



California Speech **BULLETIN**

California High School Speech Association

CHSSA Executive Council / Letter from CHSSA President	inside cover
Letter from Editor	1
Preparing for the State Qualifying Tournament	2
Response to Mr. Fraser	
<i>by Neil Barembaum</i>	3
Some Thoughts on the Activity We Love	
<i>by Jeffrey G. Granillo</i>	5
Response to Mr. Granillo	
<i>by Neil Barembaum</i>	6
Johansen's Speech in the Limelight Program	
<i>by Rod Landes</i>	7
Gabrielino's Ice-Breaker Tournament	
<i>by Derek Yuill</i>	8
Getting to First Base -- A New Way to Look at Student Congress	
<i>by Paul Pinza</i>	9
State Speech Tournament 2002: Winning Speeches	11
More Great Memories from the 2002 State Speech Tournament	17
State Speech Tournament 2002: List of Winners	18
Motions from the CHSSA May 2002 Meeting	21
Fallacies, Foibles and Fantasies	
<i>by Larry A. Smith</i>	22
Thanks for the Memories	
<i>by Reed Niemi</i>	23
Everything I needed to know I learned in Transportation 101	
<i>by Karen Glahn</i>	24
A Note from Shirley Anne Peppers	25



President -- John A. Cardoza
Carondelet High School
1133 Winton Drive
Concord, CA 94518
jac@carondelet.pvt.k12.ca.us

VP, Activities -- Reed Niemi
The Athenian School
2100 Mt. Diablo Scenic Blvd.
Danville, CA 94506
rskniemi@earthlink.net

VP, Curriculum -- Lynette Williamson
Analy High School
6950 Analy Avenue
Sebastopol, CA 95472
LWilliamson@analy.org

Secretary -- Paul Pinza
Westmont High School
4805 Westmont Avenue
Campbell, CA 95008
ppinza@cuhsd.org

Treasurer -- Neil Barenbaum
Belmont High School
1575 W. 2nd Street
Los Angeles, CA 90026
Nbarenbaum@aol.com

Editor -- Karen Glahn
Lincoln High School
6844 Alexandria Place
Stockton, CA 95207
kglahn@LUSD.NET

V.P. Public Relations
Carmendale Fernandes, *Retired*

Historian
Donovan Cummings, *Retired*
1719 Monte Diablo Avenue
Stockton CA 95203

Website:
www.cahssa.org

From the President of CHSSA

Dear Colleagues:

It is an election year, so we can be sure that politicians will focus on education as a “hot button” issue. Already the school voucher lobby is dusting off its tired, old accusations that public schools are somehow “failing our children” by providing inadequate instruction devoid of moral content. These arguments, as any teacher knows, are equally devoid of any factual basis or objective analysis. The truth of the matter (and, sadly, it seems to be a hidden truth) is that all schools — public, private and parochial — provide a common moral education based on shared virtues and universal values. Those of us involved in academic competitions are especially mindful of our great obligation to provide leadership and guidance in ethical behavior. We teach our students to respect their opponents and themselves, to recognize excellence and to strive for it, to contend honestly, to win with grace and love with dignity; to play fair.

It is more than a simple matter of “following the rules”. Such an attitude too easily corrupts to an inclination to use the rules for competitive advantage, or to interpret the rules in tortured equivocations that lead inevitably to protests and grievances and frustrated demands for judicial or legislative clarification — which means more tightly constructed rules. The purpose of our sponsorship of speech and debate competition is to provide young adults with the opportunities to develop and practice their communication skills — but our goal should be that they use these skills ethically and for the good of others. Some of our students will become lawyers — how will they practice law? Some will enter the medical professions — what sort of doctors will they be? Some will join us as teachers — what moral lessons will they pass on to their students? All of them will be fellow citizens — what virtues and values will they bring to the Republic and the world?

I suggest that the answers to these questions lie in large part in our hands. Last spring I asked League presidents that time be set aside at Congress tournaments for students to begin a discussion of competitive ethics: what, from their perspectives, are the ethical principles of competition? What is fair? What is just? What is the right thing to do? As these discussions take place the results will be reported to the CSSC and a “Code of Ethics” generated by students can be formulated and adopted.

The process need not be lengthy or involved, but it must be authentic and honest. It should especially not be hasty; such an important project should proceed with careful consideration. When the CSSC meets in January, each League should have been able to hold at least one discussion among Congress participants using whatever format is most conducive to a free and open exchange of views. The Congress Committee, under the leadership of Bob Stockton, will gather the reports from these discussions and draft a proposed Code of Ethics. At the State Tournament 2003, time will be provided for Congress participants to review this proposed Code and suggest revisions and refinements. (This discussion will not be part of the competition and could be open to other interested students.) The revised Code will be returned to the Leagues for further discussion during 2003-2004, with final adoption by the CSSC slated for January 2004.

I ask that we begin with Congress Debate not because it in particular has any special needs to be addressed, but because the activity is a logical forum to begin the process. To put it simply: students who participate in Congress are trained in the fine art of discussion; they should be best equipped to lead all our students in the development of a competitive Code of Ethics which is coherent and comprehensive.

When they do, perhaps the accusations and allegations that we are not doing our job will be answered. When they do, perhaps we can turn the tables and ask the politicians to live up to the expectations of the next generation. Perhaps the lawmakers of the Republic need some ethical guidance themselves.

And our students will lead them.

John A. Cardoza
President

A Letter From the Editor

“Have I challenged my students and myself?”

I trust that this letter finds you all well; that you have rested and relaxed and spent quality time with your families. I have had the good fortune to have spent the majority of my summer at my favorite beach, doing what I like best: soaking up the sun, reading, cooking, and enjoying the company of friends and family. It has also been a time to assess the past year. I need to do that now and again. Am I still headed in the right direction with my program and my life? Did I get out as much as I put in? Have I learned something new? Have I challenged my students and myself?

I solved my need for challenge in English by taking on the task of teaching one section of Advanced Placement English (Comp and Lang.). It's a risk. Having spent the last 10 years teaching sophomore English, I am now reading new literature, creating new lesson plans, and am under the microscope of parents, students and administrators: can I measure up to my predecessor? How well will my students do the AP exam? In preparation, I spent a week in Tacoma and learned again what I always knew: speech and debate better prepares my students for any class. In particular, analysis and argumentation play a large part in the Language and Composition class/test. I have since placed this on the “why speech is invaluable” list that I give to students and parents.

Students also seek out challenges. That is why they participate in forensics. The question is once they get here, are they challenged enough? How often have debaters gotten by with no original research, relying instead entirely on purchased evidence and generic briefs. It is hard to sit down and read through play after play to find something that works. My students see something they like, or that someone else on the team has done and they are satisfied with it. Heaven forbid that I suggest they find something new, or spend time in the library. It is hard to read magazines and newspapers and books, and take pages of notes because even if you put in a lot of work, you can lose. Where's the fun in that? It's too much work. It's hard to sell the idea that the fun of the activity is the exercise you give your brain; the reward is in the doing. It's a lot like eating spinach when you are five years old: it's good for you, no matter how much you hate it.

We need to take risks, go to that early tournament for which we think we are unprepared, compete in an event we have never tried. We need to challenge our students, stretch their limits, expand their horizons. Is this risking failure? Perhaps, but I like to think of it as risking success. Why are some students so successful? Their teachers don't let them take the easy way out. Their teachers don't accept excuses. They are presented with high expectations and demanding standards. They are given the opportunity to succeed.

I sometimes would like to take the easy way out—I would like to spend time with my family, make it home before nine o'clock instead of creating a new lesson plan for *The Scarlet Letter*, or have a weekend to myself. There are a million excuses to give for not doing what we do. Ultimately, though, I think the rewards for the risk and the challenge are worth it. My students are better prepared for the AP exam, or any exam. They are better prepared for college. They are better prepared for life. Ultimately, as my debaters might put it, the rewards outweigh.

My hat's off to those who take risks and challenge themselves and their students.

Karen Glahn, Editor

A CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS

The Bulletin will gladly accept articles from coaches, teachers, former competitors. We are looking for articles that address such issues as curriculum, competition, what's happening in your league, how has speech changed your life, texts for the classroom (reviews), etc. The Bulletin will be published three times during the course of the academic year. Deadlines are Sept. 1, Dec. 1 and March 1. Items may be submitted to Karen Glahn by e-mail (kglahn@lUSD.net) or snail-mail (Lincoln High School, 6844 Alexandria Place, Stockton, CA 95207.

Editor’s note: The following suggestions for helping to prepare for a State qualifying tournament come to us care of Hall of Fame coach Myrna Goodwin. Although it may seem that State is long time off, it is never too early to begin preparation; this may help prevent mad scrambling at the last minute, and risk of disqualification. This is invaluable for new coaches and a very good refresher guide for those of us who have been around a while. A few items on this list may vary from league to league, such as limits and fines.

Preparing for the State Qualifying Tournament

Read the invitation carefully—note the following:

- Due dates for the debate, congress, and IE portions of the contest.
- Conflict patterns for IE’s
- Overall event limits
- Event limits within a conflict pattern
- Fines for incomplete or incorrect entries

The Easy Events—these events have no documentation requirement

- Team Debate
- LD Debate
- Congress
- Foreign/National Extemp
- Impromptu

The Complex Events—ORIGINAL EVENTS—OO, OA, Expos, OA, OPP

- A Double Spaced Typed Script**
- Work sCited Page**—MLA style with internal citations *even if not direct quotes*
- Underlined direct quotes**—150 word maximum
- OPP’s** have quotes more often than one might realize (Note rule on back of coversheet regarding imitation of known characters.)
- Hi-lighted advocacy statement** in OA
- Completed Cover sheets**
- Several signatures: parent, coach, principal, student—maybe more than once
- Title—don’t be too clever because this title is used at the state contest to keep like topics separated in prelim rounds
- Carefully counted quoted words

The Complex Events—INTERPS—DI, HI, OI, Duo

- Xeroxing requirement**
- 1. Title page
- 2. Copyright page
- 3. Table of contents (if an anthology)
- 4. Every page from which material is taken (note—2 selections cannot be combined—i.e. the best parts of 2 different Martin Luther King speeches or the book version and the play version of Anne Frank)

Typed Introduction

1. Double spaced and underlined
2. Must have title and author
3. OI must also have when/where speech given
4. For those reading the scripts, it’s helpful to put “intro” or “*” at the spot in the xeroxed script where the intro goes.

Added Words

1. Added “transition” words are to be neatly written in the margin of the xeroxed script. (You cannot change the author’s intent—i.e. adding characters or jokes)
2. The added words plus the introductory material cannot exceed 150 words.

Hi-lighting

1. All words from the xeroxed script that are used by the contestant in his/her presentation must be hi-lighted (Yellow is best.)
2. **Do Not** cross out any words on the xeroxed script even if you hi-light it by mistake. **DO NOT MARK IT OUT.** If necessary, put the error in brackets and state “omit” in the margin.
3. Hi-light the title of the selection in the Table of Contents if the piece came from an anthology.

Cover Sheets

1. All Signatures—principal, parent, student, coach
2. Title—(and author for all OI’s)
3. Counted words—introduction plus transitions—150 word maximum

The Complex Events—INTERP—Part II—TI

Xeroxing requirement

1. Title page for each of the selections
2. Copyright page for each of the selections
3. Table of contents (if an anthology) for each selection
4. Every page from which material is taken (note—unless the entire selection is presented—ie *Fog* by Carl Sandburg—each selection in the TI must be at least 150 words)

Typing

1. The introduction and each transition should be double spaced and underlined
2. Must have title and author
3. It helps those reading the scripts if the introduction and transitions are each on separate pages so they can be placed between selections as delivered

Hi-lighting

1. All words from the xeroxed script that are used by the contestant in his/her presentation must be hi-lighted (Yellow is best.)
2. **Do not** cross out any words on the xeroxed script even if you hi-light it by mistake. **DO NOT MARK IT OUT.** If necessary, put the error in brackets and state “omit” in the margin.
3. Hi-light the title of the selection in the Table of Contents if the piece came from an anthology.

□ **Cover Sheets**

1. All Signatures—principal, parent, student, coach
2. Theme—Don't be too clever. What you put down affects state paneling where like themes are separated in prelim rounds.
3. % of Added Words [Just have the speaker time just his intros and transitions and figure the % of the total speech. *Or*, use the special TI form.]

Extra Ideas

1. Before you xerox the **cover sheets** for your team members, fill in the following:
 - The School—at least 2 places
 - Your signature and date—so you don't have to do them separately
2. **Paper clip** rather than staple the materials while the students are getting things together. Then, when they are completely finished, **xerox** the entire packet so you have an extra copy for your records. Once this back up copy is made, staple each set. *There are several reasons for doing this.* First, you never get the winners back. Also, you have everything in place if the student is going to National Quals. Finally, I advise you to take these back up copies to the state finals if your student qualifies. If Tom Gomes had not had an OI script last year at Long Beach, his student would **not** have been allowed to speak!
3. In **duo**, consider sending separate cover sheets home for the 2 different parent signatures and just attach both to the packet. With all events, sometimes parents are more than willing to sign the forms without the attached script. This is great because they don't get wrinkled or lost.
4. Have the students use **yellow hi-lighters** whenever possible. First, they are easier for the readers, and they don't create shadows or blackouts when xeroxing copies.
5. Before you turn in your scripts, make sure that you have carefully inspected them to insure that they meet all requirements. Do not simply rely on your student assuring you that they have indeed met all the script requirements.

Check out CHSSA
on the World-Wide Web at

www.cahssa.org



Editor's note: This is in response to an article written by Matt Fraser which appeared in the May edition of the Bulletin.

Response to Mr. Fraser

by Neil Barembaum

I would like to thank Mr. Fraser for his response to my recent article. It is good to know it was read. For the most part, I was intrigued by how much we agree. And, so, I would like to take a moment to clarify my position.

Before dealing with his other points one by one, I think I should first talk about the topic of my original rant, oral critiques. He deals with this on the second page, second column, in the middle of the page. He says, "OC's are what educational researchers call a 'prime learning moment.'" Call me selfish (selfish!), but I want some of those learning moments to take place while I'm around. I think I'm in a better position as coach to provide what educational practitioners call "learning opportunities." Not that I'm better qualified, better educated, or even a better debater. I'm just the coach. I'm the one helping the student prepare for tournament after tournament. I want to debrief round after round, not just a single round in isolation. Those few sentences on a ballot (and the ballots I write rarely have only a few sentences) can trigger many learning moments. Not just whether an argument worked in a round, but whether it has been working round after round. Something doesn't work in a round. Do we rework it, throw it out, or just find a better way of supporting it. Did it misfire because of stiff opposition, or was there an inconsistency with the rest of our case? Is this a weakness that we had discussed before the tournament that should have been better anticipated and prepared for, or were we caught with our pants down? And perhaps a key question: did we lose the argument because of a judge's particular of view? I am not impeaching the judge's judgment. However, the fact that many other judges may have bought the argument, may have some bearing on how we make adjustments.

And let's not leave out one more dimension. If I coach an entire squad, I can bring other teams into the discussion. How have they handled similar situations? What were the results? How do we handle the situation in the future? The learning opportunities are multiplying.

Mr. Fraser tells us that most of his students take notes the whole time they are being critiqued. Well, that is good. My limited experience observing students being critiqued is that they don't. Deer staring at headlights don't stop to take notes. But, then again, I would rather rely on the judges' few sentences first hand than second hand notes hastily scribbled by that selfsame deer.

Finally, there is the story of the little team from Washington State. I must say that the paradigm of the team without a coach is one I do not want to adopt. In our league, when there was a debater in a school without a debate program, the debate program at a nearby school "adopted" him, training him until he became an excellent debater.

So that is the story on oral critiques. We disagree. Surprisingly, most of the rest of his letter talks about issues other than oral critiques. I'd like to deal with some of these points. His first point was the lack of teacher-coaches. I agree whole-

heartedly. In fact, this is precisely the solution I had presented in a previous rant. We seem to agree that in order to take back team debate, coaches need to rededicate themselves to judging and, indeed, coaching the event.

His next critique was to point out the problem of the regulators. Other than defending the prohibition against oral critiques, I neither proposed nor defended any of the other of the myriad of regulations that have cropped up over the years. Indeed, it is possible to argue against oral critiques without advocating a rule against it. I think I have been pretty consistent in bemoaning the idea of solving problems with rules instead of coaching. This, I believe, is true in debate and IE's.

I perhaps should not touch his final note, lest I show my dimwittedness, but I do not understand why having students walk out of oral critiques smacks of "defy rules you do not like." The current rule outlaws oral critiques. I am asking the students to observe the rule, even though their judges do not.

Then he proceeds to attack the State Tournament for a "no-flow" rule. I need to point out (or perhaps I don't) that such a rule does not now exist. I was not on the council when such a rule was first established. I would argue vociferously against it were it to be proposed again.

His next target is our similarly dictatorial "no prompting" rule. Now, in this case, I must admit, I do not like prompting. Turrets syndrome victims aside, each debater has their own areas of responsibility, and prompting and tag teaming allows sloppy debating and shows a lack of professionalism. However, I believe it is primarily a coaching problem, so, were it allowed, I wouldn't advocate a rule against it. I am also not proposing we get rid of the rule, though Mr. Fraser is free to advocate so. I have other windmills to fight. I certainly would not advocate a zero tolerance policy for slips of the tongue, Turrets or no.

There is a difference between the California State Speech Tournament and both, the local invitationals I attend, and the TOC invitationals Mr. Fraser refers to. The invitational tournament directors have the right to set their own rules and we have the right to agree or disagree by choosing to attend or not, though I think we should abide by the rules of the tournaments we choose to attend. The California State Speech Tournament is run by CHSSA and directed by the California State Speech Council. The council represents the speech schools in California. The State Tournament is our tournament. Anyone is welcome to propose changes to the tournament. Anyone is welcome to come and give the CSSC their two cents. Mr. Fraser is welcome to come and recommend changes and share his wisdom. The invitation doesn't come from me (though I certainly concur), it comes from the CHSSA president. I haven't always agreed with what the council does while I've been a member. I have nothing to complain about regarding their willingness to listen to my wacky thoughts and ideas. If Mr. Fraser hasn't attended a council meeting in a while, I think he would be surprised how truly democratic the CSSC really is.

My statement about OCing and judges' ego may need clarifying. In Mr. Fraser's outtake, he leaves out the context in which I was writing. What would motivate a judge to defy the tournament rules and do oral critique even to the point of denying or being deceitful when challenged? How can you explain a judge telling me, "I am not going to reveal or give oral critiques, I am only going to tell them who won and why." I am sure that if

Mr. Fraser was judging at a tournament that did not allow oral critiques that he would follow the rules of the tournament. I am not questioning his motivation for giving oral critiques at tournaments that allow it. I am only questioning the advisability of doing so. As for the suggestion that "ego" is the reason I teach, I must assert that no one teaches in Los Angeles Unified because of ego.

He then turns to the idea that OC's allow more depth than a few sentences on a ballot. My ballots, by the way, are packed with more than a few sentences. It is a rare and dull debate if I don't have writer's cramps after writing my ballot. Yes, oral communication has unique benefits over writing, but we are training debaters, not judges. It is not the oral communication skills of the judges that we are trying to develop. Yes it is obvious why we have the debaters speak the debate instead of writing it. That does not make it obvious that we would want the judges speaking as well. And while it may be true that a judge may be able to say much more in a given amount of time talking than writing, that is not the point. Perhaps judges need to engage in some triage in terms of what they tell the students. Do we want interaction, clarification, and so much more after a debate, or do we want students that are able to anticipate misunderstandings and preempt them, students that can resolve issues in the debate without relying on any post-debate activities. And if there truly was a misunderstanding, and the debater was able to clarify his meaning, would the judge then change his mind? Would this be considered a continuation of the debate? Would the other side be allowed a rebuttal? I am not concerned too much about this. Deer staring into headlights rarely talk back. But it does bring up interesting problems. I might be concerned about what happens in multi-judge panels that are not supposed to confer when one judge begins their oral critiques with the other judges listening.

After praising OC's, Mr. Fraser makes a number of suggestions that I ought to respond to. Although, on occasion, my students and I have concocted squirrel cases to enliven debate, we usually do not keep our cases secret. The issue of having them come to me when they have a problem is different. I encourage it. I do not preach victimism. But, if my students want to talk about an issue, I like to think I am there for them. If they encounter rule violations that they don't feel will be acted on by the judge, then I want them to come to me. They don't expect to get the result changed, however. This applies to prepared events more than debate, perhaps, but we want to talk to the other coach and have problematic interps or original speeches fixed before they get to an invitational or a qualifier. The rules don't prohibit speed, and they do allow sharing of evidence in cross-ex, so my students would never come to me for that. My students have come to me because other students have not allowed observers to flow.

So let's examine Mr. Fraser's suggestions to his students. Disclose your arguments. Hear, hear. I am no fan of secrecy. In fact, on the local level, I think it is a great idea for nearby schools to scrimmage and even have "symposiums"—forums for students and coaches from different schools to get together to discuss debate issues.

If the other team speaks faster than you, speak smarter than them. I agree. In fact, this was the theme of one of my previous rants: A small number of intelligent arguments can beat a shotgun blast full of inferior arguments.

Share your cards because openness breeds . . . etc. I

need to include the proviso that there are rules that cover this in a debate. Certainly, outside the context of a debate (see symposium concept), sharing should be encouraged.

Ignore prompting and other distractions . . . I certainly want my students to learn how not to be distracted by other's unprofessional behavior. But I will try to coach my students to act professionally and carry out their own responsibilities.

Observers—come one come all. This is an educational activity. Students should watch and be watched.

Observers, take notes. Take notes, but don't even ask to see my chicken scratches.

But there is one more thing for Mr. Fraser to teach his students: Don't pigeonhole debaters. Don't assume that by taking one position on one issue, they will necessarily take particular positions on other issues, even if the debater thinks they would be related. If a debater believes an opponent holds a position that they haven't stated, the debater should ask the speaker to clarify her/his position in cross-ex. I didn't keep track, but I think I agree with Mr. Fraser more than I disagree. In either case, I welcome Mr. Fraser's participation in future CSSC meetings.

"Some Thoughts On The Activity We Love"

by Jeffrey G. Granillo

I recently judged policy debate and was highly disturbed with what I found. Unfortunately, what I witnessed is a problem found throughout the debate community in California. The debate I saw was filled with poorly thought out arguments, poor analysis and all too often deceit on the part of many of the debaters. Now I know that many may be tempted to stop reading at this juncture, but this article may find you saying "I know what he is talking about" on more than one occasion. I do not believe that this is the fault of the debaters, but rather the result of poor judging throughout the state that everyone seems to know about, but no one wants to do anything about. This article is intended to bring this issue of poor judging to the forefront of discussion. This issue's relevance affects the present debate community and will have infinite number of effects on the debating community of tomorrow.

Late one night I was reading an article on the CHSSA forum that has gone un-refuted for far too long, the article entitled "Observations on Debate." The author was shocked when he encountered what he dubbed "was not debate." The debaters spoke incredibly fast, and were engaged in "speech babble." The phrase, however, that should have followed "speech babble" should have been "to me." After all, the debaters in the round clearly knew what they were saying, as did their opponents. I believe this is a case where the debaters have not digressed but rather have expanded beyond the abilities of the judge to evaluate their performance. After all, if a professional pitcher pitched too fast for the umpire to make a good call on the quality of his

pitches, would we say "that pitcher pitches too fast, let's send him to the minors!" *or* would we remark, "We need a better umpire" ? Hopefully, for the sake of professional baseball, we would support the latter. This is a similar situation occurring throughout the debating community. We have an activity filled with the brightest of kids, but we provide them with individuals incapable of understanding the complexity of their ideas.

I found myself on vacation in California, taking a brief break from my educational pursuits at Cornell University, and was very upset to find an arena dominated by the incompetence of my peer judges. The assumption that an adult is "obviously" capable of judging a 17-year-old "kid" is a false premise. Just because an individual is a parent does not mean they are well informed on the national debate topic or that they are educated. To this position many retort, "The kids need to be persuasive." This I agree with 100%, but this is not the end of the story. Let's take this statement a bit further, what does persuasion mean? Does that mean presentation? Does that mean visual appearance? Does that mean quality of ideas? Certainly all play a part in any judge's decision at some level, but shouldn't we place the evaluation of the ideas first? Isn't *that* what debate is about: evaluating ideas, testing those ideas, and hopefully deducing even better ideas throughout the round?

Unfortunately, many of my peers make decisions based on the "pleasantness" of the speaker's voice, the quality of his/her tie or dress or worse yet, the school from which the students matriculate. I am not going to say what many others say, that "speed debate" is better than "persuasion debate" (whatever that may be), but I will say that overall, the quality of the judges associated with "speed debate" is superior. How many parents are capable of having a competent conversation on Rawlsian theories of justice or the importance of metaphysics with the debaters, after the debate round? If you know of such individuals, please invite them to judge in Bakersfield or Fresno, California.

I will go out on a limb at this point and say that I think the tradeoff of speed for quality judging is one that is worth making. Many may disagree because of the resulting "speech babble," but debate is about different views on the world. Should we be so quick to condemn one style of debate? It obviously has educational value to someone. The high school and college circuits both engage in "speed debate," and I believe anyone would be hard pressed to find a more engaging, educated and critical thinking group of individuals anywhere. There exists room in the debate world for both without attacking each opposing style. "Let us resist the temptation to make ad hominem attacks," a line coaches give the best of debaters but frequently ignore when discussing the differing styles of debate. There, however, exists no room for individuals who are not capable of evaluating complex ideas to be labeled as "judges."

The solution to this dilemma is simple to see but difficult to implement. Better coaches with debate experience (beyond a college communication class). Judge education programs—we need to make the debate "jargon" meaningful. And finally, relentless dedication to an activity which can unlock or condemn ideas—a power that continually demands recognition.

Jeffrey G. Granillo

Cornell University

Dept. Policy Analysis and Management

Cornell Forensics Society

Editor's note: The original article to which Mr. Barembaum is responding, was submitted to Mr. Barembaum rather than yours truly since it was in response to an article on the CHSSA web site.

Response to Mr. Granillo

by Neil Barembaum

Thank you for your interest in the California High School Speech Association, and for your article.

The topic of the state of debate has itself been the topic of much debate. The article you refer to was written for the California High School Speech Bulletin. I included several bulleting articles in the first incarnation of the web site. There have, in fact, been a number of articles (including some of my own . . .) addressing the issue since the article was published. Although it may be possible in the future for the CHSSA website to “mirror” the Bulletin, as of now, there exists neither the time nor the room to do that.

I am forwarding the article to the current editor of the Bulletin for consideration for inclusion in a future edition.

As an aside, although I agree with the assertion that the main problem in debate is not the speed, but the quality of arguments (one of my favorite arguments is from a national qualifier a few years ago—the affirmative would have the executive branch (the president) propose legislation to congress and that would undermine the confidence of the international community in our democratic system and therefore cause nuclear war). Speed is symptomatic of a system that values quantity of argument over quality.

I agree that better coaching is needed. It seems there are a number of schools where coaches abdicate their responsibility to a coach at some summer camp.

I have been frustrated with the ballots my LD students have been getting (damn that “who did a better job”), wherein judges have been writing “so and so was more persuasive” instead of explaining which arguments were persuasive or what the thought process was, or even if there was a thought process.

Nevertheless, I still adhere to the “persuasive method,” as you call it, because I do believe we are training these students for function in the real world. They must therefore be able to persuade an intelligent lay person. They should be taught to persuade an intelligent lay judge.

Keep the complex ideas. But don't use jargon. Explain the ideas in the round. Don't assume I've read the same articles the debater has. Inserting the ideas by reference instead of explaining them assumes that the ideas will do the debating. It also will tend to have the debaters know the impact the idea has on a debate without necessarily understanding the idea itself—at least understanding it well enough to express it to an intelligent lay person. How much better able to use an idea will the debater be after explaining it a few hundred times? If this means you need to reduce the number of ideas because you have to explain them, so be it. I think a little triage would be welcome. If you can do this, then bring on the speed.

In the final analysis, we both want the same thing. We want a debate that is idea-centered. We should both work toward that.

CHSSA

MISSION STATEMENT

The California High School Speech Association will encourage, support and sponsor both curricular and co-curricular oral communication which will empower students to be productive participants in American society and the global community.

To accomplish this, we adopt the following goals:

- 1)** Every student will participate in communication activities which promote self-worth and self-esteem.
- 2)** Every student will develop the critical and analytical thinking skills necessary for academic success.
- 3)** Every student will develop the skills necessary for success in a competitive environment.
- 4)** Every student will develop the interpersonal skills necessary for productive employment.
- 5)** Every student will develop the oral communication skills necessary for effective public presentations.
- 6)** Every student will develop the listening skills necessary for reaching informed decisions.
- 7)** Every student will develop skills necessary for the peaceful resolution of conflict.
- 8)** Every student will develop interpersonal skills necessary for establishing understanding among members of a diverse society.
- 9)** Every student will develop the communication skills necessary for effective & active participation in a democratic society.
- 10)** Every student will demonstrate ethical responsibility in the acquisition and practice of communication skills.



Johansen's Speech in the Limelight Program

by Rod Landes

As speech coaches we all struggle to figure out new and innovative ways to fundraise, recruit, and let the community know about our speech programs which we spend so many hours developing and for which we should be extremely proud. It has always amazed me after ten years of being a speech coach that many people have no idea what I do, or how much time is involved, and what speech and debate actually is.

So as a means of trying to fulfill all of these challenges, the past two years we have developed a program which is called Speech in the Limelight. The program is a ticketed event, which highlights Johansen's State and National Qualifiers and is held in our Theater.

The tickets are \$5.00. I ask the students to sell at least 10 tickets and/or donate, or find donations which amount to, \$100. With 40 students competing, feasibly we could raise \$4000 in donations. We have 400 seats in our auditorium, at \$5.00 a shot we could feasibly make \$2000. In addition, I encourage businesses to donate money and we put the business donations on our program. We hosted a silent auction as well. The silent auction included pies, cookies, and cakes (baked by the parents), donated Giants tickets, a plane ride and dinner at a restaurant, charm bracelets, etc. All proceeds are donated directly to the Johansen Speech program. We put a minimum bid on the items. Minimum bid for desserts was \$25; tickets and plane ride were priced at face value. During the event a local Coffee Bar business sold coffee and cookies with all proceeds going to the speech program.

Finally the program. I had three oratories, an expository, three humorous interps, one duo, and two impromptus. The first impromptu was on a communication topic; the last was topics from the audience, which were all to be used in the speech. The topics were monkeys, cheese, and motor oil!

Also we had a mini debate, with the topic: resolved that the teenagers' right to privacy was more important than the parents' right to know. 4 speech parents that I thought could debate were chosen, along with 4 of my debaters. I had the parents take the side of the student, and debaters took the side of the parents. Each speaker had a 1-minute constructive with a thirty second cross-examination period. Just long enough to make it interesting, not long enough to make it boring.

Another part of the program I added was something I started doing in my classroom this year. We read affirmations every day in every class at the beginning of each class period and we have a new affirmation each week. Usually I read the affirmation and then we read it together as a class and then we discuss the thought. Between the acts I had beginning students say their memorized affirmations. Here is an example.

The Power of a Leader

True leaders are not those who strive to be first, but those who are first to strive and who give their all for the success of the team. True leaders are first to see the need, envision the plan, and empower the team for

action. By the strength of the leaders commitment, the power of the team is unleashed.

The evening was divided up into two, one-hour acts; with a 10-minute break in between. While we were setting up for debate, we allowed people to go through and make their final bids on the auction items. The whole program lasted two and a half hours. While it was long, all who watched said the time went quickly and was very enjoyable. I have submitted my program to show you how I set it up. We had approximately 150 in the audience, and raised over \$1500 on the tickets and silent auction items. The student donations are still coming in.

I sent out free tickets to 8th graders who signed up the night of our 8th grade parent night, sent tickets to Lion's club members, as well as some tickets to other organizations who have been supportive of our speech program over the years. I also told students I was more interested in getting people there than I was in how much the tickets were. Each year we are getting bigger and better and hope to have a sellout soon. Consider this as an opportunity to fundraise, recruit and promote your program to the student body and to the community at large.

If you have any questions you can contact me at Johansen High School 641 Norseman Dr. Modesto, Ca 95357 or e-mail me at landes.r@monet.k12.ca.us.

Speech in the Limelight Program:

Megan Osborn – Today is all we have

Navdip Samra – Oratory “Get Over it!”

Katy Renz – Expository “Useless Laws”

Kanitha Soukhamthath – Essence of Success

Amber Lopez – Oratory “Courage”

Stefanie Baker – Impromptu

Mekila Martin – The Power of Belief

Don Lacey – Dramatic “Bums”

David Greene – The Teacher

Ryan Renard – Humorous “No Shirt, No Shoes, No Problem”

Jack Richards

Break:

Tim Herrmann – The Difference

Katy Renz – Oratory “Dare to Dream”

Lexi Shiovitz – Humorous “A my name is Alice”

Emily Duran – Impromptu

Jack Scott – The Power of a Leader

Erin Overweg – Thematic “Letters from the war”

Lexi Shiovitz/Amber Lopez – Duo “Open to Interpretation”

Mary Ann Zoslocki – Today

Joe Medeiros – Humorous “Dave Barry's Bad Habits”

Michael Medeiros – Never Give Up

Resolved: A teenagers right to privacy is more important than a parent's right to know

Debate:

Stefanie Baker Mr. Baker

Tim Herrmann Mr. Herrmann

Richard Ludlow Mrs. Duran

Erin Overweg Ms. Harrington

Affirmation Speakers:

Megan Osborn – Today is all we have

Kanitha Soukhamthath – The essence of success

Mekila Martin – The Power of Belief

David Greene – The Teacher

Tim Herrmann – The Difference

Ashley Spangler – Greatness

Jack Scott – The power of a leader

Mary Ann Zoslocki – Today

Michael Medeiros – Never Give Up

Gabrielino's Icebreaker Tournament

by Derek Yuill

In response to a couple coaches' requests, the following is a description of the Icebreaker Speech & Debate Tournament held each September at Gabrielino High School.

The purpose of the tournament is simple. Keep everything simple and easy on the coaches and students. There is no preparation beforehand for getting the students ready or obtaining judges. When we ran our first Icebreaker six years ago, we only had 90 groups of two. Within a couple of years, we grew to over 250 groups of two. Each year, anywhere from 400 to 500 students come to our campus on a Saturday for this tournament that begins at 8am with a general meeting in our gym, runs four rounds, a final, awards and IS OVER BY 3PM.

Students must enter the tournament in groups of two. Each group of two must be comprised of at least one novice student. Groups may be novice/novice or varsity/novice, but no varsity/varsity teams are allowed. The entry fee is two dollars per group of two, a buck a kid. Schools are charged on the number of groups they call in one week prior to the tournament.

Each group of two will compete in panels of 6 for four rounds. A tournament official (one of our coaches or captains) will go to each room at the start of each round and hand the students an envelope with topics.

Round one is Improvisational duo. The first group will open the envelope and pull three topics. A sample topic: one of you just saw Elvis and the other doesn't believe you. They will pick which one of the three topics they wish to perform. The other groups will give the first group 1 minute to discuss/prepare. At the end of one minute, they will perform their improv skit for a time of 0 to 5 minutes. Then, the next group draws/decides/performs.

Round two is Spontaneous Argumentation or SPAR. A sample topic: The mountains are better than the beaches. Here, the first two groups come to the front to the envelope provided by the tournament official. They flip a coin. The group winning the flip gets to draw and decide the debate topic. The group losing the flip, gets to decide which side of the debate they want to be. If there is an uneven amount of groups, the tournament official will ask if some group would like to debate twice. The groups will be instructed to only judge that group on their FIRST debate.

Round three is Radio Interview. A sample topic: You are interviewing the winner of Survivor. This round is run exactly the same as round one: improvisational duo.

Round four is Character Debate. A sample topic: Former Presidents debating Rock-n-Roll music is better than Country. This round is run the same as round two: SPAR.

Each group of two is given a ballot for each of their rounds. They are to rank the speakers in each of their rounds 1 to 6 (including themselves in the ranking.) The groups all bring their ballots to the tab room at the conclusion of each round. All the groups' ballots for each panel are stapled together and each group will get 6 scores for the round (provided every group showed up). The tab room will drop the high and low scores for each group/each round and get an average for the round. For example, if group 303 got a 1,2,3,4,5 (some group was a no-show) then we would drop the 1 and the 5, add the other three scores, get 9 and divide by the number of scores we added, 3. Thus, the score for team 303 in that round would be 3. It may sound complicated, but it's a lot easier than figuring out bonus entries for the State Tournament.

After all scores are calculated after round 4, we post the top 7 groups of two that will compete in the final round which is held in our gym in front of all 500 competitors. We find 3 people to serve as judges for the round and send the speakers to a holding room. Each group of two is dismissed to the gym one group at a time as they are all going to perform the same Improvisational Duo topic.

At the end of a very entertaining round, we figure up the scores and award ceramic pieces made from our school's art department to the finalists.

You might think that it all comes down to luck to be in the final out of 200 plus groups competing or that students will vote for themselves. In the first four years of the tournament, one student was in the final round each of the four years with four different partners and his group won the tournament three of those years.

This type of tournament is win/win for everyone. Beginning students get varsity partners, or at least other novice partners to maneuver their way around at their first tournament. Students get to understand the difficulty of judging. Students get a lot of speaking experience without any preparation. This is a great way to get new schools to get into speech & debate. Beginning coaches can use this tournament to wet their feet and their students' appetite for speech. And we all get to go home early enough to have dinner with our families (or if some wonderful girl would happen to come over for dinner with me).

If you have any questions, want to come to our tournament, or want some materials so you can run your own Icebreaker, you may call me at Gabrielino High School 626-573-2453

Best of luck to all of you and your teams on a great year of speech & debate.

Getting to First Base — a new way to look at Student Congress

by Paul Pinza, Westmont High School

It's tough to go back to Triple-A once you've sniffed the Major Leagues.

My first trip to Nationals as a coach resulted from a phone call in May rather than a victory in March. My student — we'll call him Gary — placed third in the Senate at our district congress two months prior. This made him the first alternate; pretty good for his first Student Congress ever. Then, like a minor league ballplayer who joins the Majors just in time for the World Series, our district chair gave us the "call up" about four weeks before competition started. Over the next month, Gary would research some forty bills, fly to Oklahoma, and compete in his second Student Congress ever.

At Nationals, I was required to judge one eight-hour session — I had never judged Congress before. What I saw in my Senate chamber awakened me to the awesome potential of this event. All twenty-four students demonstrated a keen understanding of a stunning array of subjects. In their taut, three-minute speeches, Senators wielded this data as a samurai swings his sword, deftly cutting through the rhetoric of other speeches and aiming at the heart of each controversial issue. Yet what most surprised me was the etiquette of the chamber. These students were all well schooled in the tenets of debate, yet their ability to clash never subsumed their sense of decorum. They gave outstanding speeches, then sat down and encouraged others to speak as well. In eight hours, I saw twenty-four competitors evolve into one community.

I returned to California charged with an elevated respect for Student Congress. I was energized by the images of Oklahoma, excited by what Congress could be. Unfortunately, our league's congresses quickly deflated those images. Most of our tournaments used only four or six bills, rare was the student that researched more than half of the legislation. Debate on the less popular bills would be skirted; in some sessions, nobody — *nobody* — would rise to speak during the first twenty minutes. Of course, a logjam would appear at the end of each session, and Parliamentary procedure would devolve into a series of increasingly nasty attempts to kill or extend debate. Nobody wanted the first word, but everyone clamored for the last word.

Certainly, the coaches in our state actively discourage this kind of scurrilous behavior, but I fear that the system we use to evaluate our competitors might actually encourage students to dabble in less-than-honorable tactics. Currently, our league asks judges to rank the top seven students in each session. Each judge is provided with a

sheet for tracking the speeches given by each delegate, and each is told to consider these speeches first and foremost when deciding their rankings. We also tell judges to consider the quality of a student's speeches above mere quantity, and ultimately, the students that "further debate" the most should receive the top rankings.

These guidelines are flawed in two ways. First, they are too vague to be helpful; they leave too many questions unanswered. Doesn't a competitor who asks several provocative questions further debate more than the one giving mediocre, canned speeches? Does one "A+" speech outweigh two "B+" speeches? Between a student that always offers new ideas and another who clashes constantly, which one furthers debate further? If we expect judges to compress every element in a ninety-minute Congressional debate — evidence, analysis, clash, poise, delivery, cross-examination, courtesy — into one set of rankings, we need to provide more specific paradigms for doing so. Furthermore, the use of a holistic ranking system creates an environment wherein students feel they must audition for their judges' first-place votes. This gives rise to a plethora of practices that compromise the integrity of Congressional debate. Students feel they can't say anything that might upset a judge that doesn't agree with him/her. Therefore, students "audition" with conventional, over-rehearsed, soapbox speeches that dance around the controversy at the heart of each bill. A speech's entertainment value may even be inflated with the use of superficial props or visual aids. Even more destructive is the aforementioned practice of Parliamentary sabotage. It only takes a handful of self-serving conspirators to exclude several students from the floor. What better way to woo a judge than by eliminating the other suitors?

The NFL uses a very different system to adjudicate Congress competitors, and I believe this system greatly reduces the students' incentive for mischief. This procedure — known as the Base System — requires judges to score each individual speech on a scale of one (poor) to six (outstanding). The Parliamentarian keeps track of the total number of speeches in a given session in order to determine the session's Base Level. Once the total number of speeches equals the number of representatives in the room, that session has achieved Base One. In a chamber of ten students, it takes ten total speeches to reach Base One (which means everyone has had the chance to give one speech). Twenty speeches are required to reach Base Two, thirty for Base Three, and so on. The Tabulation Room collects the judges' scoresheets and the Parliamentarian's information regarding the Base Level of the session. The individual speech scores for each student are added to determine that student's total number of points. However, if a student's quantity of speeches *exceeds* the Base Level of his/her session, then his/her speech scores are averaged and multiplied by the Base number.

Let's suppose Jessica, Munjal, and Sanida are in the aforementioned chamber of ten. This chamber reaches Base Three during its preliminary session, meaning there were at least thirty total speeches. Their individual speech scores look like this:

NAME	SPEECH	SCORES ****		
Jessica	5	5		
Munjal	5	4	5	4
Sanida	4	5	5	

Everyone had an opportunity to give three speeches, but because Munjal gave four speeches, his scores need to be adjusted to “fit the base”. Thus, the Tab Room averages his scores, and this median average (4.5) is multiplied by the Base Number (3) to determine his total points. Points for Sanida (who stayed with the Base) and Jessica (who fell behind the Base) are figured simply by adding their individual speech scores together. The final results look like this:

NAME	SPEECH	SCORES	AVG	PLACE
Jessica	5	5		
(5)	10	3 RD		
Munjal	5	4	5	4
(4.5)	13.5	2 ND		
Sanida	4	5	5	
(4.67)	14	1 ST		

Notice that the fourth speech actually hurt Munjal because it dropped his average below Sanida’s. Thus, when his scores are adjusted, he ends up in second place behind Sanida. Why does Jessica get third when her average score is higher than Munjal’s or Sanida’s? Remember, it’s a Base Three session; Jessica could have given three speeches, but she chose not to, which hurt her standing.

The Base System encourages students to participate equally during a competitive session. Obviously, you cannot earn points unless you speak, so stalling in the first part of the session serves no purpose. Conversely, if you attempt to dominate the floor by giving a multitude of speeches, your score will probably drop. The goal is to keep up with the Base Level of your session, which means that once Munjal gives his first speech, his second speech should wait until after all other representatives have given their first speeches. Moreover, the attitude of a Congressional chamber becomes less competitive and more supportive under the Base System. Students actually encourage their “opponents” to give speeches and increase the Base. The previous question will only be moved when the quality of debate merits it. In fact, during one of Gary’s preliminary sessions at Nationals, the chamber tried to move the question because debate on a given bill had grown repetitive. Gary wanted to speak on this bill, however, and he implored the chamber to give him a chance to present some new ideas. In a near-unanimous vote, the chamber allowed Gary to speak, and afterwards, they thanked him for presenting his unique perspective.

Student Congress is the only event that allows students to independently enforce rules and ethics during competition. Even as we evaluate our young delegates in the spirit of competition, we cannot sacrifice the spirit of communal responsibility that makes this event unique.

Suppose baseball players were individually ranked after each game, and their ranking determined their pay for that day. Suppose further that there was no set lineup, and teammates had to battle each other throughout the game for a place in the batting order. Can you see the juiced egos of the Major Leagues embracing the principles of teamwork under such a system? Neither can I, which is why Congressional scoring must be based on performance, not a judge’s preference.

If the entire dugout understands that the whole team must reach first base before anyone can proceed to second, you might see twenty Representatives furthering debate by listening to each other’s views. When mutual respect levels the playing field, a future Senator can gain the confidence she needs to step up to the plate, swing away at conventional wisdom, and launch a new idea over the fences of our limited perception.

In Memoriam

Sandra Gray

Sandra Gray was born in Ohio and attended a high school that had no speech program; only sixteen students were in her graduating class. At the age of sixteen, Sandra began college at Case Western Reserve. She received her Bachelors and Masters degrees from California State, Fullerton. She wanted to major in speech pathology; she took advanced public speaking and found out she had to have one year of forensic experience to meet the course requirements. This is when Sandra had her first debates; this activity was the most exciting academic endeavor she had experienced.

Sandra Gray taught at Romona High School for three and a half years; Tustin for ten years; Foothill for five years. She had many State and National competitors.

Sandra Gray served as the secretary of the Citrus Belt, president of the Orange County League, Area Four Chairperson, Vice-President of Activities of CHSSA. Sandra was present of CHSSA 1975-1977. In 1988 she was elected to the CHSSA Hall of Fame.

Marian Mellgren

Marian Mellgren taught in the Stockton Unified School District from 1949 to 1976; her forensic coaching was done primarily at Amos Alanzo Stagg High School. Marian served as President of the Yosemite Forensic League, Editor of the CHSSA Speech Bulletin, and Vice-President of the State Speech Council.

State Speech Tournament 2002 Winning Speeches

Expository 1st Place State 2002
by Sarah E. Clark, Redlands HS
"Survival of the Sexiest"

Boy sees girl. Boy wants girl. Girl wants boy to want girl. Boy marries girl. Boy and girl live happier ever after, unless boy meets prettier girl or girl meets more successful boy. There's something wrong with that picture. Let's look at our dating game, the way we pick out those partners that would suit us best, is for the most part a complex network of wants and needs, likes and dislikes, do's and don't go there's. It's a process that drives us crazy because of its complexity, but it's a process that keeps the human race alive. What do we find beautiful and why? Where do our ideas of beauty come from? Is our perception of beauty informed by nature or nurture? What if we look at prettiness because we are programmed to do just that? Is our world only a survival of the sexiest?

What if we could simplify all this confusion surrounding the idea of beauty and boil it down to some basic rules of attraction, say, here you are peoples of the world: beauty, plain and simple. Is it possible? Believe it or not, science has gotten pretty darn close. Let's think of beauty as a biological adaptation. Perhaps our extreme sensitivity to beauty is hard-wired, that is, governed by circuits in the brain shaped by natural selection. We love to look at smooth skin, thick shiny hair, curved waists, and symmetrical bodies because in the course of evolution the people who noticed these signals and desired their possessors had more reproductive success. We are their descendents. Our sexual preference is still guided by ancient rules that make us most attracted to bodies that look the most reproductively fit. So what classifies someone as being reproductively fit?

According to Leonardo Da Vinci, "beauty is synonymous with geometric form and balance of proper measure and proper size, of parts that fit harmoniously into a seamless whole" (Ectoff 15). Indeed there are our irreducible elements of beauty: clarity, symmetry, harmony, and vivid color (Ectoff 15). In animals, these elements are tied to beauty because they act as a measure of overall fitness and are signs of good development, parasite resistance, survival, youth, and fertility. Animals that display these traits have higher growth rates and survive longer. Something I like to call "Lookism," operates on a largely unconscious level. We are always sizing up other peoples' looks; "beauty detectors scan the environment: we see a face or body for a fraction of a second and rate its beauty, even give it the same rating we would on longer inspection" (Ectoff 7). Did you know that a woman can decide if a man is attractive in two-tenths of a second, whereas a man decides if a woman is pretty or not in two-hundredths of a second (Ectoff 57)? We're talking about a lapse in time of a blink of an eye for a woman, but only a zap

across the brain for a guy. Why the difference? Scientists have no idea.

What does evidence like this tell us? Simply that our reaction to beauty is automatic. But there is hope! Our thoughts and our behaviors are ultimately under our control. We are not shallow people that only seek out beautiful people because they make our palms sweat and our knees shake; we are smart, and we can make decisions about our attraction toward another based on personality, compatibility, sense of humor, and these factors far outweigh mere beauty. Despite all that, it is in the nature of animals and humans alike, to be obsessed with their appearances.

Take for example, the peacock: here he is, strutting his stuff, saying, "I'm so healthy and strong that I can afford my tail of sixty inches in radius, can siphon off nutrients to keep it in brilliant shape, and allow myself to be vulnerable to sneak attacks from behind" (Ectoff 170). And the females reward him for his trouble. Females prefer males with large, colorful ornaments, not only because they look neat, but because sexual selection has favored the evolution of display traits that easily reveal dangerous asymmetry and those that flamboyantly display symmetry. Scientists have found that running as a common thread through the ideal of beauty is an aesthetic based on proportion and number. Researchers claim that there actually exists a numerical ratio that corresponds to beauty: 1 to 1.618 (Ectoff 62). For both sexes, this ratio can be applied to the length of one's body from floor to wrist, and hip to knee and knee to ankle. This ratio reflects the characteristics of the population mean and just happens to correspond to the bodies of those that are generally perceived as attractive (Ectoff 63).

Healthy pre-menopausal women have waist-to-hip ratios of .67 to .80. These ratios run common despite the particular size or weight of the woman, both Marilyn Monroe and Audrey Hepburn had the same ratio (.72) but represent two very different images of beauty (Ectoff 191). The age range of maximum beauty, especially for women, is between the ages of 14 and 24; during this time our bodies are the strongest, our skin is the fairest, and we're least susceptible to disease (Ectoff 54). The female wants support and protection, the male wants to want to protect her and have viable offspring with her, so the female body is sculpted to fit the desires of the male. Psychologist Devendra Singh believes that men have an innate preference for female bodies with narrow waists and full hips because this shape signals high fertility, high estrogen, and low testosterone (Ectoff 192).

According to Desmond Morris, in his book, *The Naked Ape*, the body of a male animal is sculpted to fit the need of the female. To fight off competitors and support his female, he grows massive in size; to charm the female, he displays beauty (Morris 132). A man who develops more symmetrically, V-shaped, with waist-to-hip ratio of .85 to .95, is generally more attractive to women (Ectoff 185). It is unlikely that anyone notices subtle differences in wrist size or that any woman is turned on by symmetrical ankles, but men with symmetrical bodies tend to have other attractive features, such as well-proportioned faces and bodies that are more muscular, taller, and heavier than those of other men (Ectoff 177). So if we are born with our sex appeal already inherent within us, ladies, it just might not be possible to turn a frog into a prince.

The unconscious association of power, status, and height is so ingrained in us that we automatically presume that big,

beautiful people are powerful people. Indeed, in the animal world, the dominant animal tends to be the largest. Just look at the Alpha males in our society, US presidents. The easiest way to predict the winner in a US election is to bet on the taller man: up until this last year, we've had an unbroken string of hits, except for 1968 when Richard Nixon beat George McGovern (Ectoff 173). For example, the American public thought that John F. Kennedy, (the taller, more attractive candidate), beat Richard Nixon during the televised debates, but those that listened to the debate on the radio, thought that Nixon won. This doesn't necessarily mean that only tall, attractive men succeed but what I do know is that while the average height of a man in the US is five feet nine, more than half of the CEO's in American Fortune 500 companies are six feet or taller and only three percent are five feet seven or less (Ectoff 173). Speakers mount stages, religious leaders speak from altars, kings ascend thrones.

Nancy Ectoff, in her book, *The Science of Beauty*, claims that by using equations, such as the Pythagorean theorem, scientists have been able to construct a mask for the perfect human face (Ectoff 25). This mask fits a wide variety of faces, despite the particular ethnic background or age, which suggests that a beautiful face is average. Beautiful faces, like beautiful bodies, tend to display the features of the population mean. Attractive feminine faces are one that are reflective of high estrogen; they have a soft jaw, high cheekbones, wide eyes, and full lips. Attractive masculine faces reflect high testosterone: they have a strong jaw line and pronounced brows and eyes (Ectoff 25).

Have you ever noticed that top athletes also tend to be beautiful? Take for example Tiger Woods, Mia Hamm, Michael Jordan, Mike Piazza, Anna Kournikova, and Marion Jones. It's not a coincidence; they have good genes all over. In a study done at Berkeley, the track coach measured the ears of each of his runners; those that had symmetrical ears just happened to be the best runners on the team (Ectoff 49).

But what does all of this mean? What have we figured out? That we arrived in this world pre-programmed to love, desire, and do whatever it takes to achieve or possess beauty, that beauty can be measured, created, and quantified to an extent, and that all guys want is a beautiful face on and hourglass figure. That stinks so it's not fair. Beauty is a source of power like it or not and people make assumptions based on beauty.

But, what is it? Beauty isn't a fashion, it isn't a creation of the media, and it doesn't come from within. It's a random ticket in life's genetic lottery that drives the whole human race. It's a passport to success, but it's a visa; it expires. Aaron Spelling, creator of "Baywatch" and "Melrose Place" said, "I can't define it, but I know it when it walks into the room" (Ectoff 8). Beauty is a basic pleasure; and although the object of beauty is highly debated, the experience of beauty is not. Beauty probably just is in the eye of the beholder, or in this case, the beholder in the eye of the beauty.

1st Place Advocacy by Jenna Hammerling Miramonte HS "Hazing"

(Dialogue between two girls on phone) Ring, ring,Ring, ring.

Answering machine: Hi, you've reached Jenna. I'm not here right now so leave a message after the beep. BEEP.
"Jenna, this is Tiffany, from your high school. Like all of the senior girls, well-like not all of them some people are just dorks, are like going to dress up all the same on the first day of school so we can like intimidate the freshmen. We are going to cover a few freshmen girls with eggs and flour. We want to make sure they know where they belong, at the very bottom. Gosh, I'm going to love bossing them all around. So, you should dress up, but don't tell every senior girl. We aren't including everyone. Bye."
Now, many of you might be wondering what is going on. I received this call. A number of senior girls from my class engaged in an activity that is prevalent throughout the country -- hazing.

Let's be honest. When someone says the word hazing, what's the first thing that comes to mind? Anyone? For me, it's college fraternities and sororities where drunken college kids pull off stupid stunts to amuse their new-found friends. In reality, hazing is an act of violence in which a person or a group of individuals, either physically, sexually, or verbally, abuse another person. Hazing is a problem on college and university campuses. It has resulted in serious injuries and even deaths. Earlier this year, Soraya Ali-Omar, a twenty-two year old senior at Chico State, was murdered in a hazing activity where two men forced her to take the drug GHB (Indiana).

But the problem of hazing is not confined to just colleges. It is also a serious problem on high school campuses. Although hazing at any age can be exceedingly harmful, hazing at the high school level is particularly troubling because the developmental stages of adolescence create a situation in which students are more vulnerable to peer pressure due to the tremendous need for belonging. A major developmental task for teenagers, including myself, is learning how to fit in and be accepted socially by their peers. Many students don't have the courage to say no to their friends, in fear that they might not be considered cool. For instance, in 1994 a freshman at Shoshone High School in Idaho was murdered after he had the courage to stand up to seniors that were hazing him (Indiana). This example is severe, but students want to find friends and be part of some sort of community. Many students find this community in groups or in clubs. In fact, 67 percent of high school hazing victims were reported to be involved in athletics (Consequences). In 1996, at Lodi High School in New Jersey, Anthony Erekat, a member of the football squad had his hair hacked off and had players spread feces and peanut butter all over his body during an initiation (Indiana). Even more severe, in 1998, at Rancho Bernardo High School in California, a rookie baseball player was sodomized with a bat by members of his own team in the locker room (Indiana).

Often the consequences of hazing are dismissed, because boys will be boys. Now many believe that hazing is a mere tradition because students, teachers, parents, coaches, and

administrators do not regard hazing as more than an adolescent prank. But when we see Soraya Ali-Omar murdered, Anthony Erekat taunted, and a baseball player molested, I hope we realize that this is nothing to be taken lightly. At an interview with the dean of my high school, she explained that hazing doesn't exist at my school even though more than half of the senior girls participated in hazing activities at the beginning of the academic year (Bruketta). She believes that hazing is only initiation rights into a group or club. Hazing, however, is not about tradition or silly antics; hazing is about the abuse of power and the violation of human dignity. Students suffer serious negative consequences from hazing, such as depression, low self-esteem, and emotional break downs, and they feel hurt, betrayed, used lonely, and worthless (Consequences). According to Alfred University, more than 1.5 million high school students in the United States are being subjected to some form of hazing each year.

So, what's currently being done with the problem of hazing? Colleges and universities have taken serious measures to stop hazing. In October 1999, a University of Georgia student panel permanently expelled the Omega Psi Phi fraternity from the UGA campus for a series of hazing incidents involving freshmen pledges during spring semester (Shearer). The four members of the fraternity were suspended from all classes for one year. The school has specific rules forbidding hazing, promotes awareness groups, and educates their students on the effects of hazing. In fact, 90 percent of colleges and universities have instituted anti-hazing policies and educational awareness programs related to hazing, which have drastically reduced the amount of hazing (Consequences).

However, very few secondary schools have done the same (Education). In California public schools, hazing is defined in the Education Code as any activity which is likely to cause bodily danger, physical harm, personal degradation or disgrace to any person. The current penalty for committing acts of hazing is a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not less than one hundred dollars, nor more than five thousand dollars, or imprisonment in the county jail for not more than one year. Now many of you might be wondering why I am standing before you advocating legislation which already exists. The fact remains that this legislation had done nothing to curb the problem of hazing in high schools. In court, hazing charges have often been dismissed as isolated incidents, even when deaths occur (Indiana).

We need to promote awareness about detrimental affects hazing has not only on the victims but on society. Therefore, I advocate that the State Legislature of California pass the following legislation to implement mandatory hazing awareness classes in public schools.

Section 1: Every public school in California must devote one in-service day at the earliest time possible to educate teachers, administrators, and counselors on what hazing is and how they can prevent hazing in their schools.

Section 2: As well as educating faculty, every public school in California must include in the Health Class curriculum education on what the definition of hazing is and what the consequences of hazing are. The education program in this legislation would include discussion groups, workshops, and meetings with psychologists. Currently, the majority of high school students are not able to clearly distinguish what hazing entails (Consequences). With education, students will know what

hazing is and prevent it from occurring at their schools. Any student who participates in hazing will have his or her parents immediately notified. It is imperative to have parent involvement in order to curb the problem of hazing.

Section 3: All coaches and members of athletic teams affiliated with a public high school must attend a special seminar before the commencement of their sport on what athletic hazing entails. Seeing that many coaches are not members of school faculties, they must sign a waiver understanding that any involvement in athletic hazing, including failure to report incidents, will result in immediate termination.

Section 4: Schools who do can demonstrate hardship may apply for a grant to establish such a program.

Section 5: Failure in implementing such a program will result in an annual fine of five thousand dollars.

It starts with a phone call. "Hi, like this is Tiffany" -- but it can easily become more serious; and, if left unchecked by our legislature, it can escalate to a level that can be shockingly violent and even fatal. It is time to put the phone down and put an end to the practices known as hazing.

1st Place Original Oratory Alexander Aguila, James Monroe HS "Consumed By Consumption"

September 11, 2001. Our reflex -- beyond the thirst for vengeance -- was one big collective, how can I help? What can I do? Send money? Donate blood? Wave my American flag? Our government *thoughtfully* gave us *marching* orders: Do what you normally do, and Spend! Go shopping, eat at restaurants; wave not just the American flag but the greenbacks, the dough, the Washington's, Lincoln's, Hamilton's, Jackson's, and Franklin's. Buy bigóbecause that's what American's *do*. And the companies made it easieróthey were as *patriotic* as we were. Sale after sale, no sown/no interest loans, and we *heeded* the siren call, and we saved ourselves. Or did we?

Do you have more stuff than you can in your home? Do you constantly compare what you have to what other people have? Do you find yourself lying about the amount you've spent on a product? (Well, it was on sale, I had a coupon, the girl gave me her employee discount. Besides, I'll turn around and sell it on E-bay anyway, it's going to be a collectable you know.) given the choice between a slight pay raise and a shorter workweek, you'd choose the money, right? If you've answered yes to most of these questions then I'm sorry to say, you have a disease. A disease that has infected many American homes regardless of race, ag, and class. A disease that not only threatens our wallets and our health, but our values, family, friendship and faith. Yes, I'm afraid your test results have come back, and the prognosis is not good. You have Alfuenza, America's new epidemic. Afluenza, a term coined by author John DeGraf, is a "painfully contagious, socially transmitted condition of overload, debt, anxiety and waste, resulting from the dogged pursuit of more" (DeGraf et al. 2). All right, granted, you won't find it in the New England Journal of Medicine, but it's a legitimate problem. Our society is addicted to more: more money, more things, more stuff. And this dogged, persistent pursuit has left many Americans laboring to pay off credit card debt and bills. Like the bumper sticker says, I owe, I

owe, so off to work I go. It's apt comparison. We are like dwarves, toiling away in the mines in the futile belief that the more shiny things we acquire the more we'll feel desired and admired.

It is not to say that all of the solely buy to impress. For example, my mother. A single parent raising 2 teenage boys, working 48 hours a week. Her solution to exhaustion and stress is just a quiet stroll along Rodeo Drive. With the credit card in one hand, and the cell phone in the other, yes, my mom too is an Affluenza sufferer.

You know you've been bitten by the Affluenza bug when the things you own start owning you. Columnist Ellen Goodman writes, "Normal is getting dressed in clothes that you buy for work, driving through traffic in a car you are still paying for, in order to get tot the job that you need so you can pay for the clothes, the car, and the house that you leave empty all day in order to afford to live in it" (DeGraf et al 36). This is the typical Affluenza sufferer living the modern-day American Dream. A dream that wouldn't be complete without the trinkets, gizmos, and gadgets, brought by technology. Technology has brought the Affluenza virus right to our doorstep, literally. With catalog shopping, cyber shopping, and the home shopping TV networks, we can satisfy our urge to splurge, anytime, day or nightókinda like the midnight raids on the refrigerator. Or in my family's case, the sub-zero, double door Thermidor.

Now more than ever, our homes have landfills, novelty castles. Today, we Americans spend more on shoes and fashion accessories than on college education (DeGraf et al 13). We have twice as many shopping malls as high schools (DeGraf et al 13). And we have more people in these malls each week, than attend houses of worship (DeGraf et al). What are we expecting, megamall escalators to take us up to heaven?

Now some of you might be thinking, wait, this can't be an American infection. And that's true, it's not. But our country is the epicenter of this epidemic. The average American produces as much trash as two Europeans, consumes as much energy as three Japanese (New Dream). According to the United Nations, our country spends more on trash bags than 90 countries in the world spend for everything (DeGraf et al 85a).

How did we get to this point? I mean, how do we go from 1950's hula-hoop happiness, to today's consumption craze? Well, I'll tell you. I'll pinpoint the time in American history when it got out of control. In 1979, President Jimmy Carter made what became known as the "national malaise." In it he declared, "too many of us tend to worship self-indulgence and consumption" (Malaise Speech). It was the last presidential stand against Affluenza.

But Americans, mmnn, were in no mood to be scolded. We were entering the "Me Decade." So voted out the naysayer, and brought in the hero on the white horse: you guessed it, Ronald Regan. President Regan announced it's morning in America. And we woke up feeling frisky. 1980 ushered inn The Age of Affluenza. And the last 20 years thereafter, we've witnessed the greatest commercial expansion in American history. Largely due to Affluenza's twin vector of contagion: TV and advertising. TV, more than we care to believe, affects the way we think about wealth, people, and relationships. According to economist Julie Schor, TV is America's trend-setter. It sets the standard for what people want and what people think. And it specifically makes up want what other people have. There's a technical term for this; it's

called comparative consumption (Schor 80). Advertisers make fortunes exploiting this human quality. They play to our vulnerabilities, feed our egos, and make wants look like needs. Here's some insider insight. Pierre Martineau, writer of the advertiser's Bible, *Motivation in Advertising* writes that consumers "buy *everything*, and our economy is geared to the faster and faster tempo of this buying, based on *wants* which are created by (us)" (DeGraf et al 149). You see, advertisers have created this world with smoke and mirrors, and we're so distracted we don't see the sleight of hand, the commercial hook, it's the oldest trick in the book.

They've convinced us, we gotta "keep up with the Jones's." You know, we gotta keep up with the neighbors. But the sad fact is, most of us don't know who our real neighbors are anymore. And we don't need them. My mom doesn't need them. We're too busy, and bluntly put, we're too good for them. We're looking above, and ahead of them. My mom's neighbors, are the bosses, whose jobs she's gunning for. She's setting standards, setting goals, and working hard to achieve them, but she hasn't stopped to think. Think about whether these standards are worth working for.

In our frenzy to make more to spend more, we're losing sight of the truly valuable, that which cannot be comodified. We're oblivious to the toll consumption is taking on our financial well-being, our psychological health and our personal happiness. The average American annually works, much more than they did just 30 years ago (DeGraf et al 42). Credit card debt and personal bankruptcy have reached unprecedented heights. And the American personal savings rate? It's the lowest it's been since the Great Depression.

Speaking of depression, more Americans now seek treatment for depression; ten times more than in 1945 (DeGraf et al 72). In the words of psychologist David Meyer, "We excel at making a living, but often fail at making a life. In this age of plenty, we feel (a) spiritual hunger" (DeGraf et al 109).

And it's not just psychologists saying this. When Mother Teresa came to visit the United States before she passed away, she said, "This is the poorest place I've ever been in" (DeGraf et al 70). And she wasn't talking about the poverty of the streets, no, she was talking about poverty of the soul. Like hamsters in trapped cages, we run the exercise wheel; exerting all this energy, yet going nowhere. As if we had no choice. But we do.

At present, there is a revolution taking place. A worldwide movement called downshifting. People across the globe are changing their lives for the better, their jumping off the wheel. Typical downshifters quit their jobs, sacrificing cash for more flexible hours (Schor 136). They stop buying at department stores, and start buying thrift shops (Schor 136). And of the thousands of people polled who have made this change 85 percent of them don't regret it a bit (Schor 118).

Have we learned nothing from 9/11? Shouldn't that have proved that the American expression "he who dies with the most toys wins" is a big fat lie? The victims trapped in the Trade Towers didn't call their brokers on their cell phones to say good-bye. They called their children, their spouses, their siblings, their parents. Will it take *another* tragedy to open our eyes to the things that really matter? Affluenza is spreading unchecked, but there is a cure. It's really a matter of will. My parting words before I leave here today, please remember ladies and gentlemen, the best things in life aren't things. I thank you.

1st Place Original Prose/Poetry by Peter Javidpour, Arcadia HS “Allegory of the Knave”

Solomon: Ok people, let’s review. Now we know that Petrarch was the big poet in Italy in the 1300s and that Shakespeare was popular in the late 1500s, early 1600s. Now...you’re all probably asking yourselves, where does Chaucer fit in to all of this? Yeah, Brian. You have a question?

Brian: Mr. Solomon, ja ever see that one Shakespeare, uh Romeo and Juliet? The new one? And they have guns instead of swords and there’s that one Leonardo.

Solomon: Yeah, I’ve seen it. What about it?

Brian: It’s pretty good.

Solomon: So each of these writers. yeah, Brian...you have another question?

Brian: Why do we have to learn this?

Solomon: Good question, Brian...Oh, did I say good question? I meant stupid question. Despite what you may think, Brian, there really is a way to connect literature to your own life, Who can think of a time when they learned something from a book and applied it to their own life? Nathaniel, how about you?

Nathaniel: Yeah, I learned a lot from a book called The Brown in My Valley.....

Solomon: The Brown in My Valley.....I don’t believe I’ve ever... who’s the author?

Nathaniel: Seymour Butz.

Solomon: (Snapping fingers) Yeah, hey. I see what you’re trying to do here, and I don’t like it. One more move like that and you’re out of here. Listen: literature can be applied to your own life. I have here a love story written way back in the Middle Ages, but its message is so profound that it makes sense even today. Brian, will you read this story for us?

Brian: All right. Once upon a time, in a land far, far...

Solomon: Read the title fist, moron.

Oh, right...the name of the story is “Allegory of the Kuhnave”...

Solomon: The k is silent, numskull. It’s actually pronounced...

Peter: “Allegory of the Knave.”

Brian: OK, so once upon a time, in a land far, far...

Solomon: Aw jeez, Brian. Would you try sounding a little more dramatic?

Brian: OK. (Slowly) Once upon a time...

Solomon: How about an accent?

Brian: Once upon a time, in a land far, far away there live a most adventurous knight. He was a knave, not always following the strict code of chivalry and he went by the name of Count Cristobal Comico. We now join Count Comico as he and his trusty squire Salazar return victoriously from a recent battle...

CCC: Ah, wasn’t that a good battle, Salazar?

Salazar: Yes, my lord! My favorite part was when you killed that man!

CCC: HAHA. Yes...which one?

Salazar: I don’t know, you made all of their deaths look very entertaining. Oh, I almost forgot. You have a letter from a ...Princess Honeydew...

CCC: Oh, thank you, Salazar. Hm. Interesting. I feel like having an omelet. Would you like an omelet, Salazar?

Salazar: No, thank you, sire.

CCC: Fine, that means more for me.

Salazar: Sire?

CCC: Yes, Salazar?

Salazar: Aren’t you going to read the letter to the audience?

CCC: Oh, yes, I almost forgot.

CCC: She writes:

Honeydew: Dear Count Comico: I am very impressed with your recent victories in the battlefield. I would appreciate it if you came to my castle for a feast in your honor.

CCC: Signed, Princess Honeydew. Oh this is the happiest day of my life. For so many years, I killed and I slaughtered and I butchered so many anonymous people, and I finally get my just reward.

Salazar: Reward? What reward?

CCC: Can’t you see, Salazar?

Salazar: Well, of course I can. No, I can’t.

CCC: Let me explain for you: I want you to place your hands on my buttocks. Ah, yes. That’s it. That’s it, Salazar. Now keep grabbing my butt because it is big and smelly and I know you want to.

Brian: Keep grabbing it, you.

Solomon: OK, OK Brian (snapping fingers). Not funny. Not very funny, smart guy. Now if I want a comedy act, I’ll have Bob Saget read this. Now please, just stick to the story.

Brain: Ok, sorry.

Salazar: Reward? What reward?

CCC: Can’t you see, Salazar?

Salazar: Well, of course I can. No, I can’t.

CCC: Let me explain for you: Honeydew is a Princess...she is royalty. Which means she has two things...power and money.

When I meet her at the feast tonight I will ask her to marry me...if she says yes I will be a member of the royal family and then I will have power and money, too.

Salazar: Oh, splendid...what will be my reward?!?!

CCC: Haha (comforting gesture, signaling “slow down”).

Probably nothing. Now quickly! Get the horses ready for our journey!

Salazar: You know we don’t have horses.

CCC: And you know that when I say “get the horses ready” I mean “get ready to carry me.”

Salazar: (exasperated grunt, bends over) Hop on.

CCC: (bending knees) And away we go!

Brian: And away they went! To Princess Honeydew’s castle where the feast was about to begin...

(Salazar is still carrying Comico, Comico finally climbs off.)

Salazar: My lord, how do you know Princess Honeydew will fall in love with you?

CCC: Please, Salazar. What woman could resist such a handsome and dignified unibrow?

Salazar: Ah, yes. How does the old saying go? Women are like flowers-they both need unibrows.

CCC: I’ve never heard of that in my life. Ah, here is the Princess Honeydew.

Honeydew: Count Comico! So nice to meet you at last.

CCC: I have been waiting for this moment my whole life, Princess Honeydew, and I want you to know that I ...

Honeydew: Oh, wait. I want you to meet a good friend of mine. Count Comico, please meet the suave, charming and undeniably handsome Prince Alfonso.

Alfonso: Count Comico! A pleasure to meet you at last! How are

you, kind sir?

CCC: (Angry stare, mockingly) How are you, kind sir? Hmph.

(To Salazar) Look at him, Salazar. So smug with his good looks, his clean teeth, his etiquette. Who does he think he is? Makes me sick. I feel like I could just bash his pretty little face in with a large wooden club. I want to rip him in half with a.

Alfonso: I can hear you, you know. I'm standing right here.

CCC: Oh! So sorry...Prince Alfonso (to Salazar) but I must say, he does wear very nice clothes!

Salazar: Yes, they are nice clothes. Can I touch them?

Alfonso: Well, I don't see why not. (Being touched and interrupted three times) You know Count Comico I...

Brian: As the feast went on, so did the rise in Count Comico's hatred and jealousy of Prince Alfonso.

(Silence, Comico eats in anger.)

Alfonso: You know, Princess Honeydew, I just added a new stable to my estate. Perhaps I can take you there sometime and we can go horseback riding. Horses are quite magnificent beasts. Are you a horse enthusiast, Count Comico?

CCC: No, I don't own any horses.

Salazar: Oh, isn't that the truth?! Master just has me carry him around. Doctor once said if I kept carrying him my spine would crack like a twig! But it's been seven years and I can still carry him for miles! HAHAHA.

CCC: Yes. Salazar has very strong knees.

(No reaction)

Honeydew: So, Prince Alfonso, I understand you play the harpsichord. You know, I simply adore a man who can entertain.

CCC: Well, you know I-I can...um...Did you know Salazar can make very interesting whale noises? He can sound just like a whale, can't you, Salazar?

Salazar: Oh, yes! Here's a humpback! (Whale sound)

Alfonso: Oh, my Count Comico. The way you keep talking about Salazar, one would think the two of you are in love.

CCC: Well, the way you keep smelling bad, one would think that(sigh). (Whispering) I can't take it any more, Salazar. I can't let that perfect pretty boy get in between me and the Princess. I think Prince Alfonso is going to have a little accident...

Salazar: How can Prince Alfonso get into an accident...he's a very graceful man and he walks with such poise. Ohhh...you're going to kill him?

Alfonso: I can hear you, you know.

CCC: I'm sorry...Prince Alfonso, I think you and I need to have a little chat. Excuse us Princess Honeydew. (Walking into another room) Now, we must settle this situation like gentlemen, without any childish name-calling.

Alfonso: But you were calling me names!

CCC: It's not important for us to point fingers and place blame, But it is important for you to leave this castle immediately so that I may marry the Princess Honeydew.

Alfonso: What are you talking about?

CCC: Ok, then I guess I'll just have to...kill you with my sword!!! (Poking Alfonso.)

Alfonso: That's not a sword, that's a chicken bone you brought with you from the dinner table!

CCC: Ah, where is my sword? I lost it! Salazar, help! Do something!!!

Salazar: (Looks around frantically; whale sounds.)

CCC: That's not helping!

Salazar: Sorry, master.

CCC: I didn't say stop.

Salazar: (More whale sounds.)

CCC: I'll just have to kill you with this chicken bone (slapping Alfonso, Alfonso dies). Now let's get back to dinner. (Returns to previous room) (Princess) Well, Prince Alfonso and I had a little chat and we.

Princess: Where is Prince Alfonso?

CCC: (Chuckling) Well, let's just say...I murdered him...

Princess: Huh?

CCC: I mean...I...murdered...him...Listen, now that he's out of the picture...I think it would be wise of us to express our love...physically. Please, remove this veil from your face so that we may share our first kiss. So that our lips may violently entangle and passionately exchange their respective love juices.

Honeydew: As you wish...I simply can't resist your unibrow.

(Removes veil revealing ugliness)

CCC: Gadzooks! Uh...we don't have time to kiss. You probably want to show me your money vault...where you keep all the money?

Honeydew: Vault? Money? Oh, my family doesn't have any money to spare! We're as poor as poor can get.

CCC: I see...You know...I just remembered I have to go home and...well, you see...Salazar has...to go to...a feast...in his honor...(whispers) My goodness, Salazar...she's as ugly as a hog and as poor as a chimp, let's get out of here.

Princess: I can hear you, you know. I'm standing right here.

Brian: So Count Comico and Salazar left Princess Honeydew behind in dismal loneliness. And they all lived happily every after.

Brian: Mr. Solomon, that was a stupid story.

Solomon: No, Brian. It was a good story. You just heard it through stupid ears. Well, what didn't you like about it?

Brian: Why did that knight get all bent out of shape over the princess and even kill another guy to get her if he was just going to leave her because she was ugly and poor? You said there was a message in this story, but I didn't see one.

Solomon: Gosh, Brian. Now I know that the twist at the end of the story is a smack in the face to anyone who spent the last ten minutes expecting to hear a happy ending. But let me tell you that there was a very clear and very true message in that story, and if you couldn't find it, then I feel sorry for you.

Brian: Maybe you should explain.

Solomon: Maybe you should shut up.



More Great Memories from the 2002 State Speech Tournament

Special thanks to Dr. Andara Macdonald for her photography



Smiling with the President of CHSSA, John A. Cardoza



Hall of Fame Inductee Rita Prichard working hard as usual.



A happy and successful Martha Kennedy and Redlands H.S.



When are the awards going to start?



State Speech Tournament 2002

WINNERS

Policy Debate

1. Gwen Chien & Vik Singh - Leland HS, Marcus Walton
2. Gabriel Rocklin & Josh Frager - Homestead HS, Jerry Firestone/Helen Cherkasova

SEMIFINALISTS

- Deepa Mahajan & Li Zhu - Lynbrook HS
Edwin Lin & Karen Shi - Leland HS

QUARTER-FINALISTS

- Adam Bary & Paul Pulido - Damien
Elizabeth Alquist & Kyle Kimball - Arroyo Grande
Joey Tyllesen & Harrison Williams - Edison

OCTOFINALIST

- Sam Reed & Jason Hosfield - Rancho Bueno Vista
Billy Arnold & neil Gehlawat - Stockdale
Todd Carlson & Paul Ozhekh - Beyer

- Jessie Dosanjh & Nick Milinazzo - Beyer

- Erika Hope & Noah Leslie - Davis

DOUBLE OCTOS

- Matt Faust & Dan Magy - San Dieguito Academy
Dina Amin & Heather Greenslate - San Dieguito Academy
Jason Brooks & Tim Westmyer - Damien
Timmy Blalock & Ellen Dobie - Bakersfield
Anne Sidwell & Lana Isho - Beyer
Dave Wolfe & Ross Whittington - Nevada Union
Rowena Mak & Lea Mak - James Logan
Craig Wickersham & Nate Leung - Bellarmine

Lincoln Douglas Debate

1. Neel Mukerjee - Leland HS, Moe Jamil/Gay Brasher
2. Jimmy Gorham - Rancho Buena Vista, Andrea Miller

SEMIFINALIST

- Kevin Kiley - Granite Bay HS
Justin Harris - Grace Brethern

QUARTERFINALIST

- Helen Vera - Archer
Josh Braver - Cleveland
David Kuei - James Logan

OCTOFINALIST

- Valerie Serrin - La Costa Canyon
Emily Elkingtonn - Archer
Andrew Braver - Cleveland

- Georgina Jones - St Ignatius
Anna Bershteyn - Castilleja

DOUBLE OCTOS

- Melissa Taddei - Lodi
Ashley Hobbs - Beyer
Kevin McNeill - Beyer
Ian Richardson - Monte Vista, Danville
Albert Chang - Mission San Jose

- Andrew Liao - Lynbrook

- Ken Elkabany - Leland

- Imran Hague - Bellarmine

Student Congress

1. Andrea Searby - Miramonte, Sandra Maguire
2. Carlos Mejia - Kenndy, Lee Seals
3. George Komsky - Monte Vista, Danville, Dave Mately
4. Rose Doty - Monte Vista, Danville
5. Justin Glavis-Bloom - La Jolla
6. Stephanie Baker - Johansen
7. Sheyna Sears-Roberts - Carondelet
8. Elaine Lin - Miramonte
9. Chris Hogan - Mission Viejo
10. Richard Ludlow - Johansen
11. Chad Fite - Miramonte
12. Reva Litman - Monte Vista, Danville
13. Sean Kennedy - Don Bosco
14. James Chang - Pacifica
15. Joshua Yaklin - Cypress
16. Michelle Rengarajan - Westridge
17. Ben Carter - South Torrance
18. Jeremy Conrad - Long Beach Poly
19. Andy Alarcon - Long Beach Poly
20. Jennifer Chawla - Yuba City
21. Steve Lee - Yuba City
22. Nick Timiraos - Loyola
23. Allison Westfahl - Claremont
24. Harmony McMillin - Colton
25. Elaine Talebbeik - Lynbrook
26. David Sherman - Sherman Oaks
27. Albertina Thai - los Gatos
28. Alex Tcholakov - Granite Bay

CONGRESS Presiding Officer

1. Michael Gutierrez - Ridgeview, Kunath
2. Tim McGinnis - Colton, Bob DeGross
3. Joe Pabst - Miramonte, Sandra Maguire
4. Jackie Chou - LaReina

Original Oratory

1. Alexander Aguila - James Monroe, Kathy Graber
2. Ragini Srinivasan - Presentation, Ron Morales
3. Tin Yun Ho - Bellarmine, Kim Jones
4. Chad Callaghan - Bellarmine
5. Mark Halling - Miramonte
6. Tiffany Hsu - Monte Vista, Danville
7. Aruna Bharathi - Harker
8. Ben Unanaowo - James Logan
9. Deena Shakir - Leland

10. Munveer Bhanghoo - Bakersfield
11. Caitlin Yates - Redlands
12. Daniel Tran - James Logan
13. Erica Mu - San Marino
14. Katy Renz - Johansen
15. Antonio Templanza - Bellarmine
16. Vicky Wang - San Marino
17. Shivani VanDevooren - James Logan
18. Elsa Kim - Monte Vista, Danville

National Extempereaneous

1. Christos Theophanous - Miramonte, Sandra Maguire
2. Alexander Captain - Miramonte, Sandra Maquire
3. Ashley Hobbs - Beyer, Ron Underwood
4. Imran Hague - Bellarmine
5. Becky Brewer - West Bakersfield
6. Eliot Danner - Athenian
7. Scott Lichtenstein - Clovis West
8. Laura Perry - LaReina
9. Melissa Taddei - Lodi
10. Dagan Josephson - Leland
11. Elizabeth Alquist - Arroyo Grande
12. Craig Wickersham - Bellarmine
13. Richard Hsiao - Gabrielino
14. Gabe Rocklin - Homestead
15. Julia Lauper - Lincoln
16. Matt Slentz - Beter
17. Dara Kroop - Cleveland
18. Albert Leung - St Francis

Humorous Interpretation

1. Mark Engberg - Miramonte, Sandra Maquire
2. Jonathan Lovelady - Oceanside, Sharon Strong
3. Michael Ngyuen - San Gabriel, Doug Campbell
4. Jeanette Suelto - Bear Creek
5. Patrick Heil - Bellarmine
6. Amy Chang - El Cerrito
7. Stephan Cedars - Miramonte
8. Jermaih Johnston - Yucaipa
9. Victor Betts - Oceanside
10. Robert Bergin - Bellarmine
11. Max Bonilla - Gabrielino
12. Fredrick Adams - James Logan
13. Reza Mir - San Marino
14. Letica Han - Leland
15. eric Huang - Arcadia
16. Alicia Pulver - Monte Vista, Danville
17. Skyler Tennen - Cleveland
18. Wendy Rodriguez - Galt

Thematic Interpretation

1. Shana Rappaport - Miramonte, Sandra Maguire
2. Jeff Rogers - James Logan, Tommie Lindsey
3. Anna-Lyn Terre - John Marshall, Kevin Moran
4. Teresa Lee - James Logan
5. Karen Shi - Leland
6. Priya Purohit - Leland
7. Aarti Rao - Leland
8. Ellen Young - Leland
9. Sonya Imber - Miramonte
10. Rebekah Meredith - Rialto

11. Sara Know-Falcone - Oceanside
12. Darvis Shipp - Helix
13. Christine Wu - Leland
14. Roxana Sanchez - Arroyo Grande
15. Scott Timpe - Leland
16. Lauren Litel - Clovis East
17. Miriam Jackson - Millikan
18. Meg Radunich - Miramonte

Expository

1. Sarah Clark - Redlands, Martha Kennedy
2. Lauren Tang - North Hollywood, John Bernabe
3. William Wang - James Logan, Tommie Lindsey
4. Aaron Gannon - Bellarmine
5. Abe Epperson - Bellarmine
6. Chris Watters - Miramonte
7. Avery Drost - Redlands
8. Sessen Tekle - James Logan
9. Rabia Hussian - Miramonte
10. Jamie Devenport - Beyer
11. Christine Miller - Saratoga
12. Mary Lou Bui - Leland
13. Vivian Wong - Arcadia
14. Jasmine Ng - Schurr
15. Michael Hernandez
16. Leah Hazard - Bakersfield
17. Marisa VanSluyters - Miramonte
18. Judy Young - Leland

International Extempereaneous

1. Georgios Theophanous - Miramonte, Sandra Maguire
2. Raghav Thapar - Leland, Gay Brasher
3. Faris Mohuiddin - Leland, Gay Brasher
4. James Lin - Gabrielino
5. Lisa Mueller - Monte Vista
6. David Kuei - James Logan
7. Simon Berring - Miramonte
8. Sam Reed - Rancho Buena Vista
9. Colin Yee - Monte Vista
10. Karen Bhople - Bellarmine
11. Sherveen Salek - Saratoga
12. Vikram Gowrish - Bellarmine
13. Mitra Lohrasbpour - Saratoga
14. Todd carlson - Beyer
15. Nathan harling - Marysville
16. Jessica Gu - Cypress
17. Jessie Dosanjh - Beyer
18. Anne Sidwell - Beyer

Dramatic Interpretation

1. Juan Pagan - James Logan, Tommie Lindsey
2. Michelle Guest - Miramonte, Sandra Maquire
3. Taranika Echols - Fontana, Elane Fakatouat
4. Mike Smith - Roosevelt
5. Adrian Zaw - Gabrielino
6. Andy Gerges - La Mirada
7. Robert Hawkins - James Logan
8. Casey barney - Gabrielino
9. George Camany - Watsonville
10. Amber Johnson - James Logan
11. Keaton Johnson - Clash

- 12.. Holly Backman - Atascadero
13. Don lacey - Johansen
14. Sunkrish Balasubramaniam - Bellarmine
15. Anqi Huang - Leland
16. Alexander Tam - James Logan
17. Lisa Madison - Fresno
18. Michecia Jones - James Monroe

Duo Interpretation

1. Sam Cannon & Justin Bogh - Redlands, Martha Kennedy
2. Doral Miller & Brittany Turner - James Logan, Tommie Lindsey
3. Daryl Yoshihashi & Daniel Fernandez - Gabrielino, Derek Yuill
4. Michael Ai & Wendy Gu - Cypress
5. Roxanne Rosas & Zsaleh Rahimi - Gabrielino
6. Anderson Jonas & Gideon Klienman - Cleveland
7. Pierre Clark & Latoya Johnson - James Logan
8. Tony Tin & Anthony Wee - Leland
9. Cherie Murphy & Dijonn Grizzell - James Logan
10. Angela Chen & Anh Tran - Leland
11. Sean Dulake & Nelson Wang - Arcadia
12. Gloria Lin & Angela Chang - Leland
13. Jon Tupas & Vandana Sharma - Bear Creek
14. Mike Adams & Nick Dies - Cleveland
15. Devin Smith & Travis Townsend - College Prep
16. Allen Jiang & Victor Wang - James Logan
17. Young Cho & Oliver Luo - Leland
18. Paolo Bognot & Marlon Carpio - James Logan

Oratorical Interpretation

1. Anjanette McKinney - Oceanside, Sharon Strong
2. Richard Hackman - James Logan, Tommie Lindsey
3. Tiffany Johnson - Bear Creek, Karen Minick
4. Edward Perez - Gabrielino
5. Noah Bonneville - Miramonte
6. Nii Ahene - James Logan
7. Ying Vuong - Gabrielino
8. Barry Chang - Bellarmine
9. Jennifer Kretchmer - North Hollywood
10. Diane Chang - Arcadia
11. Duong Lee - Royal
12. Christine Lin - Leland
13. JJ Carlson - Miramonte
14. Nathaniel Nalam - James Monroe
15. Michelle Quint - Miramonte
16. Elizabeth Telefus - Miramonte
17. Daniel Cerone - Kennedy
18. Kelsey Jorgenson

Impromptu

1. Kyle Kimball - Arroyo Grande, Sean Pierce
2. Andrew Braver - Cleveland, Jaqueline Young
3. Omar Shakir - Leland, Gay Brasher
4. Christobal McKinney - St Ignatius
5. Adam Wang-Levine - Leland
6. Georgina Jones - St Ignatius
7. Vikrum Aiyer - mission San Jose
8. Jack Wang - Kennedy
9. Dustin Maghamfar - Bellarmine
10. Daniel Kitchell - Bakersfield
11. Kelly Mitchell - Sherman Oaks

12. Aman Grewal - James Logan
13. Kristin Mathe - La Costa Canyon
14. Mara Verby - Analy
15. Dash Vitullo - Arcadia
16. Jordanna Mosten - Marlborough
17. Christa Atwood - Del Norte
18. Lisa Ferris - Yucca Valley

Original Prose and Poetry

1. Peter Javidpour - Arcadia, Ashley Novak
2. Rachel Braswell-Trigg - James Logan, Tommie Lindsey, Tim Campbell
3. Carmen Medina - Redlands East Valley, Catherine Obregon
4. Randy Seidman, Rancho Bernarso
5. Russell Fike - Long Beach Poly
6. Sheryl Hoang - Gabrielino
7. Jacob Cribbs - Arroyo Grande
8. matthew Meo - Westmont
9. Ian Shin - Miramonte
10. Miles Niskian - Roosevelt
11. Tim Roberts - helix
12. Scott Calderwood
13. Carmel Javier - Esperanza
14. Amanda Stein - Leland
15. Winston Kwong - James Logan
16. Kyle Bates - Saugus
17. Monica Long - Miramonte
18. Megan Gramkow - Miramonte

Advocacy

1. Jenna Hammerling - Miramonte, Sandra Maguire
2. Ronni Chahal - Bellarmine, Kim Jones
3. Dani Saba - Redlands, Martha Kennedy
4. James Rapore - Brentwood
5. Zoe Silverman - Cleveland
6. Annemarie Ursini - Beyer
7. Ivette Ale - Kennedy
8. David Ho - Bellarmine
9. Kimberly Kam - Miramonte
10. Jackie Luk - Miramonte
11. Winnie Hung - Kennedy
12. Emily Knight - Redlands
13. Jackie Hawkins - James Logan
14. Sarah Messali - Mt. Carmel
15. Danny Berring - Miramonte
16. Megan Chiou - Lynbrook
17. Debbie Meron - Immaculate Heart
18. Sarah Dahms - Foothill

Motions

from the May 2002 CHSSA Meeting

Cummings suggested the creation of three Sweepstakes categories: schools with 4 or fewer entries, schools with 5-16 entries, and schools with 17 or more. The top five sweepstakes earners would win awards in the “small” category, top four earn awards in the “medium”, and top three in the “large”. *The Report was adopted as a motion to divide Sweepstakes into three separate categories (as stipulated), with each one named after a Hall of Fame coach.*

MOTION - Pritchard, 2nd Macdonald: to remand this motion (both parts) to the Sweepstakes Committee.
PASSED: unanimous.

MOTION to Revise By-Laws 01-09-E: Hybrid debate teams are prohibited from competing in State Qualifiers and the State Tournament. There is no explicit prohibition against hybrids at league events.
PASSED: voce, 2 dissent.

MOTION to Revise By-Laws 01-09-I: Codification of debate rules — constructives are for new arguments, rebuttals are for responding to those arguments, and no new arguments are allowed in rebuttals.
FAILED: voce.

MOTION to Revise By-Laws 02-05-B: To establish a seeding system for quarterfinals of debate at the State Tournament. Seedings are based on: 1) overall record, 2) number of ballots won, 3) number of wins accumulated by the contestant that defeated you, 4) total number of wins accumulated by all opponents. Pairings would only be adjusted if two contestants from the same school are scheduled to debate.
PASSED: Unanimous.

MOTION to Revise By-Laws 02-05-C: To lift the ban on notetaking in all debate rounds at the State Tournament.
PASSED: voce, 2 dissent

MOTION - Marcucilli, 2nd Brasher: To add the following to the guidelines on the judge’s ballot for Expository: “Visual aids in Expository are secondary. The speech is more important and must be given greater weight in a judge’s decision.”
PASSED: Unanimous.

MOTION to Revise By-Laws 02-05-D: To establish fines for schools who submit entries for the State Tournament after April 1. Entries received after the 1st but before April 10 will be fined \$150. Entries received after April 10 will be disqualified.
PASSED: unanimous

MOTION to Revise By-Laws 02-05-E: Eliminate the All-State Honors award.
PASSED: unanimous

02-05-F, which changes the number of schools needed to enter the qualifying tournament in order to qualify contestant to State. If the league qualifies less than three students in an event, three schools must compete in that event in the qualifier. If a league qualifies more than three, the number of schools entered in that event must equal the number of qualifiers for that event.
MOTION - Macdonald, 2nd S. Niemi: To remand Motion 02-05-F to the I.E. Committee.
PASSED: voce

MOTION to Revise By-Laws 02-05-G: To expand impromptu topics at the State Tournament. Round 1 = concrete nouns, Rd 2 = quotations, Rd 3 = current events, Semi’s = single word abstracts, Finals = quotations. *PASSED: unanimous*

MOTION to Revise By-Laws 01-09-H: Two changes in rules for interpretation speeches. A) In HI, DI, Duo, and OI, students may insert excerpts from a second work of literature if that second work is referenced within the original piece. B) In all interpretation events, published works that are used for introductions and/or transitions must meet the same manuscript requirements as the original piece.
PASSED: unanimous.

MOTION 02-05-A, regarding the establishment of Legal Counsel on the Executive Committee was remanded to the Executive Committee pending the acceptance or rejection of the similar Constitutional amendment.

MOTION to Revise By-Laws 02-05-J: To revise Article II, Section 5 so it refers to the most recent edition of Robert’s Rules of Order.
PASSED: unanimous

MOTION to Revise By-Laws 02-05-K: To revise Article VII, Section 3 so it lists the correct number of entries at the State Tournament.
PASSED: unanimous

MOTION to Revise By-Laws 02-05-L: To revise Article X, Section 6 so the addition in the tabulation example is correct.
PASSED: unanimous

MOTION to Revise By-Laws 02-05-M: To ban the use of all costumes, props, and visual aids in Student Congress.
REMANDED to the Congress Committee.

Fallacies, Foibles and Fantasies

by *Larry A. Smith*

Thirty years of participation in the state tournament lends to a collection of memories I call fallacies, foibles, and fantasies about the annual event.

Fantasy: The state tournament should run flawlessly on the time schedule.

Fact: It often does. It often does not. Coaches, who have experienced running their own local tournaments which sometimes run on schedule, but often do not, or who attend invitationals which often run on time, but often do not, are the worst of the participants when it comes to complaining on those occasions when the state tournament does not adhere exactly to the time schedule.

There are times when unexpected glitches make a tournament run behind the idealized schedule. The most frequent cause is a lack of judges, and too often a few coaches (probably those who complain the most) are at fault. Those in the judge assignment houses often call a coach name only to find that body is not present.

Excuses, mostly lame excuses, abound. "I had to take my kids to the hotel" "I had to get something to eat." "I was in the restroom." "The round was scheduled for 10:00 a.m. and I was here, but it wasn't being sent, so I left."

Those are mere foibles. Coaches should be the first to recognize they are assigned to the round, not the time schedule. If the round goes out an hour...or sometimes hours...behind time, they should be there, physically present to accept their judging assignment. No excuses. The \$100 judging deposit was instituted as a carrot-stick to address the problem of no show coach-judges. Even so, several each year forfeit the deposit by being no-shows. And then they complain.

And a tip of the hat to those coaches who willingly take on extra rounds to make the tournament work. Your dedication is appreciated by those given the thankless task of assigning judges.

Fallacy: The CHSSA constitution and by laws do not say each judging panel must have one lay person, one coach, and one college student.

Fact: That is a tradition which stems from years back when Southern California had all the powerhouse debate teams. Those in that area could attend weekly university invitationals, while those country bumpkins in the north had few choices. Southern Californian debaters were used to having panels of debate, flow sheet college students as judges and resented coming north to state tournament where "ignorant" community volunteers were prevalent in the judging pool.

Fallacy: College students make the best judges.

Not necessarily. Few colleges have strong forensic teams, and fewer still have policy debaters. Most of the pool of college students at state tournaments turn out to be students from general speech or English classes who volunteer because a sympathetic instructor offers some extra credit for the task. Many have never participated in a debate nor have they any particular expertise at taking a flow sheet. Nor do they bring fewer or more biases than

any other type of judge to any type of event they might be assigned to judge. They are, after all, just human beings, no different from anyone else, except younger and less experienced in life. (And I remember some from previous state tournaments who did not have English as their native language.)

Fallacy: Coaches make the best judges.

Note, first, coaches are human beings, subject to their own individual biases. Note, second, many are assigned to judge rounds for which they have no particular interest or expertise. For example, few schools have active debate teams, and many do not even have Lincoln Douglas debaters. More pertinently, many coaches choose to only coach students in interpretation events. So why would those coaches be superior to anyone else as a judge in debate or Lincoln Douglas? Or, conversely, why would a coach who concentrates his coaching efforts on debate or speech events and not interpretation events make a better judge for duo, humorous, dramatic or other interp events?

Fallacy: Community volunteers make the worst judges.

Read the mission statement of the California High School Speech Association. It can be distilled down to one credo: Teach effective communication skills.

Community judges have individual biases, just as do college or coach judges. Few are "experts" at any particular event, but most dutifully try to follow the judging instructions on the ballots. I always told my students that the contestant who best communicated with the judge(s) won the round. Isn't that the point of the whole endeavor? Call it judge adaptation. Any outstanding speaker can sense what type audience he is addressing and should be able to adapt to that situation rather than performing in some lock step fashion that causes a failure to communicate.

The same moms and pops, brothers and sisters, and aunts and uncles who are cajoled into volunteering their time to judge the state tournament are generally well educated and experienced in life. If they can be selected to sit on a jury to decide the fate of an accused person in a court, why, then, are they not qualified to judge a high school debate or speech event round? And many of them do have previous experience judging at local tournaments.

Fact: Any panel of any mix of 98.6 degree, breathing human beings should be acceptable for any round. Whichever contestant(s) best communicates with a particular panel will place high in the round. There is an amazing consistency and few inconsistencies in most decisions in most rounds. Sure, there are some rounds where an individual in an event is scored 1-1-7. Chalk it up to human foibles, or biases. No one should believe life is always fair or consistent.

Foibles: Intense, (maybe paranoid?), coaches nitpick at perceived "rules violations" often without knowing whether those perceived "violations" have had any effect whatsoever on the outcome of a round. Some of these lead to official protests, some valid, some not.

Examples abound at every state final. Sitting at the community-college check-in table we fielded several laments as a sort of de facto trouble desk.

One coach was concerned that the timer in the round had started the stopwatch too soon resulting in her contestant being penalized for over time. The contestant reportedly had "heard" the stopwatch start as the contestant stood in the front of the room "getting into character." Further query indicated the contestant was 50 seconds overtime! Question: how long should a

contestant be given to “get into character?” There was no way of telling without seeing the ballots whether or not the timer’s alleged mis-timing resulted in a penalty for the round.

One coach complained about some “rude” remarks made by a judge (in this case a college student) in the round. So? Why would that make a difference in the performance of a contestant? It shouldn’t, not if the contestant was focused on his or her performance rather than the judge comment. Beyond that, the perceived “rude” comment does not necessarily translate as a factor in either the decision of the “rude” judge, nor does it translate as a factor in the decisions of the other two judges in the panel. Inferences regarding the relationship between the remark and the decisions is faulty reasoning, or nitpicking. It is a shame that perceived “rude” remarks or behavior on the part of judges occurs occasionally. But we must remember, the judges are human beings....each with his or her own biases. How could the judge assignment panel know those behaviors in advance of assignment, and how can the tournament officials be held accountable for something over which there is no control, human behavior?

Foible: The start of the tournament reveals many coaches are less than efficient or responsible to their contestants.

For example, we had no fewer than a dozen students who came to our table (again, de facto trouble desk) at the beginning of the tournament. They did not know their code numbers, claiming their coach had not revealed this important bit of data to them. Maybe so, maybe not. The code numbers for each contestant are beside the contestant’s name on the copy of the entry form returned to the coach. Maybe the coach gave them the code and the students forgot. Maybe not. We sent them to the tab room to solve the problem, a task that should not be the purview of those working there.

I’ve always been amazed at how many coaches apparently do not read....anything. They do not read the constitution and by laws. They do not read the paperwork that accompanies state tournament entry materials. They do not read the time schedule or their judging assignments. Ad infinitum. A clear case in point is the number who mishandle the annual request for tickets for the post tournament dinner dance or who attempt to make hotel reservations after the set deadlines. Or those who apparently do not read and then convey code numbers to their charges.

Despite fallacies, foibles, and fantasies the state tournaments have generally been good educational experiences for coaches and contestants, and that success can be attributed to those who host the tournaments, to those who work the long hours in the administration of the tournament, and to those who coach and compete. Considering the number of people involved...coaches, judges, contestants...and the amount of paperwork... countless numbers tabulated in the tab rooms and results recorded in the debate and congress tab... the state tournaments function very well, and that is as it should be. Amazing, isn’t it?

Thanks for the Memories

A word about State 2002

by Reed Niemi - VP Activities, CHSSA

“See I told you so.” Coming from most this may sound offensive or rude, but coming from the Area Chair of this years State Tournament, it was a sincere compliment. Ron Underwood of Beyer HS (Modesto) was merely sack-dancing because host Karen Boone and Southern Valley Forensics League President LeAnn Richards had shown us the very best of what Buchanan HS had to offer. He was right and show cased his southern-most league to the fullest.

But like most David Lynch films, underneath the facade lay more than meets the eye. I learned a lot this year!

Although the awards ceremony began on time and earlier than previous years, we were assisted by the fact that little went wrong in the short turnaround between final rounds and awards. I must thank all the tournament workers that enabled us to pull it off without a problem.

The judging houses are critical to the smooth operation of a tournament. Attempting to find people with experience at assigning judges and people who are polite under great pressure is easier said than done. Once both Houses were on the same page, the tournament ran smoothly. A large thanks is in order from me to all the people who worked in the Houses, they were awesome.

I learned that we as an organization are still quite young and naive to the ways of technology and media exposure. The *Jim Leher News Hour* attended the tournament to do work on a story focusing on a few students in attendance. We are pleased to say that it will air in the near-future (aired in June 2002) and that Corporation for Public Broadcasting is now considering funding a web site for forensics. In the future we shall be much more prepared for such exposure as this and hope that this exposure will help speech and debate in California. At the same time, this year represented the first time Area Chairs turned in a database on disk rather than reams of paper to the VP Activities. Thank you to President Cardoza for his time in creating the database and the Area Chairs for utilizing it. We learned how to improve the program and next year we are excited about Version 2.0.

Because of all these learning experiences I feel much better about the 2003 State Tournament and am positive that next year will match or surpass this year’s great success. Thank you for attending and thank you for supporting speech and debate in California. See you in San Bernardino!

Everything I needed to know I learned in Transportation 101

by Karen Glahn

When I signed on for this job little did I know that my education had not prepared me adequately for most parts of it, but luckily, on the job training is the rule and not the exception for speech coaching. After 15 years I have come to realize that everything I need to know I have learned in Transportation 101.

1.) How to plan

What to do when the bus you ordered, and you have the paperwork to prove it, doesn't show up at the 5:45 AM leave time. First response—panic—while this does not really help to solve the problem, it can't be helped, especially if you are 21, just starting out and it hadn't been covered in the course on curriculum planning. I had planned; I had ordered the bus; I had expected it to be there. Silly me! Second response—stand in the parking lot and look helpless. Again, this doesn't really help to solve the problem, but what else can you help but do when you have no experience in such matters (this wasn't in the job description). Ok, so finally you begin to realize that you have to get 30 students to a destination and that you are indeed a college graduate and you should be able to handle such situations at 5:45 in the morning. Is there a number to call other than 911? Can enough parents with station wagons (since "soccer moms" with minivans hadn't been invented) be contacted and persuaded to contribute to furthering the education of a few high school students so very early in the morning (good thing the fingerprint law wasn't on the books)? Is this job paying enough? We finally did make it to the tournament, but unfortunately I am a slow learner and it took at least two more bus no shows before I figured out that I need to call transportation the day before a planned trip and remind them that I had planned.

2.) How to deal with adversity

What to do when your vans have been vandalized and rendered inoperable on the third day of the national qualifying tournament. First response—panic—I still haven't gotten over that one after fifteen years! Second response—find a broom, sweep out the glass from the smashed windows, and cruise down HWY 99 with the wind in our hair and the sweet smell of cows in our noses. Third response—realize that the bus yard (just opposite the van cage) is occupied at this hour and you can easily go in to get help. Although I wasn't sure my broom plan was better when the first driver I spoke with told me that this was a crime scene and the police or campus security (whose office is ironically located within the transportation yard and also within a stone's throw of the vandalized vans) would need to be notified (so much for windblown hair and the smell of cows). "I need to get to Modesto NOW!" Luckily, I had had the good fortune to pick a bus driver who was much calmer than I. After several calls, including security, which did not respond, she got through to her boss and then found a bus and driver to at least get us to the tournament in time for extemp prep. She herself promised to pick us up at the end of the day—I'm sure she was taking pity on

my panic stricken face and quavery voice. I often feel like I am 21 again and just starting out; what would I have done if no one had been in the bus yard? I thought about that the very next weekend as I went to pick up the vans and glanced at the bus yard that was as quiet as a mouse.

3.) How to follow directions.

Driving in a strange town, at night, in a strange vehicle—again something that wasn't covered in that curriculum planning course (I'm sure that my education was just lacking and next time around I'll pick a better institution of higher learning). At this point I should admit that I am directionally challenged. My mother did try to teach me north, west, south and east; she would tell me to turn east or that a house was located on the west side of the street, to which I always replied, "Is that left or right?" (Don't ask Dr. Macdonald either about my ability to *give* directions.) So, driving home from dinner one night at Nationals, I was convinced we needed to turn on a road called Owen. I was adamant, however, I was also directionally confused and luckily someone else in the car had a better sense of direction and we made it back to the hotel. However, my former student and my best friend in Oregon to this day fall into fits of laughter when they mimic my high pitched, slightly agitated voice saying: "It's Owen!" Since then I try hard to have a map in my face at all times (I am a frequent flyer to AAA), although it doesn't always help. What I really need is a virtual course that I can run through several times before I even leave my house or my hotel room.

4.) What to do when faced with grave danger, or how to deal with unreasonable people.

If you live in the San Joaquin Valley you live in fog for most of the winter (although some of us live in a fog more often than not). This means that you must travel by bus in very foggy conditions. (I once hosted a tournament where only the schools in the north section of our league (Stockton, Lodi) could attend as the fog was so thick. I was directing judges out the door into a white mist and assuring them that they would run into a building if they just kept walking!) So, one foggy 5:45 AM a bus driver made the decision to brave the unknown and venture down the road to Turlock. I should have known better than to get on the bus, but you are not always thinking clearly at that hour.

We started out, and immediately upon reaching the freeway I felt that the driver was going a tad too fast for the conditions, but I held my breath and hoped for the best—not a lot of traffic out there to worry about. By the time we reached the region of Turlock, the fog was so dense you couldn't see any exit signs, let alone read them, and sure enough we missed the turn (I only realized this when I managed to see a sign for Merced and knew we were farther than we should be). I told the driver I was sure we had missed the turn, since she hadn't seemed to notice. She said, "OK" and I assumed that she would take the next exit and turn us around. Silly me. She had other ideas for turning around. Right in the middle of HWY 99, where there is a grass/dirt median and nothing else to block north and southbound traffic, she decided to do a U-turn!! In a school bus!! In the fog!!

I was in the front of the bus and could not see the expressions on the faces of my students, which was probably a good thing. I also could not see the approaching cars as they came within feet of us as she continued to swing the behemoth of the bus around, taking out a few poles on the side of the road in the process and scaring my children to death.

I think I was just in shock as we “calmly” proceeded to find the correct exit and disembark. The driver got off the bus to unlock the storage compartment, at which point I followed her and inquired, with much hesitation, as to when she would be back to pick us up, at which point I got the correct response of: “Oh, I won’t be picking you up. Another driver will be here at 7:00.” I was so relieved.

Meanwhile, my students have quietly exited the bus and I walk in to register the team. I then proceed to the student headquarters to give my students their maps and codes. I am immediately bombarded with: “WE ARE NOT GETTING ON THE BUS WITH THAT DRIVER EVER AGAIN!!!! Did you see the cars that almost hit us?! CAN YOU BELIEVE THAT?!” I was glad to be the bearer of the good news that she was not going to be returning to us (I wasn’t exactly sure what I would have done if she was...hang on for dear life? Call up my “soccer moms”?).

Needless to say she was not a driver with our school district for some time after that. A couple of years later she did resurface one morning, and several of my students who had been on that fateful trip, upon seeing her in the driver seat, immediately showed signs of balking at getting on the bus. There was, however, another driver on the trip as well to monitor the offending driver’s technique. That trip was the last we saw of her. Not that any of us minded.

5.) How to stand in line or practicing patience

Patience is a virtue; I tell my students that all the time. I have learned patience through rental cars. It doesn’t matter what company you rent through, it doesn’t matter what time you arrive at the airport, it doesn’t matter what state you are in (although a more laid back one is preferable) the line to get your rental car is longer than you want it to be, especially if you got up at 3 AM to catch the 6 AM flight and changed planes at least twice. It’s even better if you have a whining teenager in tow (lucky for me I have only witnessed others with this affliction, mine are angels). This year’s nationals was no exception.

As we disembarked from the courtesy shuttle we were greeted by sprawling luggage, lounging teenagers, and a line of adults that didn’t appear to be all that long. Appearances can be deceiving. I joined the line, Mary Anne sat with the luggage. I stood. I waited. I wondered whether I might ever see any part of Charlotte besides the outside of the rental car agency and its parking lot. Thirty minutes, a couple of inches. Slower than slugs in molasses. Am I in the line for Splash Mountain at Disneyland in the middle of August?

So what do you do in line with a couple of hours to kill? You make new friends; you do have something in common after all, besides the line you are stuck in. I made a new friend from Texas. I found out a lot about how speech is run in the Lone Star State. Time passes; a lot of time passes. We begin to applaud if someone actually emerges from the inside of the building (did I mention that the line was outside, in the South, in June...) with paperwork in hand. Of course there was just another line to wait in to actually get the car (Hertz—not exactly). I felt sorry for one poor woman in line who had no idea that the National Speech Tournament was in town and who had the misfortune to want to exchange her car.

I do have to admit that the folks at the rental car agency handled the situation as well as they could and the coaches

demonstrated that patience must be practiced often in life. What else was I going to do—throw a tantrum? While this might have provided an entertaining diversion for those in line, it wouldn’t have gotten me to the counter any faster.

Was the wait worth it? I got a good car, a great deal, and still managed to meet my friends from Portland for dinner. There are worse things in life.

I would think that after these experiences I would be doing a lot better in the area of transportation. While I have learned a lot, I have not managed to calm my sense of panic when my best laid plans have been thrown aside in favor of chaos. Sometimes it’s no so bad and my students are understanding and things work out for the best, as they do in life. At other times, the chaos that ensues envelopes me and causes great ridicule at my expense at the hands of those who are entrusted into my care. Such is life. You figure it out as you go along and hope that there are people in the bus yard when you need them most.

Why speech is essential: a letter from a former competitor

From 1962 until I graduated from Edison High School in 1965, I participated in speech programs and competitions on a regular basis. Working with Mr. Donovan Cummings, I studied Original Oratory, Dramatic Interpretation, Extemporaneous Speech, Impromptu Speech, and my beloved Debate.

The skills and self-confidence I gained from these activities have served me well throughout my professional and personal life. As a fund raiser for Stanford University, Harvard University and UCLA, and as a frequent speaker and consultant in my field, I have used the things I learned to try to inspire donors to support worthy non-profits and to encourage other fund raisers to work enthusiastically and in heart-felt ways for the organizations they support.

High school speech programs, especially, but not exclusively in a competitive setting, give bright and articulate teens a healthy focus for their intellectual energies, teach them how to dissect and analyze an issue and force them to learn to present their ideas in a coherent and persuasive way. Debate especially helps them to be critical, skeptical thinkers, able to see both sides of an issue. For less confident or shy students who have trouble expressing themselves, speech provides skills to help them move beyond these limitations and overcome, or at least cope with, those fears, even when the students do not compete. For these students, the benefits may be even more important.

I shall be eternally grateful for the experiences I had as a high school student, and I was very fortunate to have had many devoted and talented teachers in the Stockton public schools during the 50’s and 60’s. However, no academic experience has proven, over decades, to be more important to the course of my future life than speech, and no teacher more influential than Mr. Donovan Cummings. Thank you for this opportunity to say how important I feel speech programs are in our public schools. Sincerely yours,

Shirley Anne Peppers

Director, West Coast Development, Harvard University



CHSSA

*Lincoln High School
6844 Alexandria Place
Stockton, CA 95207*

**PRE-SORTED
STANDARD
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Stockton, CA
Permit No. 22**
