

Parker Mitchell

Director of Debate and Forensics - Wichita High School East

Updated for: LFS (Fall 2022)

Emails - both please: park.ben.mitchell@gmail.com + pmitchell2@usd259.net

He/They/She are all fine.

Quick Version

Plz don't shake my hand

Yes email chain, no flash chain, whatever speechdrop - regardless, I will not "follow along" during speeches

Fairly equal on framework

Fairness is an impact but not the only impact

Competing interps are best

There is NOT "always a risk" although there often is one

I flow ex

Speed is good (except when accessibility/disability concerns)

Postround if you want

The best disclosure is open source + cites

OVERVIEW

Debate is a game, I'm open to almost** any of strategy that will help you win that game. My ballot will probably decide whether the proposition of the affirmative is better than the proposition of the negative.

I suspect most judges say they prefer robust clash over silly args running from it. That's cool (and valuable) but personally I also love the tricky side of debate. Find a way to get your opponent out of their comfort zone and into yours. Find an edge and exploit it. Strategy has always interested me more than refutation (opening gambits are my favorite in chess). I also love the esoteric and weird corners of debate (this is non-ideological or era biased - inclusive of weird policy, k and trad strategies). If you're happy in these places, I will also be happy.

****exceptions:** blatant/unapologetic racism, sexism, transphobia, homophobia, ableism. I have only used this exception once, I have not been close to using it again. This means unabashed behavior in this area, I have voted against arguments that were characterized as problematic for one of these reasons (plenty of times) but only once have I seen the need to stop flowing a debate (and I would have stopped the debate too, were I not on a panel).

TOPIC SPECIFIC NOTES

more willing than your avg judge to consider russia good args - i consider these equally value neutral as us/nato heg good at the start of each debate. in this vein - posturing on (x) murderous superpower evil while defending (y) murderous superpower is silly. if you want to throw down in a massive util debate about who our overlord should be, i'm all for it but no one is scoring "good person" points.

You're gonna have to do some more work on "mearshimer bad" than you are now. He is, but not for the reason you think.

As always, I'm good for the negative on T for this topic. I have never seen a topic "too small."

Does anyone know what a nato key warrant is?

Most affs on this topic are content to do essentially nothing. You will eventually get caught on this, so don't get too comfortable.

EXPERIENCE

11 years of experience in debate. Head Coach/Debate Teacher at Wichita East (2021-). Formerly: 4 years of debate for Shawnee Mission East (2010-2015), 5 years for the University of Missouri-Kansas City (2015-2020). 6 years assisting at Shawnee Mission East (2015-2021). I have worked intermittently with DEBATE-Kansas City (DKC), Asian Debate League (ADL, 2019-2021), Truman (MO, 2020) and Turner (KS, 2019). 2 years leading labs at UMKC-SDI.

Topic Experience (HS)

21 competitive rounds

Topic Experience (College):

I don't anticipate judging college debate this year. If I do, I will be very behind on any topic specifics.

SPECIFIC ARGS

T

Underrated. RVIs are bad, but I'm open to impact turns from K affs.**** Both sides should have an interp. I (almost always) evaluate under competing interpretations. I (almost never) consider precision

separately from limits and ground debates, it strikes me as an impact or internal link framing argument. On the aff -- just because you have a definition that makes you T, you don't necessarily have a good definition that makes you T. In fact, if it makes you T, it's probably a bad definition. If there's an argument I "hack" for, it's T.

****The fw/t distinction is silly and stopped meaning anything in about 2013. Regardless of if you call it "T-USFG" or "Framework" I will flow it as "T-Framework." I think this is an acceptable compromise, posturing about the distinction (either way) always reads as a bit silly to me. Framework teams - it's not "just T" or you wouldn't have to do this level of impact calc. K teams - it's a core generic you're ready for. Both - just debate it.

CPs

"Cheating" CPs are "fine", win theoretical justifications+substance and you will win, probably not going to reject the team unless the neg fails to forward a "reject the arg" claim. It was probably a mistake to give the negative fiat but i suppose we can live with it.

Statuses: I lean that Condo is good, dispo/uncondo is bad. Status theory is winnable, you need an interp and remember to ask. "(n-x)" and "wgwwd" interps are unpersuasive but I understand, gotta do what you gotta do... I'd rather you just defend infinite condo (or dispo) because those are far more logical standards.

DAs

DAs: I've sat against the negative in a couple close debates with DA/Case strategies. I have difficulty assigning "minute risk" on disads if significant defense is persuasive and/or conceded. Winning requires a clean 2nr or significant defense.

Ks

I start with the assumptions that the neg can critique both plan and non-plan parts of the aff and the aff can weigh itself, you ought to work out nuances or win a persuasive framework interp that changes this calculus. I think I have a pretty good, but not universal, grasp on most critical literature in debate. Structural Ks are common for a reason (strategic) and (although I have IRL issues with his theory) Baudrillard in debate is unfairly maligned. DnG-based Ks are winnable but test my personal patience. Cap (Marx) is a double edged sword as it was my favorite argument to debate but I also have a lot of opinions on it.

I don't know why most "Death Good" arguments are maligned as uniquely more messed up than many "big stick" policy arguments (First Strike, Drones Good etc). However, you should always be careful with any of these arguments. As an educator working with high school age students I do have a concern for safety and mental health. Ask yourself, is your argument about ethics, the spectacle of extinction/death, the value of life OR is it something that may raise concerns about your mental health like calling for self harm of any form? The first category is ok, the second is not. Similarly, reading drones good against someone whose family immigrated from an area that is affected by American imperial violence also raises ethical concerns about your argumentation. I like arguments that push and question boundaries in our activity, but you should still have an ethical framework in mind.

K Affs

They can be good. Framework can also be a good strategy against them. I find framework debates to be extremely interesting, although they make my hand hurt during the block. I usually take a lot of time deciding in both Framework debates and KvK debates because they tend to have a lot of nuance and/or moving parts. I'm often the first ballot in during a CP debate, I'm usually the last one in during a fw debate.

Presumption

Presumption: The aff should do something and have a reason for being, if they don't have both they'll probably lose on presumption. I've only voted on presumption a few times, only in debates where neither side had residual offense after 2AR/2NR, otherwise I'm usually comfortable assigning some risk to either side. If you feel presumption is going to be an issue in your debate, please say something about the way "presumption flips." I don't like having a "default," so you should tell me at any point during the debate the way to evaluate presumption. Three ways I know: Least Change, Always Neg (presumes judge kick), "Flips aff" with a CP. If neither side chooses one of these three, I'll evaluate all 3 to find the most cohesive and persuasive ballot.***** Please just have a debate about the way presumption flips as this will save time and effort.

*****the only time this came into play, all 3 ballots resolved the same way

STYLE PREFERENCE

Flowing

One sheet in the 1nc will remain that way. Each individual sheet will be straight down, overviews will not separate. Preferably don't give sub-orders before the speech ("I'm doing framework, interp first, then tva, limits da..." etc), they confuse me/are irrelevant because I am flowing straight down. I guess if you flow Ks on multiple sheets, but if that's the case, may God help you.

Speed/Clarity

Speed is generally good. Maintain clarity. I may "clear" you a few times. I should hear the full body of the card, I want to listen to every word, you shouldn't be able to get away with slurring during the body.

Masks increase the emphasis on clarity even more than online. You will need to increase your volume by almost double and slow down. Reading lips was one of the ways I made speed reading legible to my ears. To ensure speed and clarity, slow down at least 15%. I will not read off the docs to adjust for unclarity.

CX

I flow cross-x. It's binding. Open > Closed. Won't pay attention to "flex prep." I will be on my phone during prep to make it clear I am not listening. Try to ask all of your questions during CX because I can't hold the other side accountable during "flex prep."

Language

The use of racial/sexist/homophobic/transphobic slurs, in any way other than as used by individuals who are affected by those slurs, results in 0 speaks and a loss. Be mindful of problematic (non-slur) language. Mistakes happen, but so must sincere apologies.

Post-Round

you are welcome to "postround". Judge feedback made me better as a debater, I want student feedback so I'm a better educator. I'd prefer if you were kind about it, but I also know that makes me hypocritical... (to be clear, I don't *think* I'm a mean judge, but *maybe* postrounded too hard as a student)

Names

idc about names tbh but it is sometimes weird when people who I've never met before refer to me casually by name during a speech/cx etc. it's usually unnecessary and a little awkward. Only exception of note: if you have a different ballot framing for me than another judge. This is ok, albeit often inefficient. Otherwise, unless I've judged you a bunch, been your lab leader or something, it's probably weird.

ADMINISTRATION

Ethics

Ethics challenges stop the round immediately and require proof. If the accused party did violate a legitimate challenge they will receive the loss and 0 speaks, the reverse is true if the challenge is illegitimate. Clipping is definitively a violation. I will surrender to tournament regulations.

Disclosure

I will orally disclose provided the tournament allows it. Please disclose pre-debate (at a minimum). It's good.

- not sure where to put this rant but I do want it to be seen - the new wiki's download throttle intended to "resolve problems" means you should *never* just upload open source. Scouring through 20 different word documents is no longer acceptable when I'm just trying to figure out what your advantage says. This makes disclosure more difficult and repetition shows you are either lazy or maliciously trying to obfuscate your argument. This, especially when combined with shenanigans like mislabeling advantages or vague aff names, is borderline misdisclosure. I am open to theoretical objections on this front. (Notes on this: This does not mean you have to upload the same cite for every debate, just the debate you broke it in, but any changed versions should have wikify'd cites... AT: "Cites broke" - increasingly unpersuasive excuse. Even if you have to break wikify formatting, get something up there with tags and cites.)
- "It's on the wiki" is not disclosure. Mention it, but also say the advantages and what your aff does. You should know this information. Disclosure should be easy, not a chore.

Prep

Flashing is not prep. Don't steal it though.

Speaks

I (loosely tbh) [use CDR's points rubric](#), adjusting for estimated pool skill. I usually give out points between 28.2-29.5. Anything below that, there were likely quite a few problems given the division, anything above that is reserved for exceptional performances. I don't disclose speaks.

***** APPENDICES *****

Appendix 1-Online Debate

I have now judged a significant amount of online debate rounds. They mostly***** went well.

Clarity

I do not follow along with the doc. Sending your analytics will not help. It's difficult to unmute and say clear while flowing: if you're unclear I will simply not be able to flow you. This has impacted a couple 2ACs (I understand the life of a policy 2a is hard.) Be very careful about your transitions. Make note of the ability of your microphone and speed of your internet connection. (Of course, I will make an exception if you are disconnected or have extreme latency, in which case I will stop the debate).

Camera

I prefer, but do not require, your camera to be on. Watching you speak helps me with clarity and visuals for focus. This is simply a preference: if you calculate that your internet/sound setup will interfere more with clarity if your camera is on (or you have another overriding reason for your camera to be off), I have no objection to your decision.

My camera will be on during speeches, RFD and probably most of prep/dead time, excepting unique circumstances. Unless I have notified you otherwise, if my camera is off I am not ready and may be away from the keyboard (getting water, going to the bathroom etc.) Please, don't start if my camera is off or if you see an empty chair. I'm (usually) using a dual screen setup. It may sometimes look as if i'm looking past the camera or to the side. I am still paying attention.

Tech Issues

***** Tech issues - on your end: I'll consider tournament regulations. I will do everything I can allowed by tournament rules to ensure a debate takes place - I know you've worked hard, paid your entry fees and deserve to debate, however it is also unfair to the other team if I'm unable to make a decision in time because their opponent was unable to be present. I understand that these issues are not your fault so I will not be any more restrictive than the tournament requires and will always consult with tab before assessing a forfeit.

on my end: I have experienced tech issues in only a small percentage of rounds from my end. In those instances I have been able to recover my flow by either resetting speech time or on a panel the 1AR repeated the last 2 minutes.

Appendix 2-LD

Depending on your style, other sections of this paradigm may also be useful to you. Although I usually coach and judge policy (and most of my career was competing in policy), I do coach/judge and did compete in LD as well. Online preface, style preference, administration are all relevant and unchanged from policy paradigm. LARP and/or K debaters (to a lesser extent, prog/phil debaters): info in the specific args section will also be relevant to you.

Experience

I have some LD experience. I debated LD for a couple of years in KS and went to NSDA nationals. I coached LD intermittently after graduating and have come back to it this year - most of the teams I coach read trad or larp argumentation, on occasion delving into the phil and k worlds. The STYLE PREFERENCE and ADMINISTRATION sections above are relevant and unchanged from above. Depending on your approach, the SPECIFIC ARGUMENTS section may also pertain to you.

Trad

Traditional LD makes some sense to me, but it's still relatively unfamiliar compared to other styles. I'm still learning the V/VC structure. For years it simply read as impact framing args to me. I'm now understanding it a bit more, but I may still need a little support here. I'm more attracted to LARP/Phil and the wild west of progressive LD than traditional LD as these are more familiar to me. In these cases, I default to deciding whether the resolution is true or good unless presented with different ballot framing. Get creative: I find many LD topics are one sided and dull when played traditionally. Please road map and signpost - many trad debates become hard to follow without this.

LARP/K

Most familiar and easiest to evaluate for me. Speed, Ks, cps, plans are fine. See my thoughts in the policy section for specifics. I think aff util framework puts you at a huge disadvantage in the 1AR that seems just unnecessary, I think some trickier framework argumentation would be more strategic

Phil

Blends with high theory K stuff for me. I'm fairly familiar with Marx, Deleuze, Foucault, Whiteness theory, Fem, Set Col etc. I have some basic familiarity with Kant, Morton, Heidegger and Hobbes, but mostly in a Policy debate or IR Theory context. I feel competent with content but I don't judge these debates frequently. Proceed with some caution.

Theory/T

LD theory is intriguing but somewhat new to me. Probably more willing (but still reluctant) to evaluate RVIs here than in policy. Nebel T, to be honest, i'm not entirely sure who this Nebel person (?) is, but I'd be willing to consider it. I'd be an willing (but an uphill battle) to vote for hypotesting/wholeres theory in policy, so I'd imagine i'm open to this with some explanation.

Tricks/Prog

Honestly, down... With some caveats. I find this stuff fascinating and I always appreciate tricky technical debating in Policy. Biggest problem is flow time - blippy stuff may not have made it significantly on my flow and I will not check the speech doc. Make sure you have a clear setup for your trick or I won't notice it. I also don't judge this style a lot, so it's a little risky. Don't presume I've seen your trick executed before - make sure it's clearly explained and well executed. If the flow works out, you should be fine.

CX/Prep

This is true for all events but seems to be especially common in LD - I do not listen to or flow questions during prep time. I do during the 3 minute CX period. You are perfectly welcome to ask and answer questions on your prep, but I will not keep a record. In other words, your questions during prep will not help advance the debate in any way. Clarification questions might be helpful for you, but I will be unable to verify if they have honestly or accurately answered the questions. Use this time at your own risk.

Pref recommendations

(Personally, don't love these, but they appear to be a norm. These may not be totally accurate - make your own informed decisions)

1 - LARP/K/T

2/3 - Prog/Tricks/Theory

4 - Phil/Trad

Appendix 3-PFD

I get a bit lost in this "event." I will evaluate the debate technically using an offense defense paradigm unless persuaded otherwise. I will likely flow on one sheet. Your case should include offensive reasons to vote for your side, not just defense.

All debate events require clash or they are just oratory: That means whichever team goes second should explicitly answer the other team's case. The second round of speeches need to both extend arguments and answer opponents. Final speeches should include a brief overview with ballot instruction and also continue LBL work. Do not eschew clash for the sake of speaking pretty, that is a quick way to lose my ballot.

Appendix 4-Congress

Treat me as a complete novice/lay judge. Although I competed (with some success) in high school, it was on a circuit that did not take this event very seriously other than to farm NSDA points. I am extremely unfamiliar with this event and I'm very uncomfortable judging it. May god help us all if I have somehow been assigned parli (again). My best advice is keep it simple and straightforward, lighthearted and funny with a focus on persuasion. I like arguments about the text of the legislation and I like warranted analysis. Clash is a beautiful thing. Being a jerk rubs me the wrong way in this event more than others.

Appendix 5-Everything Else

Any Other Debate Event

I guess I evaluate BQD similar to a trad LD debate. Or something. Idk. Anything else: I have legitimately no idea what's going on. If I am judging in parli or "world schools", my life is in danger. Please notify my family.

Interp/Speech

No one will ever actually care about my interp paradigm but why not: I like creative blocking. An aggressive/physical blocking strategy in duo will always beat a good script. I appreciate subtle acting over outrageous acting. However, energy has its place (especially in HI). Find your moments.

Speech - I look for good organization and creativity. Intros - Quotes are terrible, anecdotes are better. Pacing matters.

NSDA/NCFL APPENDIX (From 2023)

****Fair warning for Trad teams (NSDA/NCFL):* I think there is a lot of value in traditional debate. If you go slow or talk about the stock issues, I have no problem engaging you. I would prefer you engage your opponent more offensively to increase chances of getting my ballot but don't fundamentally change how you debate for me.

However, if you devote a significant portion of your speech time to talking about how debate is dying because of these pesky kritiks and people talking fast ruining the educational value of debate I am uninterested, annoyed and likely offended on some level.

My students and I have personally benefitted significantly from policy debate that includes all of these things. There is an immense value to both traditional and "progressive" debate and these things can coexist. I am from the state of Kansas where you have to be good at both to succeed (and we have, in my opinion, the healthiest numbers in the country), so examples of debate flourishing in your state "because we're traditional" are completely unpersuasive.

Your speaks will be tanked and I will not vote on this level of the debate. I will still consider the remainder of the debate regardless, but you will have wasted your time. I want to emphasize, this does not apply to all critiques of spreading or fairness arguments against kritiks. An ableism critique or accessibility requests on this level are of course important, interesting and effective arguments. Fairness standards as a part of a framework argument against a kritik are also totally fine. There are plenty of ways to make logical and persuasive critiques of the way we function in debate without reading cards from the 1990s written by people who wanted to make debate great (white/male) again.

DISCLOSURE APPENDIX (From 2023)

Disclosure sidenote: In my opinion, you should disclose at a minimum cites of your 1AC and all INC off case/case offense on the wiki. The following practices are insufficient: listing emails, bare round reports or a billion unsorted open source docs. I had a section of this paradigm intended for TOC teams that I thought had embarrassing disclosure practices as they are disclosing open source but no cites. I still believe this is a bad practice, but I am removing my autovoter on it for NSDA/NCFL as I think there's bigger fish to fry at these tournaments (teams not disclosing at all).