

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, November 1971

No. 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Calendar for 1971-72	2
Board of Control	2
A Tribute to Daryl K. Lien	3
WHSFA Board of Control	4
Highlights of the Board Meeting	5
University Extension Continues to Support WHSFA	7
Search for WHSFA Secretary-Treasurer Candidates	7
Membership in the WHSFA 1971-72	8
Wisconsin Speech Communication Association Convention	9
WHSFA District Drama Contest Winners	10
Cross-Examination Debate	11



WISCONSIN HIGH SCHOOL FORENSIC ASSOCIATION

LOWELL HALL, 610 LANGDON STREET

MADISON, WISCONSIN 53706

affiliated with

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION, THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

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) 437-5456

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



A TRIBUTE TO DARYL K. LIEN

Daryl K. Lien, Chairman of the WHSFA River Falls District for 13 years, was given a Certificate of Recognition at the November meeting of the Board of Control. The award acknowledges his service as a member of the Board from 1943 to 1953 and again from 1968 to 1971. This fall, he chose not to be a candidate for re-election because he plans to retire from his position as Administrator of the Amery Public Schools at the end of the current school year.

Mr. Lien's interest in education has not been confined to curricular programs and forensics. He was a member of the Wisconsin Interscholastic Athletic Association Board of Control from 1961 to 1968, serving as President during his last four years on the WIAA Board. From 1966 to 1969 he was on the National Federation of High School Activities Board of Control and was Vice-chairman of the National Alliance Football Rules Committee.

Additional positions which he held are evidence of the confidence others had in his ability and judgment. He was appointed by the State Legislature to the Biennial School Aid Adjustment Committee, appointed by the Governor to the Retirement Research Committee, and elected Treasurer and member of the Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education District 18, New-Richmond. Besides fulfilling these responsibilities he served on various local boards such as church, hospital, and mental health.

The recognition now being given Mr. Lien is not the first he has received from the Wisconsin High School Forensic Association. In the WHSFA Newsletter for September 1953, the following state-

ment accompanied his picture: "Daryl K. Lien served as chairman of the River Falls District for ten years. His belief in the goals of the Association and his faith in the young people of our state was such that he freely contributed both time and effort to further the cause of effective speech in Wisconsin.... We thank him sincerely for the service he has rendered to the Association." This expression of gratitude to Mr. Lien is just as valid today as it was in 1953.

WHSFA BOARD OF CONTROL

This past September and October, elections to fill positions on the WHSFA Board of Control were held in five districts and one section. Re-elected to membership on the Board were Mr. N. F. Panzenhagen, Eau Claire District Chairman; Mr. Edwin Sievers, La Crosse District Chairman; and Mr. Raymond Behnke, Milwaukee District Chairman. The new term of office for these re-elected Board members is for three years, 1971-74.

Mr. Merwin Moen, Administrator of the St. Croix Falls Public Schools, was elected Chairman of the River Falls District for 1971-74, replacing Mr. Daryl K. Lien, who chose not to be a candidate for re-election since he will retire from the teaching profession next spring.

Mr. Gaylord K. Unbehaun, Administrator of the Brillion Public Schools, was elected to be Chairman of the Oshkosh District for 1971-72, filling the unexpired term of Mr. Thomas J. Lynch, who resigned from the Board last spring but kindly continued to serve until his successor had been chosen.

Mr. William Hintz, teacher and coach at Lake Geneva Badger High School, was elected to sectional chairmanship by the schools in the WHSFA Southern Section. He assumes the position held by Mr. J. Peter Shaw of Evansville High School, who filled the final year of an unexpired sectional term. Mr. Hintz is a former Board member, having served as Chairman of the Southern Section in 1959-62.

The names, addresses, and phone numbers of all Board members are printed on the inside front cover of every WHSFA Newsletter. However, so you may note their tenure and terms of office, we are publishing the following roster of these people who have the responsibility for creating the policies of the Association.

<u>District</u>	<u>Chairman</u>	<u>First Elected</u>	<u>Re- elected</u>	<u>Term Expires</u>
Green Bay	Peter C. Hamel, Prin. Green Bay Preble	1966	1969	1972
Oshkosh	G. K. Unbehaun, Adm. Brillion Public Schools	1971		1972

<u>District</u>	<u>Chairman</u>	<u>First Elected</u>	<u>Re- elected</u>	<u>Term Expires</u>
Platteville	Herman Laatsch, Adm. Argyle Public Schools	1961	1969	1972
Whitewater	George Buckingham, Dir. Student Services Whitewater Public Schools	1960	1969	1972
Kenosha	Paul Ussel, Prin. Muskego High School	1970		1973
Stevens Point	J. C. Gillmann, Adm. Marathon Public Schools	1956	1970	1973
Superior	Frank Cirilli, Prin. Superior High School	1968	1970	1973
Eau Claire	N. F. Panzenhagen, Adm. Cadott Public Schools	1967	1971	1974
La Crosse	Edwin Sievers, Prin. Viroqua High School	1964	1971	1974
Milwaukee	Raymond Behnke, Prin. Cedarburg High School	1969	1971	1974
River Falls	Merwin Moen, Adm. St. Croix Falls Schools	1971		1974
<u>Section</u>				
Central	Wallace E. Hoffman Green Bay Southwest	1969		1972
Northern	Marylou Patterson Eau Claire Memorial	1964	1970	1973
Southern	William Hintz Lake Geneva Badger	1959	1971	1974

It should be noted that Mr. Laatsch, like Mr. Hintz, has been on the Board at two different times. He was first elected in 1961 and served until mid-year 1963. Then he was elected again in 1966.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE BOARD MEETING

The fall meeting of the WHSFA Board of Control was held at Holiday Inn No. 1 in Madison on Tuesday evening and Wednesday morning, November 2-3, 1971. Present at the meeting were all the current Board members and two of the out-going members, Mr. J. Peter Shaw and Mr. Daryl K. Lien. Their presence helped provide an efficient transition in responsibility. Also in attendance as guests of the Board were Miss Drucilla Munson of Brookfield Central High School and Mr. Kenneth Thames of Marquette University High School. They were invited as President of the Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association and President of the Wisconsin Forensic Coaches Association.

In naming officers for 1971-72, the Board re-elected Mr. J. C. Gillmann as Chairman for the eighth consecutive year, by a

unanimous vote. He was first chosen for this office in November 1963, having served as Vice-chairman the previous year. By another unanimous vote the Board re-elected Mr. N. F. Panzenhagen Vice-chairman for 1971-72, an office he has held since November 1969.

The Secretary-Treasurer gave reports on the membership and financial status of the Association. He also presented a budget proposal for 1971-72, which was adopted by the Board.

Mrs. Marylou Patterson, Chairman of the Northern Section, was designated as the official WHSFA delegate to the conference of the Advisory Council of the Committee on Discussion and Debate, which will be held in San Francisco the last week in December 1971. This is a national meeting to which most state forensic associations will send representatives for the purpose of selecting three general problem areas (each with three discussion questions and three debate propositions) for next year, 1972-73. One of the three general topics will be chosen as the national problem area through a referendum in which Wisconsin debate coaches will participate next January. In the spring Wisconsin coaches will select the debate proposition to be used in the state in 1972-73.

At the recommendation of a special committee on WHSFA eligibility requirements, the Board adopted a simplified eligibility rule. It will become part of the General Rules which are published each year in the September issue of the Newsletter. The revised rule is not in conflict with the essential provisions of General Rule 2 on pp. 24-25 of the September 1971 Newsletter. Related to the recommendation of the eligibility committee, instructions were given the Secretary-Treasurer to prepare a standard WHSFA Eligibility-Registration form for use at all levels of competition, starting with the 1971-72 debate program.

At the suggestion of the Board, the Secretary-Treasurer will prepare a common agenda and a tape-recorded introduction for meetings of debate coaches to be held in conjunction with WHSFA District Debate Tournaments on January 29, 1972. He will also prepare comparable material for meetings of speech coaches to be held at the time of WHSFA District Speech Contests on March 25, 1972. The subject for discussion at the debate coaches meetings will be traditional and cross-examination styles of debating. At the speech coaches meetings the topic will be changes in WHSFA contests.

Miss Munson and Mr. Thames gave reports on the purpose, structure, and programs of their respective organizations, the Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association and the Wisconsin Forensic Coaches Association. In the discussion which grew out of their reports, the desirability of continued relationships between the two coaches organizations and the WHSFA was agreed upon mutually. The WHSFA Board approved a motion inviting the Presidents of the WDCA and WFCA to attend the spring meeting of the WHSFA Board of Control; they are to assume their own expenses for the spring meeting.

Before the November 1971 meeting of the Board adjourned, the Chairman, Mr. Gillmann, presented Certificates of Recognition to Mr. Lien and Mr. Shaw acknowledging their service to the WHSFA while they were Board members. A similar certificate was later sent to Mr. Lynch, former Chairman of the Oshkosh District.

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION CONTINUES TO SUPPORT WHSFA

Dr. Luke Lamb, Dean of the Educational Communications Division in University Extension, attended the WHSFA Board of Control meeting for a time on Wednesday morning, November 3. He was invited to speak to the Board members because the Extension department with which the Wisconsin High School Forensic Association is now affiliated--the Department of Communication Arts--is under his administrative leadership.

In his comments to the Board, Dean Lamb referred to the long-standing relationship between the University of Wisconsin-Extension and the WHSFA. He stated further that Extension would continue to support the Association by providing the services of the WHSFA Secretary-Treasurer, regular secretarial help, and the facilities for the state office. (In return for these services and use of facilities the WHSFA contributes \$9,000 annually to University Extension.)

For a number of years the affiliation of WHSFA with Extension has been through the Extension Speech Department. Last September this department became part of the University Extension Department of Communication Arts, which encompasses radio, television, and film as well as speech communication. The Chairman of Extension Communication Arts is Professor Walter J. Meives, who shares Dean Lamb's interest in continued support for the Wisconsin High School Forensic Association.

SEARCH FOR WHSFA SECRETARY-TREASURER CANDIDATES

Last year Dr. Herman H. Brockhaus, Secretary-Treasurer of the Wisconsin High School Forensic Association, informed the Board of Control and University of Wisconsin administration of his plans to retire from the University on July 1, 1972. His leaving necessitates hiring a replacement; a search for candidates has begun.

The position involves a combination of responsibilities. Besides serving as the WHSFA Secretary-Treasurer, Dr. Brockhaus conducts communication seminars and workshops for adults as part of the University Extension program, and teaches credit courses on the campus in Madison. He has a joint appointment in the University and is Professor of Communication arts in both Extension and the College of Letters and Science in Madison.

No major changes are anticipated in the position now held by Dr. Brockhaus; consequently his successor should have similar qualifications, including the Ph. D. degree (or near completion) since he will have University faculty obligations in both Extension and on the Madison campus.

Besides the advance degree (or considerable progress toward it), other requisites for the position are: teaching experience, preferably at all these levels--high school, college, and adult education; knowledge and experience in co-curricular speech activities as a participant and as a coach; and some experience in administration.

If you would like to nominate someone as a candidate for the position presently held by the WHSFA Secretary-Treasurer, send the name and address to Professor Meives, who has primary responsibility for conducting the search for Dr. Brockhaus' successor. His address is:

Professor Walter J. Meives, Chairman
Department of Communication Arts
University of Wisconsin-Extension
45 N. Charter Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

MEMBERSHIP IN THE WHSFA 1971-72

As reported in the WHSFA Newsletter for September 1971, the number of schools holding membership in the Association last year was 461. This year, 455 schools have joined the WHSFA, a net decline of six schools.

Some of the loss can be explained by high schools combining. For example, Trempealeau Healy merged with Gale-Ettrick, and Hollandale with Blanchardville. The introduction of the middle school program in Viroqua caused the loss of a junior high school membership.

Three schools which were not members last year joined the WHSFA in 1971-72. We welcome to membership in the Association: Madison Malcolm Shabbaz, Milwaukee Boys' Tech, and Phelps. We are happy to have them as a part of our organization.

The number of member schools in each WHSFA district now is:

Eau Claire District	42	Platteville District	38
Green Bay District	51	River Falls District	28
Kenosha District	37	Stevens Point District	53
La Crosse District	36	Superior District	23
Milwaukee District	41	Whitewater District	54
Oshkosh District	52	Total Membership	455

WISCONSIN SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION CONVENTION

The fall convention of the Wisconsin Speech Communication Association was held at the Milwaukee Inn, 916 E. State Street, Milwaukee on Friday, November 5, 1971. In the morning, sectional programs were held from 9:00 to 10:30 and from 10:30 to 12:00. The topics and speakers were as follows:

9:00 - 10:30 Sections

- "Television--Uses and Methods in the High School," Robert Shult, Oconomowoc High School
- "Determining Guidelines Which Should Be Used in Training Secondary School Teachers of Speech Communication," John Cease, University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

10:30 - 12:00 Sections

- "Developing a Unit in Intra-personal Communication in the High School Communication Course," William O'Brien, Janesville Craig High School; Craig Streff, Wauwatosa East High School
- "Film and the Teaching of Film Making in the High School," Fran Bock, Greenfield High School

After the noon luncheon the President of the WSCA, Dr. S. Clay Willmington, University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, conducted a short business meeting. The one motion which was passed removed "Forensics" as a special interest group in the WSCA. Dropping "Forensics" is not an indication of a waning interest in the area; rather it eliminates duplication. The Wisconsin Forensic Coaches Association and the Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association now meet jointly with the WSCA, and more program time is devoted to forensics than to any other area.

Tentative plans for the WSCA Spring Conference were announced by Dr. Charles Haas, who is responsible for the program. The event will be held on May 5-6, 1972 and the location (changed from previous years) will be The Pioneer in Oshkosh. Information about the conference may be obtained by writing to Dr. Haas, Department of Speech, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, La Crosse, Wisconsin 54601.

After the adjournment of the November 5 WSCA business meeting, Tom Pinter, Oconomowoc High School, introduced the speaker, Dr. Cy Svoboda, who talked on the subject: "A Psychologist Looks at the Teaching of Speech."

Current officers of the WSCA already mentioned are: Dr. S. Clay Willmington, President; Mr. Tom Pinter, First Vice-president; and Dr. Charles Haas, Second Vice-President. The other officers are Miss Thelma Rothe, Fennimore High School, Secretary; and Mrs. Dorothy L. Grinde, De Forest High School, Treasurer. Any of these people would welcome inquiries about membership in the WSCA.

WHSFA DISTRICT DRAMA CONTEST WINNERS

A total of 106 schools participated in the 1971-72 district drama contests held on November 13, 1971. Of this number, 49 received 'A' ratings and advanced to sectional competition, according to reports received by the state office. Last year 91 schools had productions in district contests, and 35 qualified for sectional contests.

Because this Newsletter went to press before the sectional contests, the names of the schools which qualified for the state finals could not be reported. The following are district winners:

Eau Claire District

Bloomer
Cadott
Eau Claire North
Fall Creek
Loyal
Menomonie

Green Bay District

Appleton West
Green Bay Bay Port
Green Bay Preble
Luxemburg
Pulaski
Suring

Kenosha District

Franklin
Greendale
Kenosha Bradford
Muskego
New Berlin
New Berlin Eisenhower

La Crosse District

Blair
De Soto
Elroy Royall
Mauston

Milwaukee District

Cedarburg
Hamilton
Pewaukee
Port Washington
Shorewood

Oshkosh District

Neenah
Plymouth
Ripon
St. Lawrence Seminary

Platteville District

Cassville
Cuba City
New Glarus
Reedsburg Webb

River Falls District

Turtle Lake

Stevens Point District

Antigo
Marathon
Schofield D. C. Everest
Tomahawk

Superior District

Park Falls Lincoln
Port Wing South Shore
Superior Central Junior

Whitewater District

Evansville
Lodi
Madison Memorial
Monona Grove
Oregon
Whitewater

The WHSFA state drama finals will be held in the new Warren Jenkins Theatre in the Fine Arts Center of the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, on December 3-4, 1971. All schools which receive an 'A' rating in sectional competition will compete in the state finals.

CROSS-EXAMINATION DEBATE

A. S. McMillion

(The following article was written by Mr. McMillion at the invitation of the WHSFA Secretary-Treasurer. It was prompted by requests from several coaches who wanted to know more about cross-examination debating. Art McMillion has had 13 years of active debate coaching experience in Wisconsin: 8 years at West Bend, 2 at Janesville, and 3 at Memorial High School in Eau Claire where he now teaches English and coaches forensics as well as debate. He holds a B. S. in Secondary Education from the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire and an M. S. in English and Education from the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Besides being an officer in the Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association, he has been a member of the WHSFA Board of Control, having served as Chairman of the Southern Section.)

Recent years have witnessed an increasing interest in the practice of cross-examination debating, especially in high school competition. The purpose of this article will be to briefly explore what cross-examination debate is and to suggest several reasons why its use should be continued and, in fact, expanded. No attempt will be made to discuss the techniques of questioning or acting as witness.

Cross-examination debate originated in 1926 with what J. Stanley Gray described as the Oregon Plan of debating, and has undergone several changes since then. Its use has grown extensively. For example, in 1952 it was adopted by the National Forensic League for use in district and national tournaments, a decision duplicated by the National Catholic Forensic League in 1956.

Increased interest in the state of Wisconsin was highlighted recently when the Wisconsin High School Forensic Association circulated a questionnaire polling Wisconsin high school debate coaches on their attitudes toward cross-examination debate. The results of that survey can be found in the May, 1971 Newsletter of the Wisconsin High School Forensic Association.

The characteristic that distinguishes cross-examination debate from traditional debate is that it contains a period following each constructive speech wherein a member of the opposing side questions the constructive speaker, or witness. A typical arrangement of speeches is as follows:

	Time Limits
First affirmative constructive speech	8
Cross-examination of first affirmative by second negative	3
First negative constructive speech	8
Cross-examination of first negative by first affirmative	3
Second affirmative constructive speech	8
Cross-examination of second affirmative by first negative	3

Second negative constructive speech	8
Cross-examination of second negative by second affirmative	3
First negative rebuttal	4
First affirmative rebuttal	4
Second negative rebuttal	4
Second affirmative rebuttal	4

Many argue for the first negative to question the first affirmative constructive speaker, contending that this arrangement affords the first negative a better opportunity to extract the kind of information he may use to best advantage in his constructive speech. Those who advocate that the second negative question the first affirmative contend that this gives the first negative a chance to make a more thorough organization of his attack. Since debate is supposed to be a team event, this observation has considerable merit; however, this method does run the risk of having questions asked which do not relate to the intended first negative analysis. Thus, the first negative must either alter his approach or simply ignore the results of the examination period. A similar controversy prevails over the order of affirmative questioning periods. Those who argue for the second affirmative to question the first negative contend that this permits the questioner to elicit the kind of responses he can use in his subsequent speech, while others argue for the first affirmative to assume this position to permit better preparation by the second affirmative constructive speaker. Debaters and coaches will have to decide which method best suits them.

The purpose of cross-examination debate is perhaps most succinctly stated by Francis Wellman who sees its purpose as "to catch truth, ever an elusive fugitive."¹ Certainly, many of us have witnessed debates in which the validity of Wellman's observation was emphatically evident. How often haven't we heard an affirmative or negative analysis go unscathed principally because the opposition was unable, given the limitations of traditional debate, to expose the specious arguments or invalid evidence. Recently I heard a chagrined debater comment to another team he had just met in competition, "In cross-ex we would have smashed you." Apparently, as second negative speaker he had questioned evidence offered by the opposition, who, in their following speeches, made replies satisfactory to the judge, but not to the negative. Challenge and response had continued throughout the rebuttal speeches, the result being that the affirmative established credibility in the judge's mind. My discussion with the debaters involved convinced me the negative was probably right, but, operating under the restrictions of traditional debate, were unable to pursue the probing and evaluating process afforded by cross-examination debate. Had the debate used the cross-examination format, an immediate clash of issues would have taken place. In traditional debate, challenges to evidence and authority are often obscured by the ensuing morass of argument and counter-argument in subsequent speeches, unlike the situation in cross-examination debate where a more immediate and crisp delineation of points of controversy can take place when techniques are skillfully employed.

Admittedly, there is considerable opposition to the notion that "truth in debate" ranks high on the priority list of goals and objectives; however, it seems to me that it would be desirable to elevate debate from being more than an academic exercise. More and more I hear my own debaters complaining about the "game-manship" of academic debate, about the preoccupation with the theoretical aspects of inherency, extra-topicality, significance, etc. Equally repugnant to many debaters is to indulge in what one writer has called "You tell me your quote; I'll tell you mine." This is not to suggest that cross-examination automatically precludes overindulgence in such practices. It does, nevertheless, provide greater opportunity for active and rewarding pursuit of the "elusive fugitive."

On a more pragmatic level, the purpose of questioning in cross-examination debate is to accomplish one or more of the following: (1) to elicit information for clarification, (2) to aid in the development of a constructive case, or (3) to assist in the tearing down of the opponent's case. John H. Munkman suggests that the purpose of cross-examination is primarily to help the judge determine the value of evidence.² The purposes, he feels, are (1) to destroy the material parts of an opponent's case, (2) to weaken the case where it cannot be destroyed, (3) to elicit fresh evidence and form new arguments, and (4) to undermine an opponent's case by showing that the opponent cannot be trusted to speak the truth or that he is disposing of matters of which he has no real knowledge.

It is important to remember that cross-examination debate affords a team the opportunity to capture a significant time advantage. Unlike traditional debate where each team is given the same number of minutes to debate, in cross-examination style there are twelve minutes of time up for grabs. If, through superior preparation and execution a team dominates the cross-examination periods, both as witness and questioner, it has seized an advantage not afforded by traditional debate.

Having briefly considered the general purposes of cross-examination debate, I would like to suggest several areas of special merit in the activity.

1. Cross-examination promotes better preparation.

It has been mentioned that the general purpose of cross-examination is to expose specious arguments and invalid evidence. The wise debater, therefore, will prepare himself for the event by developing a more thorough understanding of his analysis and evidence. If, for example, the debater wishes to use a research study as proof of his argument, he will be wise to investigate that particular study in terms of the sample used in the study, the methodology employed, the qualifications of the author, etc.

By the same token, the debater who knows that such a study is frequently used by his opponents in support of their position will also want to research it in the same manner. Although the debater cannot be expected to be aware of all the pertinent literature in the problem area, he certainly should have thorough knowledge of that literature which is crucial to the proof of his case. A few embarrassing moments under cross-examination by a skillful opponent will make the need for better preparation keenly felt.

I recently heard a debate in which the affirmative team was arguing that present jury selection processes were discriminatory. In their plan they recommended elimination of peremptory challenges. After the debate was over and my decision was made, I asked the affirmative team if "challenge for cause," which they were allowing to continue, would not also allow for continuance of discrimination of sorts. To my surprise, they were unaware of what this was. How devastating it would have been to the credibility of the affirmative's ability to "speak the truth" had this information been elicited in cross-examination.

Finally, although cross-examination is not a time for impromptu speaking, the very nature of the activity demands that the debater be prepared to explore the unexpected avenues that questioning may open up. Frequently a witness' response will open the door for further exposure of deficiencies in the opposition's case. The previous example of the debater who was unaware of "challenge for cause," for instance, probably would be vulnerable to questions concerning the voir dire process in general.

2. Cross-examination debate is more enjoyable for the debater.

Personal experience with coaching cross-examination has convinced me that it is simply "more fun" for the debater. Coaches of debate should not allow their personal enthusiasm for the activity to blind them to the fact that young people like to enjoy what they are doing. Pragmatically speaking, we are in a competitive market when trying to enlist the following of young people who can succeed in debate. Other school activities are available which, ostensibly at least, provide more tangibly pleasurable experiences. Cross-examination debate offers the kind of challenging and enjoyable experience that can attract and retain competent students. This assumes, of course, that the coach and debaters treat the cross-examination period as an integral part of the debate, and not merely as something that must be perfunctorily performed before getting on to the more important aspects.

3. Cross-examination debate has more audience and judge appeal.

Capturing audience interest is necessary in any speech activity and debate is no exception. Past experience in judging debate makes me well aware of how often it requires more than

interest in the problem area to compel attention to an uninspiring debate. I think most judges of debate would agree with me that it is more enjoyable to listen to a cross-examination debate than one using a traditional format. Skillfully handled, the questioning periods afford a more direct clash between debaters and thus a clearer resolution of issues, which for most judges is a delightful surprise. Unskillfully handled, of course, the questioning periods can result in an exercise of frustration for both debaters and judge. Also, cross-examination tends to eliminate the formalized, rigid structure of traditional debate and inject instead a more spontaneous, dynamic, and personal atmosphere. This is not to suggest that cross-examination debate is a kind of show. On the contrary, it is very realistic, since in "real" life it is not often that advocates go unchallenged by direct questioning from dissenters. Perhaps more cross-examination debating would help to assuage those debaters I often hear complaining about the irrelevance of debate in modern society. Additionally, if we are to argue that debate, since it parallels the legal system, has a practical value for those aspiring to the legal profession, then we should be concerned about promoting what appears to be the crux of that system--the cross-examination of witnesses.

Cross-examination is a vitalizing force that should be exploited more extensively. Wisconsin debate coaches are encouraging its use by more and more frequently hosting tournaments with a cross-examination division. Only by exposing our debaters to the experience will we be able to encourage its further growth.

1. Francis Wellman, The Art of Cross-Examination, Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1948, p. 204
2. John H. Munkman, The Techniques of Advocacy, London: Stevens and Sons, Ltd., 1951