

## A CATALOGUE OF INTERJECTORS' TECHNIQUES

In order to become aware that it is being led astray, the public should learn the techniques of professional interjectors. I do not mean by interjectors those persons who legitimately cross-examine a speaker; sometimes such a cross-examination results in frayed tempers but that is the sort of thing that has to be expected.

There are two main types of spurious interjection:

### THE INNOCUOUS TYPE

1. The Gadfly: Drops in on the speaker suddenly with an explosive question. Buzzes back when the subject has changed. Nuisance value only if he persists in irrelevant questions.
2. The Grandstander: Only appears when the speaker is under heavy bombardment from the audience. At other times does not show up to advantage; more to the point perhaps, 'At other times he does not show up – period'.
3. The Politician: Feels a compulsive urge every time he sees a crowd to get up and make a speech. Never allow him to get the bit in his teeth. Much harder to stop than to start. The remarks he makes usually have no connection with what the speaker has been talking about.

The innocuous interjector is, as the name implies, usually innocuous. This type has been mentioned here so that you will never make the error of confusing him with the insidious type which I shall now discuss more fully.

### THE INSIDIOUS TYPE

The name derives from the fact that this type can talk for hours without the audience being any the wiser on what fundamental attitudes his own position rests, or where he is leading their thoughts. He can shift ground to suit the predilections of the audience. This type has to be 'nailed' by the speaker so that the audience will be aware of the axe the interjector is grinding.

1. The Inquisitor: He proclaims that 'nothing can be known' and from this endeavours to reason that the speaker therefore knows nothing. Each statement from the speaker is greeted with: "What do you mean when you say...", "What exactly did you mean..." and so on ad infinitum. Never pursues his own proposition to the extent of realising that he himself must know nothing. Forgets about meanings, interested only in words. Tries to prove the speaker meaningless because the speaker perforce has to use words.
2. The Commando: Moves in swiftly, strikes hard, retreats. Has a tongue like a tommy-gun. Sprays his type of erudition in all directions. Can deny the speaker's facts simply on his own authority because (although a

sensation on his first appearance) there is very little likelihood he will return to be faced with the written evidence which rebuts his argument. Like the Inquisitor, tries to prove the speaker meaningless. Has a different method.

3. The Boatman: Subtlety itself. Looks one way but rows another. Circumvents the speaker's facts, not by abusing him but by praising him; this practised technique also helps convince the audience the interjector holds liberal views: if the speaker attempts to refute him or insists he stick to facts then that shows the speaker holds narrow views. Can indoctrinate an audience without their knowing it provided he can keep the issues, and his intentions, sufficiently confusing. Cross-interjections from other members of the audience help him immensely because a moving audience finds it hard to see the centre of the problem.

In order to prevent a recurrence of what happened on 2/9/1962 when a stranger from Sydney took the Brisbane 'bumpkins' for a ride in his little Red rented rowboat, the following action will be taken at my stand immediately an insidious type interjector appears:

1. supporters will ensure that sufficient area is clear for discussion
2. cross-interjectors will be requested to be quiet
3. having isolated the interjector, he will then be subjected to the type of examination which will reveal to the audience precisely what his technique is, what his intentions are, and the fundamental basis of his position which he is trying to keep concealed.