

# THE EX FILES

**September Edition  
Volume 1, Issue No. 1**

## From the Publisher

---

Extemporaneous speaking is unlike any other event in the forensic community. Not only do extempers not know what is going to hit them from round to round, tournament to tournament, they also have a constant job of reading the news and aligning their perspective on the world based on events that occur each day. Great extempers have to dig deep into global events and develop their knowledge of history, theories, and different perspectives on the conflicts that are writing the historical narrative we find ourselves living through.

Extemp Question Central, now in its third year, is trying to be on the cutting edge of the extemporaneous speaking community. In its first year, the website provided question to extemporaneous speaking competitors and marketed its premier work: *Elements of Style for the Modern Extemp*. Last year, the website offered those resources and began providing topic briefs, written with the assistance of Michael Garson, and provided extempers a guide to navigating US Extemp and International Extemp questions at NFL, written with the assistance of Colin West. The website also provided a tournament calendar and a champions roll call, where extempers could look at the history of tournaments that compose the season's calendar.

This year, the website is providing this first of its kind monthly magazine, *The Ex Files*, free of charge to the extemporaneous speaking community. This magazine will feature topic briefs, written by competitors of the past, to aid extemporaneous speakers, strategy articles for extempers to reflect upon, interviews with coaches and past extemporaneous speaking champions, tournament breakdowns and predictions, and the debut of a national points race that the extemporaneous speaking community can follow from September to June.

The staff of *The Ex Files* thanks you for being supportive of this website and for choosing to read this magazine. We kindly ask that you play a part in expanding the visitors on the site by spreading the word about Extemp Question Central. We hope that you enjoy this inaugural edition to the magazine and look for our next edition in mid-October! Good luck to those extempers attending the Wake Forest Early Bird and the Yale University Invitational Tournament!

-Logan Scisco



**Volume 1, No. 1**

**PUBLISHER**  
Logan Scisco

**EDITORIAL**  
**Editor in Chief**, Logan Scisco  
**Layout Coordinator**, Logan Scisco

**ART**  
**Graphic Designer**, Mason Scisco

**CONTRIBUTING STAFF**

Logan Scisco  
Michael Garson  
Omar Qureshi  
Hunter Kendrick  
Sebastian Pyrek  
Mark Royce  
Sarah Anand  
Akshar Rambachan  
Bill Thompson  
Colin West  
Merry Regan

# CONTENTS

---

## FROM THE PUBLISHER

Introduction to Extemp Question Central National Points Race.....23-27  
by Logan Scisco

## EXTEMP TOPIC BRIEFS

Public Opinion.....8-18  
by Michael Garson

Russia's Foreign Policy.....28-30  
by Sebastian Pyrek

## CONTRIBUTING ARTICLES

Alternative (Sub)structure? Yeah Right.....19-22  
by Omar Qureshi

ELIXIR.....4-7  
by Hunter Kendrick

The Right Way to File.....31-32  
by Mark Royce

## STATISTICS & DATA

2008 State Champion Roll Call.....33-34

# ELIXIR

*How IR Theory Can Cure Your IX Problems*

**By Hunter Kendrick**

*Hunter Kendrick is a 2008 graduate of Danville High School in Danville, KY. He competed in speech and debate for four years, and over that period of time he amassed fourteen different state championships in six different individual events – including eight different titles in Extemporaneous Speaking. Nationally, Hunter is most notable as a two-time finalist at the Barkley Forum of Emory University, the 3<sup>rd</sup> place finisher at the 2007 NCFL National Championships, the 3<sup>rd</sup> place finisher at the 2008 MBA Southern-Bell Round Robin, and as the 4<sup>th</sup> place finisher in International Extemp at the 2008 NFL National Championships. In the summer of 2007 Hunter was named an NFL “Academic All-American,” and by the end of his forensics career he had earned the degree of “Premier Distinction” from the NFL.*

*Hunter is a freshman at the University of Kentucky where he is pursuing degrees in History and English.*

## **What am I Missing?**

Let’s face it: there is no such thing as a perfect speech. Competing in an innumerable amount of rounds has taught me one thing – the winner isn’t the immaculate speaker, but the speaker who makes the fewest mistakes. Of course, you can always “cover-up” what mistakes you do make by wowing the judges in other areas. And, perhaps the easiest way to wow your audience is to have complex analysis.

Whether you’re a seasoned champion or someone completely new to the event, it’s clear to all that extemp gets “deep.” What I mean is that a speech is not just a collection of random facts, it is the weaving of those facts together into a cohesive answer to the question. Competitors and audience members are often looking for the “deeper meaning” or the “connection.” Sometimes it is easy to find the connection, other times it takes more effort. But, when discussing international relations, it is actually easier to find that deeper meaning than most people seem to believe at first. And, successfully finding those themes (and incorporating them correctly into a speech) can be the jumpstart a speaker needs to propel them towards success.

## **What is International Relations Theory?**

NFL Debate Champion Steve Mancuso and former University of Michigan debater Jason Hernandez wrote in the October 1998 edition of the *Rostrum* that, “IR theorists take what they know about the world and create theories that rationalize the phenomenon known as world politics... (IR theorists) explain past and current events based on the data they can assemble.” IR theories are reductive and rely on different sets of assumptions. IR theories provide REASON for ACTION (like, why did Country X attack Country Y?).

As Duke professor Ole Holsti once warned, IR theories can be comparable to putting on “colored glasses,” and focusing only on events salient to that particular theory. For example, an historic event of great importance to a realist may be completely irrelevant to a constructionist, and vice versa.

## **When Should I Use IR Theory?**

To be perfectly honest, international extemp – even USX in foreign policy rounds – is a seven minute explication on IR theory, to an extent. (Disregarding economics questions, of course.) After all, extempers are most often called upon to analyze and interpret global events, and they then predict the future based on their interpretation of the events’ meaning for global societal trends.

**A WORD OF CAUTION** – Extempers should not use IR Theory, especially in big rounds, carelessly. While it is impressive when an extemper successfully weaves an IR discussion into a speech, it is also dangerous to try said weave in the first place. Even in rounds with an experienced judging panel (say, in NFL out-rounds), IR theories require meticulous explanation when being applied to a particular scenario. Remember Mr. Holsti’s warning: different people will interpret different events in very misaligned ways. Thus, it is important for any extemper to explain any assertion to the point that his/her audience will interpret the data in the way the speaker wants, not in the way the audience is naturally inclined to do (don’t give them the chance to interpret the data in way that would be destructive to your reasoning!). So, before a speaker knows it, he/she may be bogged down in a topic area longer than intended – which can ultimately derail an entire speech.

Speaking as a former competitor who suffered with this problem his entire career, let me say this, **DO NOT LET HISTORICAL EXPLANATION AND THE EXPLORATION FOR OVERARCHING THEMES PREVENT YOU FROM ANSWERING YOUR QUESTION IN A FULL AND TIMELY MANNER!** After all, as extemp guru Jason Warren is fond of saying, “The first rule of extemp is ‘answer the question!’”

### **What Are the Different IR Theories?**

There are many, many different IR theories, and the list grows as the complexity of the international community grows. But, here is an oversimplified list of – arguably – the most important IR theories. Also, I have included examples of how/where the theories could be utilized in extemp.

*Balance of Power* – Predicts that rapid changes in international power and status – especially attempts by one country to control a region – will provoke counterbalancing actions. Thus, the balancing process helps to maintain stability between states. This theory comes into play most effectively when alliances between states are fluid and countries are not fearful of “double-crossing” each other, so to speak. Sometimes a single state can play the role of “balancer,” switching its allegiance from one side to another.

**Ex:** Europe during the Napoleonic Era and – as some (including Rachel Bronson of the Brookings Institution) believe – the Middle East today.

*Collective Defense* – A group of nations agree to protect one another against a traditional threat from an identifiable, external adversary.

**Ex:** Article V of the NATO Charter provides for the mutual defense of the member states.

*Collective Security* – This theory goes beyond the previous theory because, in the words of Inis Claude, because it creates “arrangements for facilitating peaceful settlement of disputes,” assuming that the mechanisms of preventing war and defending states under armed attack will “supplement and reinforce each other.” It is applicable to discussions of widely inclusive

international organizations. It hinges on preventing conflict, but it threatens retaliation should peace be broken.

**Ex:** The League of Nations and the United Nations.

*Complex Interdependence* – A theory developed by Joseph Nye of the American Enterprise Institute. It argues that there are complex “transnational” connections between states and societies. According to the theory, such relationships – often driven by economics – are increasing, which is causing a decrease in militarism. So, cooperation amongst states – if the theory holds true – should increase.

**Ex:** Latin America today. (Special Hint: this theory can be particularly useful when discussing Israel and Palestine).

*Constructivism* – Rejects the anarchist stances of other theories (which will be discussed later), while holding that anarchy is not the inherent global system, but, rather, what states have chosen to make with the global system. So, constructivists hold that it is possible to change, or “construct,” a new global make-up.

**Ex:** Discussions of groups like the EU.

*Democratic Peace* – Argues, empirically, that two liberal, constitutional democracies have never gone to war with one another in recent history (post 1816). It rests on one hypothesis: relations between democracies are naturally more peaceful than the relations between other regime pairings.

**Ex:** Discussions on the stability (or, rather, the potential stability) of regions like Africa and Asia.

*Dependency* – Asserts that the 3<sup>rd</sup> world countries were not always impoverished. Rather, they became impoverished through the domineering attitudes of and the forced incorporation into the world economy by, the 1<sup>st</sup> world powers. So, ultimately, the economies of the 3<sup>rd</sup> world became geared more towards the needs of their colonial masters, than the needs of their own societies.

**Ex:** Discussions on globalization.

*Golden Arches and Conflict Prevention* – In his 2000 book, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, Thomas L. Friedman supposed that no two countries that both had a McDonald’s had ever fought a war since both opened their McDonald’s. As he states in chapter 12, “when a country reached the level of economic development where it had a middle class big enough to support a McDonald’s network, it became a McDonald’s country. And people in McDonald’s countries didn’t like to fight wars anymore, they preferred to wait in line for burgers.”

**Ex:** Discussions on the decline of militancy in the face of development.

*Hegemonic Stability* – Argues that the stability of the global community depends on one dominant world power to provide said stability by enforcing the rules of the international community on other states. To be a “hegemon” in this sense a country must meet three requirements: 1.) it must have the capability to enforce the rules, 2.) it must have the desire to enforce the rules, and 3.) it must be committed to the ideal that the international community’s maintenance benefits all states.

**Ex:** Discussions on the role of the US (or, maybe in the future, China) in the global community.

*Idealism* – This is the strong belief in the effective nature of ideas. Idealists believe that baser human emotions and tendencies can be overcome by ideology, and they thus believe that societies – both national and international – can be based on morality. Morality, they argue, can be used to foment peace, justice, and stability. Idealists are incredibly reformist and even believe that war can be phased out of human interaction.

**Ex:** Discussions about disarmament/the United Nations

*Realism* – Realists believe that the world is anarchic and consists of is made up of sovereign political units called states. States inherently possess some offensive military capability or power which makes them potentially dangerous to each other; states can never be sure about the intentions of other states; the basic motive driving states is survival or the maintenance of sovereignty; states are instrumentally rational and think strategically about how to survive.

**Ex:** Any discussion of war.

#### **Referenced/Recommended Works:**

Beavis, Mark. “The IR Theory Knowledge Base.” The IR Theory Website.

<<http://www.irtheory.com>>

Hernandez, Jason and Mancuso, Steve. “Critical International Relations Theories:

Applications to the Russia Topic.” Rostrum. October 1998.

<<http://www.nflonline.org/rostrum>>

Rockwell, Spencer. “Get IR Done.” Rostrum. February 2007.

# Public Opinion

By Michael Garson

*Michael competed for Freehold Township High School in Freehold, New Jersey. He is a three-time state finalist, twice in International Extemporaneous Speaking and once in Public Forum. Michael is a graduate of the University of Texas National Institute in Forensics (UTNIF) in the summer of 2005. The following spring, Michael placed 4<sup>th</sup> in the Tournament of Champions in Extemporaneous Speaking at Northwestern University and 5<sup>th</sup> in the National Forensics League Nationals in International Extemporaneous Speaking. An academic All-American, Michael also reached the level of Outstanding Distinction.*

*He has taught extemporaneous speaking at the Metropolitan Forensics Institute (MFI) at Seton Hall University in the summer of 2006 and at the National High School Institute (NHSI) at Northwestern University in the summers of 2007 and 2008. Currently a junior at Northwestern University, he maintains involvement through his high school's and Northwestern's speech teams. He is the Co-Tournament Director of the 2009 Tournament of Champions in Extemporaneous Speaking (TOC Extemp).*

(Author's Note: Some of the ideas, facts, and vignettes offered in this story are derived from a course taught by Dennis Chong at Northwestern University in the Spring of 2008. Most of the content is also lifted from a lecture given by Michael Garson for the National High School Institute in the Summer of 2008.)

Hopefully this isn't news to any readers, but you won't be seeing a Public Opinion round at a major tournament anytime soon. Further, you are unlikely to get "What is public opinion?" in any round. Unlike the overwhelming majority of topic-based articles, this one flies under the radar. However, I would argue in my boundless sense of self-importance that public opinion is as, if not more, important as any other issue. Understanding HOW and WHY public policy is devised and implemented is highly significant. Many extempers have little difficulty explaining why a particular policy is the most effective. Yet is only the select few (like you, who is reading this article!) can understand how and if that policy can be enacted. Great ideas that are political impossible will never come to fruition. That is the beauty of understanding public opinion: it is one of the most abstract issues but has the most pragmatic and concrete of uses.

## What IS PUBLIC OPINION?

### Why we vote

Figuring out what poll to use and what voting trends are at work is a great start. Looking at the Cook Political Report's electoral report and figuring out what states are swing states is a help. But we all must ask the essential question: what makes us go to the polls. In an election that will be largely, if not entirely, decided on Obama's ability to get out underrepresented groups (youth and African-Americans), voting paradigms need to be fleshed out. Because if the "likely voters" don't hit the polls, then statistics can't save your analysis.

The original theory on voting was:

Value of voting = pB - C



In this equation,  $p$  = the probability that a single vote will tip an election (considering that no presidential election has been decided by less than 1,000 votes, let alone one, this number is as close to zero as possible. Moreover, the Electoral College automatically makes the voters Texas and California absolutely irrelevant).

“B” is the absolute benefit of your candidate winning. If McCain’s tax cuts save you \$1,000, staying in Iraq is worth \$200 to you, but having pro-life Supreme Court justice is the same as losing \$500, then the B of voting McCain is \$700. B involves economic gains/losses as well as the economic value of noneconomic decisions. Put another way, how much money would you need to vote your least preferred candidate?

“C” is the cost of voting. This is pretty straightforward. Gas prices are high, so you spend \$2 to get to the polls. You also spend an hour driving, waiting, and voting. Finally, you spend time deciding which candidate is the best choice for you. All that time and money makes voting expensive!

Using this analysis, no one should vote. The virtual zero that “ $p$ ” represents is guaranteed to make C more powerful. However, millions of voters hit the polls every election. Therefore, there is an additional variable, “b”.

“b” is the social benefit of voting. This is the key that causes people to hit the polls! There is value to being with a group of people and saying, “I voted for \_\_\_\_”. Many Americans want to tell their grandchildren that they voted for the first African-American president. Others want to put their minds at ease and know they did their part to protect the rights of the unborn.

#### *Conclusion:*

Since  $pB$  is very close to zero, the question is whether or not C outweighs b. For those who have that scenario, they’ll stay at home. For those who think there is a great deal to gain by exercising their constitutional right will be those who put someone in the White House. While I suggest looking at polls, trends, and battlegrounds, think about the race. Think about politics and elections on a grand scale. Have candidates sufficiently convinced their supporters to actually vote? Disaffected evangelicals can boost McCain in the Upper Midwest and urban minorities can deliver Ohio and Pennsylvania.

Disclaimer: I don’t think national elections can be decided solely based on voting incentives. However, extempers would be wise to analyze the feasibility of issues to be voting issues. If offshore oil drilling will put people in the voting booth, it’s important. If Barack’s middle name doesn’t boost turnout, it doesn’t matter.

#### **Voting preferences**

##### *The Tipping Point:*

Malcolm Gladwell wrote a fantastic book entitled The Tipping Point. The work suggests that ideas, environs, and people all contribute to an idea getting big. Fads, trends, and preferences all require certain conditions to be met. While we are much more interested in why illegal immigration isn't as important as it was two years ago than the rise of Blue's Clues, Gladwell offers some clues. First, the message should, but need not be, good. From pet rocks to gas tax holidays, bad ideas have been bought into. It helps if the idea is actually a good one, but this is not a prerequisite. If millions can be convinced that communism is good, then it isn't that hard to advocate massive deficit spending. So when analyzing if the public will get behind something, it is insufficient to simply bash the policy. **There is an important distinction between good policy and popular policy.** Understanding what people like to hear and what people need to hear are crucial aspects to comprehending public policy.

*The Myth of the Rational Voter:*

In another influential work, Bryan Caplan seeks to find the manifestations of voting irrationalities. Caplan asserts that there are fears and predispositions that voters may have. Through Caplan and other works, I have found three important issues on which voting behavior is more "social" and less "science".

A) Anti-free trade

Hopefully, the wondrous work by Adam Smith has been studied and understood by the extemping community. The Invisible Hand and Ricardo's research on specialization are the foundation of global capitalism. Only when economies are free to pursue profits in endeavors that are most profitable can global prosperity increase. Therefore, we *should* reduce all tariffs to zero. With all countries on equal footing, wealth be properly distributed. Developing countries will benefit from increased employment and developed countries will receive cheaper goods and services. However, voters intentionally ignore these basic principles.

Many a presidential candidate has ridden economic nationalism to the White House. Congressmen in heavily subsidized districts must swear off free trade to ensure their political future. The reason is because of the **nature of the issue**. The advantage of free trade is relatively small (\$5 shirt or \$4 shirt) and spread across the entire country (I'll assume all Americans buy shirts). The disadvantage of lost jobs is very acute. The steel worker in Bethlehem, PA and the textile worker in Cary, North Carolina both can physically see their job move to a different country. Since they lose thousands, they will vote solely on protectionist measures. As a means of irrational fear and solidarity, those who are safe from outsourcing will also oppose free trade policy. **The chasm between economic efficiency and the society's preferred distribution of wealth often results in public support for the latter at the cost of the former.**

B) Race

With Barack Obama, race has (finally) become an issue the media and the extemping community can discuss. Though I would love America to be able to move past the color of a person's skin, we have not as of yet. While any given individual might not have racial predispositions, enough

people in the electorate do to make it important. Dealing with race is extremely delicate, in public opinion and in extemp. There is a natural predisposition for extempers and voters to not seem racist. I have heard speakers intentionally duck race as an issue or paint it so vaguely that nothing is really being said. Yet, we can use this predisposition to our advantage and showcase our level of understanding

Tali Mendelberg, one of the leading experts on race in public policy, studied how the race card is played. The research is unsurprising, but very important. In short, many Americans do have racial attitudes. Minorities tend to support their own, regardless of ideology, and the “white, protestant” majority tends to oppose minorities. Moreover, people will avoid racism when it confronts them overtly. For example, when race is directly facing people (if an epithet or slur is uttered), there is a reaction to support the minority candidate. However, when the issue is subtly offered, such as in the Willie Horton ad, *voters act on their racism without feeling racist*.

Let’s look at how this relates to the 2008 election:

African-American voters were originally split between Clinton and Obama in early 2008. Once Hillary made race an issue, via her husband’s Jesse Jackson comment during the campaign in South Carolina, African-Americans rallied around Obama

As of this writing, the McCain campaign has intentionally avoided anything that could even be remotely interpreted as racist. However, Obama has started to make it an issue. He has suggested that the Republicans will say that he (Obama) does not look the presidents on the dollar bills. Though it is a bit counterintuitive, Obama **should make race an issue, politically speaking**. If he makes race an issue, then anyone who supports McCain must accept the (albeit remote) possibility that he/she is discriminating. Further, Hillary outperformed the polls in nearly every primary among white voters. The reason for this could be racial. If someone is supporting Obama, there is no reason to tell a pollster his/her intentions. However, a McCainiac might be a bit apprehensive about telling a complete stranger that he/she will not cast an Obama ballot. Since the polled do not, and cannot, explain why in verbose terms, there is a (albeit irrational) fear of being seen as racist.

*Conclusion:*

The ideal situation brings a truly colorblind society. At present, we aren’t there and it is absurd to assert as such. Though I don’t advocate being so blunt in speeches, elections do not care about social justice theory and senses of morality. They care about numbers. Obama should guilt non-African-Americans while consolidating his racial base. In contrast, McCain should keep race as undercover as possible. This way he cannot be pegged as a curmudgeonly racist white man and the true racists can hit the polls without guilt.

A) Tax cuts

Perhaps the most obvious voting preference that we have regards taxes. While everyone generally wants low taxes, the main emphasis is on tax cuts and/or rebates. There seems to be something

about getting that check back FROM the government instead of writing one TO the government. However, how money is distributed usually gets lost in the shuffle. On balance, most Americans want the “wealthy” to pay more and the “poor” to pay less. Yet, this fundamental principle of progressive taxation frequently gets hidden. It is for this reason that all tax cuts are supported. The easy justification of tax cuts is the ignorance that surrounds deficits. Without falling from the purview of this article, suffice it to say that all government expenditures must be paid back at some point. Those who do not understand, know, or accept this truism are willing to let any and all applicable taxpayers be showered in government money.

The slightly more complex version comes from poor research. It is only after the “Bush Tax Cuts” were implemented did Democrats truly gain traction calling them tax cuts for the rich. While they most certainly are, they did cut taxes across the board. Larry Bartels studies the tax cuts and notes that lower and middle class voters support the tax cut program because their individual tax burdens were dropped in nominal terms. Yet, when doing the research, Bartels found the **tax cuts shifted the burden to the lower and middle classes in real terms**. Voters were not recognizing that if \$1 goes in their pockets and \$5 goes into their neighbors’ pockets, they are getting the short end of the stick.

Pollster Frank Luntz is widely credited for incorporating framing into the tax conversation. The Estate Tax is a tax which gives the government a portion of inheritances when they are transferred. So when a wealthy person dies and wills his/her assets to family, Uncle Sam is first on the payroll. However, Luntz used focus groups and found that the “estate tax” could be called the “death tax”. By implying that the government taxes a person for dying, which is not too misleading of a representation, Luntz sparked public opposition to the tax. More importantly, he disguised the fact that the Estate/Death tax only applies to individuals who are so wealthy that most Americans would never feel its effects. This tax is only placed on the rich and is “good” for other taxpayers. Yet, the power of the correct frame, and selective ignorance, play into Americans’ decision calculus and alter public opinion.

## **Polling**

### *What’s in a poll?*

The most important thing that extempers can do with regards to polls is not read them. Though they are not wholly useless, polls frequently only serve to confuse the issues. The extemper who spoke at NFLs in June cited polls and found that Barack Obama had a double-digit lead over John McCain. Projected electoral maps gave Obama a 70 vote lead, turning Red homelands like Montana, Georgia, Virginia, and even Alaska blue. As of this writing, RealClear Politics has given John McCain a 275-265 edge. As we get closer, polls will be more helpful, but never fully accurate. Look no further than the Democratic New Hampshire primary, where all polls gave Obama a 3-7 point lead. By the end of the night, Hillary Clinton pulled the upset. Moreover, exit polls showed that Hillary did not even do disproportionately well among voters who decided in the last 24 hours. What does this mean? It means that the **polls were sampling the wrong people and/or getting the wrong responses**. History is littered with examples of polls being completely

inaccurate. Who is polled, when they are polled, and how they are polled all affect accuracy. Moreover, public opinion can move very quickly. A poll that is a week old might be totally off if a major news story has broke. Finally, polls on public attitudes never are tested. In early November, we can look at which polling company or political prognosticators most closely predicted the outcome (my bet is on the Cook Political Report) of elections. Yet, there is no feasible way of actually finding out how many Americans support gay marriage or want to overturn Roe v. Wade.

## 1. The rise of the New Media

### *MySpace, YourSpace, & OurSpace*

I find myself quite lucky to be writing about New Media to those who are most likely to use it (intelligent high school students). I do hope you appreciate the humor in using New Media to talk about it. A decade ago, it would have been unthinkable for someone, Logan Scisco, to reach out across the country, solicit articles, compile them, and distribute them to complete and total strangers. The information age has saturated every aspect of society, including politics. First, the bad news: politics can get ugly quicker. Bad news and slips of the tongue are never beyond technology's reach. I was told a story by a political strategist who attended an opponents' campaign rally. The candidate was speaking to a Hispanic audience in Southern California, got caught up in emotion, and suggested that illegal immigrants should be able to vote. This strategist discreetly had his cell phone recording the entire speech. He instantly sent the recording to media outlets during the speech. As this female candidate walked off the stage, she was already being bombarded with questions about the comment. News can travel faster than politicians, let alone their damage control teams.

Howard Dean was done in 2004 after his now infamous yell after the Iowa caucus. John McCain has had to see his "100 years" comment far more times than he would like to admit. George W Bush has had to endure video clip after video clip of oratorical weakness. It is debatable whether or not this is good for politics. I still hold out hope that Americans will vote on issues, not the top story on the 11 PM news. However, this seems increasingly difficult if the slightest misstep is caught on tape. I may be in the minority, but I would have flawed candidates than Manchurian ones.

But, there is good news. New media has engaged in Americans in ways never thought of before. Joe Trippi, author of *The Revolution Will Not be Televised*, and Howard Dean were the first to truly take advantage of the internet. They built a grassroots coalition and enfranchised the politically alienated. Those who viewed politics as a pointless display put on by old, rich, white dudes felt invested. Howard Dean could communicate with them on their terms using their preferred methods of technology. Barack Obama has taken engagement to a whole new level with his campaign. Though I do my best to remain non-partisan, Barack Obama's website is a thing of beauty. He has carefully perfected how we wants to be perceived by younger voters. He has resources for voters of all backgrounds, races, religions, and voting preferences. He has built an empire.

The Obama Empire is currently *the* object of affection across the political spectrum. MyBarack Obama allows the campaign to match supporters up with local Obamaniacs. If you enter your zip code onto his site, you can see what Barack Obama events are in your area. Most importantly, **Obama has depoliticized politics**. There are Barack Obama knitting clubs in Columbus, bowling leagues in Blacksburg, and Patriots watch parties in Hanover. Obama, like facebook, has made

himself a cyber-conduit for strangers with common interests. Yet, this is not a simply act of generosity. Obama's people know that if a group of Obamaniacs all meet for dinner in St. Louis, the campaign will invariably come up. In that group of like-minded voters there is a reinforcement of Obama's platform. Those who were leaning Democrat will be convinced into being lockstep supporters. Those with only a passing interest may turn into community organizers and campaign volunteers. In short, **Obama has gone viral.**

For all of the wonders of Obama's empowerment campaign, it does have a flaw. This style is completely *independent of the campaign*. When a candidate turns his people lose, he loses control of his own message. The quintessential example occurred recently after Obama voted in support of the FISA bill. Liberals on the site instantly formed a group opposing Barack's vote on his own website. Surely it seems odd that a candidates' supporters would bash him on his own site! Yet, this is the result of empowerment. Barack has adopted a bottom-up theory, which has prevented him from funneling information and ideology down the pipe. As discussed, politicians win when they talk about the issues they want to in the context they want to. That power is completely gone. **Obama has unleashed people power, but so far is unable to put the genie back in the bottle.**

### *Demographics*

#### 1. Values Voters

In 2004, Thomas Frank released a book that solidified what many pollsters had known all along and immediately entered the canon of extemp literature. [What's The Matter With Kansas](#) suggests that the Republican Party has convinced low-income voters in rural areas to vote on social issues instead of economic ones. This conclusion fits perfectly into the stereotype that low-income textile workers in Kentucky should vote Democrat for tax purposes, but do vote for Republicans, presumably on abortion, guns, and gay rights. This notion is largely held among the political community, but is under attack by Larry Bartels.

Bartels' study finds that low-income voters vote on economic issues more than high-income voters do. Further, there is a greater correlation of social issue preference and partisanship among the college educated than the non-college educated. This means that the MBA on Wall Street is willing to take increased taxes in favor of supporting abortion rights and gay rights. The context and depth of "values voters" can be debated more learned than us and with more free time than us. At the end of the day, the question comes down to defining a values voter and the working class. Whether or not the working class is uniquely white, as Hillary Clinton suggested, is defined by a certain income, or is based on education level changes the issue. Both major parties like to be representative of the "working class". There seems to be an element of pride that a candidate can take in claiming the majority of the working class. The perceived champion of the industrious Americans trying to get by will benefit from other voters, as well.

When talking about values voters As a product of the east coast, red states were treated as foreigners. They are strange and in no way represent or resemble my values and lifestyle. Yet, defining voters by states is absurd. For example, in Illinois, Chicagoland is exceedingly liberal and very cosmopolitan, but downstate is deeply red. Few states are so homogenous that a single stereotype fits the entire population. Surely a few readers can recognize that Cuban voters in

Miami are not the same as Jewish retirees in Boca Raton and both feel no connection to social conservatives in the state's panhandle.

Moreover, values voters are not purely bible-thumping ideologues. It is easy to cast them off as hard-line Christians who are willing to take a pay cut to damn the sinners. Anecdotal evidence and common sense disprove this myth. I read an article by Dennis Chong which examined a small town in Texas. This town was considering giving tax abatements to Apple to build a plant there. However, Apple came under fire because of its policy to give health benefits to cohabitants of employees, regardless of marital status. Many residents were strongly opposed to supporting a company which gave money to unmarried and/or homosexual couples. While this story seems to be another example of bible thumping, Chong's analysis of interviews shows a different side. The opposition movement worried about the social fabric of the town. If the business attracted the unwed and homosexuals, the social unity and trust of the region would be gone, so they argued. Therefore, there were economic incentives to block the tax abatements. Indeed, social conservatives found a backdoor way to support their social views on economic grounds. This small vignette shows the scope of a socially conservative worldview. We as Americans and extempers would be well served to treat those who disagree with us with the same intellectual respect bestowed on all others.

### **We decide, You report: Voter Intellect**

As consumers of information, voters (and extempers) cannot know everything about everything. Therefore, we all spend different levels of effort in learning which decisions to make. To be clear, those who know less about politics are not necessarily *stupid*. Hopefully, Albert Einstein spent all his time on math and science and did not worry about politics. At the nexus of interest, natural intelligence, and the opportunity to learn is "voter intellect". How much voters know about politics goes a long way in understanding how voting patterns can change.

### *Education*

In this information age, it is significantly easier to acquire information. Those who want can find voting records, policy platforms, and statistics in a matter of seconds. Yet, the American public is as politically knowledgeable as it was decades ago. This end result is the result of two opposing factors: education and options. More Americans are graduating high school, college, and obtaining graduate degrees than ever before. Being in educational environments foster learning and spurs political acumen. Yet, as we get more education, we consume less news. The rise of cable stations has allowed people to not watch the news. In the 1960s, anyone who wanted to watch television had to watch the evening news at 6 o'clock. The extent of consumer choice was CBS, Fox, or NBC. Currently, couch potatoes can opt to watch MTV, the Food Network, or HBO. The decline in newspaper readership furthers this thesis. We are busy and want to be entertained. Sadly, our interest in entertainment rarely gets more political than Jon Stewart. Thus, the positive influence of education completely neutralizes the negative influence of less news consumption.

## *Influencing Voters*

So what does this mean? If voters are as smart as they were before, but for wholly different reasons, then there is no difference, right? Wrong.

Political scientists divide the population into three groups of intelligence. The most intelligent politicians are very well-read, will watch and read from multiple sources and can ace any political quiz. The least intelligent people know frighteningly little, do not watch the news, and are unlikely to vote. In the middle reside most Americans. These people are not news junkies, but will scan the front page of a newspaper and watch soft news, like that of MSNBC or Fox News. Studies have shown that partisanship is strongly correlated with political intelligence. In other words, the most intelligent voters are most likely to vote down a party ticket. This relationship makes sense since as voters educate themselves they will find the party that best represents them. When news that is potentially damaging to a candidate breaks, it affects these three groups very differently. The most educated are unlikely to change their stance, regardless of changing circumstances (example: George W Bush and Nancy Pelosi both are not too fond of letting facts get in the way of ideology). The least educated are most willing to change their voting preference, but are unlikely to get the information. Government bailouts of Fannie and Freddie and recent successes in Iraq are too political for those who are intentionally, blissfully ignorant. Since this slice of the population does not vote and does not care, strategists remove from the equation. So who are we left with? **The moderately informed, mildly partisan crowd is the most likely to react to changing political conditions.** This group cares enough to accept new information, but is not so ideological as to reject unpopular information. Thus, when strategists talk about getting the undecided voters, it is important to recognize that are likely neither party hacks nor the completely disinterested. It is these people who determine elections, because the other 2 demographics already have decided.

### **It's My Party and I'll vote if I want to...**

Though someone feels like being cute every year, I will declare this: **there is no chance of a three-party system.** The Republicans and Democrats are too entrenched and have been for too many decades. Further, the electoral system is set up for a two-party system. The Electoral College means that a candidate who gets 10% of the vote, like Perot, gets nothing. In order to win anything, a majority is necessary. Since party affiliation runs so deep among so many voters, there is no coalition of voters willing to leave their party.

However, people occasionally jump from one party to another. This trend does happen in the case of major events, but it is still quite rare. The biggest issues to alter party bases are the Civil War, the New Deal and the Civil Rights movement. Abraham Lincoln, a Republican, so deeply alienated the South with the Civil War and subsequent Reconstruction, that the former Confederate states did not support Republicans in any election for a century. Roosevelt's New Deal created a coalition of labor, immigrants, and the Solid South for the Democrats. President Johnson's support of civil rights and his Great Society programs finally destroyed the Solid South. Southerners who blindly supported the Democrats found that their social preferences were



best aligned with Republicans. These monumental times changed the foundations of political parties and gave us the electoral maps that we have now.

Before explaining the importance of party affiliation, it is important to reiterate how rare party switching really is. From the 1960s until 2000, the southern states slowly shifted from irreversibly blue to unbreakably red. The gradual nature of change suggests that this was not instantaneous. Some falsely believe that more and more Democrats saw the writing on the wall and went Republican. In fact, it was the younger generations who moved the Democrats out of office. Democrats still do quite well in the south among the oldest of voters; those voters who were trained to vote Democrat. As the younger generations entered voting age in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, they were almost universally Republican. **This anecdotal tale shows that great party shifts do not change the current population, they simply reset the preferences of the youngest Americans, who lack hardened party preferences.**

### **Yea, yea, yea. WHO DO I VOTE FOR?**

I'm not in the business of telling people who to vote for. I reluctantly put faith in the democratic system to allow my fellow non-felons who are over 18 to make the right choices. But that does not mean that I cannot figure out what general trends determine voting choice. The main determinant of voting is party affiliation. Whether literal (i.e. I have my Constitutional Party ID card) or more symbolic, a majority of Americans are affiliated to one of the major parties. In an evenly contested race, candidates can garner at least 70% of their party's voters. The additional 30% of the base, the moderates of the other party, and the independents are what electoral victories are truly made of.

There are three factors that go into voters abandoning the party line: platform, past, and personality. First, voters can decide that one candidate has a better platform than another. Those Republicans who want to leave Iraq are more likely to vote for Barack than a generic Republican. In this election, Obama was perceived to have a far superior platform until offshore oil drilling became a key issue. Drilling is an attempt by McCain to change the nature of political discourse and shift the policy comparisons in terms that are favorable to his campaign. Yet, voters also have long memories. Obama has gained great traction saying that McCain will create a 3<sup>rd</sup> term for George W. Bush. While not entirely true, Obama must marry McCain to the Republican party which is so (relatively) unpopular. Past transgressions by a candidate or party will reflect very positively or negatively in the minds of voters. Barack Obama is virtually invincible in this factor, since Democrats' record is relatively clean given their short time in control of congress and the positive feelings associated with the Clinton presidency. The final variable is personal characteristics. This element seems the least intuitive to extempers and policy wonks, but makes the sense to less-studious voters. For those who do not know or care about the policy and party differences, they will simply vote for who they like more. Numerous studies tried to figure out how President Bush defeated John Kerry so soundly in 2004 despite having a poor track record. The most conclusive evidence found that Bush made great gains with low and middle-income white female voters compared to 2000. After looking at polling from that demographic, it boiled down to likability. Southern and Midwestern white women simply could not connect with the windsurfing, "duck hunting" Senator from Massachusetts. For all his policy failures and oratorical struggles, Bush came across as a good guy. **He was someone that these voters wanted to have dinner with.** George became humanized, and that was the difference.

## Conclusion

I apologize for the scattered nature of this article, but I tried to offer a wide array of all that studying public opinion has to offer. Again, few, if any, topics addressed will be directly asked in extemp rounds. Yet, public reaction to policies does determine their viability. If the public is, albeit irrationally, staunchly opposed to free trade agreements, it may affect the electability of a free-trade senator. How elections are won and lost can usually be traced to key demographics or issues. Those who spot those wedge issues will show superior command of politics to judges. More importantly, they will understand how the world around them thinks, and perhaps how they themselves understand the world around them.

### *Sources:*

Blink & The Tipping Point by Malcolm Gladwell

What's the Matter with Kansas? By Thomas Frank

“What's the Matter with What's the Matter with Kansas?” by Larry Bartels  
<http://www.princeton.edu/~bartels/kansas.pdf>

“Homer Gets a Tax Cut” by Larry Bartels  
<http://www.princeton.edu/~bartels/homer.pdf>

Where Have All the Voters Gone? By Martin P. Wattenberg

### *Suggested Reading:*

RealClear Politics' Jay Cost offers an in-depth look at key demographics and regions of swing states

Don't Think of an Elephant by George Lakoff

The Revolution Will Not Be Televised by Joe Trippi

# Alternate (Sub)Structure? Yeah Right

By Omar Qureshi

*Omar Qureshi was a competitor at Monett High School in Monett, Missouri. While not entering the national circuit due to travel restrictions, Omar won over twenty championships in Extemporaneous Speaking in the state of Missouri. He was runner up at the Missouri State Tournament in Extemporaneous Speaking as well as the Missouri State Lincoln-Douglas Debate Champion. As a national qualifier in Lincoln Douglas Debate and three time national qualifier in International Extemporaneous Speaking, Omar chose to attend the National Forensics League National Tournament in Extemporaneous Speaking for his three qualifying years. After a becoming a national quarterfinalist in International Extemporaneous Speaking in 2006, Omar was a national semifinalist in Extemporaneous Commentary in 2007. He was the Runner-up in International Extemporaneous Speaking at the NFL National Tournament in 2008 as well as an NFL All-American. Omar is currently a freshman at Johns Hopkins University and will be studying Economics and International Studies.*

## **An Extemper's Dilemma**

Extemporaneous speaking is perhaps the most demanding of all forensics activities. It requires the research skills of a policy debater, the theory of a Lincoln-Douglas debater, and the speaking of a polished orator. However, there are a few key differences between extemporaneous speaking and the previously mentioned events. The first of which being that in extemporaneous speaking there is no one arguing against the speaker (barring a round with a built in cross examination period), thus a speaker must sufficiently address all arguments in order to have a complete persuasive presentation. The extemporaneous speech is more analytically demanding than an oratory, and its topics change every round. Perhaps, the most vital difference is the fact that an extemporaneous speaker only has seven minutes and just one speech to relay to the judge a message. The speech must include analysis that is as deep-if not more so- than a debate case, while speaking well and engrossing the judge. For unlike a debater an extemporaneous speaker doesn't have the option to speed up to include all of his/her information. This brings up an overbearing burden on the modern speaker: how to most efficiently include arguments while not increasing the rate of delivery.

The clearest way to resolve this issue is to use substructure. Despite the way that this word strikes fear in the hearts of speakers across the nation, it is actually quite beneficial. Unfortunately, it seems that the world of extemporaneous speaking has been burdened with adherence to the universal two sub point formula. This format is highly unspecific and maybe a hindrance to effectively answering a question. The following paper will seek to resolve this particular quagmire by addressing three specific types of substructure with direct application to extemporaneous speaking.

## **PS-IR**

Primarily, it is imperative to address International Relation (IR) Theory and Political Study (PS) Theory. The natural difference between the two is that IR is an evaluation of the interconnectivity of political interaction amongst nations and institutions whereas PS is an evaluation of the causation of a situation (economic, political, or social) based inside of a nation or more specifically an institution. Both theories are critical to an effective extemporaneous speech; however the biggest challenge that remains is how to effectively plug this analysis in.

Former NFL Champion in International Extemporaneous Speaking, Spencer Rockwell, expanded upon this dilemma:

The paradox, however, once again invites a topic by topic approach to deciding not only when, but also how to use IR... best.<sup>1</sup>

It is this dilemma that must be alleviated in order to develop a sound point within an extemporaneous speech.

The most efficient way to use IR and PS is at the beginning of an individual point. By explaining theory first and demonstrating the impact on the topic second a speaker maximizes the depth of an argument immensely. In this scenario, the judge will understand the purpose of what is about to be said before it is discussed. This comes in direct juxtaposition with the alternative of the judge becoming unsure of purpose until later in the point. For example, if the question being asked was “Is Nepal’s young democracy developing effectively?” an effective way to plug in PS would be as follows:

Point 1: The government has failed to instill institutions necessary to ascertain social justice.

A. Importance of social justice with respect to democracy (PS)

“Women’s rights remain critical to the idea of democracy as becoming the will of the people... Without appropriate education for women they cannot engage effectively in an advanced economy crippling hopes of being legitimate democratic state.”

-*Sex and Social Justice*, Martha Nussbaum<sup>2</sup>

B. Nepal has failed to provide women with adequate voting rights

“42% of women allowed to vote”

-NYT May 11, 2008<sup>3</sup>

C. No education available to women

“Women schools are crumbling.”

-Asia Times July 7, 2008

The benefit of using this specific model is that it can be applied to all three points in a speech. Of course, the task of reading the material necessary to make a three point speech with specifically sourced theory built into each point is quite daunting. While making a speech that uses this IR or PS framework in all three points is impressive, this isn’t to say that it is the best way to advance an argument. After all, mixing this substructure with equally deep substructure within the other two points also can make quite the statement.

## Case Study

Case Study within extemporaneous speaking is something that must be done very carefully. However, when done appropriately an area of analysis that uses the case study format can show that the speaker has a vast array of knowledge while also bringing depth to a speech. This type of analytical formatting is certainly not necessary in all speeches, and should only be used when the topic demonstrates the need for it. For sake of consistency, the question being asked is still “Is

---

<sup>1</sup> Rockwell, Spencer. “Get IR Done.” *Rostrum*. February 2007. 23 July 2008.

<[http://www.nflonline.org/uploads/Rostrum/0207\\_025\\_026.pdf](http://www.nflonline.org/uploads/Rostrum/0207_025_026.pdf)>

<sup>2</sup> All books sourced within this essay are real books and are available at bookstores.

<sup>3</sup> All articles sourced within this essay are not real, and were used explicitly for example purposes.

Nepal's young democracy developing effectively?" and case study substructure could be used as follows:

Point 1: Corruption remains rampant at every level of the government

- A. Maoist connection with narcotics hurts parliament
  - "Maoist position in new parliament is corrupted by ties to drug lords."
  - Alan Johnston, *the Brookings Institution*, May 3, 2008
- B. Treasury department accounting flaws
  - "Treasury has no account of over \$3 billion of tax money"
  - Bloomberg July 3, 2008
- C. Local courts are easily bribed
  - "No accountability for judges- taints 73% of court cases"
  - Economist February 22. 2009

All it would take is a brief explanation at the beginning of the point about corruption being a hindrance to democracy and this point can easily flow within a speech. However, speakers rarely use the case study substructure within the context of a country specific speech. Rather, this substructure is typically used in reference to international institutions to demonstrate a speaker's knowledge of different global events and their impact in reference to an institution. A clear example of this can be found in the 2005 NFL National International Extemporaneous Speaking Final Round where National Champion Kevin Troy answered the question "Is the U.N. mankind's lone and best hope?"<sup>4</sup> Kevin answered yes and his first area of analysis used excellent case study substructure:

Point 1: International challenges demand global cooperation

- A. Diplomatic Conflicts
  - "Entangling WW1 alliances engulfed in war- UN brings nations together without those alliances."
  - New World Order*, Ann Marie Slaughter
- B. Humanitarian Arenas
  - "Darfur, AIDS, Poverty all require global cooperation"
  - World Policy Journal, Spring 2005
- C. Terrorism
  - "There must be cooperation to stop transit of nuclear weapons."
  - Nuclear Terrorism*, Graham Allison

Once again, the speaker is faced with a major challenge using this type of substructure: time. Each area of analysis in an extemporaneous speech should be around 1 minute and 30 seconds (give or take a few), as such that gives less than 30 seconds for each sub point after the introductory sentences. Nonetheless, it can be done with a little bit of practice.

### **Counterpoint**

The final bit of alternative substructure can be found as a bit of a mix between the aforementioned two. It is the counterpoint substructure. All argumentation should include an acknowledgement of opposition, and without realizing it most extemporaneous speakers address the opposition within the context of their speech by bringing up arguments that naturally stifle the claims of opposition. This being said, the counterpoint substructure is tremendously beneficial to take rhetorical prowess to the next level. This substructure explicitly sources the opposition and

---

<sup>4</sup> This final round video is available with Dale Publishing. <<http://www.dalepublishing.us>>

proceeds to disprove it. For this example, the question being asked is “Should nuclear energy be pursued to fight global warming in industrialized nations?”

Point 1: Nuclear Energy is beneficial to the environment

A. Human Danger (Opposing argument)

“People are endangered by the threat of nuclear fallout which offsets the environmental benefits.”

-The Heritage Foundation, October 2011

B. New technology is very safe (Counter Argument)

“Newly developed technology decreases the chances of nuclear fallout by 96%.”

-Scientific American, November 2011

C. Comparatively effective

“1 pound of uranium 235 produces 2 million times more energy than 1 pound of coal.”

-Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, Spring 2008

By using counterpoint substructure, a speaker can eliminate the doubt or preconceived notions a judge may have through an effectively tailored argument; all while still developing a new argument as well. This type of substructure is crucial in order for the judge to continue following the speech even if they disagree with the material, as it is the only type of substructure that specifically addresses his/her concerns while also maintaining consistency with the speaker's answer. When used well this is a clear way to diffuse common concerns.

By the same token, it is very important to address the opposing argument in either the first sub point or the second. The justification for this is found within the mindset of a judge. Disenfranchising a judge for any period of time in a speech puts the speaker in a bad position. In addressing the counterargument early in a point and disproving it later the speaker can entice the judge to continue listening. While it may not seem this way at a tournament, the judge ought to be the speaker's ally.

## **Conclusion**

Alternate substructure is by no means a call to rebel against the traditional sub point system. Rather it is an enhancement to the system. It provides clarity and an intrinsic connection to a judge on a structural level so as to supplement delivery. Substructure is by no means a panacea to all extemporaneous woes, but it is certainly a necessary tool for an excellent speaker. Speech making is always quite the challenge, doing it in 30 minutes often seems impossible, but this challenge is the reason extemporaneous speakers put in the work. Truly a melting pot of many events, extemporaneous speaking is one of the most prestigious of all forensic activities. With an effective substructure the event is only enhanced.

# Introduction to the Extemp Question Central National Points Race

By Logan Scisco

The question that has often lingered in the minds of extempers across the nation, especially those who travel the national circuit, has been the question of who the top extemporaneous speaker in the nation has been for that particular season. In some years, this question has easily been decided by a competitor who has won both the National Catholic Forensic League and National Forensic League national tournaments such as Kevin Troy's pair of victories in 2005 and Akshar Rambachan's victories last season. However, the result that has often occurred is that a collection of extempers have won the nation's top national tournaments and this split provokes the question of who is best.

Although such questions will continue throughout this season and on into ones in the future, Extemp Question Central has introduced the "Extemp Question Central National Points Race" to give extempers some type of way to rank themselves against their opponents. This points race will give points to competitors based on their performance at recognized national circuit tournaments, both national championship tournaments, and in tournaments that feature distinguished fields such as the Montgomery Bell Extemp Round Robin and the Extemporaneous Speaking Tournament of Champions at Northwestern University in May. The purpose of the rankings may not exactly be to determine who the best extemper in the nation is, but it hopes to award consistent results by top extemporaneous speaking competitors across three different types of tournaments.

By the time the first issue of this magazine hits the Extemp Question Central website, the first major national circuit tournament of the year, the Wake Forest Early Bird will be nearing its conclusion. This means that the first listing of this year's rankings, for the 2008-2009 season, will appear in the next issue. In each issue of *The Ex-Files*, this section of the magazine will feature updated points standings, all the way into the CFL and NFL National tournaments, and then giving a final recap with final standings that extemporaneous speaking competitors can look at across the country a week after the NFL National tournament concludes in Birmingham, Alabama in June.

It is Extemp Question Central's hope that this ranking system will be monitored by the extemporaneous speaking community, and will attract more attention on extemporaneous speaking competitions around the country, especially at CFL and NFL Nationals.

## How Does it Work?

The points system that will be used for the 2008-2009 season will give points to extempers based on their performance in three tiers of tournaments. Only **final round placings** will count for tournaments, with the exception of CFL and NFL Nationals, where points will be allocated to competitors who place in the semi-finals. The *Ex-Files* staff felt that such an allocation was appropriate due to the size of both national tournaments. There is no limit to the amount of tournaments that count towards an extempers total during the season. The point tiers, place a greater emphasis on tournaments with greater prestige and the points within each tier of tournament favor extempers who place highly, with a large discrepancy existing between first and sixth place.

*The First Tier: CFL and NFL Nationals*

The first tier of tournament, and the ones with the most amount of points, are the CFL and NFL National tournaments. These tournaments will likely decide who ends up on top of the rankings at the end of the season, because the point totals that extempers can accumulate at them is greater than the other two tiers. The CFL and NFL tournaments are unique in the fact that they are the one tier where points are given to extempers who finish in the semi-finals as opposed to final rounds placings like the other two tiers. These tournaments are also unique because the **winner of the NFL final round in US Extemp and International Extemp** receive twenty-five bonus points, which could make a great deal of difference in the rankings if the result ends up being close.

Here is a breakdown of the points offered to competitors from CFL and NFL Nationals:

<i>Ranking</i>	<i>Points Received</i>
1 <sup>st</sup>	150
2 <sup>nd</sup>	125
3 <sup>rd</sup>	100
4 <sup>th</sup>	75
5 <sup>th</sup>	65
6 <sup>th</sup>	55
Semi-Finalist	25
Final Round Winner (NFL only)	25

As you can tell, the extemper who places first and comes into the tournament well behind in the total rankings could make a major leap over their competitors. This point allocation was designed to make the CFL and NFL tournaments the most important tournaments on the calendar and to make them the “game changers” in the ranking system.

*The Second Tier: The “Skill” Level/Elite Invitational Tournaments*

There are two major tournaments on the extemporaneous speaking calendar that require special qualification for entry and that carry much esteem in the extemp community: the Montgomery Bell Extemporaneous Speaking Round Robin in Nashville, Tennessee in January, where sixteen of the nation’s best extempers are invited, and the Extemporaneous Speaking Tournament of Champions at Northwestern University in May. Due to their competitive nature, as well as the qualification needed for entry, both tournaments were chosen by the staff to fall into the “second tier” of the rankings. These tournaments will be worth less than the CFL and NFL National tournaments, but the winner will receive double the amount of points for a victory here than at the third tier of tournaments.

<i>Ranking</i>	<i>Points Received</i>
1 <sup>st</sup>	100
2 <sup>nd</sup>	85
3 <sup>rd</sup>	70
4 <sup>th</sup>	55
5 <sup>th</sup>	48
6 <sup>th</sup> (not awarded for MBA)	41



Sixth place will not be awarded at MBA due to the fact that the exhibition round only features the top five competitors. Unlike CFL and NFL Nationals, there will be no bonus points awarded and there will be no points for competitors who fail to make the final rounds.

*The Third Tier: National Circuit Tournaments*

This could be where some of the greatest controversy with this ranking system may exist. Extemp Question Central had to make a judgment call concerning which ten tournaments to include in this tier. The ten tournaments chosen, after much debate, were:

- \*The Wake Forest National Early Bird
- \*The Yale Invitational Tournament
- \*The University of Pennsylvania Liberty Bell Classic
- \*St. Mark’s Heart of Texas Invitational United States Extemporaneous Speaking Tournament
- \*St. Mark’s Heart of Texas Invitational International Extemporaneous Speaking Tournament
- \*The Glenbrooks Invitational Tournament
- \*George Mason Patriot Games Tournament (Invitational aspect only; not the Round Robin)
- \*The Barkley Forum for High Schools
- \*Harvard National High School Invitational Forensic Tournament
- \*2009 California Invitational Forensic Tournament

While there will be some controversy that competitors attending St. Mark’s get the opportunity for double points, because they can compete in both extemporaneous speaking categories, the quality of competition there over the years prompted the decision to give those tournaments the green light for counting. Another debatable point was in deciding to only count the invitational portion of the George Mason Patriot Games, and not the round robin. If there is one change to next year’s ranking system this may be it, with the possible move of the George Mason round robin to the second tier. However, this move will be considered during the off-season after a new round of debate.

Points for the third tier are considerably less than the first two tiers, to account for the fact that some extempers are not able to go to a significant amount of national circuit tournaments and to prevent an extemper from accumulating too many points to be caught when taking the first two tiers of tournaments into consideration. Points for the third tier also only award points to competitors who make final rounds, with no possibility of bonus points.

<i>Ranking</i>	<i>Points Received</i>
1 <sup>st</sup>	50
2 <sup>nd</sup>	40
3 <sup>rd</sup>	30
4 <sup>th</sup>	20
5 <sup>th</sup>	16
6 <sup>th</sup>	12

To get accurate rankings, Extemp Question Central will need contributions of results from all ten of the national circuit tournaments listed above. If these are not forthcoming, then Extemp Question Central will be unable to count that tournaments towards its ranking system. So please help us out!

## Will There Be a Team Rankings System?

Yes, there will be a team rankings component built into the Extemp Question Central ranking system. All extempers for a team will count towards a teams point totals throughout the year, with the winning team being recognized at the end of the season.

## What Does the Winner of the Rankings at the End of the Year Receive?

The winning extemper and the winning team will receive trophies courtesy of Extemp Question Central. The design has not been chosen yet, and Extemp Question Central welcomes suggestions. However, there will be something for an extemper and team to have bragging rights to at the end of the season.

## How Would Last Year's Rankings Have Turned Out?

This is the biggest question many reading this section of the magazine may be asking. To answer this question, Extemp Question Central went back to last year's results, based on all of the tournaments listed above, and calculated the standings.

At the end of NFL Nationals last year, this was how the top 15 in the standings looked:

RANK	NAME	SCHOOL	POINTS
1	Becca Goldstein	Newton South HS (Newton, MA)	380
2	Akshar Rambachan	Eastview HS (Apple Valley, MN)	325
3	Evan Larson	Bellarmino College Prep (San Jose, CA)	275
4	Max Webster	Montgomery Bell Academy (Nashville, TN)	245
5	Billy Strong	Des Moines Roosevelt HS (Des Moines, IA)	230
6	Aaron Mattis	Scarsdale HS (Scarsdale, NY)	228
7	Hunter Kendrick	Danville HS (Danville, KY)	215
8	Ian Panchevre	Tom C. Clark HS (San Antonio, TX)	180
9	Charlie Metzger	Suncoast Community HS (Riveria Beach, FL)	165
10	Reid Bagwell	Scarsdale HS (Scarsdale, NY)	150
11	Maddie Gardner	Eagan HS (Eagan, MN)	125
12	Omar Qureshi	Monett HS (Monett, MO)	125
13	Stacey Chen	North Allegheny Senior HS (Wexford, PA)	117
14	Brennan Morris	Randolph-Macon Academy (Fort Royal, VA)	116
T15	Ryan Mahoney	Regis HS (New York, NY)	100
T15	Rajiv Narayan	James Logan HS (Union City, CA)	100

While it will cause some controversy that Akshar Rambachan did not end up at the top of the standings after winning both national tournaments, where he accumulated his entire point total, this reinforces how the Extemp National Points Race is just that, a race of extempers to acquire points at three different tiers of tournaments. The Extemp Question Central National Points Race is simply an award of excellence across all three tiers of tournaments throughout the country and based on that formula, Becca Goldstein was the top point getter last year. However, it is worth noting that Goldstein would not have beaten Rambachan in points if she had not managed to win

the United States Extemporaneous Speaking national championship at NFL, becoming the first female extemper to do so since 1991, or place second. Therefore, there was still a lot of intrigue surrounding NFL as far as how these points would have turned out based on final results.

As far as team rankings, here were the top ten:

<b>RANK</b>	<b>SCHOOL</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
1	Scarsdale HS (Scarsdale, NY)	455
2	Newton South HS (Newton, MA)	426
3	Montgomery Bell Academy (Nashville, TN)	341
4	Eastview HS (Apple Valley, MN)	325
5	Bellarmino College Prep (San Jose, CA)	305
6	Des Moines Roosevelt HS (Des Moines, IA)	230
7	Danville HS (Danville, KY)	215
8	Tom C. Clark HS (San Antonio, TX)	180
9	Suncoast Community HS (Riveria Beach, FL)	165
10	North Allegehny Senior HS (Wexford, PA)	153

Scarsdale High School in Scarsdale, New York, who had two extempers win two national circuit tournaments last year at Wake Forest and the Barkley Forum, won the points race, edging out Newton South High School in Newton, Massachusetts by a mere twenty-nine points. Extemp Question Central hopes for another close and competitive race for the 2008-2009 season!

### **In Closing**

As was stated earlier, the first round of rankings for the 2008-2009 season will be released in the next edition of *The Ex-Files*, slated for arrival before the St. Mark's Heart of Texas Invitational Tournament. These rankings will take into consideration the Wake Forest National Early Bird Tournament and The Yale Invitational Tournament, as long as those results can be provided to Extemp Question Central soon after those tournaments have finished.

# Russia's Foreign Policy

By Sebastian Pyrek

*Sebastian Pyrek competed for Danville HS in Danville, KY and was the 2008 Kentucky state champion in extemporaneous speaking. During his three year career, Pyrek was a three-time qualifier to CFL Nationals and was a two-time qualifier to NFL Nationals in International Extemporaneous Speaking. Pyrek broke to outounds at nationals four consecutive times, with a NFL quarter-finalist finish and Barkley Forum semi-final to his credit. Sebastian currently attends New York University.*

Recent events in the Georgian breakaway regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, with a special focus on the Russian involvement in the former republic, are strong evidence that Russia is undergoing another resurgence on the international stage. Nearly two decades have passed since the dissolution of the Soviet Union, but there is a strong nationalistic spirit that never fell has returned to power; spearheaded by former President and current Prime Minister Vladimir Putin this movement has allowed the Russian phoenix to rise from the ashes of the USSR and regain its power on the international stage. Russia's involvement in Ukrainian and Belarusian politics, Estonian and Georgian post-soviet sovereignty, and international energy markets (to name a few) shows that Russia's intentions are egocentric at best. *Russia's recent posturing indicates that its leadership rejects the idea that the international community should be monopolar with the USA in power.*<sup>5</sup>

## History

The history of Russia as a world power began in the late 17<sup>th</sup> when a series of powerful leaders, namely Peter the Great and Catherine the Great, defeated the checks on Russian dominance such as Sweden, Napoleonic France, and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Russia also greatly expanded its territorial reach due to many aggressive wars, which would give it future influence over Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. The 20<sup>th</sup> century brought about many changes in the structure of Russia's Government, most important being the establishment and dissolution of the USSR in 1922 and 1991 respectively. During this time the USSR expanded its influence to large expanses of Eastern Europe and Central Asia, and after the fall of the USSR, 14 nations spit off and declared independence (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Estonia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan). Russia also lost the satellite states of Eastern Germany, Poland, Romania, and Czechoslovakia, the communist member nations of the Warsaw Pact. The 14 states that split off are still known in Russia as "Near Abroad" states to the Russians since the 1990's<sup>6</sup>, and the government of Russia asserts that these states are still within their sphere of influence.<sup>7</sup>

## Recent Events

Russia has regained much of its former power under the leadership of Vladimir Putin. In a speech at the 43<sup>rd</sup> Munich Conference on Security Policy in February of 2007, Vladimir Putin openly criticized the United States' monopolistic domination of the global scene stating that the US

---

<sup>5</sup>:Speech By Vladimir Putin:

[http://president.kremlin.ru/eng/speeches/2007/02/10/0138\\_type82912type82914type82917type84779\\_118123.shtml](http://president.kremlin.ru/eng/speeches/2007/02/10/0138_type82912type82914type82917type84779_118123.shtml)

<sup>6</sup> Vladimir Socor, "Kremlin Refining Policy in 'Post-Soviet Space'," Eurasia Daily Monitor (February 8, 2005) at [http://www.jamestown.org/edm/article.php?article\\_id=2369222](http://www.jamestown.org/edm/article.php?article_id=2369222).

<sup>7</sup> Robert Kagan (2008-02-06). "New Europe, Old Russia". The Washington Post. Retrieved on 2008-08-15.

showed an "almost uncontained hyper use of force in international relations". He said the result of it is that "no one feels safe! Because no one can feel that international law is like a stone wall that will protect them. Of course such a policy stimulates an arms race."<sup>8</sup> Many of Putin's actions have showed this philosophy: such as the vehement support of Iran's 'peaceful' nuclear program, or his opposition to the invasion of Iraq without the proper authorization of a UN Security Council Resolution.

As an international visionary Vladimir Putin wants a "fair and democratic world order that would ensure security and prosperity not only for a select few, but for all." He has also proposed that there be international centers for where civilian grade uranium could be refined, and Putin is strongly opposed to the deployment of nuclear weapons in outer space.<sup>9</sup>

There is a darker side to Russia's international involvement though. In 2004 Vladimir Putin supported the Ukrainian 'pro-Kremlin' candidate for Prime Minister, Viktor Yanukovich, even going as far as congratulating him on his victory before the ballots were fully counted (Yanukovich did not win). This sparked a massive anti-Russia movement in Ukraine known as the Orange Revolution; many Ukrainians were angered by Putin's lack of respect for Ukraine's sovereignty (Putin had visited the Ukraine twice, and many people saw his actions as evidence that Putin and the rest of Russia still saw the Ukraine as Russia's property).

In 2007, when the Estonian government decided to relocate the statue of a Soviet soldier, a series of cyber attacks were launched against Estonian Internet sites. These attacks were the largest of their kind, and many experts speculate that because of the immense scale and organization, the involved parties must have had the assistance of Russian government and telecommunications experts.<sup>10</sup>

The Russian Government has also been supporting many separatist elements in surrounding nations, mainly in Georgia and Moldova (Russia currently has troops on the ground in breakaway regions of both nations).<sup>11</sup> Many of these moves go against the statements that Vladimir Putin has made on the subjects of freedom and democracy. Russia has also used its supply of natural gas to coerce many nations into not taking anti-Russian stances. To make matters worse Russia has even proposed the creation of a natural gas cartel with Iran, Qatar, Venezuela, Nigeria, Algeria, Egypt, Indonesia, and Libya in the style of OPEC.<sup>12</sup> A cartel in this sector could cause many problems for the international energy market.

In March of 2007, the US announced that it was planning on constructing a radar system in the Czech Republic, and a missile base in Poland in order to protect the US and its allies against any threats. This system was intended to protect against Iranian and North Korean attacks, but the Russian Government saw the construction of this system as a threat, so in response, the Russians began testing new ballistic missiles that they claimed were impervious to current defensive technologies. Also in response to the construction of these sites, the Russian government also stated that it would aim their missile bases at the new sites<sup>13</sup>; this escalation of tensions has led many to fear that these moves are pushing the US and Russia back to the old days of the Cold War.

---

<sup>8</sup> 43rd Munich Conference on Security Policy. Putin's speech in English, February 10, 2007.

<sup>9</sup> See 4

<sup>10</sup> The Economist May 24, 2007: Cyberwarfare is becoming scarier

<sup>11</sup> "An Enduring Peace Built on Freedom // Revitalizing the Transatlantic Partnership". Council on Foreign Relations (November/December 2007, Vol 86, Number 6). Retrieved on 2007-12-13.

<sup>12</sup> Sunday, August 24, 2008, The Moscow Times

<sup>13</sup> Gottemoeller, Rose. Interview with Robert Siegel. Talk of the Nation. NPR. 5 June 2007.

Russia is the world's largest country by land area, and it is the world's 9<sup>th</sup> most populated country. Russia is strategically close to many important regions of the world and it also possesses a large amount of economic leverage with its large supply of natural resources. Russia's egocentric and anti-US foreign policy has created a few tough situations already, but for the coming months extempers need to keep an eye on Russia, especially at the 'balance of power' between the president and the prime minister. Russia's continued growth as an international power both politically and economically may lead the government to be less apprehensive about producing opposition to the US and its allies on future issues (and its posturing in regards to the Poland/Czech Republic US missile and radar bases). Russia also has a permanent seat on the UN Security Council, which makes it a necessary obstacle for the US to overcome on any major actions (bypassing the UN may not be the best idea). Russia also holds the key for the advancement of prosperity in its former republics, and these nations need to continue catching up technologically and economically to the rest of the world in order to prevent more conflicts in the region. Russia's intentions may not always be clear, but the world needs to keep a close eye on all that happens in the coming months in order to prevent an escalation of tensions with the re-rising power.

# The Right Way to File

By Mark Royce<sup>14</sup>

*Many extempers become slaves to their tubs, rather than letting the files serve them.*

The file boxes perennially transported by extemporaneous speakers to tournaments across the country perform a variety of functions. The most important, obviously, is the assistance they provide to the competitor's memory: facts, figures, dates, locations, and other very precise pieces of information are quickly accessible in an organized system, such that no precious prep time need be wasted in their retrieval. Furthermore, most extempers either modify an inherited set of tubs or design their own, which teaches them to organize foreign and domestic issues in meaningful categories. All the countries in sub-Saharan Africa, for instance, would be grouped together, as would intertwined economic issues back home. I might also add in jest that traversing the country with such ponderous luggage as extemp tubs teaches patience and improves physical stamina, while providing a constant reminder of how technologically antiquated the NFL's procedures are. But there is another role which extemp files frequently play that they certainly should not, and the purpose of this article is to warn of the dangers of relating to the tubs in this manner.

Do not the files often assume a kind of idolatrous affection in the minds of those who maintain them? Do not many extempers, usually of at least intermediate skill, lavish a sort of narcissistic attention on their tubs, taking care to highlight in a favorite color, to ensure that each folder contains a certain number of articles, or to resolve to file for a certain number of hours each day? Granted, such habits may be the honest manifestations of the quest for excellence: order, method, clarity, and daily attention to the headlines are essential; and a committed extemper is by all means entitled to customize the portable library on which he perpetually relies. But extempers, as a whole, devote too much time and attention to the files, striving to meet some self-imposed standard of aesthetic perfection as librarians rather than remaining focused on winning tournaments as public speakers.

I think it can be demonstrated, with relative certainty, that victory does not usually lie in the size, scope, weight, or beauty of one's file system. If the gymnasium full of competitors at any recent Nationals were magically emptied, and all that remained were the competitors' tubs, I highly doubt that their mere appearance could foretell which of their owners would survive to the final round, and which would be down after the first cut. Any decent competitor has a well-organized file system that conforms both to NFL rules and to normal standards of grace and utility; no one fails to read and highlight the *Economist*, *Washington Post*, or *New York Times*; and the same issues, in tubs across the land, are generally organized in a very similar way. Continuing our thought experiment, let us imagine that our competitors at Nationals suddenly had all their tubs confiscated, and were told that they would be forced to prepare all their speeches from memory alone. Drastic as this change would be, it would affect all in equal measure, and therefore are we prepared to assert that it would actually affect the outcome? Would not the same fluent, humorous, informed, graceful, and interesting speakers prevail to the elimination rounds, and the

---

<sup>14</sup> Mark Royce was the NFL runner-up in International Extemp in 2002, the third-place finisher the year before, and a two-time South Carolina state champion. He also won Wake Forest in 2001. Royce taught extemp at Montgomery Bell Academy while earning his B.A. in European studies at Vanderbilt University, and thrice ran draw at the MBA Extemp Round Robin. He just completed his M.A. in international affairs at American University, and currently works on Senator McCain's Presidential campaign in Arlington, Virginia.

less talented presenters be overcome in the same manner as otherwise? Surely a symphony rests more on the musicians than on their instruments, and a sculpture more on the artist than on his tools. Relatively little of the content of a seven minute extemp speech is a direct importation from the files. The artistic material (introduction, jokes, philosophic quotations) is normally memorized beforehand, and most of even the purely empirical data is harvested from the mind. The files themselves contribute the nine or ten necessary sources and the statistical information useful or necessary in certain subjects, but relatively little else. The content of the speech, to which the files have made only a minor addition, is then of course subject to the delivery skills of the performer, on which all public rhetoric ultimately stands or falls. The files are thus a relatively unimportant component of what constitutes a successful speech, and with this fact established I shall proceed with several policies that will enable students to get the most out of their tubs without devoting them undue time and energy.

Extemp pedagogy frequently exaggerates the importance of file maintenance. Practice speeches demand a coach's direct attention, and the elements of rhetorical style can be difficult to teach in the abstract. The fallback activity, therefore, is tub upkeep. A particular extemper will be assigned to print certain newspapers each afternoon, and the team as a whole must uphold a daily filing quota. They might be instructed by their coach to file 50 articles each day, to file for two hours each day, or to comply with some other equally artificial standard. Such requirements, obviously, serve as a means of verifying the students' activities and, if necessary, punishing noncompliance; but as pathways to greatness they rest upon two deeply flawed ideas. First, such thinking assumes that filing necessarily produces knowledge, which it does not. A reluctant extemper might print, read, and highlight twenty articles from the national media without comprehending any of it, and *a lot* of what passes for critical reading out there in extemp land is really little more than data processing. The remedy for this self-defeating grind is to conceive your task to be more one of daily *study* than daily filing: read, to the extent possible, at your own pace, and never forget the uselessness of merely throwing one's tired eyes over the page. The second flaw in a file-driven extemp curriculum is the belief that filing wins competitions, a connection on which we have already cast serious doubt. It is almost self-evident that rhetorical ability is what judges tend to reward the most, and thus madness alone could justify a regimen, amazingly common, in which extempers file for two hours after school each day but seldom or ever deliver practice speeches. Another common error is to assume that all entries, regardless of their obscurity, must boast at least several recent articles, an aesthetic preference which wrongly assumes all subjects to be of historical moment. A filing system should resemble a dictionary or phonebook: all possible entries are recorded since they all *could* suddenly become important, but in practice only select ones are used. An international extemper thus allocates space for all the world's countries, even though most of them, at any given time, do not make the headlines. There is such a thing, for sure, as going behind the sound bites and reaching for deeper analyses and interpretations, but ultimately the important news finds its way to you.

What then is the right way to file? The answer is to not file, and I obviously mean that in a figurative sense. Extempers should concentrate on putting things in their *minds* rather than in their tubs. Read deeply, critically, contemplatively; think through causes and effects in a logical way; and memorize introductions, quotations, and other useful artistic material. The best of the news should be placed in the tubs, the best of the tubs should be placed in the mind, and the best of the mind should be placed in the speech. An organized, efficient, and comprehensive file system is essential. But extempers often place too much emphasis on maintaining great tubs, when they should instead concentrate on delivering great speeches.



## 2008 EXTEMP STATE CHAMPION ROLL CALL

**Note:** *This section will be used in future editions to contain extemporaneous speaking results around the country. If you have the results of a local/state tournament you would like to see here, simply e-mail them to [logan.scisco@wku.edu](mailto:logan.scisco@wku.edu).*

### ALASKA

*International Extemp*  
Tamiah Liebersbach  
(Chugiak HS)

*US Extemp*  
Becky Smith  
(Chugiak HS)

### CALIFORNIA

*International Extemp*  
Will Rafey  
(Bellarmine College Prep)

*US Extemp*  
Evan Larson  
(Bellarmine College Prep)

### COLORADO

*International Extemp*  
Courtney Green  
(Delta HS)

*US Extemp*  
Jenny Koch  
(Summit HS)

### FLORIDA

*International Extemp*  
Zach Rosen  
(Nova HS)

*US Extemp*  
Stephanie Brown  
(Taravella HS)

### HAWAII

*International Extemp*  
Katarina Hughes  
(\*Iolani School)

*US Extemp*  
Christopher Ballesteros  
(Damien Memorial)

### IDAHO

Jake Stewart  
(Hillcrest HS)

### ILLINOIS

Mark Schmidt  
(Wheaton Warrenville South  
HS)

### INDIANA

*International Extemp*  
Nick Kwolek  
(Northrop HS)

*US Extemp*  
Carly Gibbs  
(Munster HS)

### KANSAS

*International Extemp 6A*  
Wennie Wang  
(Wichita East HS)

*International Extemp 5A*  
Zach Collins  
(Newton HS)

*US Extemp 6A*  
Kate Falkenstien  
(Lawrence Free State HS)

*US Extemp 5A*  
Grant Hodges  
(Salina-Central HS)

*Extemp 4A*  
Tony Prosser  
(Meriden HS)

*Extemp 3A*  
Keen Hogan  
(Lyons HS)

*Extemp 2A*  
Anna-Lara Cook  
(Sterling HS)

*Extemp A*  
Alex Jensen  
(Lincoln HS)

### KENTUCKY

Sebastian Pyrek  
(Danville HS)

### MASSACHUSETTS

Henry Litman  
(Milton Academy)

### MICHIGAN

*Class A*  
Aakash Gupta  
(Portage Northern HS)

*Class BCD*  
Bernadette Bacero  
(Divine Child)

### MINNESOTA

*Class 2A*  
Akshar Rambachan  
(Eastview HS)

*Class A*  
Nancy Dietman  
(Mounds Park Academy)

### MISSOURI

Bryan Yade  
(Francis Howell North HS)

### MONTANA

*Class A*  
Patrick Ingham  
(Columbia Falls HS)

*Class 2A*  
Katie Hoag  
(Flathead HS)

*Extemp BC*  
Dan Evans  
(Missoula Loyola HS)

## **NEBRASKA**

*Class A*  
Alexander Churchill  
(Lincoln East HS)

*Class B*  
Juliana Batie  
(Lexington HS)

*Class C1*  
Elizabeth Grimes  
(Raymond Central HS)

*Class C2*  
Madison Grinnell  
(Omaha Brownell-Talbot HS)

*Class D1*  
Jennifer Dannehl  
(Bertrand HS)

*Class D2*  
Kristen Burgess  
(Hyannis HS)

## **NEW YORK**

Jovalin Dedaj  
(Fordham Preparatory)

## **OHIO**

*International Extemp*  
Braveen Ragunathan  
(Glen Oak HS)

*United States Extemp*  
Erik Yannone  
(Glen Oak HS)

## **OREGON**

Nima Ahmadi  
(Westview HS)

## **PENNSYLVANIA**

Stacey Chen  
(North Allegheny HS)

## **SOUTH CAROLINA**

*International Extemp*  
Ashley Jordan  
(Westwide HS)

*US Extemp*  
David Lane  
(Riverside HS)

## **SOUTH DAKOTA**

*International Extemp Class 2A*  
Nisha Giridhar  
(Aberdeen Central HS)

*International Extemp Class A*  
Kristin Lentz  
(Milbank HS)

*US Extemp Class 2A*  
Jeremy Simon  
(Aberdeen Central HS)

*US Extemp Class A*  
Jane Reasoner  
(Vermillion HS)

## **TENNESSEE**

Chad Magee  
(Collierville HS)

## **TEXAS**

*International Extemp*  
Dillon Huff  
(Carroll HS)

*US Extemp*  
Nick Cugini  
(Cypress Ridge HS)

## **VIRGINIA**

*International Extemp 3A*  
Seeva Shah  
(Princess Anne HS)

*International Extemp 2A*  
Shivesh Puri  
(Blacksburg HS)

*International Extemp A*  
Tommy Dillard  
(Buffalo Gap HS)

*US Extemp 3A*  
Christina Kyriadides  
(Princess Anne HS)

*US Extemp 2A*  
Carl David Goette-Luciak  
(Blacksburg HS)

*US Extemp A*  
Tyler Coppege  
(Madison County HS)

## **WISCONSIN**

Kevin Bailey  
(Rufus King HS)

