

Wisconsin High School Forensic Association Newsletter

"Not to defeat each other, but to pace one another on the road to excellence."

Vol. XLIII

Madison, Wisconsin, February 1972

No. 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Calendar for 1971-72	2
Board of Control	2
Sub-district Speech Contests	3
Speech Contest Rule Changes	3
Request for 1972-73 Public Address Topics	6
Certificates of Participation	7
Invitation to Recommend Coaches for Judging	8
WHSFA State Drama Contest	8
Wisconsin Theatre Organization	9
1971-72 WHSFA Debate Tournaments	10
Debate Problem Area for 1972-73	11
WHSFA Represented on Advisory Council	12
Coaching Cross-examination Style Debating	13
Cross-examination Debating	17



WISCONSIN HIGH SCHOOL FORENSIC ASSOCIATION

LOWELL HALL, 610 LANGDON STREET

MADISON, WISCONSIN 53706

affiliated with

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - EXTENSION

OFFICIAL WHSFA DEBATE PROPOSITION FOR 1971-72

RESOLVED: That the jury system in the United States should be significantly changed.

CALENDAR FOR 1971-72

Dates for Contests

	Drama (1971)	Debate (1972)	Speech (1972)
Sub-District	*Oct. 30		*Mar. 11
District	Nov. 13	Jan. 29	Mar. 25
Section	Nov. 20	Feb. 12	
State	Dec. 3-4	Feb. 25-26	Apr. 22

*Latest dates for sub-district contests; all others are firm.

WEA Convention Nov. 4-5, 1971

Thanksgiving Nov. 25, 1971

WIAA State Basketball Finals Mar. 18, 1972

Easter Apr. 2, 1972

Board of Control Meetings

Madison Nov. 2-3, 1971; May 4-5, 1972

BOARD OF CONTROL

Northern Section
MARYLOU PATTERSON
Eau Claire Memorial 54701
(715) 834-8191

Eau Claire District
N. F. PANZENHAGEN
Cadott 54727
(715) 289-4211

River Falls District
MERWIN MOEN
St. Croix Falls 54024
(715) 483-3253

Superior District
FRANK CIRILLI
Superior 54880
(715) 394-0271

Central Section
WALLACE E. HOFFMAN
Green Bay Southwest 54303
(414) 432-0351

Green Bay District
PETER C. HAMEL
Green Bay Preble 54302
(414) 468-0340

La Crosse District
EDWIN SIEVERS
Viroqua 54665
(608) 637-3191

Oshkosh District
GAYLORD K. UNBEHAUN
Brillion 54110
(414) 756-2166

Stevens Point District
J. C. GILLMANN
Marathon 54448
(715) 443-2226

Southern Section
WILLIAM HINTZ
Lake Geneva 53147
(414) 248-6243

Kenosha District
PAUL J. USSEL
Muskego 53150
(414) 679-2300

Milwaukee District
RAYMOND BEHNKE
Cedarburg 53012
(414) 377-6030

Platteville District
HERMAN LAATSCH
Argyle 53504
(608) 543-3318

Whitewater District
GEORGE BUCKINGHAM
Whitewater 53190
(414) 473-2611

Chairman of Board of Control, J. C. GILLMANN, Marathon
Vice-Chairman of Board of Control, N. F. PANZENHAGEN, Cadott
Advisor in Speech, PROFESSOR HERMAN H. BROCKHAUS, University Extension
Advisor in Drama, PROFESSOR EDWARD L. KAMARCK, University Extension
Speech Consultant, MRS. JULIA MAILER

Secretary-Treasurer, WHSFA, HERMAN H. BROCKHAUS

Lowell Hall
610 Langdon Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Phone: (608) 262-2313

SUB-DISTRICT SPEECH CONTESTS

The latest date for sub-district spring speech contests this year is Saturday, March 11. Coaches who are hosting the contest for their sub-district may get the supplies they need from their District Chairman. As explained in the memo mailed from the WHSFA state office to all member schools on January 3, the following are the forms a contest host should have:

Form	Number Needed
Eligibility-Registration Form	One for each school
Judging Contract	Two for each judge
Speech Contest Critique Sheets (Different sheets for each event)	One for each contestant
Speech Contest Ballot	One for each contest section

If your school is the site of a sub-district contest and you don't have the materials listed above, phone your District Chairman; he has a supply. His name and phone number are on the inside cover page of this Newsletter.

As soon as the sub-district contest you are hosting is over, send a copy of all contest ballots to your District Chairman immediately, unless he has instructed you to mail them elsewhere.

The person responsible for the district speech contest in your WHSFA district, to be held on Saturday, March 25, needs to know how many contestants to expect. If you send him copies of your sub-district ballots as soon as your contest is finished, he'll have the information he needs to plan the district contest program.

As a postscript, here's a suggestion. When you hold your sub-district contest, why not give the judge or judges a copy of the article which follows: SPEECH CONTEST RULE CHANGES. Doing so is one way to help make sure judges know about the changes in the rules for 1971-72.

SPEECH CONTEST RULE CHANGES

Coaches, contestants, and judges need to be familiar with the numerous rule changes in spring speech contests this year. These changes, adopted by the WHSFA Board of Control last May, were incorporated in the rules printed in the September 1971 Newsletter. The amended rules, and an explanation of them, can also be found in the Contest Handbook for 1971-72. A memorandum sent to all member schools on January 3, 1972 clarified the new rules for Four-minute Speech and Significant Speeches.

As a convenient reminder, all the rule changes for this year's speech contests are summarized on the next three pages.

Extemporaneous Speaking

A speech in the extemporaneous speaking contest may be either informative or persuasive in purpose, depending largely on the topic selected. A speech in this contest must be concerned with the topic chosen by the contestant in the drawing.

The periodicals from which topics will be taken are the January, February, March, and April issues of Newsweek, Time, and U. S. News & World Report. The material a contestant uses may come from sources other than these three magazines.

The subjects the contest manager provides for the contestants' choice are to be topics, not short titles of magazine articles. Furthermore, the topics are to be worded either as specific statements or as open-ended questions. In contests with several sections of extemporaneous speaking, an identical set of topic cards shall be used for each section.

A contestant may bring to the preparation hour any reference material he wishes, but no prepared speeches or speech outlines.

At the conclusion of a speech, the judge may ask the speaker one or more pertinent questions.

Four-minute Speech

A speech in the four-minute speech contest, an event intended especially for novice contestants, may be either informative or persuasive in purpose.

A four-minute speech may be presented from memory or extemporaneously; and notes, limited to both sides of one 4x6 card may be used. (Memorandum of January 3, 1972.)

A student may not use the same speech more than one school year in four-minute speech, nor may he use it in any other WHSFA contest event.

Oratory

A speech in the oratory contest shall be persuasive in purpose. It may be a problem-solution speech on a contemporary problem, or it may be a eulogy.

The oration may be presented from memory or extemporaneously. Notes, limited to both sides of one 4x6 card, may be used.

A student may not use the same speech more than one year in oratory, nor may he use it in any other WHSFA contest event.

Public Address

A speech in the public address contest may be either informative or persuasive in purpose, depending largely on the designated topic or specific area for a particular contest.

The speech is to be (must be) presented extemporaneously; and notes, limited to both sides of one 4x6 card, may be used.

A student may not use the same speech at more than one contest level (sub-district, district, or state) in a given year, nor may he use it in any other WHSFA contest event.

Significant Speeches

A presentation in the significant speeches contest, an event intended especially for novice contestants, should be chiefly informative in purpose, though it may contain some persuasive elements.

Not to be included in the contestant's presentation is an analysis of such factors as the composition of the selected speech and the speaker's style, since this type of rhetorical criticism is not within the scope and purpose of the significant speeches contest.

That portion of the presentation written by the contestant may be given from memory or extemporaneously, but it is not to be read from manuscript. The quoted material should be (must be) read from a script.

Notes, limited to both sides of one 4x6 card, may be used in delivering that portion of the presentation written by the student. (Memorandum of January 3, 1972.)

A student may not use the same speech more than one year in significant speeches, nor may he use it in any other WHSFA contest event.

Declamation

A presentation in the declamation contest may be a selection or cutting from written prose literature, excluding public speeches. The material a contestant uses may be a selection he has written himself.

The contestant shall give (must give) an introduction he has prepared; he shall also give (must also give) transitions which are needed to establish a relationship between parts of his presentation.

A presentation in the declamation contest is similar to one in prose reading, except that a declamation is presented from memory instead of from the printed page. In both contest events the student is expected to be an interpreter of written prose, not an actor. Consequently, impersonations from television, records, or tape recordings are not permitted.

A student may not use the same declamation more than one school year, nor may he use it in any other WHSFA contest event.

Play Acting

Music and mechanical or electronic sound effects are prohibited.

A school may not use the same cutting or scene two successive years, nor may it use a cutting or scene from its production in the drama contest held the same school year.

Poetry Reading

A presentation in the poetry reading contest may be a single poem, a cutting from a single poem, or several related poems or cuttings. The material a contestant uses may be poetry he has written himself.

The contestant shall give (must give) an introduction he has prepared; he shall also give (must also give) transitions which are needed to establish a relationship between parts of his presentation.

A contestant may not use the same material more than one school year, nor may he use it in any other WHSFA contest event.

Prose Reading

The material the contestant uses may be a selection he has written himself.

The contestant shall give (must give) an introduction he has prepared; he shall also give (must also give) transitions which are needed to establish a relationship between parts of his presentation.

A contestant may not use the same material more than one school year, nor may he use it in any other WHSFA contest event.

REQUEST FOR 1972-73 PUBLIC ADDRESS TOPICS

High school forensic coaches are in the best position to recommend topics for the public address contest. They not only are well informed on contemporary issues, they also know the interests of students or what subjects students can be motivated to develop an interest in.

For the past four years the problem areas or topics used in the WHSFA public address contest have been suggested by coaches. You are invited to continue this active participation. Ideally, a recommendation for 1972-73 should include a statement of a general problem area plus three specific areas or topics, one for each level of competition: sub-district, district, and state. All topics should be worded as questions.

Mail your suggestion to the WHSFA Secretary-Treasurer any time within the next two months. May 1, 1972 is a practical deadline. The general problem area which is chosen, and the specific areas for the various levels, will be announced in the September 1972 Newsletter.

CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION

A post card order form for Certificates of Participation was mailed to each WHSFA member school along with the four copies of this issue of the Newsletter. If the order card has been misplaced or lost, write your order on your school stationery and mail it to the WHSFA state office. Specify the number of certificates you need for each of these activities: (1) drama, (2) debate, and (3) speech.

Certificates of Participation are intended for students who represented their school in any WHSFA sub-district, district, sectional, or state contest. Please note, participation must have been in an inter-school contest in the WHSFA program. Taking part in a local contest to select school representatives, or competing in an independent forensic tournament does not qualify a student for a WHSFA Certificate of Participation.

The rule which provides for Certificates of Participation is General Rule 10f on p. 26 of the September 1971 Newsletter:

"Certificates of Participation shall be provided by the state office. Any student who participates in a WHSFA sub-district, district, sectional, or state contest is eligible to receive such a certificate. The principal of each school wishing to award Certificates of Participation shall order from the secretary-treasurer, on an order form sent out by the state office, the number and kind of certificates needed: drama, debate, speech."

In drama, certificates may be awarded to all members of the cast and crew of a production presented in a WHSFA sub-district or beyond. In debate, certificates may be given to those students who represented their school in WHSFA district competition or beyond.

In speech the maximum number of certificates any school may give is 21, the maximum number of contestants from a school in a sub-district, district, or state contest. The number 21 is arrived at by applying General Rule 16a on p. 28 of the September 1971 Newsletter: "In any speech contest, beginning with the sub-district, a school may have no more than two contestants in any contest event, except for play acting in which one entry of two to five persons in the group is permitted." Since there are eight individual contest events, the total permissible number of students from a given school in these contests is 16. If the permissible maximum of 5 students in a play acting entry is added, the total is 21.

Schools may send in their order for Certificates of Participation as soon as their sub-district spring speech contest has been held. Orders will be filled by the state office as they are received.

INVITATION TO RECOMMEND COACHES FOR JUDGING

For several years WHSFA member schools have been invited to recommend high school coaches to serve as judges at the State Speech Contest. The same invitation is being given this year. A coach who is recommended, because of his competence and experience, may be from the school which makes the recommendation or from another school. The letter of recommendation should reach the WHSFA Secretary-Treasurer no later than March 15, 1972, and should give the following information:

1. The coach's name and school.
2. The contest event, or events, for which the teacher is recommended as a judge.
3. A statement of the teacher's qualifications to serve as a judge.

The 80 or more judges required for the State Speech Contest to be held this year on Saturday, April 22 will be chosen from college and university speech-communication-drama department faculties and from WHSFA member schools.

All judges, college faculty and high school coaches, will receive the same honorarium of \$20 for evaluating one contest section in the morning and another in the afternoon. All are to be guests of the Association at lunch on Saturday noon. University and college judges who live outside of Madison will also be reimbursed for their expenses in coming to the contest.

High school coaches who are engaged as judges will not receive expenses because they'll be traveling to Madison anyway, accompanying contestants from their school. In the contest, no high school coach will judge a student from his own school.

It isn't possible to promise that all coaches recommended will be given a contract to judge. The number of persons required to judge a particular contest event is an important factor in procuring judges. Please remember the deadline for recommending coaches for judging is March 15, 1972.

WHSFA STATE DRAMA CONTEST

The highest rating of "A" was awarded to four schools in the WHSFA State Drama Contest, held in the new Warren Jenkins Theatre in the Fine Arts Center of the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, on December 3-4, 1971. Since the contest was held after the November Newsletter had gone to press, it wasn't possible to include the results in that publication.

Here are the names of the 18 schools which competed in the drama finals, the plays they produced, and the grades their productions received. A nineteenth school, Eau Claire North, had

qualified for the finals but found it impossible to participate because one of the actors suffered a physical injury shortly before the day of the contest.

<u>School</u>	<u>Play</u>	<u>Grade</u>
Appleton West	"Please, No Flowers"	A
Greendale	"A Man for All Seasons"	A
Port Washington	"This Property Is Condemned"	A
Shorewood	"Waiting for Godot"	A
Bloomer	"The Happy Journey"	B
Elroy Royall	"A Thing of Beauty"	B
Evansville	"The Hunter and the Bird"	B
Fall Creek	"The Importance of Being Earnest"	B
Green Bay Bay Port	"The Lovers in Midsummer"	B
Lodi	"Games"	B
Madison Memorial	"The Bald Soprano"	B
Menomonie	"Something Unspoken"	B
New Berlin Eisenhower	"Caine Mutiny Court Martial"	B
St. Lawrence Seminary	"Waiting for Godot"	B
Superior Central Junior	"Tom Sawyer"	B
Cedarburg	"Please, No Flowers"	C
Green Bay Preble	"The Death and Life of Sneaky Fitch"	C
Luxemburg-Casco	"Interview"	C

WISCONSIN THEATRE ORGANIZATION

The following information we received from University Extension Arts-Madison will be of interest to high school theatre and drama directors. The Wisconsin Community Theatre Association and board members from the former Region 8 Children's Theatre Conference will sponsor a state-wide meeting on Sunday, March 12, 1972 at Holiday Inn No. 1 in Madison.

The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the possibility of forming a Wisconsin Theatre organization which would serve all divisions of theatre throughout the state. Representatives from the various theatre divisions in the state are encouraged to attend. These divisions include community, secondary school, children's, dance, musical, and professional theatre, as well as religious drama. High school teachers, and college and university professors and students are cordially welcome.

During the meeting, small group discussions will be chaired by graduate students from the University of Wisconsin-Madison program in Arts Administration. The discussion groups, with representatives from each division, will share ideas concerning the formation of a state-wide organization dedicated to serving the theatre needs of everyone. No predetermined goals have been established by the planning committee from the sponsoring organizations.

Anyone who is interested in any phase of theatre in Wisconsin is invited to attend and participate in the exploratory meeting on March 12. The place, Holiday Inn No. 1 in Madison, is at 4402 East Washington Avenue, on Highway 151. It is just off Interstate 90-94. Coffee will be available at 10:30 A. M., as will lunch at noon. The meeting will adjourn promptly at 4:00 P. M.

1971-72 WHSFA DEBATE TOURNAMENTS

Twenty-one schools achieved a record of 4 wins and 2 losses, or better, in WHSFA sectional debate competition this year. As a result of their accomplishment, they qualified for participation in the 1971-72 State Debate Tournament in Madison on February 25-26, 1972. These schools are:

Brookfield Central	Mequon Homestead
De Pere Abbot Pennings	Middleton
Durand	Milwaukee Marquette
Eau Claire Memorial	Milwaukee Pius XI
Green Bay East	New London
Greendale	Oconomowoc
Hartford Union	Rhineland
Janesville Craig	Sheboygan North
Kimberly	Sheboygan South
La Crosse Aquinas	Wausau West
	Wausatosa East

In the three sectional tournaments, held on February 12, there were 49 competing schools, 9 more than last year. In district competition this year, 109 schools entered debate teams; this number is 5 more than last year, but 15 fewer than in 1969-70, two years ago.

In the state tournament, all competing schools take part in three qualifying rounds. Schools achieving a 4-2 record, or better, in these rounds advance to a championship elimination bracket--comparable to a basketball tournament schedule. Those debate teams which do not qualify for championship competition participate in a consolation series, which is another two rounds of debate.

School trophies are awarded to the first and second place champions, as well as to the winner of the consolation series. Framed certificates are given to schools placing third in the championship competition and to the second and third place schools in the consolation contest. Individual debaters on the first, second, and third place championship teams are awarded gold medals. Debaters on the other teams which survive the qualifying rounds are given silver medals.

The proposition being debated by high schools in the WHSFA and throughout the nation this year is: "Resolved: That the jury system in the United States should be significantly changed."

DEBATE PROBLEM AREA FOR 1972-73

Early in February, the National Office of the Committee on Discussion and Debate of the National University Extension Association announced the 1972-73 high school discussion and debate problem area. At the same time, it also announced the three discussion questions and debate propositions related to the problem area. One of the three propositions will be selected this spring for use in next year's WHSFA debate program.

The following information about the 1972-73 problem area and debate resolutions was mailed, on February 14, to all member schools which participated in WHSFA debate this year:

PROBLEM AREA: What should be the policy toward financing elementary and secondary education in the United States?

DEBATE PROPOSITIONS: (One is to be chosen by WHSFA debate schools this spring.)

Resolved: That a voucher system should be established as the primary means of financing elementary and secondary education in the United States.

Resolved: That governmental financial support for all public elementary and secondary education in the United States should be provided exclusively by the federal government.

Resolved: That public funds should be the primary means of financing parochial and secular private elementary and secondary education in the United States.

The problem area cited above, with its accompanying debate propositions, was selected by preferential balloting last month. Each state high school forensic organization had one vote, as did the National Forensic League and the National Catholic Forensic League.

In the preferential voting in Wisconsin, the 65 WHSFA debate schools which returned ballots expressed a greater preference (161 points) for the following problem area: "What should be the role of the federal government in providing for the social welfare of United States citizens?" The problem area on financing education, which was chosen in the national referendum, was Wisconsin's second choice (123 points). Third in the Wisconsin balloting (103 points), and in the national voting as well, was this problem area: "What should be the policy of the federal government toward health care for United States citizens?"

The point system used in both the Wisconsin and national preferential balloting was also employed by many other states. A first choice vote was assigned three points, a second choice was given two points, and a third choice was counted as one point.

Through an exchange of information with forensic associations or leagues in neighboring states, we have learned that Illinois, Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota expressed the same preferences as Wisconsin. Iowa and Michigan reversed our first and second place choices; thus their preference and the national voting were the same except that in Iowa the social welfare and the health care problem areas were tied for second place.

WHSFA REPRESENTED ON ADVISORY COUNCIL

The WHSFA delegate to this year's meeting of the Advisory Council, held in San Francisco December 28-30, 1971, was Mrs. Marylou Patterson, speech teacher and coach at Eau Claire Memorial High School and Chairman of the WHSFA Northern Section. The Advisory Council is an aid to the Committee on Discussion and Debate of the National University Extension Association and is comprised of representatives of state forensic associations throughout the country and also the National Forensic League and the National Catholic Forensic League.

The Council, which meets annually in December, selects three problem area questions for consideration by the high schools in the nation. Each problem area question is supplemented by three related discussion questions and three debate propositions. These are recommended to the Committee on Discussion and Debate which then submits them to the various state high school associations and leagues for a choice. In a national preferential referendum, one problem area is chosen to be the subject for discussion and debate in high schools throughout the country one year hence.

The process of choosing the 1972-73 problem area began as early as last spring when state forensic organizations invited their member schools to suggest subjects. The WHSFA state office now invites you to recommend subjects for 1973-74. Send the Secretary-Treasurer the topics you would like to have considered in the choice of the national problem area for high school discussion and debate in 1973-74. Mail them in no later than March 15, 1972.

SUMMER HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE INSTITUTE

When the temperature is near zero and the ground is covered with snow, it's a good time to think about summer. We are glad to announce that the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire will again conduct a debate institute for high schools this coming June. The specific dates are from June 19 through June 30, 1972.

If you would like information about the 12th Annual Debate Institute for High Schools which will be held on the Eau Claire campus, write to Professor Grace Walsh, Director of Institute, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701. Should you wish to phone her the number is (715) 836-4177.

COACHING CROSS-EXAMINATION STYLE DEBATING

Larry G. Weise

(The article which follows was written by Mr. Weise at the invitation of the WHSFA Secretary-Treasurer. It is a companion piece to the exposition titled CROSS-EXAMINATION DEBATE by A. S. McMillion, which was published in the November, 1971 WHSFA Newsletter. Mr. Weise coaches debate and forensics at Monona Grove High School. Before coming to Monona in 1970-71 he was a coach in Indiana for 9 years, a majority of them at Hobart High School. He holds a B. S. in Speech from Manchester College and had done graduate study at Indiana University, Purdue University, San Jose State University, and the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater. He served for 6 years as a Sectional Chairman of the Indiana High School Forensic Association.)

Cross-examination style debating is a challenging form of the ancient art. It may be the most wonderful thing that ever happened to debate, or it may be the worst, much as debate is to an educational program. If it is treated honestly and fairly, it is a thing to be respected; but if it is misused, it is a demon. Thus goes debate in an educational program: ergo cross-examination in a debate program.

The crux of the matter is coaching. The attitudes and techniques carried by students should and do come from the coach in most situations. Mr. McMillion in his article (WHSFA Newsletter November, 1971) pointed to a number of primary purposes of cross-examination: clarification, case development or destruction, to expose errors or weaknesses in reasoning and evidence, and to throw doubt on an opponent's reliability. None of these purposes suggest (nor should they) intimidation of an opponent.

Techniques of Coaching

Coaching cross-examination debate need not be looked upon as a traumatic experience even by the most inexperienced teacher or coach. It seems that the skill most of us who choose the teaching profession develop in our methods classes, practice teaching, and internships is to ask our students questions. This ability is the basis with which we also pursue the coaching of debate.

The best time to introduce the idea of cross-examination to debaters is in the earliest explanations of what debate is. Students will accept it as the normal method without building fears. In this way, cross-examination becomes a primary "language" for the debater rather than trying to learn it as a second "language." If it is necessary to make a transition to traditional style debating, the process is a simple one (though often boring).

In starting the student in cross-examination, one should not be concerned if the student does not use all of his time. A few well-chosen questions are the first goal for the beginner.

The teaching techniques used to develop skills are probably as many as there are coaches, but a few may be helpful as a starting place.

Dr. Edna Sorber, of the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, suggests the "why" technique from earliest analysis of a new topic. In this method one might begin by asking his students, "Why should the jury system be changed? Why is that a harm? Why is that significant?" etc. If the teacher asks questions of students in the session at random, the students begin to get the feel of the topic and the technique. As the session continues, students should begin to ask questions of each other and of the instructor in a spontaneous manner.

As the year proceeds, another type of practice may have one student giving a speech and then either a single debater cross-examines him or the group performs this function.

A third practice exercise begins by playing a record or tape of a speech. You may make your own or purchase some from one of the summer clinics, educational recording companies, or from the Professional Debaters' Tournament. Students are then appointed to serve as questioner and witness, defending and attacking the content of the speech. Incidentally, this is also a good technique to teach note-taking.

General Principles

A number of principles are generally agreed upon concerning cross-examination:

1. Rudeness is unacceptable.
2. The time belongs to the questioner.
3. The witness may not question the questioner.
4. Both debaters must function without help from their partners during the cross-examination period.
5. The questioner may not use his time to read evidence, make statements, or to editorialize about the answers given by the witness.
6. A questioner may request "yes or no" answers but he may not demand them.
7. The questioner may stop the witness at any time in his answer, but he should not ask questions that he does not want answered.--The distinction is that he does not have to allow a qualification of an answer after the desired answer has been given.
8. A witness may refuse to answer unreasonable questions, including those which do not readily appear to apply to the debate or resolution.
9. Questions should not be personal attacks.
10. The witness should not be penalized for not having obscure facts or exact statistics at instant recall. Reasonableness should be the rule.

Selecting Techniques

The goals of cross-examination vary from coach to coach, but these goals will determine the techniques used by the debaters.

The "friendly but firm" approach is probably stressed more than any other attitude. While it may be possible to intimidate an opponent by aggressive behavior in the form of rapid-fire questions "barked out" in the gruffest tones, this seems to stray from the concept of friendly competition with clear logic, reasoning, evidence, and communication being the weapons. Neither does it allow for a more friendly meeting at next week's debates or later when the two are thrown together on a college campus. If intimidation comes from the "friendly but firm" approach, it should be because of the sharp analysis and probing questions rather than the sharp tongue and probing finger waved in one's face.

The "machine gun" (rapid fire) technique is usually employed to get as many questions asked as possible, but the questioner often will find the answers so thin as to be practically worthless. Usually fewer, well-chosen, well-worded questions will achieve the desired results.

Deciding on the length of answer desired and developing questions to achieve this is important. Many young debaters will ask questions in hope of long answers to fill time, while more experienced debaters may want long answers, anticipating that the witness will ramble enough to "hang himself."

Questions that elicit short answers are desirable when longer explanations may be dangerous to the questioner's case, or when there is a need to cover a lot of material.

As witness, the selection of technique is similar to that of the questioner. Traditionally, the witness tries to extend his answers so the questioner may not ask as many questions; but, as many students have learned by harsh experience, this "babbling" may lead to the very admissions that the questioner may use to his advantage. An extremely short, unqualified answer may also be used to the disadvantage of the witness. If a debater wishes to qualify a "yes or no" answer, he should do so before giving the "yes or no" to avoid being stopped before qualifying it. Once again a "friendly but firm" approach may work best, with straight-forward, adequately qualified answers. Other witness techniques observed lately are "playing dumb" to all questions--"What was your first contention?" "I don't remember."--asking for the repetition of even the simplest questions, and generally being non-communicative. It would be safe to assume that these students are not the product of good coaching, if any coaching at all.

The ideal question seems to be a simple query, one which requires a short, simple answer. This allows for a wider range of questions. As the debater advances his skills, he will learn to develop series of questions which will hopefully lead the witness from one admission to one more damaging until he is finally trapped.

A good witness should be able to see the trap coming and avoid it.

The coach's personal philosophy toward debate will dictate how the student prepares for cross-examination. Some coaches require students to develop series of questions and write or type them on cards or sheets of paper. The debater then selects those questions that apply during the opponent's speech. A somewhat less-sophisticated system has the student (loosely called a "debater" in this situation) write out a set of questions and use them in every debate. Probably the most educationally-sound method is to have the student write questions during his opponent's speech and to continue spontaneously from them. While this may contribute to defeats in the early debating, it avoids the "debating machine" image and teaches the student to think on his feet. In any case, the debater should be ready to adapt his questions to the responses he receives (which can amaze, amuse, and perplex).

Usage

It should be remembered that many judges, the author included, believe that cross-examination is meaningless to the outcome of the debate unless those answers are used in the speeches. The questions and the corresponding replies should be used in direct support or attack of particular issues. This usage should be made in the next speech of that team for greater effectiveness. This approach keeps the cross-examination period from degenerating into a "circus sideshow" with sole purpose being a psychological effect on opponent and judge.

Positioning

Where and how debaters stand in relationship to each other and the speaker's stand in cross-examination is a decision which must be made. Some debaters jockey for position in their over-zealous (and usually futile) attempt to gain a psychological and tactical advantage over their opponent.

There are two usual approaches to positioning. Probably the more logical is parallel with the opponent at a quarter turn, thus being able to address the questions and answers to the opponent without ignoring the judge. The other school of thought says the two debaters should be directly facing the judge who is, after all, the one to be persuaded. Judges this year have expressed a preference for the former positioning due to a better communication situation without giving the impression of side-to-side computers. Neither of these schools of thought condones upstaging maneuvers or gives much credence to the psychological advantage of controlling the speaker's stand.

Cross-Examination Order

Probably the most asked question about cross-examination is what order should be used. The most quoted rule concerning this issue says that "it makes no difference who questions whom in the

debate as long as each debater serves as a witness and as a questioner." Practicality has dictated that one is questioned after his constructive speech. This leaves only the issue of who questions whom.

A general "rule of thumb" is that whatever system is used, it should not delay the debate (which excludes lengthy conferences after the questioning period and before the next speech begins). The two systems are: (1) the debater who is not speaking next, questions the speaker; and (2) the debater who is speaking next, does the questioning.

The first system requires more teamwork between the debaters if the results of the questioning period are to be used immediately, but the speaker has the time to assimilate what he hears into his notes. The second system assures the speaker that "his" questions will be asked and pursued in a "satisfactory" manner, but is often accompanied by delays or poor assimilation of the questions into the speech. Though some leagues and tournaments dictate a particular cross-examination order, the author feels that this should be left to the discretion of the individual coach.

Because of the increased probability of direct clash in the debate, because of the value of cross-examination in our "search for truth," and because of its potential as an educational tool, one may take great pride and pleasure in one's efforts to teach cross-examination style debating.

CROSS-EXAMINATION DEBATING

Lloyd H. Fuge and Robert P. Newman
University of Pittsburgh

(The following article appeared in the January 1972 issue of The Rostrum, the official publication of the National Forensic League. Mr. Albert Odom, Editor of The Rostrum, graciously gave us permission to reprint it in this issue of the WHSFA Newsletter.)

Cross-examination is more than the art of debate. All the essential elements of good debate are necessary: A strong case, good adaptation to the audience, adequate evidence, and skillful delivery. Good cross-examination demands, in addition, a quick wit and a facile tongue.

General

A. Purpose of Cross-examination

To clarify an obscure point in an opponent's case, to expose factual error or unsupported assertion, or to obtain damaging admissions. It should not be used (as it is in law) to attack the witness' personal integrity.

8. Attitudes of Questioner and Witness

Both should appear to be reasonable, co-operative and eager to please. Either one should be "marked down" for unpalatable sarcasm, obvious "stalling" or appearing to browbeat his opponent.

C. Relation to Case

The value of any cross-examination decreases unless the results are tied in to later speeches. The cross-examination should be an integral part of the debate, not a sideshow.

D. Delivery

Both speakers must talk to the audience. Cross-examination takes the form of an exchange between two debaters, but basically it is for the benefit of the listeners. In public debates it is vital that both speakers face the audience while questioning or responding.

The Questioner

A. Controls the time, and may interrupt the witness to request shorter or more direct answers or to indicate that the answer he has given is insufficient.

B. Must ask fair and relevant questions. He should neither comment on the answers, argue with the witness nor make speeches. He should use his time for questioning alone, not for either constructive argument or summary. In fact, a conclusion is all the more effective if the audience reaches it without the questioner's help.

C. Should have considerable scope in the questions he asks. Since the time is his, he may waste it if he wants to. The witness should answer even if the significance or relevance of the question is not immediately apparent to him.

D. Should begin with common ground on which agreement may be expected, and proceed to areas in which disagreement develops or the witness makes significant admissions. The questioner may well begin with questions which reveal his purpose: "Do you maintain that the Nationalist Chinese Army stand as a bulwark against Communism in Asia?" "Yes." "And do you further maintain that recognition of Red China would weaken or destroy this bulwark?" "Yes." Agreement on such questions is almost certain, and the questioner clearly indicates the direction of his inquiry.

E. Should develop his attack along the lines of his basic case. He should limit the number of objectives he tries to reach; a series of at least five questions, probing a single issue of the debate thoroughly and following up the leads which the witness' answers provide, is preferable to a miscellaneous assortment of questions lacking interrelation and adaptation to the witness' answers.

F. May not insist on a simple "Yes" or "No" answer unless his question is simple, direct and factual. Questions about why something is true are necessarily complicated and the questioner cannot expect the witness to answer them briefly. Factual questions

are best, and the questioner can ask them in enough different ways to lend variety to the cross-examination.

G. Should phrase questions with the verb first, then the subject, and finally the object or modifying phrase: e. g. "Do you admit that Joseph R. McCarthy is the junior senator from Wisconsin?" He should avoid negative questions, or any phrasing with "not": "Do you not know that there have been thirty-seven violations of the Korean truce by the Red Chinese?" The answer to this can only be confusing.

H. May remind the audience and the witness of a relevant fact by beginning the question: "Are you aware that . . ." or "Are you familiar with . . ." However, the questioner's motive in putting such questions should be to put the witness on record concerning the statement involved, and not to present materials of his own.

I. Should summarize a series of questions on an issue by repeating an opening question: "Do you still consider, in light of these facts, that the Chinese Nationalist Army stands as a bulwark against Communism in Asia?" This calls for a "Yes" or "No" answer, clearly indicates that the Questioner has concluded that particular approach and allows the members of the audience to draw their own conclusions.

The Witness

A. Must answer directly and briefly any legitimate question susceptible to a simple answer. He should not question the questioner (except in using a rhetorical question as an answer), nor should he engage in "stalling" tactics.

B. May refuse to answer a tricky or unfair question--"When did you stop beating your wife?" --if he states a good reason for doing so.

C. May ask questions to clarify a question, possibly giving his reasons for considering the question obscure, or may ask the questioner to stop making speeches and to continue his questioning.

D. May clarify a question, if to do so is appropriate. He should state the qualification before his answer: "Do you believe in the desirability of democratic elections?" "For people educated in the tradition and practice of democracy, yes."

E. Can exercise some control over the question period by controlling the timing of his answers. If he feels that the questioner is dragging out the question period, he can answer rapidly, exposing the questioner's ineptitude.

F. Should not be afraid to admit ignorance if the question demands knowledge of an obscure fact.

G. Must answer without consulting his colleague or receiving help from him.