Proposal to remove references to acting in interpretation
Submitted by John Rademacher, Madison West

Summary:
Address the fact that there is too much acting in the interp rules.

Rationale:
Judges don’t know what we think the differences are between acting and interpretation. Comments on critiques and requests for disqualifications refer to “too much acting” in the categories of Farrago, Group Interp, OIL, Prose, and Poetry. Reference in the category description to a distinction allows judges to cite this as an area for improvement (or disqualification) without really articulating what actually needs to improve. Drawing attention to a distinction is confusing, especially since this never arises in Duo Interpretation. Interestingly, Play Acting and the Solo Actings are never accused of having too much interpretation. In fact, nationally Solo Acting Serious and Solo Acting Humorous are known as Dramatic Interpretation and Humorous Interpretation.

Proposed Change to Farrago, OIL, Prose, Poetry:
Remove the sentence: “This is an interpretive category, not an acting category,” from the definition of the category.

Proposed Change to Group Interp:
Remove the sentence: “Ideas are imagined though oral reading and interpretation and not through acting.” from the definition of the category.

Further information:
Definition of Interpret:
Merriam-Webster: 3. to represent by means of art: bring to realization by performance or direction - interprets a role; Every actor interprets the role of Hamlet a little differently.

Dictionary.com: 4. to perform or render (a song, role in a play, etc.) according to one's own understanding or sensitivity: The actor interpreted Lear as a weak, pitiful old man.

Jim Disrude of UW-Whitewater Forensics described the difference between acting and interpretation as follows. Acting is theatrical, using a stage, costumes, props, lighting, and different people playing each different character. Oral interp uses none of that and one person can play multiple characters and voices.