have worked have taught me so much and encouraged me in so many ways. And now I have the pleasure of seeing some of my former students become coaches themselves, and I know the pride of seeing my efforts turn into something greater than I could have hoped.

When we coach, we are part of a long history, and we help to create a successful future; not just by helping our students become leaders in a variety of chosen fields and professions, but by encouraging them to give back to the community by becoming coaches themselves. This is a sort of “paying it forward,” and it is a tremendously important part of what we do.

Too many programs are handed to teachers with no experience or interest in debate and, though many of them do excellent and commendable jobs, it would be better if more of our students stayed in the activity and filled these positions.

We must not lose sight of the big picture when we coach. It is important that we prepare our students well for each tournament, and that we teach them the skills that make our activity important, but...
it is equally important that we show our students that the activity is important in the first place, and that we encourage them to stay involved. This doesn’t necessarily mean that all of our students should grow up to become debate coaches, only that all of our students should want to grow up to become debate coaches.

Okay, so maybe that’s not necessary, either. There are, though, a thousand ways for students to stay involved. Certainly, coaching is a good one, either as a head coach or an assistant. But students can also be involved as judges, as advocates, even as parents. Support for speech and debate at Evanston Township is very high, because there are many former debaters who are now administrators or parents involved in the school: they, too, are now part of my family.

When Ms. Radow started at Nova, she had no experience in debate. Fifty years ago, that was understandable: the community was smaller and less diverse, the activity was younger, and teachers with debate experience were in shorter supply. What was understandable then, though, is unacceptable today. With tens of thousands of members, the NFL brings speech and debate to every corner of our nation, and there are thousands of experienced students graduating each year. We need more of them to stay involved, and so we need to work harder to keep them involved. After all, family is forever.

Promoting Your Forensic Program

by Steve Meadows

Think about this: Every newspaper in America has employees who are paid to report on sports activities full-time. Most of them include in their jobs (or as their only jobs) high school sports. Therefore, the athletic teams and coaches don’t have to do the level of promotion that you do. You, as the speech or debate coach, don’t have such reporters hired to work for you. You have to do it (or ask someone to do it) or no one else will. If not, forensics will remain about dead bodies, not about your kids in your town.

After a tournament:

- Type up the tournament results from your team. Often, at the beginning, you don’t have many trophies to report. I used to type, “Jenny Jones received a perfect score at the Harrison County Invitational Saturday for her performance in Prose.” That means she got a 1 in a round. It sounds good. And when they win something, treat it like the Academy Awards. We don’t get pep rallies and cheerleaders, so WE make the big fuss.

- Send your typed results everywhere you can:
  - to the person who posts items on your school’s Web site;
  - to the public relations/communications director for your school district;
  - to the faculty and staff at your school;
  - to an e-mail list you maintain for “Forensics News”;
  - to your board members and superintendent;
  - to the person who makes the daily announcements at your school;
  - and (especially) to your local paper.

Find out how your newspaper wants to receive school news (e-mail, fax, in person, whatever) and send them your team news EVERY time you compete. The newspaper in Danville is GREAT about publishing our results. I simply e-mail them the results on the Monday after each tournament. (If I do it first thing Monday morning, it often makes the paper that afternoon.) There is NO better way to build up community support for your team (and its fundraisers) than to let people know what and how you’re doing.

(continued on next page)

About the Author

Jeff Hannan is the current head coach of Evanston Township High School. He is a senior instructor at the Florida Forensics Institute in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. He won the NFL National Championship in Congressional Debate, in the House of Representatives, in 2000.

Steve Meadows is a three-diamond coach at Danville High School in Kentucky. He has served 13 terms as the Kentucky District Chair, winning the Best Chair Communications award in 2003.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Mudville High School placed third of 20 schools at the Dustburg Invitational, Saturday, November 20. The team won seven awards at the meet. Senior K. C. Outfielder led the team with first place in Poetry and sixth in Storytelling.

Grovers Corners High took first at the tournament, followed by Bedford Falls, Mudville, Walnut Grove, Mayberry, and Lake Wobegon rounding out the top six schools.

Full team results are listed below. Mudville will next compete at the Lake Wobegon Above Average Invitational on December 4.


For further information, please contact coach Tom Sawyer at 555-236-9999 or tom.sawyer@mudville.kyschools.us. We welcome a chance for an article about the team or to have a picture of the kids with their trophies in the paper.

###
THE BAYLOR BRIEFS
Announces the 2010-2011 Policy Publications

BAYLOR BRIEFS:
Substantially Reducing U.S. Military Presence in South Korea, Afghanistan, Kuwait, Japan, Iraq, Turkey

COMPLETE AFFIRMATIVE CASES
• First affirmative outlines of several affirmative cases complete with evidence.
• Second affirmative briefs complete with evidence and arguments to answer anticipated negative arguments.
• Evidenced answers to anticipated plan attacks.

COMPREHENSIVE NEGATIVE BRIEFS
• Briefs of first negative arguments against a variety of potential cases complete with evidence on the briefs.
• Completely developed disadvantages and plan-meet-need arguments against a variety of cases . . . evidence on the briefs.

CONTENTS INCLUDE
• Conceptual framework of analysis of the 2010-2011 High School Debate topic.
• Over 1,500 pieces of evidence from hard-to-find sources.
• Comprehensive index to all extension evidence.

WHY THE BAYLOR BRIEFS?
• The next best thing to attending a good summer workshop.
  The Baylor Briefs are an excellent method for learning independent analysis and case construction skills.

NEGATIVE CASEBOOKS: Substantially Reducing U.S. Military And/Or Police Presence in South Korea, Afghanistan, Kuwait, Japan, Iraq, Turkey

• Vol. I: The Harms of Substantially Reducing U.S. Military Presence in South Korea, Afghanistan, Kuwait, Japan, Iraq, Turkey
• Vol. II: Current U.S. Policy Reducing U.S. Military Presence in South Korea, Afghanistan, Kuwait, Japan, Iraq, Turkey
• Vol. III: Topicality of Substantially Reducing U.S. Military Presence in South Korea, Afghanistan, Kuwait, Japan, Iraq, Turkey
• Vol. IV: Generic Disadvantages to Reducing U.S. Military Presence in South Korea, Afghanistan, Kuwait, Japan, Iraq, Turkey

NEGATIVE’S BEST TOOL
• Complex empirical studies made easy to understand and actually use in debate rounds.
• A complete index to the evidence in each volume.
• All evidence on one side of the page.
• Evidence conforms to NFL recommended standards.

WHY THE NEGATIVE CASEBOOKS?
• The entire research staff is composed of seasoned college debate coaches. America’s finest research libraries are utilized.
• Winning Debates. The casebooks cover almost every potential negative strategy.
• Recent evidence, almost all since 2008.

PLEASE SEND ME

___ Copies of THE BAYLOR BRIEFS
1-10 copies $34.95 each ■ 11 or more $29.95 each

___ Copies of THE NEGATIVE CASEBOOKS
Complete Four-volume set
1 - 3 sets $54.95 ■ 4 sets or more $44.95

THE NEGATIVE CASEBOOKS: Individual Volumes
___ Copies of Volume I at $18.00 per copy
___ Copies of Volume II at $18.00 per copy
___ Copies of Volume III at $18.00 per copy
___ Copies of Volume IV at $18.00 per copy

NAME ________________________________________ SCHOOL _____________________________________________________________

ADDRESS __________________________________________ CITY __________________________ STATE __________ ZIP __________

TOTAL AMOUNT ENCLOSED* ________________________ SEND MY ORDER VIA SPECIAL HANDLING? ** Yes___ No ___

*We cannot accept checks made payable to Baylor University. Credit extended to educational institutions and libraries only upon receipt of a valid purchase order.

**Prepaid orders shipped free of SPECIAL HANDLING: 15% of purchase price • Fax (254) 848-4473 • Phone (254) 848-5959 • Order Forms Online: www.baylorbriefs.com

Make Checks Payable to: COMMUNICAN P.O. Box 20243 ■ Waco, Texas 76702
THE VALUE DEBATE HANDBOOK

The Value Debate Handbook is the most popular textbook for Lincoln-Douglas debate. It provides a simple system for analyzing Lincoln-Douglas debate topics. It provides fully evidenced briefs on significant American values in easy, ready-to-use form. The Value Debate Handbook shows how to LINK the briefs to any of a wide variety of debate topics.

New Features
- Expanded discussion of the meaning and relationship between Values and Criteria with special emphasis on how to argue for and against ideologically derived values like justice, legitimacy, the Social Contract, etc.
- The addition of new non-Western philosophers whose values and worldviews conflict with and oppose those of most European and American philosophers
- Revised format and discussion of how to use philosophers in actual debates

A comprehensive glossary of L-D concepts and terms, essential for beginning debaters.
- A reading list for exploring various values and criteria

Special Features
- Complex value conflicts made easy to understand and use in debate rounds.
- Criteria for evaluating value choices.
- Philosophers made easy to understand.

THE 2010-2011 LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE RESEARCH SERIES

- A complete publication on each of the four official NFL, Lincoln-Douglas Debate Topics. Most major high school tournaments use the NFL topic in their LD contests.
- Complete value analysis of each proposition.
- Everything you need to debate each of the NFL Lincoln-Douglas topics in complete ready-to-use form.
- Email delivery option is available.

Contents of Each Publication
- Analysis of each topic.
- Sample affirmative and negative case outlines with evidence and analysis.
- Rebuttal and refutation guides and briefs.
- Publications delivered to you before debate begins on each new topic (4 issues, Sept. 2010 thru Mar. 2011)

THE 2010-2011 PUBLIC FORUM DEBATE RESEARCH SERIES

- A complete publication on the NFL Public Forum Topics for September 2010 through March 2011 (7 Monthly Issues)
- Complete analysis of each topic with guidance for further research.
- Everything you need to debate each of the NFL Public Forum topics in complete ready-to-use form.
- Email delivery option is available.

Contents of Each Publication
- Expert public forum analysis of each topic.
- Sample affirmative and negative case outlines with evidence and analysis.
- Rebuttal and refutation guides and briefs.
- Publications delivered to you before debate begins on each new topic (7 issues, Sept. 2010 thru Mar. 2011)

PLEASE SEND ME

- Copies of THE VALUE DEBATE HANDBOOK
  1-10 copies $29.95 each (11 or more $34.95 each)
- Copies of THE NFL PUBLIC FORUM RESEARCH SERIES
  Subscription Price: $130.00 (Includes monthly topics September 2010 thru March 2011)

NAME ____________________________________ SCHOOL ____________________________
ADDRESS __________________________________ CITY ____________________________ STATE __________ ZIP ________________

TOTAL AMOUNT ENCLOSED* ______________________ PHONE Number to assist in processing order: ______________________

*We cannot accept checks made payable to Baylor University. Credit extended to educational institutions and libraries only upon receipt of a valid purchase order.

Fax (254) 848-4473 • Phone (254) 848-5959 • Order Forms Online: www.baylorbriefs.com or www.communican.org

Make Checks Payable to: COMMUNICAN P.O. Box 20243 • Waco, Texas 76702
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.

**The Three Week Program**: The Three Week Accelerated program balances improving students’ debate technique through expertly critiqued practice rounds, along 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. The Core program is an intensive but value priced option for students who are seeking a program of depth and quality on a great campus. Students may also apply to the Swing or Sophomore Scholars labs, two special programs within the larger Three Week program. 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 debate institute during the summer of 2010. The Sophomore Scholars lab is an intense program emphasizing technique and research skills for rising sophomores.

**The Four Week Program**: The Four Week Program is fully integrated with the Three Week Program, but adds an additional week, which focuses primarily on technique and practice rounds. Students are guaranteed to get at least 10 fully critiqued practice rounds in the final week! In addition to the average of 12 rounds during the three week program, the extra rounds give participants nearly 25 rounds by the end of the summer, the equivalent of a semester or more of experience by the start of the school year! Four Week students are welcome to apply to the Swing Lab for the first three weeks of the camp.

**Faculty**: The SNFI faculty is composed of current and former competitors and coaches from successful programs across the country. Past staff members and initially confirmed staff for summer 2010 include:

Corey Turoff - SNFI Policy Debate Program Director, Co-Policy Coach for Stanford Debate and The Head Royce School of Oakland:

Jon Sharp - U. of Kentucky
Judy Butler - Augusta Prep, GA
JR Maycock - Highland HS, UT
Alex Zavell - Emory Univ
Brian Manuel - Harvard Univ & Lakeland
Rich Boltizer - Stanford Debate
Shanara Reid - U. of Pittsburgh
Sara Sanchez - Lexington HS, MA
JR Maycock - Highland HS, UT
Rachel Schy - Redlands University, CA
Matthew Fraser - Stanford Debate / HRS
Jenny H Creek - formerly Stanford
Jeff Martin - Stanford Debate (coach)

“I learned more at this camp than I did during the entire school year.”
- Justin Mardjuki, previous SNFI Participant

*Prices are tentative and subject to change*
Policy Debate Special Programs at the 2010 Stanford National Forensic Institute

The SNFI now offers two exclusive labs for the summer of 2010! These programs are designed to improve on specific skill sets for debaters serious about dramatically improving understanding of debate technique as well as argument production and development. For the same price as our accelerated program, students can work closely with our most experienced staff to fine tune their debate skills.

The Swing Lab  July 25 - August 14
Resident: $3,385*   Commuter: $2,665*

The Swing Lab is a “second camp only” option taught by one of the community’s most talented instructors, jon sharp, of the University of Kentucky. The Swing Lab features in-depth practice for mastering in-round technique and argument development with a master teacher of debate. **New changes** to the swing lab curriculum for 2010 include: An extended round-robin conducted through the course, a judge proctor program where swing students will judge debates with instructors to gain a new perspective from the other side of the ballot, and a new emphasis on evidence production balancing augmenting existing arguments with creating/innovating new ones.

The Sophomore Scholars Lab  July 25 - August 14
Resident: $3,385*   Commuter: $2,665*

The Sophomore Scholars Lab offers exclusive education in debate skills for rising sophomores led by veteran instructor Judy Butler, formerly of Emory University. This lab provides extended heavily critiqued practice debates and step-by-step instruction of the evidence production process.

*Prices are tentative and subject to change

Phone: 650-723-9086   Web: www.snfi.org   Email: info@snfi.org
Exceptional Instruction

Lab Leaders
Mike Wascher • Lake Highland
  Workshop Director & Senior Lab Leader
Beth Eskin • Timber Creek High School
  Senior Lab Leader
Carol Green • The Harker School
  Senior Lab Leader
Jonathan Peele • The Harker School
  Senior Lab Leader
Jeff Roberts • Mountain Brook
  Senior Lab Leader
Rob Baron • Eagan High School
  Senior Lab Leader
Dr. Sandra Berkowitz • The Blake School
  Senior Lab Leader
Rob Schebel • West Des Valley (IA)
  Senior Lab Leader

Lecturers
Dallas Perkins,
  Coach of Debate, Harvard Debate Council
Sherry Hall,
  Coach of Debate, Harvard Debate Council
Stefan Bauschard,
  Harvard Debate & Planet Debate
Dr. Minh Luong
  Yale University

Guest Lectures by faculty from Harvard and other major universities
Harvardpfdebate.org
July 4-16th, 2010

$2495 Resident, $1095 Commuter, $995 Electronic Participants
2010-11 Policy Topic:

Debating US Foreign Military Presence

by Stefan Bauschard

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially reduce its military and/or police presence in one or more of the following: South Korea, Japan, Afghanistan, Kuwait, Iraq, Turkey.

Introduction

This year’s Policy resolution introduces two central questions: Should foreign military and/or policy presence generally be reduced and should those reductions occur in one or more of the countries listed? This essay will focus on unpacking arguments that affirmative and negative teams can use to address these central questions.

To make the significance of the discussed arguments clear, I want to focus on some key terms in the resolution. First, military and police presence.

Wikipedia defines the military as “an organization authorized by its country to use force, usually including use of weapons, in defending its country (or by attacking other countries) by combating actual or perceived threats. As an adjective the term “military” is also used to refer to any property or aspect of a military.”

This is what most people understand the military to be, but I do want to highlight two important elements of the definition. First, the military includes all of its “weapons,” and second, that the military refers to its “property.” So, reducing military presence in these countries can mean a reduction solely in weapons systems or property. The topic does not require that troops/people be reduced.

According to Wikipedia, a “police” force is “a public force empowered to enforce the law and provide security through the legitimized use of force.” In relation to foreign military service, police usually refers to “military police,” “a military corps that enforces discipline and guards prisoners” (Wordnet), but it can also include training and support of civilian police forces, such as US training of the Iraqi police.

The term “police” was added to the resolution because in some countries, particularly Iraq, many of the individuals that articles refer to as being part of the US military presence are really “police.” This term was largely added to enable affirmatives to topically reduce all of the US presence that could be described as “military,” even if it was technically not military. Although the term was added for that reason, it is likely that some affirmatives may find specific policing operations and reduce those.

One case that the term “police” clearly opens the topic up to is reductions in International Military Education Training (IMET) programs. These programs are heavily criticized on human rights grounds because they teach governments how to repress their own citizens.

While the IMET affirmative clearly meets the term “police” in the resolution, it is not clear that it meets “in” since most IMET training for foreign policy forces occurs at Fort Benning in Georgia. Some of the training, however, does occur in the host in the trainee country, and Turkey participates in IMET training.

It is also worth pointing out that the resolution contains the word “its,” meaning the military presence that belongs to the US government. One open question is whether or not the use of private military contractors is included in “its” military presence. Intuitively, these contractors are part of the US military presence, so a case can be made in favor of reducing them, but as noted by Dr. Richard Edwards in the most recent issue of the Forensics Quarterly, there are interpretations of “its” that render private military contractors non-topical.

The Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary (1993), defines “its” as “of or belonging to itself as a possessor” (p. 623). Private military contractors clearly don’t “belong to” the US.

Although the weapons that are under control of the US military seem to be pretty clearly part of the US military presence in the country, one interesting issue is whether or not US arms sold to another country are still part of the US military presence. Intuitively they are not since the weapons are now in the possession of another government, but arms sales to other countries are often provided in order to create interoperability between US weapons systems and those of the recipient country. Also, the US military frequently provides substantial training for the use of the weapons system(s). So, a case can be made that restraining at least some particular arms sales is topical.

The term “reduce” generally means to lessen from existing levels. Cases that pledge not to increase US presence in a given country in a particular way in the future are arguably not reductions. Also, while affirmative teams are able to argue that reductions in troops in one country (for example, Iraq) leads to troop increases in another country (for example, Afghanistan) if the affirmative plan cannot mandate that troops taken from one country go to another country.

“In” generally means “within,” so the reduction has to be among military or police forces that are physically present within one of the countries in the resolution. Although different countries make different claims regarding territorial waters, most affirmatives will need to deal with US military and/or police forces that are physically present on the land or ports of the topic countries. Dealing with US forces at sea will introduce substantial topicality problems. And, even if some US forces are close enough to the country to be considered to be “in” the country, the affirmative can only reduce their use within any waters the country claims to be part of its territory, setting up a simple circumvention argument for the negative—any restricted forces at sea could simply be moved outside of the territorial waters.
What’s at Stake in the Resolution Countries

In this section I want to provide some basic background information regarding the current political situation and the status of US military deployments in the countries listed in the resolution.

Afghanistan. After the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 that destroyed the twin towers of the World Trade Center, the US produced evidence that the Taliban, which controlled Afghanistan at the time, was providing refuge and support to the Al Qaeda terrorist group that attacked and destroyed the towers. In order to prevent the Taliban from continuing to provide a safe haven to Al Qaeda, the US invaded Afghanistan in October of 2001 and forcibly removed the Taliban regime.

Since 2001, the US has sustained this military presence in Afghanistan with substantial assistance from many North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies. Shortly after his election in 2008, Obama pledged to substantially increase the number of US troops in Afghanistan by 30,000 in order to back a troop surge strategy designed by Stanley McCrystal. The plan does establish July 2011 as the anticipated beginning of the end of the surge.

There are now almost 150,000 troops in Afghanistan, with US soldiers making up nearly 100,000 of the deployed soldiers. Most of the remaining troops are from NATO countries.

Many critics of the surge and war argue that the presence of US troops simply increases anti-Americanism, creates a breeding ground for terrorism, overstretches the US military, and traps the US in a war that it cannot win. Critics of specific military operations include criticisms of US drone attacks that often result in civilian casualties and the war on Afghan poppy.

Defenders of the war and the surge argue that targeting military efforts in particular areas of the country can stabilize it and that instability in Afghanistan means a return of the Taliban and the Al Qaeda threat. Further, they argue that a decision to back down now would undermine the credibility of the United States.

There have been recent moves to reach out to the Taliban to integrate them into the Karzai government. Recently, Afghanistan president Hamid Karzai, has reached out to Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, the leader of Afghanistan’s Hezb-e Islami paramilitary group that has provided major support for the Taliban and Al Qaeda.

Iraq. In March of 2003, the United States invaded Iraq largely under the auspices of the claim that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons, and that Iraq supported terrorist groups that could use those weapons against the United States. The US military did topple the government of Saddam Hussein and supported his execution for crimes against the Iraqi people on December 30, 2006.

The US military remains substantially deployed in Iraq, largely to prevent a civil war between the Sunnis, Shiites, and the Kurds, the main ethnic groups in Iraq.

To date, most of the conflict has been between the Sunnis and the Shiites. As explained by Dr. Rich Edwards in the most recent issues of the Forensics Quarterly, almost 90% of the world’s 1.5 billion Muslims are Sunnis with the remaining 10% Shia, but Shiites constitute the majority of Muslims in both Iran and Iraq. The division among Muslims dates from the controversy over who should lead after the death of the Prophet Muhammad. Abu Bakr, an adviser to the Prophet Muhammad, became the “first Caliph of the Islamic Nation” in an elective process that is viewed as legitimate by Sunni Muslims. Saddam Hussein was a Sunni Muslim who maintained an iron fist control of the country and its oil resources. Current Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki is a Shiite with a Shiite-dominated government that now controls much of the country’s wealth.

Although civil and ethnic strife continues to this day, it is not anywhere near the scale it was in 2007 and 2008.

President Obama ran on a campaign of withdrawing the US military from Iraq. When he took office in early 2009, the US had more than 140,000 troops in Iraq. By February 2010, that number was under 100,000 and is expected to decline further under a 2008 Status of Forces (SOFA) agreement with Iraq that calls for US military combat forces to be withdrawn from Iraqi cities by the end of 2011.

Although this signals potential inerency problems for the affirmative, more than 50,000 troops are to be left behind for training and other non-combat missions. The US is currently involved in training the Iraqi Police Services (IPS), the civilian security arm of the government, as well as The Iraqi Security Forces (ISF), the military armed forces of Iraq. Also, it is not clear that this agreement covers US contracted private security forces that will remain in Iraq. Moreover, there is no certainty that the US will follow the SOFA agreement. If violence escalates in Iraq, the US could potentially leave far more than the 50,000 troops it says will remain.

Advocates such as Phyllis Bennis in Ending the Iraq War and Tom Engelhardt in Bases of Empire: The Global Structure of US Military Posts argue for an immediate withdrawal of the entire US military presence in Iraq, contending that the continued presence will magnify anti-American opposition and prolong the civil war. Critics of a quick withdrawal such as James Phillips in What Role Should the US Play in the Middle East? argue that a quick withdrawal will unravel the progress produced by the surge and send Iraq into a civil war. It also threatens US credibility because it would abandon existing US commitments under the SOFA.

A large number of private security firms that have been contracted by the US government also operate in Iraq, the largest of which is Blackwater, which has now changed its name to XE.

Nuri Kamal al-Maliki is the current prime minister of Iraq and the head of the Islamic Dawa Party. Al-Malaki was elected in 2006 and his current term extends to mid-2010. The party faces substantial challenges because many consider it to be an installed puppet of the United States and others criticize the Shiite-dominated group for not including the Sunnis.

Kuwait. In 1990, Iraq invaded Kuwait as a result of disputes over oil rights on the Iraqi-Kuwaiti border. Then President George H.W. Bush (Bush I) assembled an international coalition that, led by the US, drove Iraq out of Kuwait. At the height of that war, the US had more than 100,000 troops in Kuwait, though the current number is less than 30,000. Kuwait is primarily used as a staging area for US operations in Iraq and to support the draw-down on US forces from the country.

The main US base in Kuwait is Camp Arifjan. The base is just south of Kuwait city and is home to approximately 15,000 US troops. With the draw-down of the Iraq war, this base serves primarily as a transit point for troops on the way home to the US, though the base still serves as a point for more direct military operations in Iraq.

Although the Kuwait government strongly supports US operations in Iraq and its military base in the country, there
is substantial popular opposition to the US military in Kuwait, fueling radicalism in the country. Critics of the base argue that it increases radical opposition to the government, a radicalism that threatens its survival. Since Kuwait is generally considered to be a well-functioning democratic Muslim state, collapse of the government would send a problematic signal, potentially unraveling the emergence of democratic governance throughout the Middle East.

Defenders of the base argue that it is essential to US military operations in Iraq and to provide general logistical support to our Middle East military presence. US Central Command (CENTCOM) announced in February 2008 that they are establishing a permanent platform for “full spectrum operations” in 27 countries in the region in Kuwait. Negatives can take advantage of this to read links to general power projection arguments, but affirmatives can also take advantage of it to argue that the plan leads to a more systemic reduction in US military presence in the Middle East.

Turkey: Just over 3,000 US troops are stationed in Turkey, most of which are at the Incirlik Air Base. Although the number of troops is small, the deployment is significant for a number of reasons.

First, Incirlik is home to one of the largest remaining stockpiles of US tactical nuclear weapons, otherwise known as B61 gravity bombs. Some countries see these weapons as essential deterrents against Russian aggression in the region. Critics argue that the weapons are vulnerable to theft and that they undermine US credibility on non-proliferation initiatives.

Second, Turkey’s secular democratic government is being challenged by growing movements within the country that support an Islamic state and want to overturn the country’s Kemalism, which is equivalent to the separation of church and state in the US. In 2007, the Justice and Development Party (AKP) won 47 percent of the vote in a national election – more than double what any other party won. The AKP, lead by Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan, has been accused by the military and others of leading efforts to replace Kemalism with an Islamic government, and the military threatened a coup against the government. Abdullah Gul, a conservative Muslim, is the current president.

Third, Turkey is an important member of the NATO alliance. Any changes related to US security policy regarding Turkey will likely have an impact on this important alliance.

Fourth, there is a strong intersection between the US occupation in Iraq and US relations with Turkey. When the US launched the invasion of Iraq in March of 2003, Turkey would not let the US attack from its territory or fly over the country. The reason Turkey prohibited this is that Turkey was opposed to the war because it feared that the US would support an independent Kurdish state in Iraq and Turkey had been the victim of a number of cross-border attacks by the Partiya Karkern Kurdistan (PKK) party out of northern Iraq. Turkey claims the PKK is a terrorist group and it is the PKK who would have made up at least a large part of an independent Turkish state.

Japan: After Japan surrendered to the US at the end of World War II, Japan became bound by a US-written constitution that prohibited the development of land and sea military forces. In exchange, the US pledged to protect the security of Japan.

This pledge to protect Japan’s security takes many forms, including a commitment to defend Japan with US conventional forces. Currently, nearly 50,000 US troops are present in Japan, with more than 75% on 38 bases on the Island of Okinawa. Japan contributes almost $5 billion a year toward the cost of supporting these military operations.

Most of the troops are located in Okinawa because the island is located close to Taiwan and the South China Sea. Since most think that the greatest threat to Japan comes from China and the spill-over resulting from a conflict in that region that could spread to the region to Japan, many think that this is the prime location for the majority of the troops.

Although the Japanese government has historically been supportive of the US military presence in Japan, the fact that the bases consume more than 20% of the total land area of Okinawa, generate a considerable amount of noise and traffic, and that the behavior of US soldiers in the area has been less than noble has generated substantial popular opposition. Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama, who won an election in August 2009, campaigned on a commitment to reduce the number of bases. This election meant the triumph of the Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ) over the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) for the first time in nearly 50 years.

In order to reduce the opposition to the bases and strengthen the alliance, the US concluded a basing realignment agreement with Japan in 2006 to move more than 8,000 US soldiers to Guam, a US territory located in the Pacific, by 2014 and to relocate many of the marines in Okinawa to Henoko on the Northeast corner of the island.

This agreement has recently been threatened by Prime Minister Hatoyama who has suggested that Japan will not uphold the agreement to move the troops to Henoko. President Obama has aggressively pushed Yatoma to uphold the agreement, though nothing has been resolved as of the time of this writing (March 2010). Publicly, Hotoyama has committed to not relocating the entire base to Guam, but it remains to be seen if he will come out strongly in favor of a substantial relocation.

Critics of the Okinawa bases (including Henoko) argue that the bases are no longer necessary given the end of the Cold War, that the Western security structure in Asia leads to militarism in China, that any security concerns can be fulfilled by relocating US bases to Guam and US naval forces in the region, and that Japan should assume a greater burden for its own defense. Defenders of the bases argue that they are essential to deter Chinese aggression against Taiwan and adventurism in the South China Sea, to prevent Japan from developing nuclear weapons, and to promote a stabilizing US presence in the region.

There is a debate related to the value of Japanese conventional and nuclear rearmament. Most scholars contend that such rearmament would be undesirable because it could set-off a destabilizing arms race in Asia, and others argue that it would boost deterrence and enhance stability in the region.

While most critics of US deployments in Japan argue that a significant withdrawal will undermine a problematic alliance, others argue a US draw-down in Okinawa will resolve the most important issue between the US and Japan related to the future of the alliance and that a withdrawal will therefore strengthen it. Given the strength of this evidence, it will likely be a popular affirmative this year.

Another significant issue related to the US military presence in Japan has been US efforts to develop various missile defense systems with Japan and to station them in the country as a means to help Japan defend
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itself against missile threats from China and North Korea. Critics argue that such systems are destabilizing, actually enable the remilitarization of Japan, and support the development of space-based weapons. Defenders argue that they are important to Japanese security and boost military-to-military cooperation that is essential to the alliance. Cases about missile defense have been popular on past topics and are likely to be popular in 2010-11.

One additional issue that has come up relates to the presence of US nuclear weapons at Japanese ports. Though Japan acknowledges that it had secret agreements with the US to allow ships carrying these weapons to port in Japan during the Cold War, this is no longer an issue because the US no longer carries tactical nuclear weapons on ships, and these are the nuclear weapons that were at issue. Although there is some evidence that Japan would like a pledge that the US would never port such weapons in the future, such a commitment would not be a reduction.

South Korea/Republic of Korea (ROK).
The Korean war of the 1950s has never been declared over, but an Armistice agreement has eliminated the current fighting. And as a result of that armistice, the US has stationed tens of thousands of troops in the South. These troops had mostly been stationed along the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ), a 2.5 mile area that divides North Korea (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK)) and South Korea, though recently the US has moved many of these troops further into South Korea in order to present a less hostile image to the North. These troops primarily serve as a tripwire that assures the South Koreans that any attack on them will be an attack on the US, committing the US to repel any aggression by the North.

Although the government supports continued US troop presence in the region, popular opposition to the troops, just like in Japan, is high. This reached a high point in 2002 when US troops in an army truck accidentally killed two teenage South Korean girls.

The opposition to this incident contributed substantially to the election of human rights lawyer Roh Moo-hyuan as president from 2003 to 2008 and lead to additional changes in the US military presence in the ROK. Most significantly, in 2004 the US and the ROK negotiated a new SOFA that included a reduction of US troops from 40,000 to 25,000 by 2012, the movement of a major US military base out of Seoul, the capital of South Korea, and the return of more than 60 bases to the ROK.

But when North Korea tested a nuclear weapon in 2006, this changed. The ROK’s fears of North Korea’s new nuclear weapons contributed to the election of a new president—Lee Myung-bak, the former mayor of Seoul and CEO of Hyundai. Myung-bak ran on a pledge to cap the reductions in US forces at 28,500 and to respond more strongly to potential North Korean aggression.

Despite the North’s nuclear tests, advocates of withdrawal remain strong, claiming that withdrawal will force the South to take its security concerns seriously and undertake efforts to both protect itself and to move to developing relations with the North. Critics fear that a rapid withdrawal will boost ROK defense spending so significantly that it could touch off an arms race in Asia, including the regional development of nuclear weapons and that it would leave the ROK vulnerable to an invasion by North Korea. The DPRK’s reclusive dictator, Kim Jong-il is considered near the end of his life and very unstable. Given this, there is a reasonable concern that the DPRK could launch an invasion of the ROK.

Prior to 1991, the US did store tactical nuclear weapons in South Korea, but President Bush removed these weapons at that time.

Affirmative Advantages—The Harms of Foreign Presence
Most affirmative advantages will stem from the harms of the continued foreign military and police presence. Some of the advantages will be country-specific, but others will be more general. These general harms can be broken-down into a number of separate arguments that will serve as the basis for distinct advantages.

US military readiness/hard power. Continued foreign military presence threatens US military readiness in three ways. First, deploying large numbers of troops and police in the topic countries means that they cannot be used for other more important missions, that overseas deployment results in substantial wear on equipment, and considerable psychological wear impacts the troops. Second, the enormous cost of the overseas deployments threatens the economic foundations of the United States, undermining the ability of the US to continue to project military power. Third, alienating other countries through current deployments threatens relations with some countries and potentially additional deployments that may be needed.

Soft power. Alienating other countries and other populations arguably undermines US “soft power,” or likability. Loss of soft power undermines the ability of the US to obtain cooperation with other key international actors on issues such as environmental destruction, the spread of disease, and the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Terrorism. US military presence in foreign lands, particularly in Kuwait, Afghanistan, and Iraq arguably substantially increases alienation of the population and makes it easier for radical terrorist groups to recruit members.

Militarism. Projecting military power is arguably grounded in the driven by the ideology “which claims that the military is the foundation of a society’s security, and thereby claims to be its most important aspect” (Wiktionary). Some scholars contend that this ideology of militarism inevitably produces genocidal wars and thermonuclear destruction. William Walter Hunt writes in his 2009 book, Christian, Buddhist, and Confucian Protests Against Military Bases in Okinawa: A Study of Seven Religious Leaders, that “Takazato insists that violence is inherent to the military…A soldier may be a good son to his mother, or a good husband to his wife. However, once he is integrated into the military, he learns the imperative of killing the enemy before the enemy kills him…Teaching humanity in the military is a gross contradiction. The military is a place for teaching brutality”’’ (p. 169).

Imperialism. US projection of military and police power into foreign lands is arguably part of “a policy of extending your rule over foreign countries,” or imperialism (Princeton Wordnet). Imperialism is heavily attacked, with critics arguing that it is the foundation for mass murder and genocide.

Security. A popular kritik during the last decade of debate, the security kritik argues that our desire for military and police security is driven by a false sense of insecurity that ultimately leads to militarism and war.

Human rights. Some argue that foreign US military presence results in extensive
human rights abuses. Teams can read direct impacts to human rights violations (basically taking the form of a morality claim), but also read larger, consequentialist impacts to human rights violations, such as conflict and war.

**Civil conflict and war.** Iraq and Afghanistan affirmatives are likely to claim that US military and policy presence in those countries generates anti-Americanism and prolongs, if not drives, civil conflict in those countries.

**US-Islamic relations/clash of civilizations.** Foreign military and police presence in the Middle East will aggravate relations with Islamic groups, potentially leading to a “clash of civilizations” and war.

**Disadvantages—Problems with Reducing US Military Presence**

Although some of the disadvantages to reducing US military presence will be country-specific, many will be general. In this section I will discuss these disadvantages and provide a couple of examples of specific disadvantages.

**Politics.** There is substantial political support in both parties for sustaining our current military deployments in all of the countries listed in the resolution. Withdrawing troops may undermine Obama’s political support and threaten other items on his agenda. This traditional “political capital” disadvantage is likely to be very popular next year.

**Midterms.** With this year’s midterm elections schedule for November 2, this disadvantage will likely come into play in a number of debates. Negatives will argue that plans that are unpopular with the public will be blamed on Obama and Congress and that this will translate into losses for the Democrats in the midterm elections. Teams will likely argue that the Democrats will inevitably lose seats in the midterms, but that the losses triggered by the plan will push them away from their majority and that the Republican agenda is bad. Teams may argue that a Republican majority will derail immigration reform, Obama’s climate control agenda, or result in tax decreases that threaten the economy. Other impacts are possible, but these impacts have been run in debates to date.

**Hegemony.** Withdrawing troops from any of the countries in the resolution could threaten overall US global leadership. In Asia, the US has alliance commitments that the plan may require the US to withdraw from, threatening our credibility. In Afghanistan, the US has just increased military troops and the plan would likely be seen as an expected and radical reversal of that commitment. Although the US is currently reducing its military presence in Iraq, the plan would accelerate/alter the timetable, reducing the commitment that we have already made to Iraq. In Kuwait, the US has a significant military presence that is not being reduced that is important to our power projection in the region, so withdrawal from Kuwait could be seen as a reduction in our commitment to the Middle East. Similarly, in Turkey the US has a modest military presence that it does not plan on decreasing. The plan would withdraw critical commitment to an important North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) ally.

**Alliance credibility.** As just discussed, reducing US military presence could violate alliance commitments/treaty agreements that we have with other countries. This could undermine these alliances, leading to regional impacts (Asian insecurity/conflicts, for example). This type of disadvantage will be most common against the South Korea & Japan affirmatives.


When the US-Japan alliance is strong, a calm settles over Asia. If, on the other hand, Japan lost faith in America or came to the conclusion that Japanese interest would be sacrificed by us for the benefit of China—and I think Asia would immediately become more dangerous—that need not happen but to avoid it we must understand one thing with greater clarity: Asia is not Europe. Since the invention of the nation state, generations of Europeans grew up thinking about how to balance one nation’s interests against another’s. This horizontal sharing of power became the mainstay of European foreign policy and the center of gravity in the international quarter. British foreign policy was grounded on the notion that no nation should be dominant on the continent of Europe. French and Russian foreign policy wanted the German states to contemplate a two-front war as a means of moderating German ambitions. Germany, from the opposite perspective, wanted to avoid encirclement. All looked to others as a means of enhancing their own positions inside Europe and throughout the world. Now, with the advent of the European Union and the collapse of the Soviet Union all that has changed but the culture of balancing one nation’s interests against another’s has not. America came of age as a great power seeing itself in a European mirror. Our foreign policy has largely been Eurocentric. As a result we have often looked at the world in European terms, searching for balance in a European fashion. Simply put, that is a very foreign concept to most Asians. Power has not been shared horizontally in Asia. It has been thought of in vertical terms. Someone is above and someone is below. Europe has been about balance; Asia about hierarchy. The strongest have been on top, the weakest in descending order. Asia will need time to get comfortable with the notion that someone’s advance does not have to come at the expense of someone else’s decline.

**Nuclear weapons proliferation.** If the US withdraws troops from a country, that country could see that as a weakening of the US security commitment, causing it to develop nuclear weapons. In reference to Japan, Joseph Nye explains:

Joseph Nye, 72, a university distinguished service professor at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, served as assistant defense secretary for international security affairs under the administration of former US President Bill Clinton, *The Daily Yomiuri* (Tokyo), January 9, 2010, p. 1, “CHARTING JAPAN’S COURSE; Japan, US must reaffirm alliance’s importance”

A: If Japan wants no American troops, we will withdraw the troops. I think that would be a big mistake for Japan. What the troops provide you is a security guarantee which is credible. Japan is faced with both China and North Korea as nuclear powers and of course Russia. Japan needs an American guarantee if it doesn’t wish to develop its own nuclear weapons. How do you make that guarantee credible? You make that credible by having American troops
in Japan. Anyone who attacks Japan—North Korea for example—is going to kill Americans as well as Japanese. But if Japan asks for the removal of troops, Americans of course would remove them.

**Chinese/Russian aggression.** Perceived loss of the US commitment to global military engagement could empower historical enemies of the US, such as Russia and China, to act more aggressively.

Jamestown Foundation, July 7, 2009. <http://www.jamestown.org/single/?no_cache=1&tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=35241&tx_ttnews%5BbackPid%5D=13&cHash=021157f86c>

Chinese perceptions of American power are consequential. China’s assessment of the global structure of power is an important factor in Chinese foreign policy decision-making. As long as Chinese leaders perceive a long-lasting American preeminence, averting confrontation with the United States is likely seen as the best option. If Beijing were to perceive the US position as weakening, there could be fewer inhibitions for China to avoid challenging the United States where American and Chinese interests diverge. Since the late-1990s, Beijing has judged the United States as firmly entrenched in the role of sole superpower. As long as the comprehensive national power of China and the other major powers lagged far behind the United States, and the ability of China to forge coalitions to counterbalance US power remained limited, Beijing concertedly avoided challenging US interests around the world; for example, when the United States invaded Iraq.

**Terrorism.** This disadvantage takes the opposite approach of the affirmative terrorism advantage, arguing that if the US is perceived as being militarily soft-line that this will embolden terrorists world-wide.

**Country politics.** Reducing US military presence in one of the listed countries is likely to impact the political situation in those countries. For example, the new Prime Minister of Japan has been arguing in favor of reducing the US military presence in the country since he began his election campaign. An actual US withdrawal could benefit him politically, potentially making it more likely for him to be able to pass policies that he would otherwise be unable to do. If the US were to withdraw from Afghanistan, this could undermine the credibility of President Hamid Karzai, undermining security in the country. Karzai was selected as the Afghan interim leader by the International Conference on Afghanistan held in Bonn, Germany on December 5, 2001. In 2004, Karzai was elected to a 5-year term as Afghanistan’s president. He won re-election in 2009, but the election was widely criticized for being corrupt.

**Troop shift.** Withdrawing a significant amount of troops from one country may result in their deployment to another country, particularly Afghanistan. Negatives could argue that increasing troops in Afghanistan, or some other place, is bad.

**Private military contractors.** Private military contractors are private companies hired by the US government to perform US military operations. If the US reduced its military presence, the US may simply shift toward using more military contractors. This is not only a general circumvention argument, but it is a disadvantage because these contractors are highly criticized for violating human rights and for generating even more anti-Americanism than standard US military deployments. Of course, if it is topical to restrain these contractors, affirmatives may act to solve this by directly reducing them.

**Reverse spending.** Substantially reducing the US foreign military presence could save a lot of money. This money, however, would probably not be used to reduce the deficit but would likely be spent somewhere else. Negatives will likely argue that some particular federal program will be cut now due to lack of funds, that reducing spending will save the program, and that the program is bad.

**Soft power bad.** As discussed in the advantage section, reducing US military presence abroad could increase US soft power. Negatives can argue that this increase in US soft power is bad because it could, for example, lead to sanctions on Iran, sanctions on North Korea, and efforts to secure other items on its international agenda, which are arguably bad.

Negatives will likely argue that some particular federal program will be cut now due to lack of funds, that reducing spending will save the program, and that the program is bad.

**Troop shift.** Withdrawing a significant amount of troops from one country may result in their deployment to another country, particularly Afghanistan. Negatives could argue that increasing troops in Afghanistan, or some other place, is bad.

**Private military contractors.** Private military contractors are private companies hired by the US government to perform US military operations. If the US reduced its military presence, the US may simply shift toward using more military contractors. This is not only a general circumvention argument, but it is a disadvantage because these contractors are highly criticized for violating human rights and for generating even more anti-Americanism than standard US military deployments. Of course, if it is topical to restrain these contractors, affirmatives may act to solve this by directly reducing them.

**Reverse spending.** Substantially reducing the US foreign military presence could save a lot of money. This money, however, would probably not be used to reduce the deficit but would likely be spent somewhere else. Negatives will likely argue that some particular federal program will be cut now due to lack of funds, that reducing spending will save the program, and that the program is bad.

**Soft power bad.** As discussed in the advantage section, reducing US military presence abroad could increase US soft power. Negatives can argue that this increase in US soft power is bad because it could, for example, lead to sanctions on Iran, sanctions on North Korea, and efforts to secure other items on its international agenda, which are arguably bad.

**Coup.** Many affirmative teams will claim to substantially improve US relations with countries such as Russia, Iran, and China. Some affirmatives may go a step farther, claiming that the plan will result in Iran giving up its nuclear weapons. There is good evidence for all three of these countries that indicates that if leaders in those countries substantially improved ties with the United States, and particularly if Iran gave up nuclear weapons, that there would be a coup against them.

**Nuclear proliferation good.** Many teams will claim that their plan results in efforts to curtail the proliferation (spread) of nuclear weapons. Some scholars argue that the spread of nuclear weapons is good because it deters conventional war.

**Israeli insecurity.** The presence of US military forces in countries such as Kuwait helps to both deter regional aggression by countries like Iran and to serve as a means of reassuring allies like Israel that the US could act to deter and prevent Iranian aggression if necessary. Withdrawing troops from Kuwait could create significant security fears in Israel, causing them to disclose the existence of their nuclear arsenal and/or attack Iran’s nuclear infrastructure.

**Economy.** The US military is a significant source of employment and the weapons purchases it uses to sustain foreign military operations have a large indirect impact on the economy.

**Attacking Solvency**

Affirmative plans will literally reduce the US military presence in one or more of the mentioned countries through an act of fiat, so it will be difficult for the negative to argue that the affirmative can’t solve in terms of actually reducing the troops. There are, however, a couple of basic solvency arguments that the negative can make.

**Attack the ability to solve the harm.** Most of the general harms are very difficult for the affirmative to solve. There are many reasons, for example, US global leadership in is in decline, and pulling US troops out of one of the countries in the resolution is unlikely to address all of those factors.

**Private military shift.** As discussed in the disadvantage section, withdrawing US military troops could result in a shift to private contractors.

**Stop the Mission Counterplan**

Some affirmative teams will claim harms that are specific to what the military does when it is deployed. For example, some affirmatives will argue that it is bad for the US military to engage in the war on drugs in Afghanistan and that reducing
the US military presence will prevent the military from engaging in that drug war. When this is the case, the negative can counterplan to simply have the US order the military to stop engaging in the drug war and that the actual reduction in presence is disadvantageous. US credibility arguments are probably the best net-benefits to this disadvantage.

**Agent Counterplans**

As with all topics, affirmatives will also be required to defend their agent of action against other alternative agents. Affirmatives could have the executive order the reductions, have Congress eliminate funding for the deployment, or have the courts, most likely the Supreme Court, rule that the deployment is unconstitutional.

Negative teams that are able to box the affirmative into specifying a particular agent will be able to counterplan with another agent. If the affirmative uses the courts, negatives can counterplan to use the executive or the Congress and argue that court action is a violation of Judicial Deference toward military policy. If the affirmative picks the Congress, the negative could counterplan with the executive and argue that Congressional action intrudes on executive authority/presidential power.

**Process Counterplans**

Negatives can also change the process through which the plan is passed or implemented.

*Consultation.* One of the most popular process counterplans is the consultation counterplan. This counterplan argues that one of our allies or allied organizations—NATO, for example—should be given the chance to veto the plan and that this opportunity will strengthen the alliance. Japan and China are also countries that negatives frequently choose to consult.

*Conditioning.* Conditioning counterplans have become more popular in college debate in the last couple of years and are likely to become very popular in high school debate on this topic. The basic idea behind a conditioning counterplan is that the US will do the plan if and only if another country or actor does something else. For example, the US could agree to reduce its troop deployment in Afghanistan if Russia agreed to reduce the sale of nuclear technology to Iran. All negatives need to do to write these counterplans is find another actor that is in support of the plan and then condition the plan on action by the other actor to do something that the US wants.

*Delay.* Generic delay counterplans are common on every topic, with the most common being to simply delay doing the plan until after a particular Congressional agenda item has been voted on. In the fall, negatives may propose doing the plan after the midterm elections, arguing that waiting will avoid any negative fallout on the election.

More importantly, however, I note this because I think there are stronger topic-specific delay counterplans that can be run. For example, the US has pledged to start drawing-down forces in Afghanistan in July 2011. Many affirmatives who run Afghanistan cases will likely argue that that this will not occur and that the withdrawal process needs to begin. Negatives, however, may counterplan to maintain the July 2011 date to start withdrawal and withdraw whatever element of the force the affirmative argues that we should withdraw at that date. This counterplan will not only avoid the politics disadvantage, but also US credibility and alliance net-benefits because the withdrawal will occur as planned and as currently supported by our allies.

**Advantage Counterplans**

Counterplans that solve the affirmative advantage without adopting the affirmative plan, otherwise known as “Advantage Counterplans” are becoming more popular. On this resolution, I can easily see a number of advantage counterplans.

*Increased recruitment.* Many affirmative teams will claim that the US military is currently overstretched and needs to substantially draw-down in one of the topic countries in order to sustain its overall readiness. To deal with this advantage, negative teams can counterplan to increase overall readiness levels by recruiting more troops and investing in new and replacement weapons systems.

*Strategies to improve soft power.* There are other ways of increasing soft power than reducing US military presence in one of the listed countries. Actions such as closing Guantanamo Bay, passing climate control legislation, and working more with the UN are all likely to increase US soft power.

*Strategies to solve terrorism (impacts).* There are a number of things that the US can do to reduce the risks of terrorism, including increasing cooperation with Russia to stop nuclear weapons from being stolen from aging Russian complexes, improving port security, and increasing domestic surveillance.

*Pressure on Israel.* Increasing pressure on Israel to reduce building settlements in the West bank is likely to improve relations with the Islamic world.

*Development/nation building.* Improving development and nation building, at least in Afghanistan and Iraq, could reduce the risk of civil conflict in those countries. The US military could remain but simply do more to “win the hearts and minds” of people in these countries.

*Policies to reduce/prevent human rights abuses.* Human rights violations by the US military could be substantially reduced by internal policies designed to prevent abuse of human rights by the US military. These policies include more self-policing and internal monitoring.

Net-benefits to all of these counterplans are disadvantages to reducing US military presence, including US global credibility, alliance relationships, reverse spending, and troop shift. Politics is also a potential net-benefit—teams will just need to win that the politics disadvantage links to the withdrawing of troops and not to the counterplan.

**Kritiks**

This topic will give rise to three basic types of kritiks that apply to this topic.

The first type is solvency-based kritiks. This type of kritik will argue that until we solve some underlying problem—capitalism/neo-liberalism, the oppression of women, the problem of military violence and conflict will remain.

A second type of kritik will focus on the problems of the extreme rhetoric of nuclear apocalypse that is used to justify the affirmative plan. Negatives that advance these latter kritiks will argue that the focus of the debate should be on the rhetoric that we use to justify our actions rather than on the desirability of the actions themselves.

**Topicality—Reigning in the Affirmative**

This essay is not meant as a broad topicality essay, but negative teams need to be prepared to win a couple basic topicality arguments in order to restrain the affirmative.

*Military presence in.* Negative teams will need to be able to win that reducing “military presence in” means that the affirmative has to reduce the military presence that is confined to the geographic
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borders of the country. This will exclude affirmatives, for example, from reducing US naval patrols in the area or the general “nuclear umbrella” that extends over countries like Japan and South Korea.

Substantial reduction. Although “substantial” topicality debates are often difficult to win, negatives will need to argue that affirmatives must make a meaningful reduction in the military presence in a country. Otherwise, affirmative teams that run Iraq cases will simply argue that we are reducing troops now and that the disadvantages are non-unique. If the affirmative, however, has to be a substantial reduction beyond what is occurring now, there will be strong links and uniqueness to the disadvantages.

Its. Negatives need to make sure that affirmative plans are only reducing the US military presence in the listed countries and not the military presence of other countries. For example, many other countries have a military presence in Iraq and Afghanistan. Affirmatives could claim by effect that those countries will also reduce their military presence, but it would not be topical for the affirmative to enter into agreements with those countries to reduce their military presence.

Affirmative Strategic Choices

I think that there are two basic approaches to writing affirmative cases on this topic.

Go big. The first choice is to “go big” and massively reduce US military presence in one of the topic countries. Affirmatives should focus on turning the big negative disadvantages right in the IAC by arguing that military presence in that country undermines US military readiness, threatens our global credibility, undermines the war on terror, and is big enough to outweigh even a reasonable risk of the politics disadvantage. An example of a case in this area would be to withdraw from Futenma, Japan.

Affirmatives can also argue that massive reductions are consistent with many of the alternatives to popular kritiks and that allies such as Japan and NATO would say no to the reductions, giving the affirmative leverage against the consult counterplans.

Go small. The second choice is to “go small” and make reductions that are just big enough to be topical, but reductions that would not be highly visible in ways that would reduce US credibility or large enough to threaten relations with key allies. Examples of cases in this area include eliminating cooperation in specific missile defense systems with Japan.

If you “go big,” you will have a lot of link offense against popular generic arguments, but you must be willing to work hard enough to take on all of this research and blocking. If you “go small,” you must be prepared for topicality debates, you will probably struggle more against the process counterplans, and you’ll need to be able to win solid “no link” arguments against the generic disadvantages.

Negative Strategic Choices

There are some basic approaches that the negative can take to prepare for the season.

Prepare to debate presence. This is the real “meat” of the topic—should the US reduce its military presence? There are a number of advantages that can be claimed from such reductions, but many of the advantages can argue that reducing presence is needed to solve the majority of that term was for debate. Though it will be important for the negative to make the affirmative advocate a substantial reduction, I suspect that the phrase military presence will be less subject to painstaking topicality debates.

Prepare to debate the agent or process. If you are a debater who likes to avoid debates on the central issues of the resolution, you can always enjoy debating, and teams that are well-prepared for this debate will likely do well on the topic.

The debates, however, will evolve well beyond this issue into specific issues related to troop deployments in particular countries. Affirmative teams will undoubtedly have tricks related to the link between the affirmative plan and hegemony, which will make it more and more difficult for the affirmative to reliably debate.

Where I do think the affirmative will struggle throughout the year is proving that it is necessary to reduce presence rather than acting to solve the harms through some other means. As a result, I think the topic will end up becoming centered on a more limited set of cases where the affirmative can demonstrate that a reduction in presence is needed to solve the majority of the harms.

About the Author
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Above: The 2010 Arthur N. Rupe Scholars from the New Mexico District.
Students Gain Priceless Skills in Public Forum Debate

Public Forum Debate was created in 2003 to cement the linkage between forensics and the general public. This audience-friendly format features conversational discourse on timely, relevant topics that have been taken directly from the headlines. In 2009, 4,446 debaters entered Public Forum at their district tournament—more than any other event and more than Lincoln Douglas Debate and Policy Debate combined.

In 2008, Public Forum Debate achieved another milestone after gaining the support of the Arthur N. Rupe Foundation. This substantial support is designed to promote Public Forum Debate at the local and national level. The grant created RupeScholars.org, where Public Forum students and coaches can access exclusive interviews, research, and resources from leading professionals. The grant will also provide scholarships to more students and in higher amounts at the NFL National Speech & Debate Tournament in Kansas City this summer.

The NFL is proud to work with like-minded organizations such as the Arthur N. Rupe Foundation to expand educational opportunities to deserving students throughout the nation.
The Stanford Public Forum Debate camps are committed to the same professionalism with Public Forum debate that SNFI has brought to Policy debate and Lincoln-Douglas debate for the past 20 years. Serious student of public forum debate wanting to take their activity to the next level are encouraged to attend, as are those just beginning in this style of argumentation. A special Advanced debate section is planned for this summer, a week focusing on practice rounds, and a beginners level week. Activities are often in small groups so as to maximize improvement.

We offer three different one-week long Public Forum programs. These camps are designed to build skills similar to our Parliamentary program but with a specific focus on the structure and strategies unique to Public Forum Debate. This program also offers students with little to no experienced coaching at their schools the opportunity to develop the necessary skills to coach themselves effectively to success.

These exclusive one-week programs will feature:

- A low staff to student ratio - averaging 1 staff for every 8 to 10 students
- Lots of practice debates - half of the total instructional time will be spent on conducting practice debates with extensive critiques
- Seminars on brainstorming, constructing and supporting arguments and theory of argumentation from the ground up
- Topic analyses on a number of commonly used topic areas through a spirited examination of current events
- Public Forum will be headed by Les Phillips, formerly of Lexington High School, Lexington, MA; and Ashley Artmann, UC Berkeley Invitational Champion in Public Forum, 2008. Additional staff will be added as necessitated by enrollment. All instructors will have extensive personal experience in debate, and will draw from different disciplines including value debate and policy oriented debate to maximize the depth and breadth of each student’s experience.

The sessions are held in an intimate setting that allows plenty of question and answer sessions and one-on-one interaction with instructors, not just rote learning. Students are allowed to develop their talents in a relaxed and supportive atmosphere with excellent supervision. Students will emerge from the program as more confident public speakers and as experts on the rules, style, and strategies of Public Forum Debate, ready to compete in the fall!

“I would recommend this camp to all debaters at every level. The staff is exceptional and you leave with a much higher understanding of debate as a whole”

- Victoria Anglin
2007 SNFI Participant
The growth of Public Forum Debate has more than **doubled** in size since its national debut in 2003.

**PFD DISTRICT ENTRY TOTALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>4,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>4,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>4,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>4,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>3,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>3,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>2,176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures represent individual students, not teams.*

*Congratulations to all of the 2010 NFL National Qualifiers! Pictured from top to bottom are students from Northwest Indiana District, Show Me (MO) District, and South Carolina District.*
There are many debaters to whom public speaking comes naturally. Alas, we cannot count ourselves among them. And yet, we won the 2007 National Forensic League Public Forum Debate Championship.

Failure was no stranger to us when we arrived in Wichita in the summer of 2007, for we had not escaped our novice years unscathed. We had had our fair share of those moments that all debaters know too well; when the connection between brain and tongue is magically severed, and you find yourself babbling incoherently in a room full of intelligent people. But those moments only fueled our desire to win and our dedication to knowing and understanding the topic better than anyone else there. And then things began to change, as debate tournaments ended with trophies or elimination rounds, rather than with tales of horror. Debate became a source of pride and empowerment, rather than humiliation and dread.

Still, as we made our way to Wichita, the prospect of competing against the best debaters in the country was nothing short of daunting. Our mother’s blind faith notwithstanding, we had no expectations. The goal was to avoid complete and utter mortification. We had spent hours and hours becoming intimately acquainted with the tournament’s topic: handgun bans. Short of taking a field trip to a firing range, we were about as familiar with handguns as Charlton Heston or Jason Bourne. As the rounds passed, we discovered the full extent of that knowledge. And to our great astonishment, we realized that we had the power to win. Our teammates realized as well, equipping us with research and supporting us unstintingly throughout that grueling week. Our success became more than our own personal victory: It was a triumph for our school’s debate team. Winning nationals energized our debate team. Success begat success, as our teammates and those who came after us realized that winning was within their reach.

For us, perhaps the most lasting impact has been the conviction with which we approach critical thinking, analysis, and interpersonal communication. We have come to trust our intellectual instincts and to believe that we can express our thoughts coherently and convincingly. Having overcome the initial terror of public speaking, we seem to have found our voices. In the process, we discovered the true power of words. We now believe that the sheer force of a well-constructed argument has been all but forgotten in a world of increasingly coarsened political debate. If, somewhat miraculously, the countries of the world, or our own nation’s fragmented political world, manage to reconcile their differences, it will not be through warfare, through intimidation, or through strategic military alliances. It will be through rational, persuasive negotiation spoken by wise diplomats and leaders, many of whom probably spent their freshmen year stuttering through NFL debate rounds.

---

About the Authors

Amanda and Emily Scherker are the 2007 NFL National Public Forum Debate Champions from Ransom Everglades High School in Florida. They currently attend Northwestern. Amanda is class of 2013 and Emily is class of 2011.
A little less than five years ago, I began competing in high school forensics at my alma mater, Mesa Ridge High School, in Colorado Springs, Colorado. I started in Public Forum Debate, later moving to various individual events and Lincoln Douglas Debate. The world of Public Forum in Colorado was, and still is, flourishing. There were seemingly innumerable teams from scores of schools, making the field enormous at any given tournament. I debated alongside several partners, each providing a different perspective, as well as benefits and challenges. Though my Public Forum experience provided an outlet for creativity, fun, and competition in high school, the experience went far beyond high school and laid the foundation for critical life skills.

As a sophomore at Ripon College, I still use many of these skills, be it in writing academic papers or in collegiate forensic competition. In high school, Public Forum Debate represented a stepping stone to other events in forensics. I started competing in the fall of my sophomore year of high school. In February of that school year, I branched out into Extemporaneous Speaking. In many ways, I feel that Extemp and Public Forum require much of the same skill set, including direct arguments through a few points, conversational delivery, and clarity and conciseness in vocabulary. After trying Extemp, I eventually dabbled in every NFL event except Duo. Though the world of forensics may seem intimidating and scary to a young high school student, Public Forum gently helped me to develop a wider skill set so I could experiment with other events.

While other forms of debate and individual events are worthwhile for specialized skill sets, my experience suggests that Public Forum is the most effective in creating excellent communicators. Because Public Forum judges are not expected to be experienced in a specific debate paradigm, competitors must be able to communicate clearly and effectively with the average person. In reality, this skill set is far more widely used outside of forensics than are the skills found in other events, making it more applicable for real-world scenarios, be they interpersonal relationships, workplace behaviors, or any sort of politics.

On a personal level, Public Forum created my love for forensics. Because I enjoyed every tournament, found success, and used Public Forum as a gateway to other events, I decided that I wanted to continue in the world of forensics. I now compete in collegiate forensics, where I have qualified to the AFA-NIET national forensic tournament, certainly thanks to the skills I developed as a Public Forum debater. In collegiate forensics, making clear, sound, and effective arguments that the average person can comprehend is a necessity. These communication skills will remain important far after graduation. For this reason, I hope that Public Forum will live on and bring the same passion I found to many future generations.

“Though my Public Forum experience provided an outlet for creativity, fun, and competition in high school, the experience went far beyond high school and laid the foundation for critical life skills.”

About the Author
Jeremy D. Johnson is a sophomore Communication and Politics and Government double major at Ripon College in Ripon, WI. Jeremy earned a degree of Outstanding Distinction and awards in International Extemp, debate, and congress in three years of competition at Mesa Ridge High School in Colorado Springs, CO. He is now a nationally-qualified collegiate forensic competitor for Ripon College.
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IDEA/NJFL National Middle School Tournament

June 24-27 2010

The tournament will provide competition opportunities to talented middle level students from across the nation, consistent with the mission of the National Junior Forensic League (NJFL) to extend the benefits of debate and speech education to young adolescents.

Visit www.juniorforensicleague.org for more details.
The Milton Academy Middle School speech team is a co-curricular activity designed to train students in the fundamentals of performance. The team includes students from all grades—sixth, seventh, and eighth—and is led by Grade 8 captains Emmie, Jack, Morgan, and Rubye (see photo, above).

Members of the Upper School team prepare middle school speakers for tournaments held throughout the year. Middle School Speech Team coaches from the Upper School (Grades 9-12): Amelia, Catherine, Quinn, Anisha, Elisabeth, Cameron, Jovonna, Isabelle, Dylan, William, Anthony, Christine, Patrick, Samuel, Eric, Lina, Louis, Lily, Martin, Liz and Zach.

These Upper School students donate their time to help the Middle School students learn their skills while showing them what speech dedication means. Without the help of the high school students, the concept of a speech team would be a daunting undertaking; however, with the proficiency of the high school pros, middle school students quickly become more confident speakers in a variety of events! One of the highlights of the year occurs in February when the high school coaches and middle school speakers compete at the same tournament. The Mardi Gras Tournament hosted by NFL District Chair, Marc Rishitelli, invites Middle and Upper School teams to the same tournament. This is a thrilling event for all and a great day for speakers and coaches to demonstrate what they have learned together. This year both teams placed at the festival and thoroughly enjoyed seeing each other perform (see photo, below).

Massachusetts Middle School Forensic League (MMSFL) Student Reflections

Nashoba Brooks Festival
October 25, 2009........................................

• “I love competing. Last year I hated this speech stuff, but now I love it! I am glad to compete again and see all of my friends.” - Surabhi

• “This was my first speech competition. So I was really nervous. But after talking for two rounds, I am so glad I came!” - Catherine

• “For the first tournament of the year, this tournament was amazing! I also judged for the first time, and got a whole new view of what my judges think when they judge me!” - Maura

• “Speech is a great experience, no matter who you are or what you like.” - Alexandra

• “Had a blast!” - K. C.

Novice Tournament • Milton Academy
November 15, 2009.................................

• “This is my second tournament as Captain and I am having lots of fun. We just set up awards and I am remembering being a novice and how helpful this competition was to me.” - Rubye

• “Great atmosphere, good people, great orange juice and bagels, good judges.” - Thom

• “So much FUN!” - Lainey

• “Fun, but the impromptu has hard words!” - Crag

• “It was so exciting! I hadn’t really
expected the nerves, but it was a lot of fun and I can’t wait until the next one.” - Francesca

“Snow Day Speech Special • Nashoba Brooks • December 13, 2009..........................

“When I started speech I was nervously petrified, but now as I am in my second year I feel confident, for this entire experience has changed my life.” - Monica

“I love that I see the same people every time and get to see how they change, especially in the small categories like Play and Poetry.” - Elizah

“Speech is AWESOME!” - Zivi

“I’ve always been terrified to speak in public. But when I joined speech and debate it really gave me confidence and courage.” - Masoka

“It was amazingly awesome when they called my name for finals. The whole thing is super fun.” - Isabel

“Good luck, everyone!” - Wilson Middle School

“I’ve grown so much from doing speech. I think everyone who has done it has taken something positive from the experience.” - Marina

“I have gone from Poetry to Prose to Oratory and learned so much.” - Zoe

“So I’ve been doing speech and debate for three years now, and I just thought I might take a minute to reflect on my times in speech. I competed at the middle school level for years, and have learned a lot. At first, it was all about winning; the thrill of hearing your name being called for finals or the happy feeling you get when you know you did your best. But now that I am doing it in high school, I realized that speech is a lot more: bonding with friends, hanging out with and meeting new people. Through speech I learned how to express my feeling through speaking, and the true meaning of friendship. Through speech I realized that, though winning maybe fun, it’s just as important to do your best.” - Kavya (High School Judge)

“OMG! I absolutely love speech! This is my third tournament and it was just amazing. I enjoyed watching the Duos and other Prose readings and it really showed me how little kids like me can have so much confidence.” - Priyanka

“This is an amazing tournament! Everyone I have seen has been fantastic—I can’t imagine anyone doing any better! Keep up the good work, and thanks to Pike for having us all here.” - Daisy

“This tournament has been one of the roughest competitions I have ever been to.” - Ayah

“I am still not sure why I decided to try out for speech in sixth grade, but I’ve never looked back. Even though it’s my third year, it’s the first year I’ve started to break to finals. It’s always been so fun. And even though none of us think about it while we are having so much fun, it will help us later on.” - Moorea

“WOW! This tournament was so much fun! I watched friends perform well, broke to finals, and just had a great time overall.” - C.B.

“You can learn so much about your public speaking abilities.” - Mack

“I enjoyed the Pike competition. Everyone loves the Pike!” - Amee

---

**National Junior Forensic League**

Several MMSFL schools are involved in the National Junior Forensic League (NJFL) and will attend the IDEA/NJFL National Middle School Tournament in Des Moines, Iowa, in June. For more information about the NJFL and its National Tournament, visit www.juniorforensicleague.org.

---

**About the Author**

Debbie Simon is a three-diamond, Hall of Fame coach who has coached at Milton Academy (MA) for more than 35 years. She has coached national champions, several finalists, and more than 100 national qualifiers. Under her leadership, Milton Academy won the coveted NFL Bruno E. Jacob Trophy in 1997. Simon has generously given her service as a past New England District Chair, and has been honored with the NFL Distinguished Service Award. She has coached at several summer institutes, including most recently, the George Mason Institute of Forensics.

---

**Massachusetts Middle School Forensic League Mission Statement**

The ability to present oneself effectively—in interviews and before both small and large groups—is considered one of the most valuable life skills any of us can develop. And yet, in survey after survey, Americans rank their fear of public speaking ahead of their fear of dying. According to comedian Jerry Seinfeld, “at a funeral, most people would rather be the guy in the coffin than the one giving the eulogy.”

We believe that, while public speaking courses can give people opportunities to develop their communication abilities, it is ongoing practice that results in the development of presentation skill. We recognize that forensic activity provides young people with a unique forum for this kind of skill development.

We recognize, too, that students in the sixth through eighth grades have their own special developmental needs. During adolescence, when young people change so much from one day to the next, consistency is important to them. Many sixth through eighth graders feel particularly self-conscious or awkward in interpersonal settings, so comfort and collegiality are important to them. It is not our goal to prepare middle school students for high school forensics. Thus, we have made a conscious choice not to approach our activity as a “junior” forensic league.

We believe that, through participation in consistently structured, comfortable, and collegial MMSFL contests, sixth through eighth grade students can gain poise and confidence in their abilities as both speakers and listeners. In addition, we believe that the development of such skills helps them learn to “speak up” for positive change in the world around them. We believe that the development of such skills helps young people to become effective leaders.

~ Created by Sue Wurster, President, and the MMSFL members
Inspiring youth leaders around the world.

**IDEA’S GLOBAL EVENTS**

**HIGH SCHOOL** The People Speak Global Debates challenge young people all over the globe to speak up and change the world. Participate in March and April by holding a public debate or performance showcase and by helping to improve your community. The free downloadable Global Debates toolkit walks you through every aspect of the project, challenging you to take the lead. Winning teams and their teacher receive all-expenses-paid trips to the IDEA Youth Forum in the Netherlands. To learn more and get your toolkit, visit ThePeopleSpeak.org.

**MIDDLE SCHOOL** The IDEA-NJFL National Tournament is the premiere middle school debate event. This large open tournament, featuring a variety of formats including storytelling and poetry as well as popular debate formats, is designed to instill and nurture in younger students an appreciation for divergent viewpoints and diverse cultures. The 2010 tournament takes place in Iowa City, Iowa, June 24-27. Registration begins early 2010.

**HIGH SCHOOL** The International Tournament of Champions, a Worlds-style event, brings together high school students from as far away as Canada, the Philippines, India, and Korea for two days of discussion and friendship-building activities. This event is unique because it takes place on the campus of Willamette University in Salem, Oregon, offering competitors a taste of undergraduate life. Students stay in dorms and enjoy free time on campus after competition. Willamette University conducts a workshop the day before the tournament. The 2010 ITOC takes place May 22-23.

**HIGH SCHOOL** The IDEA Youth Forum, now in its 16th year, gathers 250 young people from more than 30 countries for nearly three weeks of competitions, workshops, and cultural experiences. IDEA groups participants from different countries into three-person teams. Team members must work together to address controversial issues. The 2010 Youth Forum will take place in The Netherlands, July 22-August 4.
Easy Dinners with a Difference

Homemade Gourmet® is proud to offer three ways to help provide your students with the opportunities they need and deserve while you strive to care for yourself and your family.

Fundraising
Easy-to-sell meal solutions provide the opportunity for your team to earn the money they need to compete and travel. Our online fundraiser ordering system makes it simple to keep track of individual sales and totals.

Delicious Meal Solutions
Have high-quality meal ingredients and menus complete with grocery lists delivered right to your door so that it’s easier to spend precious time with your own family.

Income Opportunity
Supplement your salary with additional income to reach your personal goals.

Bringing families back to the dinner table is our mission. Let us help fulfill yours!

Call 1-888-477-2848 and provide Fundraiser Code 848339 to learn more.
Monday through Friday, 8:00am – 5:30pm CST
OR
Email: customersupport@homemadegourmet.com and provide Fundraiser Code 848339 to learn more.

www.homemadegourmet.com
Planet Debate 2010-2011
Bringing the nation’s leading debate coaches & resources to you

In Collaboration With
The Harvard Debate Council
The Harvard Public Forum Institute
The National Forensics League
The Capitol Classic
Georgetown Debate Seminar
The Gonzaga Debate Institute
Mean Green Workshops
Dr. Rich Edwards
Dr. Timothy O'Donnell
Dr. Sandy Berkowitz
Dr. Minh Luong
Shane Stafford
Adam Jacobi
Mike Wascher
Beth Eskin
Carol Green
Brian Manuel

Expanded Instructional Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Classroom Lectures</th>
<th>Textbook</th>
<th>Lessons</th>
<th>Producer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>75-100</td>
<td>NFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>Dr. Berkowitz, Dr. Luong, Shane Stafford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Forum</td>
<td>75-100</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>75-100</td>
<td>PF Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>100-125</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Harvard Debate, Drs. O'Donnell &amp; Edwards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty minutes in length, downloadable, and progressively sequenced, lectures designed for classroom use and individual instruction. Associated textbook readings, lesson plans, and assessments are available for each lecture. Check inside for the complete listing of available material.

$795 -- FULL MASTER ACCESS 1-15 USERS
$895 -- FULL MASTER ACCESS 16-30 USERS
$1295 -- FULL MASTER ACCESS 31-100 USERS

www.planetdebate.com
POLICY DEBATE INSTRUCTIONAL VIDEO SERIES

Our policy instructional video series features between 100 and 125 sequenced instructional videos. Seventy-five of the videos are designed to teach beginning debaters and coaches all of the fundamentals of policy debate. The lectures include an associated text book and follow-up lesson plans and assessment tools.

Fifty additional videos are targeted at more advanced users and cover everything from advanced kritik debating to more sophisticated use of permutations and advanced counterplan and topicality debating.

Designed for classroom viewing and follow-up instruction, all of the videos are approximately twenty minutes and length. The videos also include much more than a talking head lecture. They include integrated examples from real debates, multimedia news references, power point slides, and many other tools.

**Introduction to Debate**

Overview of the types of debate
- Argumentation
- Toulmin model
- Inductive & Deductive reasoning
- Cause-effect reasoning
- Sign, division, analogy, narrative

Tournaments
- Organization & structure
- How are tournaments paired
- Registering for tournaments
- The Mechanics
- Dress & behavior
- Student judges

**Policy Debate Basics**

Skills for success
- All about policy debate
  - Basic Structure of a debate
  - The stock issues & the affirmative
  - The negative
  - Types of arguments

Disadvantages
- Introduction & Parts
- Answering/Inventing arguments
- Careful -- Double-turns
- "Straight-turning" a disadvantage
- Advanced answering tips
- Kicking a disadvantage

Counterplans
- Introduction
- Types of Counterplans
- Counterplan Competition
- The non-topicality standard
- Counterplans don't need to solve
- Answering counterplans
- Extending counterplans on the negative
- Deciding when to run a counterplan
- Counterplan theory
- Permutations
- Status of a Counterplan

Critiques & Kritiks
- Introduction
- Different types
- Structure
- Answering
- Kritiks in the block
- Debating Ks in the 1AR
- Debating Ks in the 2NR
- Debating Ks in the 2AR
- Beating DAs with a K Affirmative
- Beating CPs with a K Affirmative
- Answering Ks of DA impacts
- Framework
- What is a framework debate?
- Arguing in favor of a plan requirement
- Arguing against a plan requirement
- Role Playing
- How to Address the Role Playing Arguments
- Generic K answers

Topicality
- What is T and why is it important
- Structuring the Topicality Argument
- Answering Topicality
- Guiding the debate -- reasonability vs. Limits
- The "interpretations" debate

Cross-examination
- Background and purposes
- Types of Questions/Generating Questions
- Answering Questions
- Avoiding bad cross-examination technique

Winning on the Negative
- General approach
- Three ways to win

Speeches
- Three 20 minute lectures on each speech

Flowing
- How
- What
- Pens & computers
- Practice

**Other Leading Lecturers**

Stefan Bauscha, Harvard Debate
Maggie Berthiaume, Chattahoochee
Sherry Hall, Harvard Debate
Jenny Heidt, Westminster
Calum Matheson, Harvard Debate
Jane Munksgaard, New Trier
Dallas Perkins, Harvard Debate
Nicole Serrano, MBA
Tara Tate, Glenbrook South

---

Dr. Rich Edwards

Dr. Edwards is one of the most recognized names in high school debate. While best known for the TRPC software that runs thousands of high school and college tournaments, he has also produced hundreds of debate handbooks, has authored numerous Forensics Quarterlies, and is recently the author of *Competitive Debate*. In 2007, he was named the Humanitarian of the Year by the National Forensics League.

Dr. Timothy O'Donnell

Dr. O’Donnell is the Director of Debate at the University of Mary Washington in Fredericksburg, Virginia. During his time at Mary Washington, Dr. O’Donnell has not only established Mary Washington as one of the leading programs in the country, but he has built it into a national powerhouse, with the team receiving back to back “first round” (top 16) rankings in 2009 and 2010.
POLICY DEBATE EVIDENCE SERIES

Planet Debate already hosts more than 80,000 individual evidence cards and more than 3,000 files that have been collectively downloaded more than 500,000 times since June of 2009. Between now and August, 2010 we will upload more than 100 new files on the 2010 military presence topic and add close to 100 additional files between August 2010 and June of 2011. Our evidence series is made up of a number of different components and includes more than 100 individual files, less than $6-$8/file for our Master subscribers.

MILITARY AFFIRMATIVES. Ten fully-briefed affirmative cases will be available by May 15, 2010. These affirmative cases, two for each country in the resolution, are excellent ways for debaters to begin early practice debates and to assist with the formulation of arguments over the summer. Fifteen affirmative cases will be available by August 10th.

MILITARY NEGATIVE CASE FILES. Negative files for the affirmative cases just discussed will be available on the respective dates. We will also make 100+ page comprehensive negative files on the most popular camp affirmitives available by September 1, 2010.

MILITARY DISADVANTAGES. Six generic military disadvantages will be released by May 30th. Disadvantages include Russian Aggression (Read Spread), Chinese Aggression, Allied Proliferation, U.S. Global Leadership, Conventional Weapons trade-off, and reverse spending. Five additional disadvantages will be available August 10th.

MILITARY COUNTERPLANS. Five generic military counterplans will be available by May 15, 2010. Counterplans include Consult NATO, Consult Japan, Offsets, End Strength, and Increased Military Presence.

MILITARY KRITIKS. Five generic military kritiks will be available by May 30, 2010. Kritiks include Nuclearism, Feminist International Relations, Militarism, Disarmament, and Positive Peace.

CARD DATABASE. Edited by Harvard Debate Coach Sherry Hall, the evidence consists of more than 80,000 existing cards and at least 10,000 additional cards on the 2010-11 resolution. The database is both a great way to enable students to access individual back file cards and to assist them with the process of learning to write their own briefs.

WEEKLY TOPIC UPDATES. Fifty pages in length, these weekly updates include a general geopolitics update and 10 pages of updates on each of the topic countries.

CAMP FILES. All publicly available debate camp files are available at Planet Debate. The files are organized by camp, subject, argument type, and are fully integrated will all of our other files for easy access.

THOUSANDS OF BACK FILES. Planet Debate features a comprehensive collection of back files all the way back to the 2002-3 mental health topic.

KRITIK ANSWERS. More than 100 sets of kritik answers that are organized alphabetically for easy access and use.

POLITICS. 75-150 pages of updates on popular politics disadvantages released every Thursday. 35 releases total. These releases are included with the Master evidence package, but can be purchased through a politics subscription.

Eli Anders, Stefan Bauschard, Sherry Hall, Brian Manuel, Calum Matheson, Scott Phillips, Tripp Reproebick
CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE INSTRUCTIONAL VIDEO SERIES

Our Congressional Debate instructional video series features between 75 and 100 sequenced instructional videos that are designed to teach beginning debaters and coaches all of the fundamentals of Congressional Debate. The lectures include an associated text book and follow-up lesson plans and assessment tools.

All videos are being produced in partnership with the National Forensic League.

The instructional videos are part of the Master subscription package and can also be purchased as part of a unique Congressional Debate subscription for $199.

Skill Areas
Speech Construction
Refutation in Congress
Congressional Debate Questioning
Research Strategies for Congressional Debate
Parliamentary Procedure Basics
Presiding in Congressional Debate, Part 1
Presiding in Congressional Debate, Part 2
Politics & Ethics in Congressional Debate

Basic Civics
Flowing Congressional Debate
Writing Legislation for Congressional Debate
In-Session Awareness and Strategy
Group Discussion and Success in Committees
Advanced Refutation: Crystallization
Judicial Influence in the Legislative Process
Federalism & Legislative Jurisdiction
Advanced Parliamentary Procedure and Drills
Approaching Differing Tournaments & Voting Procedures
Running a Congressional Debate Tournament

Topic Areas: Approaching Certain Issues from a Congressional Standpoint
Legalizing Marijuana
War on Drugs
K-12 Education Reform: Assessment
K-12 Education Reform: Teacher Quality
Immigration: Mexico
Immigrant Amnesty
Israel/Palestine
Lobbying
Abstinence-Only Sex Educ.
ICC
Voting/Election Reform
Electoral College
Federal Budget Process
Crime & Punishment Issues
Culture: Capital Punishment, Abortion, etc
Privacy Issues
Alternative Energy
Telecommunications
Economic Sanctions
Road Safety (Cell Phones)
US Membership in UN

Adam J. Jacobi previously coached for more than a decade at Rufus King International Baccalaureate (IB) High School in Milwaukee, WI, where he taught courses in speech communication and IB Theatre. A two-diamond NFL coach, Jacobi coached students to NFL championships in the Senate, House, Congress Presiding Officer, and Extemporaneous Commentary, as well as an NCFL champion Policy Debate team and a Harvard National Congress champion. Jacobi wrote the text, Student Congress Debate, has been a senior faculty member in Congressional Debate at the Florida Forensic Institute, and was a consulting educator for the NFL/US State Department’s International Debate Exchange Program. He has held a variety of forensic leadership roles, including president of the Wisconsin Debate Coaches’ Association, Congress director for the Wisconsin Forensic Coaches’ Association (WFCA), and Congressional Debate Advisory Committee for the University of Kentucky Tournament of Champions. In 2008, he was the youngest recipient to be honored with the WFCA’s coveted William R. Hinz Wisconsin Coach of the Year award.

Jacobi is Coordinator of Programs and Education for the National Forensic League. He also is an adjunct instructor of communication and assistant forensic coach at Ripon College. He is a member of Ripon Rotary, and prior to teaching, worked as a legislative assistant for a Milwaukee Common Council member, and as an account executive for a public relations firm. He graduated from Carroll University with a B.S. in Communication-Public Campaigns, and has completed graduate work in education and communication, including professional development from Harvard University’s Graduate School of Education.
PUBLIC FORUM DEBATE INSTRUCTIONAL VIDEO SERIES

Our Public Forum Debate instructional video series features between 75 and 100 sequenced instructional videos that are designed to teach beginning debaters and coaches all of the fundamentals of Public Forum Debate. The lectures include an associated text book and follow-up lesson plans and assessment tools. The content of the lectures will be captured from the Harvard Institute for Public Forum Debate (harvardpfdebate.org) this summer.

Introductory Issues
- What is PF
- How is it different
- How is it similar
- Speech order & times

The First Constructive
- Purpose of it
- What goes in a case
- Different types of cases
- Organization of a case
- Writing a case
- Content
- Offense vs. defense
- Framework
- Intros and conclusions
- Flex case
- Which side to take?
- Strategy and speaking 1st and last

Crossfires
- What are they
- Controlling
- Questions
- Preparation

The Resolution
- Types
- Defining terms
- Technique of Analysis

Judges
- Types
- Adaptation
- Seeing from the judges’ point of view

Delivery
- Voice
- Eye contact and movement
- Persuasive speaking

The Second Constructive

The Third Constructive
- Time allocation
- Spreading

The Fourth Constructive

Summary Speech One
- Purpose
- Setting Up
- Narrowing the debate
- Comparing & contrasting

Summary Speech Two

Final Focus 1
- Purpose
- Setting the RFD
- Strategy
- 1st v. 2nd speaker

Final Focus 2

Mike Wascher

Last year, Mike’s team won the Catholic National Forensic League tournament and debated through the quarter-final round at the Tournament of Champions. His teams have been in late elimination rounds or won tournaments at Blake, The Crestian at Pine Crest, Emory, Harvard, Laird Lewis, Minnesota, The Glenbrooks, and Florida Blue Key. Last year his varsity team finished second at the Florida Forensic League State Championship and one of his novice teams finished second in the FFL Novice State Championship. He joins with the Harvard Debate Council in managing the Harvard Institute for Public Forum Debate.

Beth Eskin

Beth Eskin has coached at Timber Creek High School in Orlando, FL since 2001 when the school first opened. She has grown the program into one that has been successful locally, state-wide and nationally. In the three years that Timber Creek Debate has competed on the national circuit, her Public Forum Debate students have broken deep into elimination rounds, including quarters at NFCFL Grand Nationals, Yale, Glenbrooks, Crestian and the TOC, and semi-finals at Emory, Glenbrooks, Blue Key, and TOC. Her PF team of Kaitlyn Westerberg and Tad Ewald are the 2009 Florida Public Forum Debate State Champions. Beth also serves as the President of the North Florida Catholic Forensic League, as the Chair of the NFL Florida Panther District and serves on both the NFL Public Forum Wording Committee as well as the TOC Public Forum Advisory Committee.
LINCOLN DOUGLAS DEBATE INSTRUCTIONAL VIDEO SERIES

Our Lincoln Douglas Debate instructional video series features between 50 and 100 sequenced instructional videos that are designed to teach beginning debaters and coaches all of the fundamentals of Lincoln Douglas Debate. The lectures include an associated text book and follow-up lesson plans and assessment tools. Topics include:

- Intro to LD debate
- Speeches
  - Affirmative Constructive
  - Negative Constructive
  - First Affirmative Rebuttal
  - Second Affirmative Rebuttal
  - Second Negative Rebuttal
- Cross-Examination
- Preparation Time
- Case Construction
- Traditional LD
- Value premise
- Kritiks in LD
- Policy in LD
- Value criterion
- Flowing
- Blocks writing
- Argument construction
- Research
- Speaking & delivery

LINCOLN DOUGLAS DEBATE EVIDENCE SERIES

Comprehensive briefings on the the Lincoln Douglas topics that are released within 14 days of the topic announcement.

- Topic in Context
  - Analysis which places the topic in historical, political, and/or economic context.

- Topic Briefing
  - This briefing introduces the major issues related to the topic, introduces key experts and their positions, and covers the topic in an interdisciplinary fashion.

- Strategies and Arguments
  - This section outlines suggested strategies and identifies key arguments for both the affirmative and negative sides.

- Topic Bibliography
  - As the title suggests, this section contains a list of resources that was used in the preparation of the topic briefing and additional resources for further research.
EXTEMP SERIES

Get weekly Extemp questions and research links!

ELECTRONIC CLASSROOM

Manage Your Team, Tournaments, and Research Efforts Online

Our growing electronic classroom, first launched in the fall of 2009, features many tools to support team management. The Electronic Classroom (EC) makes it possible for coaches and teachers to

- Quickly email all registered students
- Upload and manage evidence files in a restricted environment
- Drag & drop any file on Planet Debate into individual user mail boxes
- Post messages into the home page blog section of Planet Debate that only their users can view
- Create a parent mailing list to easily disseminate tournament information sheets

About Planet Debate

Planet Debate is a Project of the Harvard Debate Council and Harvard Debate, Inc., a non-profit corporation that was formed to support the Harvard debating team and the Council’s broader mission of expanding debate instructional opportunities nation-wide.

In addition to attending more than ten competitive tournaments during the year, council members run nationally competitive high school and college tournaments, support debate initiatives in prisons in the greater Boston area, and work with underserved students in the city's schools.

Co-founded in 2002 by Stefan Bauschard, Dallas Perkins, and Sherry Hall, Planet Debate has served the instructional and research needs of more than 1,000 schools and 50,000 students.

If you have any inquiries related to the instructional opportunities that are available through Planet Debate, they should be addressed to its President - Stefan Bauschard - SBauschard@planetdebate.com.

Questions related to the Council's high school or college tournaments should be addressed to Sherry Hall at hallsherry2@gmail.com.

Any general questions related to Harvard Debate should be directed to Dallas Perkins at dperkins@fas.harvard.edu.
2010-11 PLANET DEBATE ORDER FORM

In addition to expanding our content and reducing our prices, we have also simplified the ordering process.

- **Master 15** -- Provides full access to all resources for all events for up to 15 users from your school.
- **Master 30** -- Full access for up to 30 users from your school.
- **L-D 5** -- Access to Minh’s 5 topic releases, the lecture series, and all other instructional supports for 5 users from your school.
- **Congress** -- Access to the lecture series and all instructional supports for 5 users from your school.
- **Politics** -- Access to the weekly politics release plus all of the politics lectures for five users from your school.
- **Policy 15** -- Access to all policy resources for up to 15 students from your school.
- **Policy 30** -- Access to all policy resources for up to 30 students from your school.
- **Exttemp** -- Exttemp access for 5 users

---

**OUR PLANET, YOUR DEBATE**

Our motto is more true than ever. Debate is expanding globally, and we are excited to be a part of it.

**Questions?**
info@planetdebate.com or 781-775-0433

Fax order: 617-588-0283  Mail order/Purchase order: Harvard Debate, 490 Adams Mail Center, Cambridge, MA, 02138
In the spring of 2010, the NFL Board of Directors approved the creation of the first supplemental debate event for pilot implementation at the 2010 Kansas City National Speech and Debate Tournament.

Crafting a supplemental debate event requires many considerations including time, format, structure, and understandability. After significant discussion and collaboration, a model has been developed that would modify existing rules of Parliamentary Debate to address the needs of a supplemental event at nationals.

The one-on-one debate format will address a topic that changes each round. The debate does not permit published material to be used or consulted during the round, but debaters may reference scholarly work in their speeches. Debaters will not read pre-written speeches, briefs, or evidence. Instead, debaters speak impromptu from a few notes that record the arguments the other debater made, as well as outline his/her own main points. Each of these points should be signposted, explained, supported by relevant facts and examples, and given impact. Debaters must learn to think on their feet, adding and elaborating upon arguments while speaking. However, unlike Parliamentary Debate, all time is protected. A speaker may not interrupt another.

Resolutions
- A different resolution for each round will be used. The list of all possible resolutions will be presented to the debaters during supplemental re-registration. The list will include approximately 20 resolutions.
- All resolutions debated will be straight resolutions (meant to be debated literally) in the form of “Be it resolved that…”
- The topic of each round will be about current affairs or philosophy. The resolutions will be general enough that a well-educated high school student can debate them. They will be phrased in literal language.
- Resolutions to be debated might include:
  - Be it resolved that the Middle East peace process is futile.
  - Be it resolved that the minimum wage in the United States should be reduced.
  - Be it resolved that looting is morally acceptable in times of crisis.

Objective of the Debate
- The proposition debater must affirm the resolution by presenting and defending a sufficient case for that resolution. The opposition debater must oppose the resolution and/or the proposition debater’s case. If, at the end of the debate, the judge believes that the proposition debater has supported and successfully defended the resolution, s/he will be declared the winner. If the judge believes the opposition debater has successfully undermined the case for the resolution, s/he will be declared the winner.

During the Debate
- No published materials (dictionaries, magazines, books, etc.), prepared arguments, or resources for the debaters’ use in the debate may be brought into the competition room.
- Debaters may refer to any information that is within the realm of knowledge of liberally educated and informed citizens. Judges will disallow specific information only in the event that no reasonable person could have access to the information: e.g., information that is from the debater’s personal family history.

### Format • Time Limits

| Proposition Constructive | 2 min |
| Cross-Examination of Proposition | 1 min |
| Opposition Constructive | 2 min |
| Cross-Examination of Opposition | 1 min |
| Mandatory Prep Time | 1 min |
| Proposition Rebuttal | 2 min |
| Opposition Rebuttal | 2 min |
| Mandatory Prep Time | 1 min |
| Proposition Rebuttal | 2 min |
| Opposition Rebuttal | 2 min |

**Total: 16 min**
THE KANSAS CITY AREA is an excellent location for the 2010 LFG/NFL National Speech and Debate Tournament. To make planning a little easier, the national office is happy to provide a preliminary overview of the tournament. Please keep in mind that all logistics are tentative and subject to change.

A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE TOURNAMENT LOGISTICS

• **Sunday (Registration)**
  
  This year, the tournament registration and NFL vending expo will take place on Sunday, June 13, from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. at the KCI Expo Center. The KCI Expo Center is centrally located from all hotels and other competition venues.

• **Monday and Tuesday (Preliminary Rounds/Early Elims/Host Party)**
  
  There will be six venue areas used for the preliminary competition. The Marriott KCI Airport and the Hilton KCI Airport will host Congressional Debate. Park Hill South High School will host Policy Debate. Park Hill High School/Congress Middle School will host Lincoln Douglas Debate and Public Forum Debate. Oak Park High School will host the Extemporaneous Speaking events and Original Oratory. Staley High School will host Humorous, Dramatic, and Duo Interpretation.
  
  All main event preliminary and early elimination competition on Monday and Tuesday will occur between 8 a.m. and 6 p.m.

  The local host party will take place in downtown Kansas City, MO, at the Power and Light District and the adjacent College Basketball Experience. Students eliminated from main event competition on Tuesday will re-register for Wednesday supplemental events at the College Basketball Experience during the local host party.

• **Wednesday (Elimination Rounds/Supplemental Events)**
  
  There will be three venues used on Wednesday, June 17. Students who qualify for elimination round 9 of all main event speech and debate events (Interps, Original Oratory, US Extemp, International Extemp, Lincoln Douglas Debate, Policy Debate, and Public Forum Debate) will compete at Park Hill South High School on Wednesday. Congressional Debate semifinals will be held at the Marriott KCI Airport. Those students re-registered for supplemental events will compete at Park Hill High School/Congress Middle School on Wednesday. All competition will occur between 8 a.m. and 7 p.m. on Wednesday.

• **Thursday (Elim Rounds/Supp/Cons Events/Interp Finals/Diamond Awards)**
  
  On Thursday morning, debate elimination rounds will continue at Park Hill South High School. Congressional Debate will hold its final round sessions at the Hilton KCI Airport. All supplemental and consolation events will occur at Park Hill High School/Congress Middle School.

  On Thursday evening, attendees will enjoy the national final rounds of Humorous, Dramatic, and Duo Interpretation, as well as the Coaches’ Diamond Ceremony at the KCI Expo Center.

• **Friday (Supp/Cons/Main Event Finals and National Awards Assembly)**
  
  The remaining main event final rounds (Original Oratory, US Extemp, International Extemp, Lincoln Douglas Debate, Policy Debate, and Public Forum Debate), as well as the supplemental and consolation event finals, will be held throughout the day on Friday at the KCI Expo Center.

  On Friday evening, the National Awards Assembly will be held at the KCI Expo Center.

Do you have important questions about the logistics of the 2010 “Jazzin’ it up in KC” Nationals that weren’t answered here? Feel free to contact the National Office at 920-748-6206 or e-mail nfl@nflonline.org.
1. All schools should stay at one of the NFL recommended hotels. The lowest rates have been negotiated for our members. **Please do not stay outside the block.** Properties that do not appear on this list are likely highly inconvenient for participation in the tournament. Morning and afternoon traffic could add substantial time to your commute if you are located outside the block. In addition, hotels not on the list have no contractual obligation to the NFL and therefore, we cannot provide any level of reservation protection at these properties.

2. When calling hotels, all coaches must mention the NFL National Tournament block to receive the posted rate. **All room reservations within the block are subject to an automatic two-night non-refundable deposit per room to avoid double booking.**

3. **All** hotel properties on the NFL list are easily accessible and are within 15-20 minutes by interstate or surface streets of every Monday-Friday competition venue. The host Web site will have downloadable maps from every hotel to the KCI Expo Center, the KCI Airport, and the competition sites. You can print all needed maps before ever leaving home.

4. **The Congressional Debate hotels are the Marriott KCI Airport and the Hilton KCI Airport.** It is recommended that teams with congressional debaters stay at one of these two properties if possible. These hotels are an excellent choice in both price and feature. Travel time between each hotel is less than 10 minutes. The Hilton will host the preliminary sessions of the Senate and the final session of both the House and Senate. The Marriott will host the preliminary sessions of the House and the semifinal sessions of both the House and Senate.

5. It is recommended that coaches go to the individual Web sites of the hotels to determine which property fits the needs of their program. All hotels on the list are convenient to the tournament venues. Schools are encouraged to book early as hotel blocks will fill up rather quickly.

6. **Key Travel Times to Note:**
   - All hotels to KCI Expo Center (1 to 10 minutes)
   - All hotels to any of the schools (5 to 20 minutes)
   - Any school to any school (10 to 20 minutes)

7. **PLEASE LOOK AT A MAP!** Before reserving rooms, all coaches should look at a road atlas and an enlargement of the North KC area to get a better perspective on travel logistics. Also look at downloadable maps on the host Web Site. The key to a less stressful week is to seriously consider following the above lodging suggestions provided by the national office.

Additional tournament information (logistics, complete driving directions, maps, individual event schedules, etc.) will be available on the NFL Web site at [www.nfonline.org/NationalTournament](http://www.nfonline.org/NationalTournament) and at the local host site at [http://debatekc2010.org](http://debatekc2010.org).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No.</th>
<th>Hotel Name / Web Site</th>
<th>Address (in Kansas City, MO unless otherwise noted)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Rate (sorted by)</th>
<th>Amenities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marriott Kansas City Airport........................</td>
<td>775 Brasilia Avenue..................................</td>
<td>816-891-7500</td>
<td>$102 IP, AS, FC</td>
<td>SOLD OUT CONGRESS HOTEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hyatt Place Kansas City Airport....................</td>
<td>7600 NW 97th Terrace................................</td>
<td>816-891-0871</td>
<td>$109 CI, CB, OP, AS</td>
<td>SOLD OUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Holiday Inn KCI Airport and Expo Center........</td>
<td>11728 NW Ambassador Drive..........................</td>
<td>816-801-8400</td>
<td>$103 CI, R, IP, FC, AS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Radisson Hotel Kansas City Airport...............</td>
<td>11828 NW Plaza Circle................................</td>
<td>816-464-2423</td>
<td>$99 IP, FC, AS, R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>The Elms Resort and Spa.............................</td>
<td>401 Regent Street • Excelsior Springs, MO........</td>
<td>816-630-5500</td>
<td>$98 CF, FC, IP, OP, R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Candlewoods Suites KCI Airport...................</td>
<td>11110 NW Ambassador Drive..........................</td>
<td>816-886-9700</td>
<td>$96 FC, GL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Chase Suite Hotel....................................</td>
<td>9900 NW Prairie View Road............................</td>
<td>816-891-9099</td>
<td>$90 CB, FC, GL, OP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Comfort Inn Kansas City International Airport...</td>
<td>1201 Branch Street • Platte City, MO..............</td>
<td>816-858-5430</td>
<td>$90 CB, CI, AS, IP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Best Western Airport Inn and Suites..............</td>
<td>2512 NW Prairie View Road...........................</td>
<td>816-214-6027</td>
<td>$75 CB, FC, IP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hawthorn Suites by Windham Kansas City Airport</td>
<td>11951 Ambassador Drive................................</td>
<td>816-464-5500</td>
<td>$69 AS, CB, FC, IP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Howard Johnson Plaza Hotel KCI Airport.........</td>
<td>7301 NW Tiffany Springs Road.......................</td>
<td>816-268-1600</td>
<td>$67 AS, CB, FC, CI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Microtel Inn and Suites Kansas City Airport....</td>
<td>11831 NW Plaza Circle................................</td>
<td>816-270-1200</td>
<td>$50 AS, CB, CI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Extended Stay America............................</td>
<td>11712 NW Plaza Circle................................</td>
<td>816-270-7829</td>
<td>$34 GL, AS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAP LEGEND

CONGRESS SITES
1 • Marriott Kansas City Airport
11 • Hilton Kansas City Airport

VENUES
A • KCI Airport
B • KCI Expo Center
C • Park Hill High School / Congress Middle School
D • Park Hill South High School
E • Oak Park High School
F • Staley High School

HOTELS
0 • Best Western Airport Inn and Suites
1 • Marriott Kansas City Airport
2 • Hampton Inn Kansas City Airport
3 • Hawthom Suites by Wyndham Kansas City Airport
4 • Four Points by Sheraton KCI Airport
5 • Radisson Hotel Kansas City Airport
6 • Fairfield Inn & Suites Kansas City Airport
7 • Holiday Inn KCI Airport and Expo Center
8 • Extended Stay America
9 • Microtel Inn and Suites Kansas City Airport
10 • Super 8 / Country Inn KCI Airport
11 • Hilton Kansas City Airport
12 • Candlewood Suites KCI Airport
13 • Comfort Inn KCI Airport
14 • Residence Inn Kansas City Airport
15 • Chase Suite Hotel
16 • Drury Inn & Suites KCI
17 • Courtyard Kansas City Airport
18 • Embassy Suites Kansas City Airport
19 • Hyatt Place Kansas City Airport
20 • Sleep Inn Airport
21 • Howard Johnson Plaza Hotel KCI Airport
22 • American Inn
23 • Guesthouse International Hotel, Suites & Conference Center
24 • Hampton Inn - Kansas City / Liberty
25 • Holiday Inn KC Northeast
26 • The Elms Resort and Spa
27 • Comfort Inn Kansas City International Airport

AMENITIES LEGEND (opposite page)
AS = Airport Shuttle
CB = Complimentary Breakfast
CI = Complimentary Internet
FC = Fitness Center
GL = Guest Laundry
IP = Indoor Pool
OP = Outdoor Pool
R = Restaurant

REMINDER:
When you book, it is NFL policy that you reserve with an immediate two-night, non-refundable deposit to hold each room. The NFL must eliminate speculative booking (reserving rooms just in case you qualify) and double booking (booking two locations until you arrive). If you reserve excess rooms, you will be charged a two-night, non-refundable deposit on each room booked, even if cancelled later.

Note: Map is to scale, but hotel and venue notations are approximate.
Please look at a road atlas and enlargement of the North KC area to get a better perspective on travel logistics.
2010 NATIONAL TOURNAMENT VENUES

Marriott Kansas City Airport

Hilton Kansas City Airport

KCI Expo Center

Park Hill High School

Congress Middle School

Park Hill South High School

Oak Park High School

Staley High School

Jazzin’ it up in KC

NFL Nationals 2010
Need to rent a car?

HERTZ is the NFL’s official rental car company.

Whether you make reservations for travel through hertz.com, a travel agency, or global online travel sites such as Orbitz, Travelocity, etc., utilize your official Hertz/NFL discount code:

CV # 04JZ0001

Each time you place a reservation, you instantly qualify for member discounts!

Visit hertz.com or call 1-800-654-2240 today!

Series II – PHILOSOPHERS include: Plato, Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, Edmund Burke, Henry David Thoreau

The LD Great Philosopher Library

The Lincoln Douglas Great Philosopher Library Series provides separate, complete volumes on each of the ten most popular philosophers used in LD debate. You may order each volume individually, order Series I, Series II, or the complete 10 volume set.

Each volume contains a complete edited version of the philosopher’s most important work and an essay written by some of America’s outstanding LD debaters and teachers explaining the philosophy and demonstrating in a clear easy-to-understand manner how to use the philosophy to win debates!

SPECIAL FEATURES

• A complete text of the major original work of each philosopher
• Clear explanation of the philosophy espoused by each philosopher
• A focus on the world view of each philosopher: What is the nature of humankind? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good? What is the nature of the good?
• Application of each philosopher’s ideas to fundamental American values
• A guide for applying each philosopher’s ideas to Lincoln Douglas debate topics
• Strategies for indicting and refuting each philosopher in a debate round
• An easy-to-use method for utilizing each philosopher in structuring both the affirmative and negative cases

SERIES II – SPECIAL FEATURES

• Explanations on how to respond to each Series II philosopher... from contemporary theorists, such as Rawls, Nozck and others. A guide to using the philosophical theories, as well as attacking their use.

Why the Lincoln Douglas Library of Great Philosophers?

• Greater student understanding: The student has access to the actual text. Reading isolated quotations without access to the whole text leads to misunderstanding and confusion. The complete essay accompanying the text guides the student in a correct understanding of the text.
• An excellent teaching tool: Students can use the text and the essay as the basis for class discussions, reports, etc., in preparation for the actual debates.
• Winning debates: The text applies the philosophy to the Lincoln Douglas debate format in an easy-to-use way. Better debating is inevitable!

ORDER FORM

PLEASE SEND ME
THE LD GREAT PHILOSOPHER LIBRARY SERIES

| Copies of THE LD GREAT PHILOSOPHER LIBRARY SERIES - The entire 10 Volume Set | $130.00 per set of ten volumes |
| Copies of PHILOSOPHER LIBRARY SERIES I - 5 Volume Set | $75.00 per set |
| Copies of PHILOSOPHER LIBRARY SERIES II - 5 Volume Set | $75.00 per set |

PHILOSOPHER LIBRARY SERIES I:

| Copies of JOHN STUART MILL, “On Liberty” | $17.00 per copy |
| Copies of JOHN LOCKE, “The Second Treatise of Government” | $17.00 per copy |
| Copies of JEAN-JACQUES Rousseau, “The Social Contract” | $17.00 per copy |
| Copies of THOMAS HOBBES, “The Theory of Individual Rights, The Leviathan” | $17.00 per copy |
| Copies of IMMANUEL KANT, “The Categorical Imperative - The Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals” | $17.00 per copy |

PHILOSOPHER LIBRARY SERIES II:

| Copies of PLATO, “The Republic” | $17.00 per copy |
| Copies of ARISTOTLE, “The Politics” | $17.00 per copy |
| Copies of THOMAS AQUINAS, “The Just War Theory” | $17.00 per copy |
| Copies of EDMUND BURKE, “Reflections on the French Revolution” | $17.00 per copy |
| Copies of HENRY DAVID THOREAU, “On Civil Disobedience” | $17.00 per copy |

NAME___________________________

ADDRESS__________________________

CITY__________STATE____ZIP_______

TOTAL AMOUNT ENCLOSED $__________

• Make Checks Payable to COMMUNICAN, P.O. Box 20243, Waco, TX 76702
• Credit extended to educational institutions and libraries only upon receipt of a valid purchase order number.
• Publication date June 10, 2008. All pre-paid orders shipped free.
• All items will be shipped free and handling.
• Fax (254) 848-4473. Phone: (254) 848-5959 Email: communican@hot.net.com
• Order Forms Available Online: www.communican.org
Outstanding Books On:

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially reduce its military and/or police presence in one or more of the following: South Korea, Japan, Afghanistan, Kuwait, Iraq, Turkey

The Most Complete and Comprehensive Debate Handbook in Two Volumes: Rapidly becoming the most important resource for high school debaters. Includes 4000 pieces of recent evidence, an outstanding index, fully explained strategies, and evidence which meets all recommended NFL citation standards. Almost all evidence since 2008. Evidence focuses on hard-to-find books not included in electronic databases.

ORDER FORM

PLEASE SEND ME:

NATIONAL DEBATE HANDBOOK

1-5 sets $54.95 per set
6 or more $39.95 per set

THE NEGATIVE VOLUME

1-5 volumes $34.95 each
6 or more $24.95 each

THE AFFIRMATIVE VOLUME

1-5 volumes $34.95 each
6 or more $24.95 each

TEACHER’S PUBLIC SPEAKING RESOURCE BOOK $89.95 per copy

TEACHER’S DEBATE COURSE RESOURCE BOOK $89.95 per copy

2010 SUPPLEMENT TO TEACHER’S DEBATE RESOURCE BOOK $40.00 per copy

CD of KRITIK KILLER: WINNING ANSWERS TO THE CRITIQUE $30.00 per CD copy

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY STATE ZIP

TOTAL AMOUNT ENCLOSED $ ______________________

Make Checks Payable to COMMUNICAN, P.O. Box 20243, Waco, TX 76702.

Credit extended to educational institutions and libraries only upon receipt of a valid purchase order number.

Publication date June 5, 2010. All pre-paid orders shipped free.

Orders will be charged for shipping and handling.

Fax (254) 848-4473 Phone (254) 848-5959 Email: communican@hot.net

Order Forms Available Online: www.communican.org
HONOR YOUR STUDENTS

With custom plaques from the NFL!

PERPETUAL PLAQUES
(also available in Walnut)
Medium 10.5 x 13" (18 students) • Large 12 x 15" (24 students)

5 x 7" ENGRAVED STUDENT SERVICE PLAQUE
Perfect for chapter officers, tournament volunteers, and other deserving students

We have additional sizes and styles available! To customize your award, or for more information, contact Andrea Neitzel at andrea.neitzel@nationalforensicleague.org or 920-748-6206.

www.nflonline.org/community/catalog/89/plaques
I am one of those people who always seems to have something to say. Whether it be about politics, movies, pop culture, or sports, I am rarely at a loss for words. The Irish part of my family blames it on the Blarney Stone while my mother (probably more accurately) blames it on my father. Second-generation forensic kid and coach—there is no doubt that my tendency to gab runs in the family. But despite the breadth of topics that I find myself discussing, often I find that I say the things I want to say rather than the things I need to say.

Yes, there actually is a difference. We enjoy saying the things we want to say. The things we want to say include answering a question correctly in class, proclaiming how our team is the best after winning an important game, or offering a compliment or praise to an acquaintance or someone we admire. Sometimes the things we want to say coincide with the things we need to say, but not always. Usually the things we need to say are the things that society writes off as unimportant, or that the media finds unexciting and not worth of an inch of column space. Whether it is a simple thank you, an earnest apology, asking for help, or being genuinely happy and congratulatory to an opponent who placed higher than you did—things that we need to say can be hard. After four years within the competitive world of forensics and a year of college in my back pocket, the thing I need to say is, thank you.

Thank you… for giving me the chance to succeed.

From the National Forensic League and all its sponsors to the coaches and competitors who have come before, thank you for blazing the trail which has allowed hundreds of thousands of students to claim membership in the oldest honor society in the United States. Thank you for the constant support and behind the scenes work that most of us will never see—whether planning, hosting, and running the National Tournament, creating a system to support districts and coaches, or working to create partnerships with colleges and organizations that support NFL alumni as we continue on our own journeys.

Thank you to the coaches, specifically in Colorado Grande (and particularly, my parents), who have offered support, encouragement, guidance, and more than a few laughs along the way. Colorado Grande has been more than an NFL district; it has been my family and continues to be a year after graduation. Thank you for never giving up on me and never letting me pretend that something was my best effort when it was far short of it. Thank you for not only seeing my potential but the potential of those around me and forming us into a group of leaders that have the ability to go out and change the world. You all have been for me what I know other coaches around the nation have been to their students: a coach, a friend, a rock of support, an inspiration. Thank you.

Thank you… for providing a constant reminder of humility.

I honestly cannot thank my parents enough for all the support, love, encouragement, and coaching (at times more than I wanted) over the years. The two of them work harder than any of us on the St. Mary’s team ever have, and we often forget to say thank you for driving us absolutely insane and giving us the skills to compete successfully while keeping forensics an enjoyable experience. But the skills and success are not what I am most thankful for; I am most thankful for being reminded to be humble.

When my dad competed for the Saint Ignatius forensic team in high school, my grandfather seemed to have an odd way of celebrating his success. After my dad came home from a successful tournament with a trophy or award in hand, my grandfather would praise my father and then simply tell him to take out the trash. My grandfather’s lesson was simple; no matter what you achieve or what honor you receive, humility is an invaluable quality. You are never too good to take out the trash. This idea resonated with my dad and his siblings (who—in their own time—all took out the trash as a celebration for something), and became a celebration tradition that my parents passed on to me.

Taking out the trash always served as two reminders in my career. It was an obvious reminder of humility in life, just as my

---

Student of the Year Spotlight

by Danielle Camous

---

Rostrum
grandfather intended, but it always appeared as a parallel to my own high school forensic career. In order to accomplish something noteworthy I had to do the hard and (often) less-than-pleasant work. I couldn’t just skate by, but had to truly roll up my sleeves and work, even if it sometimes meant completing a task that I would rather not do (like taking out the trash). I learned that, not only will I never be too good for a job, but that the hard, less-than-pleasant work is often a necessity. Through that hard work, we gain the skills necessary to succeed.

Humility is something that our culture seems to lack as a whole, so thank you for always making me take out the trash. (My 5’4” frame is just too small for a big head!)

Thank you… for constant support and friendship.

A number of my closest friends, heroes, favorite confidants, and role models are all NFL alumni. I thought those who competed with (or against) me in high school were the only ways this forensic community would make an impact on my life, and I thought that imprint would only be seen in the high school chapter of my life. I have never been more wrong.

Almost a full year after my last high school forensic round, other alumni from the NFL family continue to make a profound impact on my life. From the friends across the US who still allow me to call in favors or offer a supportive shoulder when life becomes overwhelming, to the friend who convinced me to join mock trial, then taught and coached me from across the country… all I can say to you is, thank you. Thank you for all of the support you have given, the challenges you have issued, and the memories that we continue to share.

The competitive chapter of our lives may be over but our friendship and love know no bounds. From California to Pennsylvania, Oregon to Massachusetts, Texas to Connecticut, Indiana to Washington DC, and everywhere in between, you have been a shining light in my life and in the lives of so many more. I hope that our paths will continue to cross in the future and that we can journey a while longer together… because at some point, I expect that we will be changing to the world together. Until then (for all the time I never said it), thank you for all that you have done for me both in high school and long after our Saturdays in a high school cafeteria ended.

To all those who have been named as their district’s Student of the Year and to those who will be named National Student of the Year Finalists, congratulations! This award serves as a thank you from your district for everything you have done! Be grateful and honored to represent such a spectacular Class of ’10! Congratulations, once again. It is now your turn to say thank you…

**About the Author**

Danielle Camous is the 2009 NFL Student of the Year. An alumna of St. Mary’s High School in Colorado Springs, CO, Danielle earned awards in debate, congress, and US Extemp during her four-year career and achieved a degree of Premier Distinction. She is now a student at the University of Colorado at Boulder.
Run your tournament **online** affordably!

SpeechWire

**tournament services**

Speech - Debate - Congress

The **easy-to-use** web-based system

Join the **hundreds** of coaches who have already experienced the **SpeechWire** difference:

**Registration, Scheduling, Tabulation and Results Posting**

**Faster -- Easier -- Accurate -- Detailed**

- Online invitations and **registration**
- Easy-to-follow **setup wizard**
- **Runs online** - no software to install
- All you need is a **web browser**
- Run on **any number of computers**
- Fast, smart and fair **scheduling**
- Customizable **tabulation**
- **Post results** online with one click
- **Free tech support:** phone and email
- **Used hundreds of times** in 12 states
- **Anything** from invites to state finals

Coaches have already used SpeechWire to run tournaments in California, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Virginia, West Virginia and Wisconsin. If your state is listed, SpeechWire can probably already run your tournament; if not, we can work together to customize SpeechWire to your needs. SpeechWire has also already been used to run entire state final series.

Learn more at [www.SpeechWire.com](http://www.SpeechWire.com)
Stanford National Forensic Institute  
2010 Lincoln Douglas Program

SNFI is built upon a long history of educational and competitive success. SNFI teaches students to excel in forensics by thinking critically and arguing persuasively, and achieves success for all students with a focus upon:

Quality Instructors
SNFI knows that generally speaking, the best instructors are not the youngest instructors. We focus on hiring the most experienced instructors, and the most successful coaches of competitors. Our faculty has coached competitors to outrounds and championships at the most prestigious tournaments around the country including NCFLL, NFLs, and TOC. Our instructors know how to create champions at every level of competition. Recent faculty expected to return include Tim Hogan (Apple Valley), David Weeks (Swarthmore), Mike Spiratos (The Meadows School), Nadia Arid (Presentation), Johanna Tyler (UT Austin), Beena Koshy (formerly of Sacred Heart), Ari Parker (Glenbrook North), and Dan Meyers who serves as the Division Director for Lincoln Douglas (The Meadows School). Detailed staffing info will be available on the website by March.

Carefully Crafted Curriculum
SNFI's curriculum carefully balances lab time, practice rounds, mandatory lectures, and electives. All labs are led by our expert faculty with a special eye to balancing the skills of the instructors with the needs of each student. Each student will participate in a minimum of 10 critiqued practice rounds; most participate in more. Our lecture series focuses on providing students with solid foundations in both debate and philosophy. Labs then focus on implementation of those concepts so that students can see how to utilize each lecture. Our elective series allows students the freedom to choose an in-depth investigation of a skill or philosophy of their choosing.

Unique 3rd Week Experience
The optional 3rd Week of camp allows students to focus on practicing with some of the best instructors in the country, and provides introductory rounds on the September-October National topic. Each student is guaranteed ten or more practice rounds. There is no better way to get ready for the beginning of the season than to have already had two tournaments worth of rounds critiqued by our expert faculty.

LD Two-Week session: July 25 - August 7
Resident: $2,210*  Commuter: $1,750*

LD Third Week Session: August 7 - August 14
Resident: $1,440*  Commuter: $1,150*

*Prices are tentative and subject to change.

Phone: 650-723-9086  Web: www.snfi.org  Email: info@snfi.org
Best Sellers

Visit us online to learn more about our educational book and DVD resources—many developed or selected by champion coaches from across the country!

Over 30 speech and debate titles ready to download at your fingertips

Popular downloadable resources from CDE, The Interp Store, and Victory Briefs are also available!

LEARN MORE

www.nflonline.org/community/catalog
First, ask yourself this question. If you could buy a certificate for $20 that entitled you to go to a local florist and receive a FREE bouquet of flowers every month for an entire year (that’s 12 bouquets), would you buy it? Believe it or not, that’s what this fundraiser is all about!

Your organization can easily raise up to $3,000 within 3-7 weeks!

Our program WORKS!

• There is no upfront money; our product is consigned to you.
• An outstanding value for only $20!
• There is no local competition with this product.
• The certificate is valid for an entire year from date sold.

Congratulations to the following coaches who have earned specific levels of accreditation:

- Shawn Briscoe, South Anchorage High School, AK, PFC
- Derek Yuill, Gabrielson High School, CA, APFE, PFC, APFC
- William S. Hicks, Brebeuf Jesuit Prep, IN, PFE, APFE, PFC, APFC
- Holly Hathaway, Connersville High School, IN, PFE, APFE, PFC, APFC
- Laura Whitcombe, McCutcheon High School, IN, PFE, APFE, PFC
- Tammy Daugherty, Munster High School, IN, PFE, PFC
- Harold Easton, Marianas High School, MP, PFE, PFC
- Lyle R. Linderode, Gahanna Lincoln High School, OH, PFE, APFE, PFC, APFC
- Cody Duncan, Borger High School, TX, PFE, PFC
- Deanne Christensen, Oak Ridge High School, TX, PFE
- Adam J. Jacobi, National Forensic League, WI, PFE, PFC, APFC

Four levels of accreditation are offered: coaches and educators must be active NFL member coaches to receive the accreditation. To learn more about earning NFL Accreditation, visit www.nflonline.org/Main/Accreditation.
Why YOU should be in Denton for the Mean Green Workshops

✓ New LOWER PRICES for 2010! You won’t find value like this anywhere else.
✓ Unbelievable staff! Why pay thousands more to access some of the best minds in debate?
✓ Incredible student-faculty ratio: 4 to 1 with 291 students in 2009!
✓ Library system designated a major research library by the U.S. Department of Education!
✓ Multiple computer lab access and wireless access in every building on campus!
✓ Safety and comfort are the primary concerns for Residential Life Director Kandi King!

Policy Debate

Director: Dr. Brian Lain, University of North Texas

Four Week Session: June 20 - July 17, 2010 $3100
Three Week Session: June 20 - July 10, 2010 $2200
Two Week Session: June 20 - July 3, 2010 $1600
Skills Session: July 10 - July 17, 2010 $1000

Alumni tell us the Skills Session was their most valuable camp experience ever!
Your coach works with you, your partner & one other team for the entire week!
Participate in a variety of skill debates & a mini-tournament. 16 rounds in ’09!
Designed for all levels!

Lincoln-Douglas Debate

Director: Aaron Timmons, Greenhill School

Three Week Session: June 20 - July 10, 2010 $2200
Two Week Session: June 20 - July 3, 2010 $1600

Congressional Debate, Public Forum Debate, & Public Speaking

Director: Cheryl Potts, Plano Senior High School

Two Week Session: June 20 - July 3, 2010 $1600

No Application Fees! Check out our website with store, online registration, evidence, forums, & more:

www.meangreenworkshops.com

For more information, write Institute Director Jason Sykes:
director@meangreenworkshops.com
**Summer Forensics Institute**

**JULY 11-24, 2010**

**WHY CHOOSE BRADLEY?**

*Bradley's summer camp creates winners.*

*Bradley's forensics team is the most successful team in the nation's history.*

*Bradley is affordable.*

$995 includes two weeks of coaching, instruction, room and board, and there are no hidden charges or add-ons.

*We focus on process over product.*

At Bradley's camp, students leave with a polished product and the time-tested process to make all their pieces shine.

*Our coaches travel, judge, and coach on a national circuit.*

They know what other judges are looking for and can help you create it.

*Let's face it—size does matter.*

Our team of top high school and college coaches will give you the personal attention you require and teach you everything you need to succeed in forensics competition. Bradley is the right size for you.

**WANT MORE INFO?**

Emily Skocaj: Continuing Education  
309.677.3900; eskocaj@bradley.edu

Dan Smith: Director of Forensics  
309.677.2439; dan@bradley.edu

www.bradley.edu/continue
Why Do We Do Policy Debate?

by James M. Kellams

Since 1973, Louisville High School, one of the smallest schools in the Eastern Ohio NFL District, has produced more than 250 state qualifiers, five state champions, more than 40 national qualifiers, and 11 national finalists. The Louisville High School Speech and Debate Club success is guided by a mission statement which proclaims, “The Speech and Debate club is about non-violent, civil disobedience. It is about expression of ideas, and the desire to be heard and change the way people think.” At Louisville, students in the debate program are encouraged to respectfully question the status quo and to become proactive in their quest for the truth. After all, we believe this is the mission of forensics: to find and proclaim the truth and such exploration empowers the individual.

For Louisville and others in the Eastern Ohio district, Policy Debate encapsulates all that is right about forensics. It is the most rigorous of all forms of debate in National Forensic League competition, pushing the students to the limits of their ability and beyond, as well as pushing common standards about how they view the world. While other forms of debate also encourage students to examine both sides of an issue or exercise critical thinking, Policy Debate allows students the opportunity to engage the issues to a much greater degree than other debate categories which frequently change topics. Policy Debate enables students to recognize the far-reaching implications of an issue which often transcend philosophies, ideologies, and national boundaries. One soon realizes that a simple plan, for example, to increase social services for persons living in poverty in the United States, has links to the devastating impacts of hunger, slavery, and dehumanization on a global scale. When a student’s mind is expanded in such a way, one is capable of recognizing how addressing seemingly insignificant issues at home can link to favorable changes for people who are often out of sight and forgotten in other parts of the world. Policy Debate thus becomes an instrument for social change not as a consequence of the activity itself, which is nothing more than spoken words delivered in coded jargon in a closed room at an auctioneer’s pace. Rather, Policy Debate facilitates social change because it expands global awareness, encourages expression of ideas in the face of opposition, and sparks many to proactive participation in activities and careers which give back to their communities.

These days, speech and debate programs throughout the region have been evaluating the benefits of Policy Debate against the perceived negatives. By now, all have heard the criticisms of jargon-laced speeches delivered at excessive speed and high maintenance costs resulting in a uniquely specialized, “elitist” activity which limits community involvement. As a result we are seeing many programs eliminate Policy Debate. Undoubtedly, Policy Debate is evolving, driven by the need to adapt to under-funded programs, and the increase in popularity of other forms of debate, some of which are intentionally structured to be unlike Policy Debate. At Louisville, we see the positive effects Policy Debate has on the educational process of individual students, and so we choose to adapt to the various budget and administrative constraints by training new judges and coaches, shifting to electronic-based evidence repositories, and encouraging students to see Policy Debate as a personal challenge to be conquered rather than feared. The personal benefits one gains are just too great to be dismissed for reasons which often boil down to nothing more than a judge’s preference.

We would encourage coaches and program administrators to not focus on the outward presentation of a complex activity like Policy Debate. Look under the hood and evaluate the massive challenge that Policy debaters routinely overcome to compete in an activity that is life-changing and so personally rewarding that students often credit their successes to their high school debate experience.

Every year, thousands of students engage in hundreds of thousands of hours of research and rehearsal pouring over millions of words to engage in a program of competitive rhetoric debating pressing social issues. Yet for all the sound and fury, very rarely does it result in meaningful public dialogue and not a single debated issue is solved as a result of high school debate. So why do we do it? Clearly, debate is an educational activity designed to empower students with life-enriching skills, and Policy Debate is one of the most effective at achieving this objective. The Louisville mission statement says, “...It is about expression of ideas, and the desire to be heard and change the way people think.” At Louisville, we are seeing the mission come to fruition, as those former state qualifiers interact with their community, changing the way people think. This is how Policy Debate effects real and lasting social change. This is why we do Policy Debate.

About the Author

James M. Kellams is Debate Coach for Louisville High School in northeastern Ohio. He has been passionately involved in the debate program for five years, and this is his first year as a certified assistant coach under Kelly Ladd, Director of Forensics at Louisville High School.
See what’s new on NFLtv.org

More than 200 videos now available!
THE BEST OF NATIONALS!

Spring into Action with the 2009 Final Round DVDs from the NFL!

Only $180.00

SPRING SPECIAL

Order by May 31, 2010, and get a voucher for $10 off your order of the 2010 Final Round DVDs!

Pre-order your 2010 set TODAY!

NATIONAL FORENSIC LEAGUE
125 Watson Street • PO Box 38 • Ripon, WI 54971
(p) 920-748-6206 • (f) 920-748-9478
www.nflonline.org
**Champion Coaches**

**Championing Tomorrow’s Champions**

**Florida Forensic Institute**
and
**National Coaches Institute**

Regular Session: July 23 - August 6, 2010
Optional Extension: August 6 - 9, 2010

**MEET OUR BLUE RIBBON STAFF**

- **Bob Marks**, Director of Curriculum
- **Lisa Miller**, Nova High School
- **Chris McDonald**, Eagan High School
- **Jeff Welty**, Durham High School
- **Adam Jacobi**, NFL Coordinator of Programs and Education
- **Jeff Hannan**, NFL National Champion, Evanston Township High School
- **Bret Hemmerlin**, NFL National Champion, Roseville High School
- **Natalie Sintek**, NFL National Champion, Professional Actress and Comedian
- **Hoang (Mario) Nuguyen**, NFL National Champion, Plano Sr. High School, Western Kentucky University
- **Ben Robin**, Western Kentucky University
- **Nicholas Gilyard**, Two-time Emory Champion and Harvard Champion, Nova High School
- **Lindsey White**, NFL National Champion, Harvard Champion, Eastview High School
- **Special Guest Lecturer**: **J. Scott Wunn**, Executive Director of the NFL

**Now offering training for middle school (grades 6-8) students and coaches!**

- Small labs with top instructors from across the country
- Specialized curriculum for all levels of expertise
- Individual attention
- Supervised hotel accommodations
- Excellent research and instructional facilities
- Affordable tuition for a CHAMPIONSHIP EXPERIENCE
- Optional session extension gives students a chance to delve further or switch gears

**www.ffi4n6.com**

_read more about some of these coaches below!_

**Chris McDonald** is the Director of Debate Activities for Eagan High School, in Eagan, Minnesota. An active, successful debate and speech coach for the past 19 years, Mr. McDonald is currently the President of the Minnesota Debate Teachers Association, as well as the District Chair for the Southern Minnesota NFL District. Mr. McDonald’s students have compiled an impressive resume of success in both debate and speech. He has coached more than 50 students to the NFL National Speech and Debate tournament, where they have achieved three NFL National Championships and two runner-ups in Extemporaneous Speaking.

**Adam Jacobi** previously coached for more than a decade at Rufus King International Baccalaureate (IB) High School in Milwaukee, WI, where he taught courses in speech communication and IB Theatre. A two-diamond NFL coach, Mr. Jacobi coached students to NFL championships in the Senate, House, Congress Presiding Officer, and Extemporaneous Commentary, as well as an NCFL champion Policy Debate team and a Harvard National Congress champion. Mr. Jacobi is Coordinator of Programs and Education for the National Forensic League. He also is an adjunct instructor of communication and assistant forensic coach at Ripon College.

**Ben Robin** has coached the Western Kentucky University forensic team for the past five years. During those five years, the team has earned four American Forensics Association and four National Forensic Association national team championships. An outstanding teacher/coach, Mr. Robin is an excellent addition to what is considered to be the finest Original Oratory staff in the nation.

**Natalie Sintek** was the 2004 National Humorous Interpretation Champion of the National Forensic League and the 2004 National Catholic Forensic League Champion in Dramatic Performance. A graduate of Eagan High School in Eagan, Minnesota, she completed her bachelor’s degree at Western Kentucky University, where she helped lead her team to national and international championships. Her personal collegiate championships are many, but what makes Ms. Sintek stand out even more is that she won national and international titles in interpretation, platform, and debate events. As an educator, she has coached students to final and semi-final rounds at the NFL and CFL Nationals.

_Not all summer forensic institutes are created equal—and at FFI, we continue to prove it!_
Unit Plan in Storytelling: Understanding the Human Experience

by Adam Jacobi

Master creative writing expert, author, and leader of the highly praised Story Seminar, Robert McKee has inspired award-winning screenplays and novels. His poignant words capture the essence of why storytelling is so important: “Stories are the creative conversion of life itself into a more powerful, clearer, more meaningful experience. They are the currency of human contact.”

In her performance, Smith plays members of the trial jury, the LA Police Commissioner, a Black community activist, a Latino journalist, Congresswoman Maxine Waters, Cornel West, and a Korean liquor store owner, among others. She splices and weaves segments of narrative monologues together, much like the collegiate American Forensic Association event of Program Oral Interpretation. The result is a cogent dialectic that shows how individuals construct their own interpretation of a situation through their own experiences and reality, and allows audience members to arrive at their own conclusion, based on the perspectives presented. “We need to reach for the core of our humanity with all its glory and all its challenges. I am looking to illuminate something about our humanness. The solutions lie not in my monologues but in the collaborative humanness of audience members who walk out of the theater with the potential to make change.” (Smith)

Smith brings credibility as a MacArthur Genius Award winner and scholarship as a professor at New York University School of Law and Tisch School of the Arts (and previously at Stanford University). She also brings experience as a television actress on such shows as The West Wing—where she played national security advisor, Nancy McNally—and Nurse Jackie, where she plays Gloria Akalitus. Several years ago, I attended a coaching workshop led by Dr. Peter Pober, now director of forensics at George Mason University. Pober eloquently described how performance theorist Antonin Artaud conceived of a walking scrapbook notion, where a performer would draw on observation of mannerisms of the people s/he encountered throughout life.

Anna Deavere Smith certainly captures distinct subtlety in her performance of myriad characters without appearing superficial. Smith’s lifelong fascination with language and linguistics also allows her to convey the verbal nuances, enhancing the authenticity of the dialogue, and therefore,
performance. In fact, Smith describes the way people share their experiences as being like singing, which has varying rhythm and passion. Her interviewees, who provide the real life experiences that Smith transcribes verbatim into dialogue for performance, often take a circuitous path to elucidating the heart of the story they’re telling. Smith upholds the importance of this as providing insight into the reality of that individual.

The stage script was adapted to a screen version that aired on PBS—complete with footage from the LA riots—and is available for a reasonable cost with several teaching aids. There’s also an episode of PBS NOW, where Smith is interviewed about Twilight: Los Angeles, 1992, and it provides some valuable perspectives about her process. While as a matter of practice, I would usually show just excerpts of films in the classroom, there is a particular benefit to seeing Smith’s argument develop, holistically. The quality of reflective journal entries, discussion, and inspirational stimulus to students is worth the investment in a few class periods.

Understanding Goals

The art of storytelling as performance can be traced to ancient Greece, where Thespis was acclaimed as the first winner of a theatrical competition in Dionysia, Athens. Along with Western society’s rhetorical roots in Aristotle, the Dionysian festival provides theatrical lineage, which is why actors are often called thespians to this day. In fact, the Educational Theatre Association’s International Thespian Society, the honorary society for theatre, calls its chapters “Thespians.”

In the interpretive realm of forensics, performance theories and techniques are akin to theatre, and all can find their root in the tradition of storytelling. In the NFL, Storytelling as a competitive event exists as a consolation event at the National Tournament, whereas several state leagues offer it as a regular category. In Wisconsin Storytelling, for instance, a student must prepare four or five stories based on prescribed annual topic areas, and deliver a different story of up to eight minutes, each round of competition, at a singular tournament.

Storytelling involves endowing a sense of audience mood through the tone of performance. In forensics, this tends to be children, but depending on the circumstances, could be a council of elders. There’s also a sense of spontaneity. Acting theorist Konstantin Stanislavski advised actors to rehearse to be spontaneous on stage. The paradox here is that the repetition of practice would seem to create a uniform product. The challenge is to be as impulsive as a good jazz musician, to play off the audience and the energy of the moment.

The beauty of this unit is that in the development of a coherent, cohesive story narrative, it encourages critical thinking that extends to the top of Bloom’s Taxonomy. In terms of National Standards for Theatre Education (developed by the American Alliance for Theatre Education and the Educational Theatre Association), it meets all content standards enumerated, especially if an analysis of Twilight: Los Angeles, 1992 is used as a generative topic.

Performances of Understanding

Lessons to accompany Twilight: Los Angeles, 1992 may vary, depending on the course, and in a more traditional speech communication or social studies class, could be done as an ethnographic study of cross cultural communication. Encouraging students to actively listen and watch, take notes, and write a two to three page reflective journal entry for homework following each class period is a great way to ensure they are thinking critically about their observations. Subsequent class discussion of the issues, Smith’s process of gathering the interviews and her subsequent performance tactics are also relevant.

A great benchmark lesson to use in tandem with this unit is the Physical Analysis described in this Rostrum column in March 2009. Building on the tenets of physical analysis, ask students to interview someone in their neighborhood, place of worship, family, or workplace. Teaching students effective interviewing techniques is important, but in this context, it’s important for them to allow the interviewee to tell the story on his/her own terms and in his/her own time. Audio recording the interview is encouraged, so the student can replay it, to study the paralanguage, tempo, and filler phrases the interviewee uses. If the student is unable to audio record that, they should take detailed notes, and add observations of those aforementioned qualities as soon after the interview concludes as possible, so as not to lose the authenticity of characterizing their subject.

It helps to conference with students as they cull their interview material to create the narrative story. Depending on the time constraints, students may have to condense, but they should include the major plot devices. Professor of theatre education at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Dr. Robin Mello calls the individual moments of stories “bones,” and students should assemble a skeleton outline. This allows them to deliver the story extemporaneously to sustain spontaneity. Dr. Mello’s Storytelling course provides much of the model for this unit plan.

Students also should workshop their story with a partner, or in a small group setting. This allows students to work collaboratively, give each other direction, and to help them bring details to the surface.

Along the way, so that students understand and appreciate the development process involved in building their story, they should keep a reflective journal. This also provides documentation of how effectively students are learning. They should also journal about classmates’ performances, as well as debrief their own. As a culminating journal entry, they should describe what they have learned about the human experience as a result.

Resources


About the Author
Adam Jacobi is the NFL’s Coordinator of Programs and Coach Education. A former two-diamond coach of three NFL champions and an NCFL champion, he has taught courses in speech communication and International Baccalaureate theatre.

About the Artist
Hyunyoung Kim is a senior at North Allegheny Senior High School. Born in Tucson, Arizona, she and her family moved to Korea when she was just three years old. Growing up, she participated in various intellectual and artistic activities ranging from choir concerts, school plays, and dance to art, piano, math, and science competitions. Through these experiences, she found her special talent in art and science. She came to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in 8th grade and later joined numerous clubs, including the speech and debate team. She currently plans to attend Cornell University.
Filling faster than a Los Angeles freeway

VICTORY BRIEFS INSTITUTE
on the campus of UCLA | www.victorybriefs.com

This year's program will be available the following dates:

Session I: July 11-24, 2010
Track Focus Week 1: July 25-31, 2010
Track Focus Week 2: August 1-7, 2010
Track Focus Week 3: August 8-14, 2010
Session II: August 8-21, 2010

Last year VBI filled in March.

Many students did not get off the waiting list. We recommend that you register early!

VBI 2009 Alumni have won the following tournaments so far this season*:


*as of January 26, 2010
When the pairings are released at a tournament it is not uncommon to see debaters and coaches scurrying off to look at pairings from previous rounds to see who they could talk to regarding the case positions or arguments of their upcoming opponent. Coaches talk to coaches that may have judged their upcoming opponent. Debaters will talk to their friends or teammates. Coaches will pull out the flows of the rounds they’ve judged to see if they can prepare their teams. People seem more than willing to share information with their friends and teammates, yet when there is a call for open disclosure, with the exception of Policy Debate, there is virtually zero participation.

Assumptions

I am going to start with the premise that some level case disclosure happens at most tournaments in one way or another. Case disclosure is the sharing of information regarding a competitor’s case. The case disclosure that is common typically takes the form of flow sharing between competitors, teammates, or a coach to a student. Based simply on observation, at the very least, disclosure happens within teams.

Thesis

Since disclosure happens anyway, it ought to be open to all competitors regardless of the number of teammates, coaches, or friends one has at any given tournament. The current “system” is exclusionary and often makes tournaments hurtful situations. It benefits large teams who either 1) bring many kids to tournaments or 2) have many judges in the judging pool, both of which go hand-in-hand. Finally, open disclosure provides the academic check and peer review of research that is common in all of academia.

The Case for Disclosure

1. Friendlier Tournament Atmosphere

One of the most frustrating things for me to watch is one debater being prepped out by a group of coaches or other debaters because they happened to know someone or are friendly with someone who either previously watched, judged, or debated against them, while the other debater just sits there and waits, not having any idea what their opponent is arguing. I don’t find the prep-out to be intrinsically frustrating. In fact, I have no qualms with coaches who help their debaters prepare for rounds. I even have less of a problem with teammates who help each other. My concern is for the debater who isn’t as connected, or doesn’t have as many teammates.

We haven’t done our job to make the activity kid-friendly when we maintain a system that isn’t friendly and collegial and instead inherently favors those who are connected.

2. Democratization of Power

The common response I hear from those who are against open disclosure is that they think it will cause “more work” at tournaments because everyone will know what is being run, so there will be pressure to prep. This concern, ironically, comes from coaches who have large teams and, when it comes time to want to prep (say, before a big outround), at their disposal are a large number of flows, friends who have judged or seen their opponents, or any number of ways to find out what is being run.

“Open disclosure provides the academic check and peer review of research that is common in all of academia.”

Thoughts on this article—or others? Comment on the NDCA Web site www.debatecoaches.org.
If you would like to submit an article to the NDCA Coaches Corner, please contact Mike Bietz at bietz@hwdebate.org.

Rostrum
Whether it is always used or not, the ability to exercise power at will is something that is reserved for those who are politically connected, have a large team, or have a number of judges in the pool. An open case list democratizes this power so that everyone has the ability to choose when s/he feels like prepping and when s/he doesn’t.

3. Academic Integrity

The idea of peer review is something that is not only accepted but is also expected in academia. Debate is a high-stakes activity. For many of our students, it is perhaps the primary extracurricular activity they will do in high school. For some of our students, the monetary and time costs associated are burdensome. Regardless of each individual’s commitment to the activity, academic integrity is not something we should take lightly.

If a student were to come to you with a case that uses evidence entirely from an unnamed personal blog that cites no sources or provides no qualification, would you accept it as a “good case?” Probably not. However, we do not treat what is said or presented in rounds with the same rigor that we would expect from the evidence we want our students to use in their cases. The ability for everyone to see what everyone else is quoting or using as evidence is important not only because it allows us to check to make sure that everything is done in an ethical and fair way, but also because it is academically proper to do so. We send the wrong message when we take this academic portion out of the competitive activity.

The reason why the high-stakes element of my argument is important is because we need to have a side constraint placed on the competitiveness of debate. We need to encourage integrity. Peer review is important to maintaining this integrity.

Concerns

I am genuinely eager to hear peoples’ concerns about open disclosure. A lot of people have the same objections, and I hope to respond to some of those. However, if you have concerns that are not raised here, I really hope you contact me so we can continue the discussion.

1. It harms the “little guy” because big teams will prep out everything.

As I outlined above, big teams already get many, many more flows than the smaller teams just because they have more debaters, more judges, and more coaches. Open disclosure gives everyone access to the same information. Additionally, it helps the “little guy” even more because for many of these debaters, the option of going to a lot of tournaments isn’t available. Open case disclosure gives them the ability to see what other teams are running prior to showing up to the tournament. Thus, there is an added benefit of equalizing not only information at a tournament, but also equalizing (to some degree) the playing field for people who do not have the resources to travel as much.

2. We will lose.

(No one will actually admit that this is a reason they are against case disclosure, but we all know it exists.) Not true. My team puts all of their cases on the NDCA wiki http://debatecoaches.org/wiki/index.php?title=2009-2010_Harvard-Westlake_School_(LA,_CA) since the beginning of the Jan./Feb. resolution, and haven’t done too poorly.

Second, many of the schools that contribute to the wiki are also schools that are very successful.

Third, see my previous argument about the open disclosure that happens anyway.

3. I don’t want to have to work so hard.

No one is going to force anyone to work. Right now the effort that is put into finding out what people are arguing is very difficult for some and very easy for others. A coach who has a team that has access to information with a single e-mail, text message, or instant message may see the case list as a way to increase their workload. But this coach has had the choice all along and will continue to do so. We ought to be looking out for the debater who is not connected or doesn’t have a coach or doesn’t have a big team. For them, the ability to see what everyone else is doing will level the playing field and at least help them overcome the most difficult barrier—the social/political one.

4. Kids won’t have to think on their feet.

Not true. The strategies and nuances that happen in a round are still spontaneous. The type of thinking on the feet that we should be encouraging is smart and thoughtful, and not one that encourages wacky case writing that might be on academically shaky ground. Many coaches like to analogize debate to the courtroom or to congress. In both scenarios, the tactic of surprise is not one that is used. Even if you were going to say that we are preparing students for the real world, encouraging surprise as a means of winning or doing well is something that is not sustainable. In academia and in the private sector, the expectation is that your arguments are well warranted, well researched, and well thought out. You are expected to have had many individuals vet your work. The same should be true in debate. There is plenty of opportunity to “think on your feet” in the course of a debate round. The basis however (the research, the evidence, the empirics) should not be something that we ought to leave to spontaneity.

Conclusion

Right now there is no conclusion to this debate. I do hope that debate can move toward the openness that we see happening all around us—in technology, in academia, and in newsgathering. This move toward openness is one that we ought to embrace. That said, I also understand that it is contrary to the paradigm many of us grew up with when it came to debate. Please contact me so we can further this discussion. I’m confident that there are ways we can make access to information and open disclosure suitable for all.

About the Author

Mike Bietz is a former president of the National Debate Coaches Association, director of the Victory Briefs Institute, and is the current debate coach at Harvard-Westlake School in Los Angeles. He welcomes all comments at bietz@hwdebate.org.
The National Forensic League proudly presents *Learning Lincoln Douglas Debate*. This is the perfect companion to the NFL’s online text and series of lesson plans, available at [www.teachingdebate.org/ld](http://www.teachingdebate.org/ld). This instructional DVD is intended as a tutorial for students and coaches alike, and can be used in the classroom, or to catch up a student who has missed instruction.

The DVD is hosted by two coaches who wrote the NFL’s Lincoln Douglas Debate lesson plan series. Hall of Fame coach Pam Cady Wycoff of Apple Valley High School in Minnesota introduces Lincoln Douglas Debate, explaining its benefits and what makes it unique. Coach Joe Vaughan of Scarsdale High School in New York brings his award-winning coaching experience and process-oriented mind as a science teacher to the segments that parallel the lesson plans:

- What is an Argument?
- Understanding Values
- Refutation and Clash
- Case Structure
- Research Methods
- Structure of a Round
- Cross-Examination
- Flowing
- Crystallization and Voting Issues

Additionally, the DVD includes a demonstration debate by two alumni champion debaters, with commentary by Mr. Vaughan.

[www.nflonline.org/community/catalog/82/dvds](http://www.nflonline.org/community/catalog/82/dvds)
Learn during the leisure of summer!

All modules are designed to be completed in 10 hours.

CONTINUING EDUCATION UNITS (CEUs)

Modules Currently Available:

• Basics of Extemporaneous Speaking
• Basics of Interpretation
• Basics of Parliamentary Procedure
• Ethics and Competitive Forensics
• Introduction to Lincoln Douglas Debate
• Introduction to NFL and HS Forensics
• Introduction to Original Oratory
• Introduction to Policy Debate
• Team Development and Management

Learn online, anytime.

www.mnsu.edu/nfl

contact Kathleen Steiner for more information • call 507.389.2213 • e-mail kathleen.steiner@mnsu.edu

EARN YOUR PROFESSIONAL ACCREDITATION FASTER!

That’s right. By earning CEUs, you will be one step closer to achieving one of the NFL’s four levels of professional accreditation. Visit our Web site today!

www.nflonline.org/CoachingResources/Accreditation
The following excerpt is a recap of a feature in November’s *Rostrum* (p. 11-12), giving context to changes in rules and procedures for Congressional Debate:

Senator John C. Stennis often advised people to “look ahead.” In that spirit, students who participate in the NFL’s district and national congress chambers simulate the legislative process by attempting to solve problems and change the status quo for the better. Since the National Forensic League held its first Student Congress in Wooster, Ohio in 1938, it has undergone several evolutions and spun off a number of different local variations. Despite change, the event continues to hold true to its mission, “promoting leadership and communication skills through rigorous interaction and debate on issues confronting our democracy” and it remains the one event that uses a real-world framework as a platform for discourse.

The Board of Directors recently passed a number of changes in Congress, culminating more than three years of discussion by three different committees, review by district leadership from across the country at two separate leadership conferences and an online survey. The changes address top concerns brought to board members and the national office alike, driving the following goals:

1. Create parity and respect between Congress and other main events
2. Attempt to bring conflicting rules into alignment
3. Simplify polices and procedures at both the district and national tournaments
4. Establish consistency and transparency (ease of implementation) among district tournaments
5. Establish a congressional debate model for all parts of the United States

At its core, Congress remains the same student-centered event, especially at the local and district level. Students originate topics for debate by writing bills and resolutions, they set their own agenda, they serve as presiding officers, and they give speeches and vote in support or opposition of legislation under the framework of parliamentary procedure.

*(continued on next page)*
“At its core, Congress remains the same student-centered event, especially at the local and district level.”

Legislation

The *docket* of legislation to be released May 10 will contain:
- 25 items of preliminary legislation
- 12 items of semifinal legislation
- 6 items of final legislation

In setting the order of business, students may propose an agenda or briefly caucus committees to propose an agenda. The agenda shall be determined by a majority vote by the chamber.

Schedule

There will be four preliminary sessions, not three. Each session will last for about three hours; have a new presiding officer, new seating chart, resetting of precedence and recency; and begin with new legislation that has not been debated in a previous session. Also, each first negative speech on legislation is followed by a two-minute questioning period.

Advancement

At the end of each session, scorers will rank their eight most preferred legislators (which may include the presiding officer), and legislators with the lowest cumulative rank total advance to the next level of competition or place at the end of the tournament. Points are still awarded for speaking and presiding, and these will be recorded as NFL points for the tournament, but points no longer have bearing on advancement. The Base system is officially retired. The parliamentarian no longer hand-picks one student to advance; s/he ranks along with judges, but *holistically*, for all four preliminary sessions the two semifinal sessions, or the single final session. S/he also will still rank order all students in the chamber, to be used as the final tie-breaker.

Evaluation of debaters and presiding officers will be done using the new evaluation ballot, available at [www.nflonline.org/AboutNFL/LeagueManuals#Events](http://www.nflonline.org/AboutNFL/LeagueManuals#Events). The ballot prompts scorers to take speeches, answers to questions, and even the quality and pertinence of questions asked into account when holistically ranking students at the end of a session. A scorer may decide that quality trumps quantity of participation, and can note this on the form.

Placement of six (instead of nine) finalists—including the National Champion—at the end of the Sen. John C. Stennis National Congressional Debate will be determined by tabulated judge ranks, with an expanded panel of judges including respected coaches, bipartisan chiefs of staff and committee clerks from the US Congress (with thanks to our valued partner, the Stennis Center for Public Service Leadership), and local public officials. Recognizing the top six is consistent with all other NFL events, as well as the computation for the Mundt school award.

The 2010 National Congressional Debate also marks the debut of Senate and House Leadership Bowls, awarded to one senator and one representative whose cumulative **student rank totals** from the preliminary, semifinal, and final sessions is a testament to the respect they command as leaders within their chambers. This replaces the student vote at the end of the final session to determine the national champion and placement.

To adjourn this article, it’s important to note that while several functions of the National Congressional Debate have been streamlined, Congress still remains a student-centered event at its core, with students interpersonally negotiating and simulating the legislative process. The new Leadership Bowls encourage civil treatment beginning in the preliminary session (as opposed to the old process of student voting, which influenced just finals), so students must exhibit humility, respect, integrity, and leadership in their service as a legislator from the very beginning of the tournament, and through the very end.

Want your ad published in *Rostrum*?

*About the Author*

Adam Jacobi is the NFL’s Coordinator of Programs and Coach Education. A former two-diamond coach of three NFL champions and an NCFL champion, he has taught courses in speech communication and International Baccalaureate theatre.

Contact Sandy Krueger at the NFL Office for more information: sandy.krueger@nationalforensicleague.org
The NFL is looking for new, fresh articles to publish in our monthly magazine.

Visit us online for more information:

www.nflonline.org/Rostrum/Writing
Academic All Americans

(March 5, 2010 through March 30, 2010)

COLORADO
Fairview High School
Robin Betz
Chris Guthrie
Hinsdale Central High School
Suzanne K. Oskouie
Mesa Ridge High School
Christian Pitera

MARYLAND
Loyola Blakefield High School
Matthew Alonsozana
Adam Conner
Michael Tich

MISSOURI
Blue Springs South High School
Jackson Hobbs
Leah Kucera
Daniel Philyaw
Savannah R-3 High School
Kathleen Barbosa
Zach Beattie
Andy Kozinski
Aaron Munsell
Keiffer Sticken

NEW YORK
The Bronx High School of Science
Carolyn Clendenin
Zack Elias
Dylan Gorman
Ian Irlander
Daniel Lee
Max Lesser
Carolyn Lipp
Thomas Lloyd
Andrew Markoff
Stephanie Mazursky
Julia Reinitz
Matt Ross
Emanuel Schorsch
David Seidman
Theresa Tharakan

NEW MEXICO
Albuquerque Academy
Katherine Leung

OHIO
Copley High School
Emily Nace

OREGON
North Valley High School
Rebecca Patch

SOUTH CAROLINA
Bob Jones Academy
Emma Claire Galloway

TEXAS
Winston Churchill High School
Claire Daviss
Mario Villaplana

UTAH
East High School
Christian Bennett
Mike Ricks

WISCONSIN
James Madison Memorial High School
Michelle Yang

FLORIDA
Wellington High School
Alex Hernicz

ILLINOIS
Glenbrook South High School
Richard Day
John McLeod
William Thibeau
John Zhao

INDIANA
Brebeuf Jesuit Preparatory School
Kristin Froehle
William H. Groble
Aditya Krishman
Sara Staszak
Maconaquah High School
Jason Stanley

IOWA
Spencer High School
Gabriella (Abby) Bedore

KANSAS
Goddard High School
Sarah Jack
Topeka High School
Matthew R. Bevens
Anna L. Hamilton
Kelly Murphy
Moundridge High School
Katie Erin Stevens
Marike Elizabeth Stucky

NEBRASKA
Kearney Sr. High School
Katherine Nelson
Jessa Newby
Keegan Potthoff
Millard North High School
Colin Anderson
Elizabeth Johnson
Tiffany Taylor
Joshua Temple

NEVADA

NEW MEXICO
Albuquerque Academy
Katherine Leung

APPLY TODAY!
www.nflonline.org/DistrictInformation/AwardNominationApplication
Celebrate each achievement with NFL honor society insignia for students and coaches!

The National Forensic League offers pins, jewelry, honor cords, and more!

ORDER TODAY!

www.nflonline.org/community/catalog
NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY
DEBATE &
SPEECH INSTITUTES
LEARN FROM THE BEST
rising seniors
rising juniors
rising sophomores
www.northwestern.edu/nhsi
1-800-662-NHSI
nhsi@northwestern.edu
The Stanford Parliamentary Debate program returns this summer, bringing the same professionalism to parliamentary debate that SNFI has brought to policy debate and Lincoln-Douglas debate for the past 20 years. Serious students of parliamentary debate wanting to take their activity to the next level are encouraged to attend, as are those just beginning in this style of argumentation. A special Advanced section is planned for this summer. Small group activities ensure that students of all experience levels can be accommodated.

These exclusive one-week programs feature:
- **A low student to staff ratio** - averaging 1 staff to every 10 students or better
- **A great number of practice debates** - half of the total instructional time will be spent on conducting practice debates
- **Seminars on brainstorming**, constructing and supporting arguments and theory of argumentation from the ground up
- **Topic analyses** on a number of commonly used topic areas through a spirited examination of current events
- **Live and work on the Stanford University campus** in a stimulating and secure environment
- **Work with national caliber instructors**, including formative members of East and West Coast style parli
- **Learn to develop cases** of various types, including both ‘tight link’ and ‘loose link’ style cases, how to debate serious topics, and be effective on lighter topics as well

The camp is held in an intimate setting that allows plenty of question and answer sessions and one-on-one interaction with instructors, not just rote learning. Students are allowed to develop in a relaxed and supportive atmosphere with excellent supervision. Students will emerge from the program as more confident public speakers and as experts on the rules, style, and strategies of parliamentary debate, ready to compete in the fall.
AVAILABLE FOR PURCHASE AT THE NFL STORE AND TheInterpStore.com

TheInterpStore.com

THE GRAY BOOK INCLUDES:

★ GUMS
★ I DREAMED I WAS A VIDEO GAME
★ THE GRIMM GIRLS
★ AND THE AWARD GOES TO
★ TO EVERY COIN

PREVIEW EACH SELECTION AT TheInterpStore.com

A FORENSICS ANTHOLOGY
EDITED BY GREGORY T. BURNS

ALWAYS BRANCHING OUT WITH NEW INTERP MATERIAL
### Donus D. Roberts Quad Ruby Coach Recognition

(January 23, 2010 through March 30, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School / State</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denise Rawlings</td>
<td>Diamond Ranch High School, CA</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Holland</td>
<td>East Bakersfield High School, CA</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Hanhong</td>
<td>Gabrielino High School, CA</td>
<td>1156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Plekarski</td>
<td>Irvington High School, CA</td>
<td>1072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Paletz</td>
<td>La Reina High School, CA</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Lawrence</td>
<td>Lynbrook High School, CA</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis James Summers</td>
<td>Ponderosa High School, CA</td>
<td>1052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Newkirk</td>
<td>San Dieguito High School, CA</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erick M. Rector</td>
<td>Saratoga High School, CA</td>
<td>1289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Scott</td>
<td>Air Academy High School, CO</td>
<td>1047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique Taylor</td>
<td>Aurora Central High School, CO</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carley Lee Holladay</td>
<td>Chaparral High School, CO</td>
<td>1048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Todeschi</td>
<td>Eagle High School, ID</td>
<td>1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carly Wells</td>
<td>Adlai Stevenson High School, IL</td>
<td>1081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Adams</td>
<td>University High School, IL</td>
<td>1024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Alt</td>
<td>Canterbury High School, IN</td>
<td>1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Fretz</td>
<td>Carroll High School, IN</td>
<td>1047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Thorp</td>
<td>Fishters High School, IN</td>
<td>1044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jin Lee</td>
<td>Manhattan High School, KS</td>
<td>1161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Blankenship</td>
<td>Larry A. Ryle High School, KY</td>
<td>1266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Emmons</td>
<td>Paducah Tilghman High School, KY</td>
<td>1040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Harris</td>
<td>Grand Rapids City High School, MI</td>
<td>1062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Eichele</td>
<td>Blaine High School, MN</td>
<td>1071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristine Gruenberg</td>
<td>East Grand Forks Sr. High School, MN</td>
<td>1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Meyer</td>
<td>Eden Prairie High School, MN</td>
<td>1074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Torson</td>
<td>Hopkins High School, MN</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Urtel</td>
<td>Mankato East High School, MN</td>
<td>1118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Aikey</td>
<td>Prior Lake High School, MN</td>
<td>1095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodi Kyllonen</td>
<td>Roseville Area High School, MN</td>
<td>1173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris A. Miller</td>
<td>Lee’s Summit West High School, MO</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Roberds</td>
<td>Marshfield High School, MO</td>
<td>1165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shellie Kingaby</td>
<td>Myers Park High School, NC</td>
<td>1127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Mitchell</td>
<td>Science High School, NJ</td>
<td>1178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trey Smith</td>
<td>East Mountain High School, NM</td>
<td>1114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School / State</th>
<th>Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christy Briggs</td>
<td>Reno High School, NV</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane D. Steiker</td>
<td>Byram Hills High School, NY</td>
<td>1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Prater</td>
<td>Middletown High School, OH</td>
<td>1057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon Snook</td>
<td>Vermilion High School, OH</td>
<td>1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Eric Worstell</td>
<td>Whitmer High School, OH</td>
<td>1025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Franck</td>
<td>Wooster High School, OH</td>
<td>1049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina E. Broughton</td>
<td>Bethany High School, OK</td>
<td>1005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky Allen</td>
<td>Kingfisher High School, OK</td>
<td>1076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Daniel Nolan</td>
<td>Norman North High School, OK</td>
<td>1107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna J. Landon</td>
<td>Sequoyah High School, OK</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Neal</td>
<td>Verdigris High School, OK</td>
<td>1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Walsh</td>
<td>Mc Minnville High School, OR</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Barringer</td>
<td>Oregon City High School, OR</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Martin</td>
<td>Tigard High School, OR</td>
<td>1244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher D. Otis</td>
<td>Lakeview Christian Academy, PA</td>
<td>1003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Biery</td>
<td>Morristown East High School, TN</td>
<td>1086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca A. Meek</td>
<td>Devine High School, TX</td>
<td>1074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle Peterson</td>
<td>El Paso Coronado High School, TX</td>
<td>1047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan Thomas Williams</td>
<td>Grand Prairie High School, TX</td>
<td>1047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Hahn</td>
<td>Grapevine High School, TX</td>
<td>1009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Trook</td>
<td>Lubbock High School, TX</td>
<td>1029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Ingersoll</td>
<td>LV Hightower High School, TX</td>
<td>1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laren Swenson</td>
<td>Juab High School, UT</td>
<td>1034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Baca</td>
<td>Juan Diego Catholic High School, UT</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britany Wheeler</td>
<td>Murray High School, UT</td>
<td>1012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Hammond</td>
<td>Syracuse High School, UT</td>
<td>1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Helman</td>
<td>Kaniak High School, WA</td>
<td>1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane McCoy</td>
<td>Mercer Island High School, WA</td>
<td>1031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Scheffler</td>
<td>James Madison Memorial HS, WI</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Voss</td>
<td>Sheboygan North High School, WI</td>
<td>1236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David M. Powell</td>
<td>Vincent High School, WI</td>
<td>1058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Shadrick</td>
<td>Green River High School, WY</td>
<td>1075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Philips</td>
<td>Hot Springs County High School, WY</td>
<td>1094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Waugaman</td>
<td>Kelly Walsh High School, WY</td>
<td>1003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When author Bruce Gevirtzman decided to veer away from nonfiction and focus on a novel, he opted to explore familiar subjects: teenagers and debate. A former high school debater and NFL coach, Gevirtzman had decades of experience with teens and a wealth of related research in his arsenal. Couple these interests with an extensive investigation of the Kennedy assassination (Gevirtzman is listed in the *Who's Who of Kennedy Assassination Researchers*) and you have *Love and Death in Dallas*.

The tale follows Randy Whitman, a standout debater who predicts that his senior year will be his “best year so far.” Unfortunately, Whitman’s dreams begin to unravel atop the infamous grassy knoll in Dallas on November 22, 1963. Complicated romances, close-minded parents, formidable debate opponents, and even a bully compound Whitman’s trauma. It’s a perfect storm of teen drama, juxtaposed against American history.

I recently spoke with Gevirtzman about the novel, its origins, and his advice to would-be writers. His responses shed light on both the novel and the accomplished alum behind it.

**Jenny Corum Billman:** What inspired you to write *Love and Death in Dallas*?

**Bruce Gevirtzman:** Well, I’ve had a novel in me for years. I decided I needed to write about something I knew about. Whenever you write something, you try to do it about things you know. I think it makes the story more credible.

**JB:** Talk to me about your speech and debate background. I know you were a coach.

**BG:** I competed at Excelsior High School in debate and individual events for all four of my high school years. When I was in college I competed in debate and individual events. Right out of college I got a job teaching, and the reason I got the job was because I could coach debate. I was at Bishop Amat for two years and then at La Mirada where I taught for 37 years. I coached speech and debate at both schools. I actually just retired.

**JB:** How did you transition from teaching and coaching to writing?

**BG:** All the time I was teaching, I was writing and directing plays and readers theatre. I became involved in a group called *Phantom Projects*. They have produced my plays all over the place. They travel with them and produce them locally. I have been writing for them for about 10 years. About four years ago I decided I wanted to write a book about teenagers, because I thought it would be helpful, and I had some things to say. I wrote another book called *Straight Talk to Teachers*. My forte is being funny. It doesn’t show up in the novel that much—it’s such a serious book.
Spangled Banner.

Kennedy had died, and they played The Star the radio, the announcer came on and said president had been shot. When we turned on got called out for a minute, then he came freshman world history class. The teacher was back in January of last year. So this maybe the Kennedy assassination is the had died. I remember that, and I thought, when Cronkite broke in and announced that messing around on YouTube. I saw the video something totally different. One day I was and I was working already on a novel about the final manuscript for my second book, can. I was actually working on something inconsistencies and make it the best that you first draft, I don't know where everything How did it work? that it is fiction. I caution people to know what's fact and what's fiction.

JB: Talk to me about the writing process. How did it work?

BG: It’s actually easier to do—I had a truthful premise, because the event actually happened. All the stuff about Oswald is true, except for some of the conversations, which are obviously fabricated because there is no way to know what was said. The stuff with Jack Ruby is true. I figure that my theory about what happened that day is just as good as anybody else’s. It’s just a theory. But by having a fact, having the historical background, made it easier. The danger is that it is fiction. I caution people to know what’s fact and what’s fiction.

JB: Where were you when Kennedy died?

BG: I was sitting in a classroom, in a freshman world history class. The teacher got called out for a minute, then he came back in and he was crying. He told us we needed to turn on the radio. He said that the president had been shot. When we turned on the radio, the announcer came on and said Kennedy had died, and they played The Star Spangled Banner.

JB: How did you come up with the characters?

BG: For the main characters—Carmen, Ira, Maria, Tommy—I thought back to a lot of the people I knew when I was in school, when I was a debater. All the characters reminded me of people I’d met. The romantic part is a personal story, as well, too. When any writer comes up with fiction, there is a little bit of themselves in the character. In addition, you want the characters to serve a purpose. Who’s going to be the adversary? Who’s going to be the girlfriend? Why?

JB: How did being a debater shape your protagonist, Randy?

BG: He was obviously very smart and very analytical, and I guess these kids who are involved with debate, they think a lot. They are always trying to work through the different options. Maybe in Randy’s case this is what happened. There were other options. Right before the state tournament, there is a chapter about what Randy wished he had done—where he tackles the guys, runs to the street. That becomes his legacy. That’s not what happened. But that’s what he wished had happened. The fact that he was a debater, he was always thinking, meant that he was always weighing options. At the end, he gets some closure by the way he handles the state tournament debate. He doesn’t win that debate. It’s another commentary about how there are more important things in life.

JB: The debate coach in the story, Mr. Lott, did so much for his team. Did you have a Mr. Lott?

BG: Mr. Lott actually was my debate coach! That was his name, Mr. Lott. He didn’t die of leukemia [as the fictitious Mr. Lott did]. But he was my mentor.

JB: Was he able to see you become a coach?

BG: He did, actually. When I went to Whittier College, my debate partner and I went over as a team, and he went over as a coach. So he coached me in college as well. Then he got a job in the San Diego area. He died a few years after that.


BG: [Laughing]. My agent said to leave it open for a sequel, so I did.

JB: Any hints for the sequel?

BG: I’ve given it a lot of thought, but I don’t know where we’re going to go with it. More with the assassination, more with Tommy. Not sure how much Carmen in the next one. A lot with Maria and his parents. I think the whole family dynamic is interesting. His sister, his parents being generally good people, with ideas that a lot of people at that time had—the bigotry, the narrow mindedness. That was more the norm back then.

JB: Do you have any advice for would-be writers?

BG: Go for it! It’s very, very difficult. It’s extremely difficult to get published now with the market the way it is. When you write, you get rejected a lot. But keep going for it. It fact, it’s interesting. I had one agent to whom I sent a query letter say, “What do I know? I rejected Twilight.” So my advice is to write all the time. Write stuff that comes to mind, even if you know you aren’t going to use it. Over-write. Write much more than you need. Sometimes I know even as I’m writing something that I’m not going to use it. And that’s okay.

JB: What is the main thing you want people to take away from your novel?

BG: What truly matters is that the way we live our lives. There are so many things we become involved with in our lives that don’t matter. Our time here is so short that we need to focus on things that are meaningful to us, the things that will matter even after we are gone. That’s our legacy.

About the Author

Jenny Corum Billman is the Coordinator of Public Relations for the National Forensic League. She holds an MA and a BA in Communication, both from Western Kentucky University, where she was a 4-year member of the forensic team and a Scholar of the College.
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Judy Kroll has taught debate for the past 35 years with the last 30 years coaching and teaching at Brookings High School in Brookings, South Dakota. During her coaching career at Brookings she has qualified more than 117 entries to the National Tournament in Policy Debate, Lincoln Douglas, Public Forum, Extemp, and Original Oratory. She has been recognized as the Debate Coach of the Year in South Dakota by her peers five times. She was South Dakota Teacher of the Year in 1997. Judy has received the South Dakota Speech Communication Association Distinguished Service Award and has served as President of the organization for two years. She has chaired the Northern South Dakota District for 27 years and has served on numerous other communication committees. Judy has served in the National Tab Room for debate and individual events on several occasions and has judged many final rounds at the National Tournament. She had students in the final round of Policy Debate at the Portland Nationals where her teams placed 2nd and 3rd and the school received an Excellence award in debate with 72 rounds accumulated by three teams.

NFL Hall of Fame Coach Gary Harmon taught in public secondary schools for 32 years. Twenty of those years were at Salina Central High School. During that time he taught English, individual events, and debate. His students have won numerous state and national awards. Since retiring six years ago, he has been teaching and coaching at Kansas Wesleyan University as well as helping with the local high school students. His students at Kansas Wesleyan have won several national championships in Pi Kappa Delta competition.
Gregg Hartney’s tenure as a teacher and coach of debate and speech has spanned 34 years, five schools, and two states. Known primarily as a Policy Debate coach, he has nevertheless coached students to NFL Nationals in every event, more than 50 students in all. He has been a District Committee member for 21 years and has served on Oklahoma’s state competition committee for the past eight years. In 2001 he was named Oklahoma’s Outstanding High School Speech Teacher and in 2007 received the Outstanding Speech, Debate & Theatre Educator Award from the National Federation of High School Associations. In addition to debate and competition classes, Gregg has taught Public Speaking, American Government, Economics, Drama, Preparation for College Testing, and World Affairs. He has also served stints as an assistant track coach and coach of the Academic Team. He met his future wife Kathryn Scott in the coaches’ lounge of a tournament, and 22 years later both of their daughters have won awards in tournament competition. Like most teachers, Gregg takes great pride in the future careers of his former students and stays in touch with as many as he can. Along with numerous attorneys, professors, ministers, doctors, military officers, and various public officials, he notes with pride that 20 of his alums have gone on to coach debate at the high school level.
New Diamond Coaches

• THIRD DIAMOND •
Lyle R. Linerode
Gahanna-Lincoln High School, OH
February 10, 2010
6,316 points

• THIRD DIAMOND •
LeAnn Richards
Edison Computech High School, CA
February 10, 2010
8,704 points

• THIRD DIAMOND •
Karen Vaughan
Foothill High School, NV
February 11, 2010
8,524 points

• THIRD DIAMOND •
Bruce Benson
Madison High School, ID
March 1, 2010
7,901 points
New Diamond Coaches

• SECOND DIAMOND •
Josh Anderson
Olathe Northwest High School, KS
February 14, 2010
3,842 points

• SECOND DIAMOND •
Kelly Clark Garner
Petal High School, MS
February 16, 2010
3,323 points

• SECOND DIAMOND •
Gary Leiker
Southeast High School-Cherokee, KS
February 19, 2010
3,343 points

• SECOND DIAMOND •
Barbara Giuliano
St. Joseph’s Preparatory School, PA
February 23, 2010
3,988 points

• SECOND DIAMOND •
Catherine C. Stamps
St. Cecilia Academy, TN
March 1, 2010
3,051 points

• SECOND DIAMOND •
Mark Thul
St. Francis High School, MN
March 1, 2010
4,100 points
New Diamond Coaches

• FIRST DIAMOND •
Johnathan M. Davidson
Skyline High School, UT
January 30, 2010
1,502 points

• FIRST DIAMOND •
Donald L. Perkins
Terry Sanford High School, NC
February 4, 2010
1,503 points

• FIRST DIAMOND •
Lenalee N. Robinson
Lincoln County High School, GA
February 6, 2010
2,246 points

• FIRST DIAMOND •
Suzanne Kelly
Vanguard College Prep School, TX
February 8, 2010
1,521 points

• FIRST DIAMOND •
Julie E. Hillend-Jones
Emerald Ridge High School, WA
February 8, 2010
1,540 points

• FIRST DIAMOND •
Suzanne M. Beltran
North Shore High School, TX
February 11, 2010
1,570 points

• FIRST DIAMOND •
Daniel Dominique
University School, FL
February 14, 2010
2,312 points

• FIRST DIAMOND •
Bill Nicolay
Snohomish High School, WA
February 17, 2010
4,265 points
New Diamond Coaches

• FIRST DIAMOND •
Penny Harris
Central Catholic High School, OH
February 18, 2010
1,525 points

• FIRST DIAMOND •
Justin Ashton
Plainfield North High School, IL
February 22, 2010
1,680 points

• FIRST DIAMOND •
Carol Stilz
Wood River High School, ID
February 28, 2010
1,506 points

• FIRST DIAMOND •
W. Bryan Gaston
Heritage Hall School, OK
March 1, 2010
1,526 points

• FIRST DIAMOND •
Robert Clayton
Bonneville High School, ID
March 3, 2010
1,983 points

• FIRST DIAMOND •
William Lemonovich
Trinity High School, PA
March 14, 2010
1,501 points

• FIRST DIAMOND •
Lisa Hoffmann
Mt. Lebanon Sr. High School, PA
March 15, 2010
1,505 points

• FIRST DIAMOND •
Lory A. Stewart
Garland High School, TX
March 23, 2010
1,505 points
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Average No. of Degrees</th>
<th>Leading Chapter</th>
<th>No. of Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Three Trails (KS)</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Blue Valley North High School</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Calif. Coast (CA)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Leland High School</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Kansas Flint-Hills</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Washburn Rural High School</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Florida Manatee</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Nova High School</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Millard North High School</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Northwest Indiana</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Munster High School</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Show Me (MO)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>Blue Springs High School</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>San Fran Bay (CA)</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>James Logan High School</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>East Los Angeles (CA)</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>Gabrielineo High School</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>The Bronx High School of Science</td>
<td>842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rushmore (SD)</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Sioux Falls Lincoln High School</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Northern South Dakota</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Aberdeen Central High School</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Southern Minnesota</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Eagan High School</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Sierra (CA)</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Sanger High School</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>East Kansas</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Shawnee Mission East High School</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Illini (IL)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Downers Grove South High School</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Ozark (MO)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Central High School - Springfield</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern Ohio</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Perry High School</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Heart Of America (MO)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Liberty Sr. High School</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Sunflower (KS)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Wichita East High School</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Northern Ohio</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Canfield High School</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>South Texas</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Bellaire High School</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Northern Illinois</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Glenbrook South High School</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Claremont High School</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>West Kansas</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Salina High Central</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Bozeman High School</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Utah-Wasatch</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Sky View High School</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain - South (CO)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>George Washington High School</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Ridge High School</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Idaho Mountain River</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Hillcrest High School</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Golden Desert (NV)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Green Valley High School</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>New England (MA &amp; NH)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Manchester Essex Regional High School</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Carver-Truman (MO)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Neosho High School</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Central Minnesota</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Eastview High School</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Eastern Missouri</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Pattonville High School</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Idaho Gem of the Mountain</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Mountain Home High School</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>South Kansas</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Fort Scott High School</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Great Salt Lake (UT)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Skyline High School</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Sundance (UT)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Bingham High School</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Cherry Creek High School</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>East Texas</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>William P. Clements High School</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Deep South (AL)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>The Montgomery Academy</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Desert Vista High School</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Florida Panther</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Trinity Preparatory School</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nebraska South</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Lincoln East High School</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Wind River (WY)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Green River High School</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Southside High School</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>West Los Angeles (CA)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Fullerton Joint Union High School</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hole In The Wall (WY)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Cheyenne East High School</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Tarheel East (NC)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Pinecrest High School</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Western Ohio</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Notre Dame Academy</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Heart Of Texas</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Del Valle High School</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>North East Indiana</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Chesterton High School</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Average No. of 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>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>North Coast (OH)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Gilmour Academy</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Southern Wisconsin</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Brookfield East High School</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Northern Lights (MN)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>St. Francis High School</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Central Texas</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Winston Churchill High School</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>West Iowa</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>West Des Moines Valley High School</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Carolina West (NC)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Myers Park High School</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Pittsburgh (PA)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>North Allegheny Sr. High School</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hoosier Crossroads (IN)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Kokomo High School</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Portage Northern High School</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>Inland Empire (WA)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Lake City High School</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>North Texas Longhorns</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Colleyville Northern High School</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>Chesapeake (MD)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Walt Whitman High School</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Colorado Grande</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Central of Grand Junction High School</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>North Dakota Roughrider</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Fargo South High School</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Valley Forge (PA)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Truman High School</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Northern Wisconsin</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Appleton East High School</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Lone Star (TX)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Plano Sr. High School</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Comeaux High School</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hoosier Heartland (IN)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Fishers High School</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Space City (TX)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Asief Elsik High School</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Western Washington</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Gig Harbor High School</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>Greater Illinois</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Belleville West High School</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Georgia Northern Mountain</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Henry W. Grady High School</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Grant County High School</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Florida Sunshine</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Pine View School</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>West Oklahoma</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Norman North High School</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>East Iowa</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Indiana High School</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain-North (CO)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain High School</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>North Oregon</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Tigard High School</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>New York State</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Scarsdale High School</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Albuquerque Academy</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>Tall Cotton (TX)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Seminole High School</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Oak Grove High School</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Big Valley (CA)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>James Enochs High School</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>East Oklahoma</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Jenks High School</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Morristown West High School</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Puget Sound (WA)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Kamiak High School</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gulf Coast (TX)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Gregory Portland High School</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>UIL (TX)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Hallsville High School</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>South Florida</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Michael Krop High School</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Capitol Valley (CA)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Mira Loma High School</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>LBJ (TX)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Princeton High School</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sagebrush (NV)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Reno High School</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Wheeling Park High School</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Georgia Southern Peach</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Carrollton High School</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Punahou School</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Salem High School - Salem</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>West Texas</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>El Paso Coronado High School</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Bangor High School</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>South Oregon</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Ashland High School</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Bellwood-Antis High School</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Iroquois (NY)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>R. L. Thomas High School</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Pacific Islands</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>CheongShim Int’l Academy</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome New Schools!

Esperanza High School, CA
Irvine High School, CA
Sierra Canyon School, CA
West Ranch High School, CA
Conifer High School, CO
Frederick Douglass High School, GA
Kell High School, GA
Maynard Jackson High, GA
Ronald E. McNair High School, GA
South Forsyth High School, GA
Maryknoll High School, HI
Carbondale High School, IL
East St. Louis Sr. High School, IL
Waterloo High School, IL
Marian High School, IN
Glasgow Christian Academy, KY
Sky Academy, KY
Albert Einstein High School, MD
Bethesda Chevy Chase High School, MD
Marriotts Ridge High School, MD
Poolesville High School, MD
Oxford Hills High School, ME
Natick High School, MA
Holland Christian High School, MI
Pillager Public Schools, MN
Riverview Gardens High School, MO
Milnor Public School, ND
Christian Communicators of Owasso/Collinsville, OK
Harriton High School, PA
Northeast Bradford High School, PA
Taylor Allderdice High School, PA
Cane Bay High School, SC
Salt Lake School for the Performing Arts, UT
Champlain Valley Union High School, VT
Rutland High School, VT
Chiawana High School, WA
Holy Names Academy, WA
Mt. Horeb High School, WI

Jazzin’ it up in KC
NFL Nationals 2010

http://debatekc2010.org/preorder

PRE-ORDER GEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32oz Aluminum Water Bottles</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Size Vinyl Portfolios</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazzin’ It Up 2010 T-Shirts</td>
<td>$12 / $15 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlds of Fun Day Passes</td>
<td>$33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royals Tickets</td>
<td>$12 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* T-Shirts $12 (S-XL) and $15 (2XL-3XL)
** If we sell 1,000 Royals Tickets, NFL Executive Director J. Scott Wunn gets to throw out the first pitch!
Be a part of the excellence

Dare to be remarkable

To the University, Forensics is an opportunity to demonstrate academic excellence, to excel in competition of the intellect, and an extension of the entire academic atmosphere. At WKU, Forensics is an internationally renowned program recognized as a model for academic distinction among its peers, which recruits the finest talent in the country.

To the student, Forensics is an opportunity to cultivate life-long friendships, travel the country, and receive college credit for what you already love to do. As a result of the incredibly supportive administration, the students in Forensics at WKU enjoy many benefits, which is why WKU is home to more high school and collegiate national champions than any other program in the country.

Simply the best!

- The only team to win the National Forensic Association Championship in debate and individual events in the same year. WKU accomplished this feat multiple times.
- The only team to win the National Forensic Association, American Forensic Association, and International Forensic Association Championships in the same year. WKU accomplished this feat multiple times.
- Winners of the International Forensic Association World Championship every year in attendance.
- Kentucky Forensics Association State Champions for over two decades.
- Recognized by the Kentucky Senate and House of Representatives for Forensics Excellence.
- Recognized by the United States Senate and House of Representatives for Forensics Excellence.
- Designated as a Program of Distinction by the Post-Secondary Education Council.
- WKU's SFI is one of the most reasonably priced summer forensics institutes, coached by numerous collegiate and high school national champions.

Join the excitement

Interested in Hearing More About WKU Forensics — E-mail jace.lux@wku.edu — Or visit us at www.wku.edu/forensics
20 YEARS FROM NOW, YOU’LL ARGUE THIS IS WHERE YOU EMERGED AS A GREAT LEADER. AND NO ONE WILL DARE REBUT YOU.

WHERE WILL THE NFL TAKE YOUR FUTURE?

MEDIA MOGUL

TOP JOURNALIST

SUPREME COURT JUSTICE

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Many National Forensic League members go on to do great things. Perhaps, including you. Lincoln Financial Group. Proud sponsor of the NFL. Visit lincolnfinancial.com/nfl to learn more about our sponsorship.

Hello future.*