



California Speech Bulletin

California High School Speech Association

CHSSA Executive Council / CHSSA Mission Statement	2
Letter from CHSSA President Sharon Prefontaine	3
Letter from the Editor	4
2008 Nationals Report.....	5
2008 State Tournament Results.....	6
2008 Winning Speeches	8
2009 State Tournament Information	15
“Keeping Computers Out of Debate Rounds” By Einar Johnson	16
“No Need to Fear Computers” By Chuck Ballingall	19



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.:

President – Sharon Prefontaine
Monta Vista High School
21840 McClellan Rd.
Cupertino, CA 95014
sharon_prefontaine@fuhisd.org

VP, Activities – Nermin Kamel
La Mirada High School
13520 Adelfa Dr.
La Mirada, CA 90638
562-868-0431 x3563
kamel_nermin@nlmusd.k12.ca.us

VP, Curriculum – Rita Prichard
Granite Bay High School
#1 Grizzly Way
Granite Bay, CA 95746
916-786-8676 x5157
rprichard@rjuhsd.k12.ca.us

V.P. Public Relations
Carmendale Fernandes, Retired
20200 Lucille Ave., Suite 102
Cupertino, CA 95014

Secretary – Chuck Ballingall
Damien High School
2280 Damien Ave.
LaVerne, CA 91750
ballingall@damien-hs.edu

Treasurer – Neil Barmbaum
Miguel Contreras LC
322 South Lucas Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90017
nbarembaum@me.com

Editor – Marcus Walton
C.K. McClatchy High School
5735 47th Ave.
Sacramento, CA 95824
marcus-walton@sac-city.k12.ca.us

Historian
Ron Underwood, Retired

WEBSITE
<http://www.chssa.org>

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.

THOUGHTS FROM CHSSA PRESIDENT

sharon prefontaine

As I watched the recent political debates, I was reminded again of the service speech educators provide not only to students but to the public. We teach and reinforce the use of active listening, critical thinking, articulate speech, and a well-modulated tone; we caution against the use of logical fallacies including ad hominem arguments, and we emphasize the importance of non-verbal behaviors such as facial expression. Most importantly, we support the use of reasoned argument and respectful discourse essential to the democratic process.

At the September meeting, the CHSSA council in a vote of 20-7-1 approved the use of computers in policy debate. In response to this vote, one league president chose to initiate the petition and referendum process, leading to a vote by all CHSSA members in the state on the issue of computer use in policy debate. Verbal protests against the referendum suggested that the issue had been decided and that the use of the referendum process would merely prolong the discussion unnecessarily. I suggest that by following the initiative and referendum process, CHSSA continues to exemplify what it wants to teach students – to take a stand on an issue – to debate it reasonably and respectfully – and to use the democratic process of voting to resolve the issue. Might the vote to use computers be overturned? Might another proposal to change the by-laws be made again in response? Yes to both questions. In 1996, Donn Parson of the University of Kansas suggested the cyclical nature of practices in speech and debate. He wrote,

What will be the use of computers fifty years hence? One can envision a screen on which the debater displays supporting evidence at the touch of a computer button. Perhaps the computer will enable competition without travel, a sort of “briefing” system similar to moot law courts. Perhaps oral advocacy will no longer be practiced in debate. Perhaps the 2046 [debate championship] can be conducted over the computer. But then in early 2047 a coach ... will suggest we scrap the whole system and invite a very few teams to meet each other face-to-face and have a single competent judge render a decision based on the arguments heard. It will seem revolutionary, but worth a try. Or perhaps not.

That we may change the rules again and again speaks to the nature of the democratic process; it is sometimes time-consuming and inconvenient, but it is the point of discourse and elegant and active participation in such discourse is the purpose for which we prepare students.

Sharon F. Prefontaine
President, CHSSA

A LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

marcus walton

There are times when I am a loud, opinionated blowhard. There are times when I stay quiet when I should loudly voice my displeasure. I have spent the better part of my life trying to find a balance between the two extremes. Maybe I have finally achieved that balance—at least on this issue.

CHSSA Councilmember Einar Johnson has a long argument in this edition of The Bulletin outlining his objection to the use of computers in policy debate. At first glance, it reads like an attack on me and every other coach who chooses to compete in national circuit style debates. But when you read deeper, I think it can be seen that Johnson truly believes that computers and fast talking are killing the activity. I strongly disagree. But that's not what's important.

Unfortunately, this is just another chapter in the long struggle between those who would see policy debate stick to a more traditional form and those who see it as a game played only by those who like speed and technicalities. This division needs to end.

Policy debate is my favorite event. The research burden, the innovation of students, the in-depth discussions that occur both in and out of round have given me more intellectual and academic stimulation than any other classroom subject or extracurricular activity.

Unfortunately, the constant attacks on differing styles of policy debate has weakened it. Instead of acknowledging the benefits gained from both “lay” and national circuit styles, each camp resorts to demeaning the other. Each side accuses the other of hurting education. The truth is that both styles are good for education and both styles can be bad for education.

It does no good for student to access 27 reasons agent specification is good on their laptop if he or she can't convince a community judge why their tax dollars should be spent on concentrated solar panels. Likewise, it does no good for a student to have 3x5 cards with evidence from a 1983 book on the environment who can't weigh the impacts of global warming versus those of an economic collapse.

Our students should be able to do debate technically as well as persuasively.

I think the California State Champions in policy debate have managed to do that over the last decade. I'd argue that it is impossible to do well at the state tournament without having the experience of national circuit style debate. It is even more difficult to do well without having the ability to persuade.

I hope we can come to understand that neither side is wrong in this divide. I hope we can also understand that both types are necessary for policy debate to survive.

A Call for Submissions

The Bulletin will gladly accept articles from students, 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 Marcus Walton by e-mail (mewalton@gmail.com).

What happens in Vegas...

...ought to be celebrated in California

California schools excelled at the National Forensic League National Speech Tournament, which took place in Las Vegas in June. California students took home two national championship trophies in speech events, 12 appeared in final rounds, and seven were semifinalists.

Stephen Elrod of Bellarmine won Dramatic Interpretation and **Taman Narayan** from Leland placed first in Impromptu. **Georgi Dimitrov** from Bellarmine was named the tournament's top speaker in policy debate, winning the Phyllis Flory Barton Debate Speaker Award.

Other notable accomplishments:

Damien High School Coach and CHSSA Council Secretary **Chuck Ballingall** was inducted into the NFL Hall of Fame.

Gabrielino High School, coached by **Derek Yuill**; James Logan High School, coached by **Tommie Lindsey**; and Leland High School, coached by **Gay Brasher** received the Schwan's School of Excellence Award in Speech.

Bellarmino College Prep, coached by **Kim Jones**, and Damien High School, coached by **Chuck Ballingall**, received the Schwan's School of Excellence Award in Debate.

Bellarmino also received the Schwan School of Excellence Award in All Events.

Monte Vista (Danville), coached by CHSSA Council Member **David Matley**, won the Senator Karl E. Mundt Trophy for accumulating the highest number of Congress points since the first National Congress in 1938.

In Original Oratory, **Alexandria Tippings** of Schurr placed fourth and **Tina Nguyen** of Gabrielino placed fifth.

In Humorous Interpretation, **Varun Rajan** of Leland placed third.

In Dramatic Interpretation, **Stephen Elrod** of

Bellarmino placed first, **Tania Odesho** of Leland placed second and **Lindsay Rico** of Brea Olinda placed sixth. Odesho also won the Bama Bowl for winning the final round.

In Duo Interpretation, **Raymond Truong** and **Steven Truong** of San Marino placed second.

In U.S. Extemp, **Evan Larson** from Bellarmine placed third and **Rajiv Narayan** from James Logan placed fourth.

In Extemp Commentary, **Elliot A. Olson** of Miramonte placed second.

In Prose, **Mathew Jenkins** of Fullerton Joint Union placed fourth.

In Impromptu, **Taman Narayan** of Leland placed first and **Roy Liu** of Leland placed third.

In Lincoln-Douglas, **Aparna Ramanan** of Leland placed eighth.

In Public Forum, **Parijat Chakrabarti** and **Vijay Sridharan** of Bellarmine placed fourth and **Kaavya Gowda** and **Kelsey Hilbrich** of Harker placed seventh.

In Policy Debate, **Joe Grimes** and **Will Rafey** of Bellarmine placed fifth and **Andres Gannon** and **Trevor Chenoweth** of Damien placed sixth. **Georgi Dimitrov** from Bellarmine was the top speaker and **Carl Rice** from Bellarmine was the tournament's fifth place speaker.

In Student Congress, **Stephanie Benedict** of Harker placed sixth in the senate and **Raza Rasheed** placed sixth in the house.

Four students were honored with the Wayne E. Brown Show Me Excellence Award for qualifying for the National Tournament in four consecutive years: **Stephen Elrod**, Bellarmine; **Sebastian Bauge**, East Bakersfield; **Colin Caprara**, LaCosta Canyon; and **Varun Rajan**, Leland.

2008 STATE TOURNAMENT RESULTS

HELD AT SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY

Name	School	Coach	Name	School	Coach
Original Oratory			Oratorical Interpretation		
1 Bryce Weiglin	Fullerton	Sal Tinajero	5 Terry Reilly	Bellarmino	Christopher Wolf
2 Alexandria Tippings	Schurr	Carrie Cunningham	6 Christine Blauvelt	San Marino	Oliver Valcorza
3 Phoebe Peronto	Claremont	David Chamberlain	7 Aakash Sathappan	Bellarmino	Christopher Wolf
4 Patrick Le	Gabrielino	Derek Yuill	Oratorical Interpretation		
5 Tina Nguyen	Gabrielino	Derek Yuill	1 Nate Howard	Helix Charter	Gregg Osborn
6 Sorin Chereji	James Logan	Tommie Lindsey	2 Mohit Kochar	Leland	Gay Brasher
7 Vanessa Menchaca	Gabrielino	Derek Yuill	3 Jasmine McLeod	Mount Miguel	Thomas Gomes
Original Advocacy			4 Matt Russo	Leland	Gay Brasher
1 Chip Morton	Bellarmino	Christopher Wolf	5 Vandana Pai	Leland	Gay Brasher
2 Sam Brodey	Campbell Hall	Jeannie Walla	6 Michelle Zhu	Arcadia	Ashley Novak
3 Karen Thai	Gabrielino	Derek Yuill	7 Rebekah Miller	Fullerton	Sal Tinajero
4 Niraj Asthana	James Logan	Tommie Lindsey	Thematic Interpretation		
5 Brian Austin	Centennial	Amber G. Ayers	1 Wagner Catherine	Granada Hills	Ali Taylor
6 Jennifer Lin	Arcadia	Ashley Novak	2 Nupur Dokras	Leland	Gay Brasher
7 Michelle Carranza	Fullerton	Sal Tinajero	3 Steven Leal	James Logan	Tommie Lindsey
Impromptu Speaking			4 Blanca Canales	Fullerton	Sal Tinajero
1 Roy Liu	Leland	Gay Brasher	5 Grace Ng	Leland	Gay Brasher
2 Anish Pathipati	Mira Loma	Neil Forrester	6 Kim Secoquian	James Logan	Tommie Lindsey
3 Aparna Ramanan	Leland	Gay Brasher	7 James Shechet	San Marino	Oliver Valcorza
4 Simon Huang	Leland	Gay Brasher	Humorous Interpretation		
5 Safeena Mecklai	Mira Loma	Neil Forrester	1 Varun Rajan	Leland	Gay Brasher
6 Andrew Crutchfield	Rodriguez	Brad Crutchfield	2 Austin Ashford	James Logan	Tommie Lindsey
7 Emily Chesbrough	Miramonte	Sandra Maguire	3 Coleton Schmitto	James Logan	Tommie Lindsey
National Extemporaneous Speaking			4 Deanne Chen	Leland	Gay Brasher
1 Evan Larson	Bellarmino	Christopher Wolf	5 Celena Allen	James Logan	Tommie Lindsey
2 Rushil Ram	Leland	Gay Brasher	6 Ryan Vasquez	Bellarmino	Christopher Wolf
3 Alex Kasner	Granite Bay	Rita Prichard	7 Becca Samuel	Edison	LeAnn Richards
4 Rajiv Narayan	James Logan	Tommie Lindsey	Dramatic Interpretation		
5 Maria Theophanous	Miramonte	Sandra Maguire	1 Tania Odesho	Leland	Gay Brasher
6 Wild Bill Chen	Gabrielino	Derek Yuill	2 Stephen Elrod	Bellarmino	Christopher Wolf
7 Carl Rice	Bellarmino	Christopher Wolf	3 Lindsey Rico	Brea Olinda	Christopher Schaadt
International Extemporaneous Speaking			4 Raymond Liu	Leland	Gay Brasher
1 Will Rafey	Bellarmino	Christopher Wolf	5 Javier Kordi	James Logan	Tommie Lindsey
2 Markus Brazill	San Marino	Oliver Valcorza	6 Danny Gould	Bellarmino	Christopher Wolf
3 Tony Wang	Miramonte	Sandra Maguire	7 Lauren Cao	Leland	Gay Brasher
4 Al Ho	Gabrielino	Derek Yuill	Duo Interpretation		
5 Elliott Velson	Monte Vista	Dave Matley	1 Huynh - Bonilla	Gabrielino	Derek Yuill
6 Zachary Levine	Edison	LeAnn Richards	2 Reed - Schurrings	Fullerton	Sal Tinajero
7 Matt Rossetto	Bellarmino	Christopher Wolf	3 Gordo - Huang	Gabrielino	Derek Yuill
Expository Speaking			4 Yi - Storer	Leland	Gay Brasher
1 Vivian Lam	Gabrielino	Derek Yuill	5 Najibi - Johnson	James Logan	Tommie Lindsey
2 Madeleine Heil	Presentation	Timothy Case	6 Khuu - Jenkins	Fullerton	Sal Tinajero
3 Stacy Chang	Leland	Gay Brasher	7 Huynh - Phung	Gabrielino	Derek Yuill
4 Mai-Lan Vugia	Miramonte	Sandra Maguire			

2008 STATE TOURNAMENT RESULTS

HELD AT SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY

Name	School	Coach	Name	School	Coach
Original Prose and Poetry			5 Arjun Shenoy	Saratoga	Janaki Murthy
1 Samanta Cubias	Monroe	Kathy Graber	6 Nipun Bhandari	Monte Vista	Dave Matley
2 Natasha Huey	Torrance	Lesley Sluyter	7 Nick Way	Ponderosa	Stacy Buchholz
3 Steven Quach	Helix Charter	Gregg Osborn	8 Brendan Bashin-Sullivan	Miramonte	Sandra Maguire
4 Neelam Kumar	James Logan	Tommie Lindsey	9 Michael Harris	North Hollywood	Cydney Fox
5 Enoch Sim	Ponderosa	Stacy Buchholz	10 Brittney Bevelaqua	Mark Keppel	Patrick Reis
6 Pricilla Merritt	Fullerton	Sal Tinajero	11 Sebastian DeLuca	Monte Vista	Dave Matley
7 Chris Rains	Redlands	Steve Caperton	12 Meredith Madnick	Miramonte	Sandra Maguire
Lincoln-Douglas Debate			13 Jordan Moshe	Miramonte	Sandra Maguire
1 Bilal Malik	James Logan	Tommie Lindsey	14 Aakash Keswani	Monte Vista	Dave Matley
2 Calvin Lee	Bellarmino	Christopher Wolf	Student Congress Presiding Officer		
Semi Natalee Pei	Mountain View	Stephen Hess	1 Sherif Elzarka	Monte Vista	Dave Matley
Semi Paul Strauch	College Prep	Lexy Green	2 Joseph Lim-Effendy	Mark Keppel	Patrick Reis
Qtrs Huu Nguyen	James Logan	Tommie Lindsey	3 Yvette Lopez	Rancho Buena Vista	Don Etheridge
Qtrs Emily Barber	Bakersfield	Andrew J. Scherrer	4 Chris Enright	Bellarmino	Christopher Wolf
Qtrs Arvind Kannan	Bellarmino	Christopher Wolf	Sweepstakes		
Qtrs Percia Safar	Monte Vista	Dave Matley	1. Bellarmino	127	
Policy Debate			2. Leland	122	
1 Grimes – Rafey	Bellarmino	Christopher Wolf	3. James Logan	114	
2 Murdter – Kazi	St. Francis	Doug Dennis	4. Gabrielino	72	
S Maltiel – Johnson	Bellarmino	Christopher Wolf	5. Monte Vista	51	
S Vijay – Deshmukh	Bellarmino	Christopher Wolf	6. Fullerton	49	
Q Simmons – Wong	Bellarmino	Christopher Wolf	7. Miramonte	36	
Q Kang – Katz	San Dieguito	Kerri Leonard	8. Claremont	24	
Q Berger – Chan	James Logan	Tommie Lindsey	9. San Marino	21	
Parliamentary Debate			10. St. Francis	20	
1 Narayan - Kuo	Leland	Gay Brasher	11. Helix Charter	19	
2 Rasheed – Miletich	Claremont	David Chamberlain	12T Arcadia	17	
S Noah – Millerick	Analy	Lynette Williamson	12T Edison	17	
S Burnes – Coulter	Analy	Lynette Williamson	12T Mira Loma	17	
Q Noah - Millerick	Analy	Lynette Williamson	15T Analy	16	
Q Catterton - Stafford	Analy	Lynette Williamson	15T Granada Hills	16	
Public Forum			15T Monroe	16	
1 Ashford - Nguyen	James Logan	Tommie Lindsey	18. Valencia	13	
2 Pathipati – Pathipati	Mira Loma	Neil Forrester	19T Arroyo Grande	10	
S Leung – Chen	Leland	Gay Brasher	19T Mountain View	10	
S Abbasi – Tran	Monte Vista	Dave Matley	19T Presentation	10	
Q Feldman - Smith	Valencia	Kim Forbes	19T San Dieguito	10	
Q Bodapati - Chakrabarti	Bellarmino	Christopher Wolf			
Student Congress					
1 Marielle Bolano	Monte Vista	Dave Matley			
2 Colin Caprara	La Costa Canyon	Krista deBoer			
3 Brian Louie	Monte Vista	Dave Matley			
4 Lucas Duplancic	Miramonte	Sandra Maguire			

2008 WINNING SPEECHES

Original Prose and Poetry First Place 2008

The Baptism of Omar

By *Samantha Cubias*
Monroe High School
Coach: *Kathy Graber*

MOTHER: Chiquito! Baby! Wake up, wake up, WAKE UP!
Ah! Baby? Are you okay? We're at the church.

BABY: Yawns. Geeze, mom. Could you be a little more gentle? I'm a baby for Christ's sake! What the- Hey! Where are we? What am I wearing?

MOTHER: Aw, you look so cute in your silk gown that Abuelita bought for you.

BABY: Cute? You put me in a dress and call me "cute"? I look like a girl! And an ugly girl at that! And what's this? A bracelet? Well, it tastes good so I'll keep it, but you people are going put me through a gender identity crisis if you keep this up.

MOTHER: Buenos Dias, padre. Yes, this is he. This is Omar.

BABY: Who the heck is that?

PADRE: Excellent. What name is this child of the lord to be given?

BABY: She just told you! My name is

MOTHER: Omar San Francisco Diego Antonio Jose de La Cruz!

BABY: That is not my name!

PADRE: Excellent. Come, let me hold Omar San Francisco Diego Antonio Jose de la Cruz and we shall move on to bless him with holy water.

BABY: Holy Water? What the hell is holy water? Hey, what's he doing? No, don't wet my forehead! It's not bath time. It's wet! My face is wet! No... No! No!

Baptisms are a huge deal. And if you're from a family that happens to be both Catholic and Latino, like mine, it's an even bigger deal. The Baptism of Omar: an original. It's important to know that whenever there is a baptism in the family, everybody and I mean everybody gets together.

From my Tia Lola and My Tio Marcos, who live down the

street, to my Tio Chepe, who I didn't know existed until last week, everybody comes together to celebrate.

And it's even more important to know that there are four things that are guaranteed to be present at any baptism party: Beer, food, kids and well, and more beer. Because, you see, wherever there is beer there are drunken uncles ready to drink it and wherever there are kids, there are plenty of Tias ready to reprimand any and all parenting skills.

TIA LOLA: Mija, don't hold the baby that way! You're going to break his neck, or even worse, get his new silk gown dirty.

Meet my Tia Lola. She thinks she knows everything about raising kids.

TIA LOLA: Here, let his abuelita hold him.

LUCY: Mama, I can hold him perfectly fine. I'm his mother. I know what I am doing! Shit!

Meet my cousin Lucia. Omar is her first child and she's still getting used to this whole being a mom thing.

TIA LOLA: Why don't you want my help? Do you think I am too old? For your information, I raised you all by myself. Yes, I dropped you on your head a few times, but look you came out okay, no?

LUCY: You dropped me on my head? Is that why I hear voices?

TIA LOLA: Hey, do not change the subject, okay? Now tell me, why you don't want me to hold my own grandchild?

TIO MARCOS: Buenas Tardes, Senioritas!

Meet my Tio Marcos. He's married to my Tia Lola and currently holds the world record for the most beer consumed within 24 hours.

TIO MARCOS: I am sorry I missed the ceremony. I had some prior engagements.

TIA LOLA: Marcos, how could you miss your own grandchild's baptism? You were past out on the couch again, weren't you?

TIO MARCOS: Ay pues Lola. Why you always think I am an alcoholic?

LUCY: You drink before 10 am, Papa.

TIO MARCOS: Okay, I admit I was passed out on the couch again. Look, Lola. To make it up to you, I brought

Continued on Page 9

The Baptism of Omar

Continued from Page 8

FIVE CASES OF CERVEZA!

LUCY: But Papa, there are only Four cases.

TIO MARCOS (Counts): FOUR CASES OF CERVEZA! I guess one of them must have disappeared on the way over here.

TIA LOLA: ‘Viejo, largate de aqui! Get out of my face!

TIO MARCOS: Okay, Lola. But if you need me, I’ll be hanging up the pinata!

The pinata was the highlight of Omar’s Baptism Party. My Tio climbed on top of the roof and maneuvered the giant cardboard burro that was suspended in Midair. Then all the little kids grab a stick and swing at it. It can can be both fun and dangerous at the same time.

TIA LOLA: Okay, Carlitos. Since you have never hit a pinata before, you get to go first. I’m going to blindfold you now, okay? Okay. Is that okay?

CARLITOS: Tia, it’s too tight! I can’t feel my face!

TIA: Carlitos, it has to be tight. How else do I make sure you don’t cheat? Okay. Ey, Viejo! Do not fall off the roof because I am not taking to you to the hospital again! Tio: Okay, vieja! Let’s get started already!

TIA: Okay. I am going to spin you Carlitos and on the count of tres, you can start swinging. Uno, Dos, y Tres! Orale! Let’s just say that if you weren’t wearing a helmet when Carlitos took his first swing, you came back from the backyard feeling just as bad, if not worse than the pinata.

Luckily, my Tia Lola has the remedy for everything.

KID #1: Tia, Carlitos hit my head with the stick! I’m bleeding!

TIA: Oh wow, you are! Here have some frijoles.

KID # 2: Tia, Carlitos hit my stomach with the stick! I think I’m bleeding internally.

TIA: Wow, you are! Here, have some frijoles!

TIO: Ey, vieja. I fell off the roof. And landed on the stick. It’s in a place where the sun doesn’t shine.

TIA: Yeah, you’re right, it’s stuck in there. Here eat some frijoles! Everybody! Eat some frijoles!

LUCY: Mama, I’m not that hungry. But thanks anyway.

TIA: You do not want my frijoles? Why? Are you anorexic? Do you hate my food? Does your husband beat you?

LUCY: No I am not anorexic! And no my husband does not beat me!

TIA: Don’t lie to me. Why do you not want my frijoles?

LUCY: Mama, I ate frijoles earlier. I’m just not hungry anymore!

TIA LOLA: Fine then, if you do not want my food and you do not want my advice then get out of my kitchen!

A fight always breaks out in the kitchen. Usually it’s between Lucia and my Tia Lola, or between my Tio Marcos and my Tia Lola, or between anyone and my Tia Lola.

Either way, Omar’s baptism party ended in the same way as any other party in my family ends, my Tio Marcos played the guitar and My Tia Lola danced to it. Ay Ay Ay Ay Canta y no Mores! (Gabriel).

Then, my Tio Marcos became so emotional that he decided to give us another one of his inspirational speeches.

TIO MARCOS: Attention por favor! Attention Please!

Look, I just want to say first of all, that I wish the best to my beautiful daughter and her baby, Oscar.

LUCY: Papa, his name is Omar!

TIO MARCOS: Right, to my beautiful daughter and her kid: I love you very much. Now, I want to let you all you know that you can do anything you want in life. I mean it.

When I came to this country I know only 5 words: Take me to Funky Town (LippsInc),

But now, I know a lot of words! I was able to do it, and you can do so much more! Never forget that. And never forget that I love you. I love you and you don’t even know it. Oh look, now I am crying. Oh, my tears taste like Cerveza.

TIA: Ay, Viejo. You embarrass me with all your crying, but I like it. Let’s go home and I’ll show you how to really hang a pinata.

TIO: Okay, vieja! But you drive. My stomach hurts. You frijoles give me so much gas, I think I can power the car myself. See?

TIA: Bye Mija, take care of this baby, okay?

LUCY: Okay mama. Baby, the party is over now. Are you tired?

OMAR: Tired? Are you kidding? This has been the best party I’ve ever been to! Crazy women, flying burros and guitar playing? This is my kind of family! Do me a favor, doll face. Get me out of this dress and hand me a cerveza!

Works Cited

Gabriel, Ana. “Cielito Lindo” Sony International, 1995.

Lipps Inc. “Funikytown” Casablanca Records, 1979.

CODE NAME: POS, EXPOS

By Vivian Lam

Gabrielino High School

Coach: Derek Yuill

Sing James Bond theme song (Connery).

The name's Lam, Vivian Lam. Doing my pos, expos. On age, espionage, and we're on a mission to separate the past from the now, the facts from the fiction and the realities from the deceptions.

So, espionage...what is espionage? Well, according to the trusty Dictionary.com, espionage (noun) has three definitions that basically mean the same thing: "The act or practice of spying, the use of spies by a government to discover the military and political secrets of other nations, and/or the use of spies by a corporation or the like to acquire the plans, technical knowledge, etc., of a competitor" ("Espionage"). Basically, it's the practice of spying to get information. In past decades, espionage has infiltrated our pop culture with the Spy Kids, Jason Bourne, Alias, Kim Possible, James Bond, and Austin Powers. But how can we distinguish Hollywood spies from real spies? Today, our mission is to break past Hollywood's mirage of espionage, for despite its glamorous visage, it's an art filled with devotion and occasional sabotage, and so let's begin our voyage to clear up the mysterious image of espionage. To do so, we will first crack into the past and present system of espionage. Then, we will identify a spy's typical garb and gear, and finally we will analyze our data to see the concealed support that espionage provides for us all.

So, how did espionage sneak its way into our world? When we needed to discover our enemies' motives. The ancient Greeks "were the first to develop the extensive use of poisons, including toxins derived from plants and snakes" ("Lerner") to defeat their foes. In China, Sun Tzu wrote The Art of War, which describes espionage techniques and strategies ("Lerner"), and ancient Rome's spy agency convinced unwanted enemies to join its side. This same group told Julius Caesar he was going to be ambushed. But he was killed, so he must not have heard them well ("Lerner"). During the Middle Ages, Bishop Pierre Cauchon of Beauvais had a spy befriend and betray Joan of Arc, leading to her ultimate death (Frohlick). And during Queen Elizabeth's reign, it was Sir Francis

Walsingham who developed a comprehensive European spy system ("Walsingham").

Now, all this information about the English spy system's origins and the posse that jumped Julius Caesar is great, but when do we come in? We've practiced espionage since America's beginning, but only during World War II was it "coordinated on a government-wide basis" ("History"). The Office of Strategic Services, or OSS, was created in 1942 to obtain sensitive data from abroad. Then, President Truman decided we needed a centralized intelligence organization, and created The Central Intelligence Agency, or CIA (he wasn't known for his creativity). The CIA did what the OSS did, but with a cooler name ("History").

So, how would one spot a spy today? What does a real spy look like? Me. I am a real spy. No, I'm just kidding, but that's what spies generally look like- ordinary people like you and me. And there are two main types of spies: those that blend in with their surroundings, and those that hide from it altogether. Their code names: Chameleon' spies and Ghost spies.

First, Chameleon spies use unique techniques to blend in. Hollywood makes it appear that spies always wear Versace tuxedos and drink Grey Goose martinis, shaken not stirred. But if we look at Mr. James Bond here (looking very spy-ish you must admit), and' place him in a different scenario, we see that he's anything but subtle. Although James Bond is not the best example of a Chameleon spy, Sydney , on the TV show Alias adorns a myriad of different disguises to accommodate the needs of her missions.

In fact, blending in is so important, that spies have gone out of their way to disguise themselves. One technique was cross-dressing. In 1745, 26-year-old Chevalier d'Ebn de Beaumont was chosen to be Louis XV's, that's code for 15th, spy. One of his missions was visiting Tsarina Elizabeth at St. Petersburg, and so he appeared as the beautiful and quite fashionable Mademoiselle Lia de Beaumont. Today, spies still go to extremes to hide their identity- like Vladimiro Montesinos, a Peruvian Intelligence Officer who got plastic surgery in the year 2000 to avoid trouble (Hoffmann).

Next is the Ghost category of spies. Ghost spies stay hidden from society—such as Jason Bourne from the Bourne Identity, Supremacy, and Ultimatum, who poses as an ordinary citizen. True story: On November 24, 2006, former Russian spy Alexander Litvinenko was assassinated. Traces of the radioactive polonium-210 were detected in his urine. Who put it there? Of course there are the regular suspects, but all we know for certain is that it was a Ghost spy (Jordan).

And right here in America, March 24, 2008 is the

Continued on Page 11

CODE NAME: POS, EXPOS

Continued from Page 10

date that finally ended an eighteen month investigation of a supposed spy family. Chi Mak, the brain of the spy clan, was sentenced to 24 years and five months in prison and fined \$50,000 dollars. For years, Chi Mak and his family had blended into American society, and were all played their part as a ghost spy very well, you know until they got caught (Reza).

Now, what's this? Invisible ink? Some sort of contraption? No it's just aboard. But! Spy gadgets and equipment are essential to espionage. A spy without gadgets is like a couch with no seat, Arnold Schwarzenegger without muscles, an expos without boards. Chameleon and ghost spies both use them during missions.

In the James Bond movies, all twenty-three of them, Mr. Bond uses camera wristwatches, tear-gas pens, homing pills (which he eats to be located), a jet pack, a miniature flare gun, a cassette recorder hidden in a book, mini rocket cigarettes, electro-magnetic RPM controller, and dagger shoes ("List of James"). Ah... but which of these gadgets are imaginary and which are real? Well, I am proud to say that because of the technology that we have today, we have been able to bring a Bond gadget alive today. The Omega Sea Master Planet Ocean tracks each second, minute, and hour that passes in a day. Ladies and gentlemen, I present to you, the Omega Sea Master Planet Ocean. Yea I know, it's just a watch ("Omega").

But even away from the spotlight, gadgets played a crucial part in espionage and have aided spies for centuries. But During World War Two, spies had gadgets such as exploding rats and sneakers specially molded to leave fake footprints ("British"). During the Cold War, spies used devices like poisonous umbrellas used in the assassination of an important, but apparently unpopular, Bulgarian dissident ("Tools"). Inside the umbrella was the poisonous chemical, toxin ricin. The umbrella was lightly jabbed into the dissident and barn he was dead. Well, actually, it would probably be more like gloop he's dead (because it's liquid).

Spy technology has indeed come a long way. An important aspect of espionage is the secret delivery of messages.

Since the beginning of espionage, codes have been used to covertly transfer messages. In Ancient Rome,

Julius Caesar used his own codes by writing each word with letters three places backwards in the alphabet. So espionage would be BPMFLKXDB, and Vivian would be SFSFXK. Clearly, it would take a while to decode, so imagine poor Julius Caesar, being assassinated and having to deliver the secret message "Help Me! My friends have betrayed me and are now attempting to assassinate me, and by the way, they're succeeding," which translates into EBIM JB! JU CNFBKAP EXSB YBQMXUBA JB XKA XMB KLT XQQBJQFKD QL XPPXPPFKXQB, XKA"...No wonder he's dead (Hoffmann). Today, we use computer technology to encrypt virtually unbreakable code systems. Another method is outright invisibility. Originally, people wrote messages with milk or lemon juice, which would be revealed by a candle's heat (Hoffmann).

Unfortunately, when you get a little too close, you find that it's hard to read a message when it's on fire. Luckily, we later started using chemicals such as copper sulphate, which is visible when combined with sodium iodine (Hoffmann). People also hide secret images in pictures; Lord Baden-Powell once drew important maps in pictures of butterflies. Others use steganography to hide data in files of music (Hoffmann). And spies have also been known to hide information in dead drops, everyday objects with secret containers inside of them. Proof? In January of 2006, Russians found an electronic dead drop in a rock in Moscow, which the British were using to transfer information (Hoffmann).

Although gadgets are very important, spies use other special techniques to complete their missions. William Shakespeare once said, "Love is Blind" (Shakespeare), and spies took advantage of this human weakness. Hollywood got this right in depicting espionage: from James Bond to Alias. spies on the big screen used love as a useful tool to obtain information. According to Markus Wolf, former head of the International Intelligence agency, the Romeo method was used by male spies who married women in government to obtain important documents ("The Man"). And, one of history's most infamous spies used love as her number one weapon.

Mata Hari—originally known as Margaretha Zelle—was one of France's most acclaimed exotic dancers, and is synonymous with sensuality and espionage today. During World War I, she got close to many foreign officials, so the French used her to obtain intelligence. But in one case, she didn't tell the French about an encounter with a German official. The French executed her for being a double spy on October 15, 1917 ("The Execution").

Continued on Page 12

CODE NAME: POS, EXPOS

Continued from Page 11

Often times, spies are thought of as shady, sketchy, sneaky people, but they are actually very loyal. Espionage has allowed bravery to shine in the name of our country. In 1776, Nathan Hale volunteered to sneak into British territory to retrieve information for the Continental Army. He was caught, but right before he was hanged, he shouted for all to hear, “I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country” (Nussbaum).

Espionage; an art not for the weak hearted. Spies can dedicate their whole lives to one project, which may never be publicly revealed; their legacy is their country’s safety. And with that thought, I leave you with this; sing James Bond theme song (Connery).

Works Cited

“British Special Operations Executive (SOE): Tools and Gadgets Gallery.” World Wars. [bbc.co.uk](http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/worldwarstwwo/soegallery.shtml). 10 Jan. 2008 <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/worldwarstwwo/soegallery.shtml>>.

Connery, Sean, Honor Blackman, and Shirley Eaton. Goldfinger. 1964.

“Crafty Codes of American Spies.” Newsday.com. 2008. 9 Jan. 2008 <<http://www.newsday.com/community/guide/lihistory/ny-history-hs417a,0,6764482.storp>>.

“espionage.” dictionary.com. 10 Jan. 2008 <<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/espionage>>.

“The Execution of Mata Hari, 1917. EyeWitness to History. 2005. 26 Mar. 2008 <<http://www.eyewitnesstohistory.com>>.

Frohlick, Virginia. “BISHOP PIERRE CAUCFION’S INFAMOUS POSTHUMOUS DOCUMENT.” The Lost Chronicles, The Story Of Joan. of Arc. 10 Jan. 2008 <<http://www.stjoan-center.com/novelapp/joaapO2.html>>.

“History of the CIA.” Central Intelligence Agency. Central Intelligence Agency. 25 Mar. 2008 <<https://www.cia.gov/about-cia/history-of-the-cia/index.html>>.

Ho mann, Leah. “The Evolution Of Spy Tools.” Forbes.

com. 26 Mar. 2008 <http://www.forbes.com/2006/04/15/intelligence-spying-gadgets_cx_jh_06slate0418tools.html>.

Jordan, Mary, and Peter Finn. “Radioactive Poison Killed Ex-Spy.” washingtonpost.com. The Washington Post. 26 Mar. 2008 <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/11/24/AR2006112400410.html>>.

Lerner, Adrienne Wilmoth. “Espionage Information.” Espionage and Intelligence, Early Historical Foundations. 25 Mar. 2008 <<http://www.espionageinfo.com/Ep-Fo/Espionage-and-Intelligence-Early-Historical-Foundations.html>>.

“List of James Bond gadgets.” Wildpedia. 26 Mar. 2008 <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_James_Bond_gadgets>.

Lyman, John. Center For American Progress 28 Oct 2005. 10 Jan. 2008 <<http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2005/10/bi09719.html>>.

“The Man Without a Face.” CNN Interactive. CNN. 26 Mar. 2008 <<http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/cold.war/experience/spies/interviews/wolf/>>.

Nussbaum, Greg. “Nathan Hale.” Mr.Nussbaum.com. 2006. 26 Mar. 2008 <<http://www.mrnussbaum.com/nathanhale.htm>>.

“Omega Seamaster Planet Ocean Casino Royale In Limited Edition.” Gizmodude.com. 26 Nov. 2006. 26 Mar. 2008 <http://www.gizmodude.com/time_machines/omega_seamasterplanet_ocean_casino_royale_ffilimited_edition.php>.

“Organization, Operations, and Management, 1947-1996.” U.S. ESPIONAGE AND INTELLIGENCE. National Security Archive Microfiche Sets. 8 Mar. 2008 <<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/nsa/publications/ie/index.html>>.

Reza, H.G. “Sentence issued in military data case.” Los Angeles Times 25 Mar. 2008: 1B+.

Shakespeare, William. “Shakespeare Quotes.” Absolute Shakespeare. 21 Jan. 2008 <<http://absoluteshakespeare.com/trivia/quotes/quotes.htm>>.

“Tools of the Trade.” CNN-Cold War Experience. CNN. 10 Jan. 2008 <<http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/cold.war/experience/spies/>>.

“WALSINGHAM, SIR FRANCIS.” The Columbia Encyclopedia. Sixth ed. 2007. 10 Jan. 2008 <<http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1E1-WalsinghF.html>>.

“Who Served Here.” Historic Valley Forge. National Center for the American Revolution/Valley Forge Historical Society. 9 Jan. 2008 <<http://www.ushistory.org/valleyforge/served/arnold.html>>.

A Pathological Paradox

By Chip Morton

Bellarmino College Preparatory

Coach: Christopher Wolf

In March 2005, an otherwise-healthy twelve-year-old was admitted to Kaiser Hospital in Santa Clara complaining of pain in his leg. Doctors diagnosed an infection—probably from a minor cut or scratch—and prescribed antibiotics. His condition deteriorated and he was transferred to intensive care. Toxic shock led to massive organ failure, and within 24 hours he was dead, a victim of MRSA—methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (Blum [Personal Interview]). In English, that's a raging infection resistant to standard antibiotics.

Drug-resistant infections are out of control. The World Health Organization has cited antibiotic resistance as one of the top three public health problems of the twenty-first century (Levy 313)—behind only AIDS and malaria. In October, the Journal of the American Medical Association reported that MRSA alone now kills more people in the US than AIDS. (FOX News [On-Line]). Tufts's drug-resistance expert Dr. Stuart Levy writes, "We are clearly in a public health crisis ... We're on the road to a ... public health disaster" (Shnayerson 14).

Nearly half the common forms of meningitis and pneumonia now resist penicillin and strains of dysentery, tuberculosis, and typhoid resist frequently-used drugs. So does streptococcus, the cause of common throat and ear infections. In the US alone, deaths from infectious disease increased 58% between 1980 and 1992 (Day 42-53). Last October, school districts in Kentucky, Maryland, and Virginia temporarily closed schools in response to MRSA cases (Urbina [On-Line], FOX News [On-Line]). One in twenty US hospital patients acquires an infection in the hospital, and 70% of those infections resist at least one common antibiotic. As a result, 90,000 patients die each year (Day 20-26), more than twice the number killed in auto accidents.

These statistics have varied human faces: In Pennsylvania, two-year-old Dalton Canterbury left brain-damaged by bacterial meningitis (Day 7-9). In Illinois, Shane Matthews hospitalized for three months after routine surgery because of a hospital-acquired infection (Levy 174-175). In Texas, teen Bryan Alexander dead five days after his first symptoms of pneumonia (Shnayerson 12). Tragically, victims of such infections could have been successfully treated ten years ago.

How did we get here? Alexander Fleming's 1928

discovery of penicillin launched a medical miracle. Developed into an effective drug during World War II, penicillin was hailed as a "magic bullet", and as recently as 1969, the US Surgeon General declared, "We can close the book on infectious diseases" (Shnayerson 18). Just thirty years later, a new Surgeon General announced "A global resurgence of infectious disease" (Shnayerson 21). What caused the "magic bullet" to turn against us? Two things: Overuse and underdevelopment.

Overuse is the antibiotic paradox: the more you use an antibiotic, the less effective it becomes. Antibiotics kill weak bacteria, allowing drug-resistant bacteria to emerge in place of their frailer relatives. Dr. Levy compares resistant bacteria to weeds. In a healthy lawn, weeds sprout in only a few locations—but if the grass dies, there is more space for the weeds to take over (Day 11). So, when antibiotics kill weak germs, tough germs move in. Antibiotic resistance has escalated because increasing use has killed *weak* strains of bacteria and allowed the strong to thrive. The common, but potentially deadly *Staphylococcus aureus* was treated with penicillin in the '40s. (Wikipedia [On-Line]) Now more than 95% of *Staphylococcus aureus* resists penicillin, and 60% also resists penicillin's successor, methicillin (Kardar [On-Line]). Almost all types of bacteria exhibit more resistance now than 10 or 15 years ago (Australian Broadcasting Company [On-Line]). As Dr. Barry Kreiswirth of the Public Health Research Institute puts it, "The bugs are getting stronger, and they're getting stronger faster" (Shnayerson 18).

Overuse of antibiotics is rampant in the US. The Center for Disease Control estimates that one third of outpatient prescriptions—nearly 50 million annually—are unnecessary (Shnayerson 10). People who mistakenly believe that antibiotics cure colds and flu demand prescriptions, and doctors often comply. It's simpler to write an unnecessary prescription than to lose an angry patient to a more compliant MD.

Misuse is part of overuse. If patients skip or stop doses of prescribed antibiotics as soon as symptoms disappear, partially-resistant bacteria survive, reproducing and spreading in place of susceptible bacteria killed by the drug.

Human patients are only part of the problem. 84% of the antibiotics in the US are consumed by animals—and most of the animals aren't even sick! American farms use 24.6 million pounds of antibiotics a year—five and a half times human consumption. Small doses are routinely fed to healthy animals to stimulate growth and weight gain ("The Issues: Antibiotics" [On-Line]), and the drug-resistant bacteria that develop pass on to farmers and consumers. And not just in meat—Significant quantities of bacteria

Continued on Page 14

A Pathological Paradox

Continued from Page 13

survive in the two trillion pounds of animal waste produced annually by America's farms. Run-off from the waste enters rivers, lakes, and groundwater, and bacteria are also present in fertilizer spread on agricultural fields ("Antibiotic Resistance-An Emerging Public Health Crisis" [On-Line]).

In 1986, Sweden banned non-therapeutic use of antibiotics for farm animals. Denmark followed (Shnayerson 137), and studies since indicate a dramatic reduction in resistant bacteria in Danish livestock ("Antibiotic Resistance-An Emerging Public Health Crisis" [On-Line]). The European Union enacted a similar ban, but the US continues to allow this atrocity (Shnayerson 142). Why? Because American meat producers tell us that a ban would raise food costs, but a National Academy of Sciences study indicates the average grocery bill would grow only 15 cents a week ("The Issues: Antibiotics" [On-Line]).

Underdevelopment of new antibiotics is the other side of the problem. The truth is, it's not profitable to produce new antibiotics. Development of a new drug typically takes 10 to 15 years and costs about \$800 million (Salyers 118). And because the patentable period is only 17 years—often starting early in the development cycle—companies have only a brief window before competitors take advantage of their investment (Shnayerson 113). Is it surprising that drug firms lose interest in antibiotics and shift their focus to more profitable products (Infectious Disease Society of America [On-Line])? Vitamins, Vicodin, and Viagra are better bets than finding a successor to Vancomycin, today's antibiotic of last resort. Since 1998, the FDA approved just ten new antibiotics and only two are substantially different than existing ones. Half the large pharmaceutical companies cut back antibiotic research by the '80s. So while there were 60 antibiotics under development ten years ago, only thirteen are currently being researched (Gottlieb). Infectious-disease specialist Jonathan Blum says, "We're heading in the wrong direction. Drug-development efforts are not keeping up with increasing resistance to antibiotics" (Blum [Personal Interview]).

Unless we curb overuse of antibiotics and spur creation of new drugs to tackle resistant bacteria, the age of antibiotics will be brief.

Therefore, I advocate that the US Congress pass the following legislation: Increase funding for the Center for Disease Control's antimicrobial resistance program to \$150 million, as recommended by the Infectious Disease Society

of America (Infectious Disease Society of America [On-Line]).

2) Ban non-therapeutic use of antibiotics in animal feed, as recommended by the American Medical Association, the American Public Health Association, and the World Health Organisation and also require a veterinarian's prescription to purchase antibiotics for animals.

Include new antibiotics under the Orphan Drug Act of 1983 to motivate pharmaceutical companies to develop new antibiotics through tax incentives, patent extensions, and expedited FDA reviews (Wikipedia).

We can't sit back and treat one infection at time. Too much is at stake.

Imagine a world *without* antibiotics. Childbirth becomes more dangerous. Surgery is frequently fatal. Injured soldiers die from infections as often as from wounds. Strep throat can cause permanent heart damage. Minor cuts and scrapes become life-threatening illnesses. Tuberculosis and pneumonia rise to leading causes of death. Cancer and AIDS patients die faster, succumbing to opportunistic infections.

Antibiotic resistance is unavoidable; it is not unbeatable. Let's make sure that keeping "miracle drugs" effective doesn't require a miracle.

Works Cited

"Antibiotic Resistance-An Emerging Public Health Crisis." KeepAntibioticsWorking.com. Keep Antibiotics Working: The Campaign to End Antibiotic Overuse. August 15, 2007. <http://www.keepantibioticsworking.com/new/resources_library.cfm?refID=36366>

Australian Broadcasting Company. "How Close Are We to a Nightmarish Return to a Pre-Antibiotic Era?" Millennium Bugs 1999. Australian Broadcasting Company. August 12, 2007. <<http://www.abc.net.au/science/slab/antibiotics/superbugs.htm>>

Blum, Jonathan. Personal interview. August 20, 2007.

Day, Nancy. Killer Superbugs: The Story of Drug-Resistant Diseases. Berkeley Heights: Enslow Publishers, 2001.

FOX News. "Kentucky School District to Close 23 Schools After MRSA Staph Infection Reported." FOXNews.com. October 27, 2007. FOX News Network. January 15, 2008. <<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,305677,00.html>>

FOX News. "Superbug Scare: Virginia District's Schools Scrubbed; Teen Not First to Succumb to Deadly Infection." FOXNews.com. October 17, 2007. FOX News Network. January 15, 2008. <<http://www.foxnews.com/stoiy/0,2933,302605,00.html>>

Continued on Page 15

A Pathological Paradox

Continued from Page 14

Gottlieb, Scott. "Attack of the Superbugs." The Wall Street Journal Online. October 30, 2007. [The Wall Street Journal](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB119370158861775597.html). January 27, 2008. <<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB119370158861775597.html>>

Infectious Disease Society of America. "Bad Bugs, No Drugs Executive Summary." [Infectious Disease Society of America](http://www.idsociety.org/Content.aspx?id=5558). August 12, 2007. <<http://www.idsociety.org/Content.aspx?id=5558>>

"The Issues: Antibiotics." Sustainable Table. [Grace](http://www.sustainabletable.org/issues/antibiotics/). August 12, 2007. <<http://www.sustainabletable.org/issues/antibiotics/>>

Kardar, Sean S. "Antibiotic Resistance: New Approaches to a Historical Problem." ActionBioscience.org. March 2005. American Institute of Biological Sciences. August 12, 2007. <<http://www.actionbioscience.org/newfrontiers/kardar.html>>

Levy, Stuart B. [The Antibiotic Paradox: How the Misuse of Antibiotics Destroys Their Curative Power](#). Cambridge: Perseus Pub., 2002.

Salyers, Abigail A. [Revenge of the Microbes: How Bacterial Resistance is Undermining the Antibiotic Miracle](#). Washington, D.C.: ASM Press, 2005.

Shnayerson, Michael. [The Killers Within: The Deadly Rise of Drug-Resistant Bacteria](#). Boston: Little Brown, 2002.

Urbina, Ian. "Schools in Several States Report Staph Infections, and Deaths Raise the Alarm." October 19, 2007. [The New York Times](http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/19/us/19staph.html?_r=1&ref=education&orefslugin). January 15, 2008. <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/19/us/19staph.html?_r=1&ref=education&orefslugin>

Wikipedia. "Orphan Drug." August 12, 2007. [Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Orphan_drug). August 13, 2007. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Orphan_drug>

Wikipedia. "Staphylococcus Aureus." August 12, 2007. [Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Staphylococcus_aureus#Treatment_and_antibiotic_resistance). August 14, 2007. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Staphylococcus_aureus#Treatment_and_antibiotic_resistance>

CHSSA State Championships 2009

Host: Culver City High School

Dates: April 24-26, 2009

FRIDAY

9:30 AM	Early Registration
10:00 AM	Registration
Noon	Congress Meeting
1:00 PM	President's Meeting
2:00 PM	Team, LD, Rd. 1
3:15 PM	Extemp Draw
3:45 PM	IE A Round 1 Congress Round 1
5:45 PM	Team, LD, Rd 2
7:30 PM	IE B Round 1 Congress Round 2

SATURDAY

8:00 AM	Team, LD – Rd. 3
9:15 AM	Extemp Draw
9:45 AM	IE A Round 2
11:15 AM	Team, LD – Rd 4 Congress Round 3 Parli/PF Rd 1
1:00 PM	IE B Round 2
2:45 PM	Team, LD – Rd 5 Congress Round 4 Parli/PF Rd 2
4:00 PM	Extemp Draw
4:30 PM	IE A Round 3
6:15 PM	Team, LD – Rd 6 Parli/PF Rd 3
8:00 PM	IE B Round 3

SUNDAY

8:00 AM	Team, LD – Rd 7 Parli/PF Rd 4
9:15 AM	Extemp Draw Congress Semis
9:45 AM	IE A Semis
10:30 AM	Parli/PF Rd 5
11:15 AM	IE B Semis
1:00 PM	Team, LD – Rd 8 Congress Finals Parli/PF Rd 6
2:15 PM	Extemp Draw
2:45 PM	IE Finals
3:15 PM	Cong Finals, Parli/PF Rd 7
4:00 PM	Team, LD Finals
4:30 PM	Parli/PF Finals

Pattern A: NX, IX, IMP, OO, OA, EXP

Pattern B: DI, HI, TI, DUO, OPP, OI

Rounds will be moved up as time permits.

Schedule subject to change.

Keeping Computers Out of Debate Rounds

By Einar Wm. Johnson

It is tragic, to me, that the National Forensics League opened the door to having computers in debate rounds. I have judged several rounds at invitational tournaments where computers have been used in round with students either speaking while sitting behind the computer or standing with tubs or other materials stacked and the computer on top so that, once again, the speaker's face is eclipsed by the machine. I have seen no debaters utilizing computers in a round exhibiting anything remotely resembling good speaking skills.

Now a contingent of the California High School Speech Association (CHSSA) State Council is pushing hard to permit in round use of computers at the State Tournament in all forms of debate (excluding Parli), without the use of the internet being permitted. I am adamantly opposed to such a proposal, and am vigorously fighting against the in-round use of computers in any form of debate, and have been asked to state my reasons in this article.

Since originally writing this article, the CHSSA Council, at its meeting last month (September 2008), although soundly defeating such a proposal in May 2008, voted to allow computers in rounds, but only in Policy Debate (rejecting the proposal as to LD and Public Forum). The issue is not yet finally decided, however, because I believe this is such an important issue that all coaches of CHSSA member schools, State-wide, should vote on whether to allow computers in rounds in Policy debate and I have called for a referendum vote, under CHSSA Rules, to reverse the recently passed allowance of computers in Policy rounds. This is not a pipe dream—I have the required Petition signatures to force a State wide-vote. I can only hope that those who do not participate in Policy Debate will still vote to exclude computers from rounds as it is a matter of protecting the rights of “have nots” that cannot procure the equipment, a matter of promoting effective public speaking, and a matter of avoiding the risk that computers will find their way into other forms of debate.

As to my reasons for opposing computers in debate rounds, first, and foremost is the fact that CHSSA is an organization focusing on the teaching and promoting of good speaking skills. CHSSA has an extensive mission statement and effective public speaking is core to its purpose. Contrary to this objective, as illustrated above, laptops in rounds cause further informality in stance and the total eclipse of a student's face. Computers in rounds will simply significantly diminish the already diminishing communica-

tive and persuasive aspects of debate.

Second, speaking from a laptop in a formal competition is not only oxymoronic, it is contrary to real world experience. Teachers, politicians, and lawyers (as but examples) present from paper notes or no notes at all—they would not, and do not, present from computers before a classroom or an audience. Our students should not be deceived into believing that speaking from computers represents an effective form of formal debate, let alone of formal communication.

Yes, there are board meetings behind the scenes where people sit behind laptops and exchange ideas, but even those individuals would not speak from behind a computer if presenting to a stockholders' meeting or some other audience. A computer might be used to generate a slide show or graphic in a formal business setting, but such presentations have no place in a debate round where the art of oral communication and persuasion should be key. (I have heard of at least one collegiate team that turned the laptop around and exhibited pictures of devastation and ruin.) Once a computer is in the round, the public speaking element of debate will be undermined and there is no telling where the slippery slope will take us—quite possibly to internet use in rounds and to complete apathy for even the basics of public speaking. Indeed, as noted above, this battle is not just about Policy Debate—if computers are allowed in Policy rounds an obvious slippery slope will be a further effort to allow them in LD and Public Forum rounds. No coach should believe that just because s/he does not do Policy debate that this is a non-issue as to them because the slippery slope puts all forms of debate at risk. Every coach should also be interested in assuring all State sponsored events are fair and open and accessible to all, not just a few (the exclusivity created by computers in rounds is addressed in detail below).

I will grant anyone that, especially in Policy debate, there are poor speaking skills being exhibited even without computers, such as the ridiculous practice of high speed speaking, otherwise known as spread debate. However, that is no reason to surrender and accept such poor presentations and then add to the problem. Just as we should have drawn a line against spread years ago, we should draw the line at computers in rounds now. We also should be actively engaged in reforming the poor speaking often exhibited (though not universally so) in debate. The quality of speaking we see in final rounds at State should be the goal for all rounds. (CHSSA has an impact not only at the State Tournament, but at League levels as well where its rules are followed and where the same goals should be focused upon).

A formal speaking competition should exhibit persua-

Continued on Page 17

Keeping Computers Out of Debate Rounds

Continued from Page 16

sive and articulate speaking and should create a connection with the audience to the fullest degree possible. Debate should be as much about effective communication as any other CHSSA event. Nor do I accept the premise that CHSSA's unique judging pool will check the problem. Spread is alive and well at the State Tournament even though it does not win there and even though judges hate it. We contained spread in our League by drawing a line in the sand against it—that is the only thing that worked. Even when debaters ask me for my judging philosophy and I tell them I abhor spread, they still spread. When I tell them I follow State rules they admit they have never read them (an omission I seek to cure through CHSSA legislation in January that will require debaters to sign a written acknowledgment that they have read the CHSSA Rules and a commitment to abide by them). Sometimes rules are the only way to achieve goals. There is already too much “anything goes” in debate. There is simply no reason to let the tail wag the dog by opening the door to something that will not promote the qualities for which CHSSA stands. Frankly, NFL should reconsider its position for the same reasons (it has recently voted to allow computers in Policy rounds permanently, though I have already gotten the attention of some members of the National Council through correspondence and I am fighting to preclude use of computers in Policy rounds at the National level as well and will write and submit a separate article to the *Rostrum* focused on NFL; it is noted that the NFL took this action without even taking a straw poll of its membership and it is also noted that at least one Council member that voted for the proposal has told me he believes that my approach at the State level is appropriate).

Third, computers also introduce a noise level in a round, including the tapping of keys, which is distracting and interferes with the communicative process. Discussion of having printers in rounds further escalates the noise level and distractions.

Fourth, leaving the computer at the door also promotes advanced preparation and limits the amount of material that is accessible. The research burden in Policy debate is already ridiculous—do we really want to give those that can afford laptops the advantage of carrying even greater volumes of material? I believe limits are prudent and force more effective preparation. Limits also protect the “have nots” that do not have a computer to store a ton of data. (This issue is further addressed below).

Part of the analysis and reasoning that goes with debate is at the preparation stage, trying to anticipate arguments and finding materials to oppose them. Allowing computers in rounds will simply further encourage and exacerbate pre-fabricated briefs that can be effortlessly found by a word search in a round. Students will be even less familiar with their materials than they are presently.

Fifth, permitting laptops in rounds also makes evidence exchanges a comical scenario at best.

Either students will literally stand behind their opponents peering at their computers or students will be passing computers back and forth. Having a printer going during a round not only adds to the noise level, as noted above, it also adds to the expense and also makes for one more thing that needs to be hauled around when supposedly, as addressed below, one reason the proponents push for this is to lessen the amount of baggage being hauled around.

Sixth, permitting laptops in rounds in any form of debate also makes debate more EXCLUSIONARY, pitting the “haves” against the “have nots” in a manner in which the “have nots” are prejudiced. Public schools are not about to budget for a laptop for every student and would not want the risk of loss and damage in any event. Most programs are lucky to have enough to survive financially without expanding into portable technology. Risk is also at play when a student's own computer is lost or stolen (a risk a coach does not need either) even if the fact that many students cannot afford a laptop is ignored. Furthermore, some students are not as computer literate or experienced as others because of economic disparities in the schools.

I will not be inclined to continue to have policy teams if computers are allowed in rounds because I am not about to send my students into a round with the equivalent of a bow and arrow (paper files) against a Gatling gun (computer access which represent hundreds of tubs of material into rounds). I also remember well the comment of one coach that he could tell who would win a round upon entering the room and seeing one team with computers and one team without. Computers will simply become a “badge” of “true” Policy debaters in the minds of many judges, leading to a further exclusivity in the event.

Many of the advocates of computers in rounds are coaches of teams with large budgets that travel the National Circuit. They argue they want to eliminate the expense and burden of flying around with debate tubs. The schools I coach at do not fly anywhere, with the exception of the rare opportunity to go to Nationals (which I ended up funding out of my own pocket in the past). “Have nots” do not have the luxury of flying around. They are already forced

Continued on Page 18

Keeping Computers Out of Debate Rounds

Continued from Page 17

to travel locally in a limited geographic circuit, with occasional invitationals, due to budget constraints, but have no less desire to make it to, and excel in, the State and National Championships. Thus, the proponents' argument turns on itself as it fully illustrates that this is a "have" versus "have not" issue. There are already enough social chasms in debate without adding computers in rounds. (As an aside, I have yet to see a tub in either an LD or a Public Forum round so the argument of hauling less stuff around would only apply to Policy Debate in any event and yet, a vigorous effort was made in September to allow computers in the rounds of LD and Public Forum as well).

Since the "have nots" will have to rely on the limited resources they can generate and carry with them in debating against teams that have computers full of data, far surpassing anything they can carry now, they will be severely prejudiced by computer use in a round. **WE SHOULD NOT BE PROMOTING THINGS THAT WILL LEAD TO EXCLUSION, PARTICULARLY BASED ON ECONOMIC DISPARITY.**

There is no reason to permit a contingent that wants cheaper flight expenses to permanently alter the method of presentation of debate at the State level. Indeed, if California takes a firm stand against computers in the round perhaps this particular movement will die and California will end up having a profound influence on other programs by preserving what little is left of effective speaking in many rounds of debate. Perhaps limits on evidence and narrower topics—both much needed reforms in Policy—will be looked to as alternative solutions, issuing an invitation to have more join the event rather than a boot in the pants out of it.

Seventh, exclusion of internet use is unenforceable. I am an attorney by trade (I coach as a volunteer) and have a client with a small box that can easily fit in a pocket. That box can pick up internet for him practically anywhere from a satellite feed he subscribes to. Not only could a student access the internet in a round using such a device, he or she could also quickly procure pre-fabbed briefs from the right sources on that one case that might not be covered by the computer's files. Team mates could also easily transmit messages to debaters. Hopefully, coaches would not, but they could. All of the foregoing can occur without detection making any attempted regulations unenforceable and unmanageable. Indeed, violations may well have occurred

on the National Circuit without discovery—the absence of a report does not mean the activity is not occurring. In fact, it is implicit within the desire to regulate against it that this type of activity can occur—the problem is that it cannot be readily detected. Accessing the internet is very easy without detection. IN FACT, at the recent CHSSA Council meeting a well respected coach and member of CHSSA's Hall of Fame expressed that she had developed doubts about having computers in rounds when a debater reported to her that the debater had been in a round where he or she could observe the other side using the internet, but knew the judge could not see that such use was occurring, apparently leading no protest, but making clear the difficulty of dealing with the enforcement of the internet prohibition. Such an example also illustrates that an assumption that no violations have yet occurred as to internet use is a poor and unfounded assumption.

Regulating internet use could also end up making debate more about protests than debating with no means to get to the truth short of a computer forensics expert. Data is too easily erased and activating the internet without being seen is extremely easy. The likelihood is that rules against accessing the internet will be ignored, with the rules being mere lip service, providing the "haves" an even greater advantage over the "have nots". (Indeed, even though tag teaming is not supposed to occur under CHSSA and National rules, coaches who do not believe that should be the rule simply ignore it—anarchy is prevalent in debate and it needs to be stopped, not supported.) Keeping a computer out of a round is easily enforceable and draws a clear line.

Eighth, at one college invitational I heard a student complain that her computer had crashed in the prior round. Computers in round thus present the added dimension of mechanical failure in a round.

While one can say that is an assumed risk, once again that philosophy does not account for the prejudice to the activity or the prejudice to the "have nots" since it has been suggested the "have nots" can buy used computers cheap—inferior and outdated equipment that would have greater potential to fail.

All of the foregoing is offset by NOTHING as there is NO NEED to have a computer in the round - - there is no substance behind the inexplicable desire of some coaches and students to promote and engage in poor public speaking. Indeed, even advocates of computers in rounds concede it does not promote good public speaking, but assert that people should have the right to choose to speak poorly.

The latter assertion belies the fact that the speech community as a whole should have a say in what is and is not promoted in competition. CHSSA should take pride

Continued on Page 19

Keeping Computers Out of Debate Rounds

Continued from Page 18

in itself and care about what kind of end product it produces—debate exists first, and foremost, as an academic exercise. CHSSA, and the entire State, should care how the public perceives what CHSSA is about and how CHSSA goes about achieving it. I have been told that computers are just a tool and coaches should have the right to choose (while being told by the same person that no one will win State speaking from a seated position behind a computer), but if in the context of a round it is a damaging, counterproductive, and exclusionary tool we should not offer it as an option.

There is, I suppose, the argument that expense can be saved in travel for those with the good fortune of being able to afford air fare, but the miniscule impact of that argument and the fact that it highlights the “have”/“have not” dichotomy has already been addressed. (Once again, it is unclear why LD and Public Forum were ever even on the table as there are no massive amounts of tubs of evidence in those events—there is, however, the ability, if computers are allowed, to bring massive quantities of information even into those forms of debate which, as noted above, is not a good thing).

This is just another instance, like spread debate, where a contingent seeks to get their way by forcing others to accede to their poor standards. Just as spread has driven many away from Policy

Debate (and the risk of the same is now entering LD Debate), and will ultimately prove to be its doom (to my dismay—I was a non-spread Policy debater from middle school to college graduation), computers in rounds have far more than a nominal impact on the course of debate. CHSSA is about public speaking and it should not permit something that will even further denigrate the speaking exhibited in many debate rounds. Let us look to preserve debate as a communicative exercise, to protect the “have nots”, and to eliminating the prospect of improper conduct. Our kids have plenty of exposure to computers, including preparing for debate, but computers have no place in the round. There are already enough social chasms and maverick movements in debate and there has already been enough erosion of the quality of presentation in debate. Let’s stay committed to teaching kids how to skilfully persuade and speak rather than burying their faces in computer screens. Let us take a stand and let us take it now.

No Need to Fear Computers

By Chuck Ballingall

Computers in debate will enhance the quality of debate and will make debate more, not less accessible to small programs. Computers will eventually make paper virtually obsolete; already many students find them to be a more efficient means of flowing and timing debates. Computers are the future, and we should allow our students and coaches to use them, innovate, and find even more uses for them.

Einar Johnson seems to believe that the expense of computers will make it impossible for small programs to compete in policy debate. To the contrary, the digital age in debate is causing many barriers, including financial ones, to fall. It is now possible for anyone with access to the internet to download every file produced at virtually every summer debate institute in the country. While there is certainly an expense associated with the purchase of laptops, that expense has fallen considerably over the years. In just a few years, teams will be carrying the bulk of their evidence around on their hard drives. The whole system will be much more efficient and less expensive to maintain than the paper based system in place today.

Mr. Johnson also argues that the use of computers in rounds will cause debaters to develop poor presentation habits. While this may happen in a few instances, teams will not be rewarded by the judges at the State Tournament for this behavior. Good speaking will continue to be rewarded, as it has been through several other changes in the technology of debate.

I would respectfully ask that you vote against the proposed ban on computers in policy debate.

CHSSA
290 Cashman Circle
Sacramento, CA 95835

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