# 1NC vs Mollow 1AC

## 1NC

### 1

#### Our interpretation is that the negative shouldn’t have the burden of rejoinder against affirmatives that don’t defend this month’s topic through a hypothetical policy implementation if they are disabled.

#### Violation:

#### Standards

#### [1] Fairness – their interp explodes limits and allows affs to monopolize the moral high ground. The lack of a stable mechanism lets them radically re-contextualize their aff and erase neg ground via perms. Disabled Fairness is good and prior – [A] Violating the fairness of disabled folk is worse since it uses their disabilities to your advantage [B] disabled folk will always be behind within systems of fluency which means our weighing claims are key to accommodation. Cutting negs to every possible aff wrecks small school debaters, which has a disparate impact on under-resourced and disabled debaters. Anything else lets you defend ableism bad for 6 means and disabled debaters have to say ableism good or else they loose leading to self hate and ressentiment – turns under your ROTB

#### They don’t get to weigh the aff – it’s just as likely that they’re winning it because we weren’t able to effectively prepare to defeat it.

#### [2] Switch Side Debate – read your stuff on the neg which non-uniques your offense and is net better since a Kritik on the neg has to be tailored to the aff– otherwise your discussion starts and ends at the 1AC.=

#### [3] Refinement – a well-defined resolution is critical to allow the neg to refute the aff in an in-depth fashion. This process of negation produces iterative testing and improvement. Only a resolution with ground on both sides allows for the most clash which controls the internal link to education. Committees outweigh because they discuss the best topic for a stasis point – even if some resolutions are bad it is net better for a group to create a topic rather than an individual. Discussion between two disabled debaters is uniquely good according to your aff since systems of fluency and the drive have excluded us so we need strategies we agree upon now which require iterative testing and clash

#### [3] Ableism –

#### [A] Autism DA – those with autism require rules and predictive topics to get a sense of routine that makes them feel safer – unpredictability leads to violence against them. [B] Anxiety – refusing to disclose the aff hurts those with severe anxiety who need predictable advocacies and need to know about the future to avoid triggering attacks

#### [4] TVA – read the aff on my wiki – the bray aff is a semiocap aff that uses disabled folk to turn capitalism against itself

#### Framing:

#### Disabled Frwk before the aff – A~~] Prior question. My theory argument calls into question the ability to run the argument in the first place. They can’t say the same even if they criticize theory because theory makes rules of the game not just normative statements about what debaters should say. B~~] Fair testing. Judge their arguments knowing I wasn’t given a fair shot to answer them. Prefer theory takes out K because they could answer my arguments, but I couldn’t answer theirs. Without testing their args, we don’t know if they’re valid, so you prefer fairness impacts on strength of link. Impact turns any critical education since a marketplace of ideas where we innovate, and test ideas presumes equal access.

#### Paradigm Issues:

#### Use competing interps – topicality is question of models of debate which they should have to proactively justify and we’ll win reasonability links to our offense.

#### Drop the debater because dropping the arg is severance which moots 7 minutes of 1nc offense

#### No rvis—it’s your burden to be fair and T—same reason you don’t win for answering inherency or putting defense on a disad.

#### They can’t weigh the case—lack of preround prep means their truth claims are untested which you should presume false—they’re also only winning case because we couldn’t engage with it

#### No impact turns—exclusions are inevitable because we only have 45 minutes so it’s best to draw those exclusions along reciprocal lines to ensure a role for the negative

### 2

#### **A. Interpretation: If the affirmative reads arguments related to ableist violence they must give a content warning before their speech. These conversations are empirically trauma inducing and warnings are a good idea. Carter 15,** [Angela Carter (Ph.D. Candidate in Feminist Studies, University of Minnesota), "Teaching with Trauma: Trigger Warnings, Feminism, and Disability Pedagogy," Disabilities Studies Quarterly, 2015] Similarly, in their original petition, Oberlin students suggested trigger warnings when "issues of privilege and oppression" arise in the classroom (AAUP). Such suggestions also conflate potential discomfort, or personal injury, with the disabling affects of trauma and being triggered. However, an opportunity arises when students make these conflations. As educators, rather than dismissing trigger warnings outright, we could engage students about how systems of oppression work and explain the difference between pedagogically productive discomfort and trigger-induced re-traumatization. As educators, we could use this conversation as an opportunity to discuss the use of trigger warnings before the Internet. Historically, trigger warnings, Andrea Smith reminds us, began as "a part of a complex of practices" within the anti-violence movement working to recognize "that we are not unaffected by the political and intellectual work that we do" and that "the labor of healing has to be shared by all" (Smith).

#### **B. Violation: They didn’t give a content warning.**

Graphical user interface, text, application, email

Description automatically generated

#### **C. Standard:**

#### **1. Access – Content warnings for those who suffer from trauma or anxiety are excluded from the conversation without content warnings. Carter 15,** [Angela Carter (Ph.D. Candidate in Feminist Studies, University of Minnesota), "Teaching with Trauma: Trigger Warnings, Feminism, and Disability Pedagogy," Disabilities Studies Quarterly, 2015] Given these findings, it is imperative that the debate on trigger warnings focus on the inherent questions of access. However, because of the misuse of "triggered" to reference anything that makes someone uncomfortable, disagreements about the classroom as a "safe space" often divert the conversation away from any real discussion of pedagogy and access in higher education. In his 2012 research, Mark Salzer found that students with mental illness were more likely to withdraw because of the impact of "perceived sigma and discrimination" than because of personal struggles with the symptoms or stresses related to their disability (Salzer 1). Because such students are "often viewed as disruptive, lacking academic skill, prone to violence" they are often socially isolated and left alone to question "how welcome they are on campus" (2). These findings suggest that simply providing information about mental illness and "chiding the audience to treat individuals with mental illness" by noting the available resources, is not an effective approach to decreasing the rate of withdraw for disabled students (6). The false conflations of access with "safety" allow accommodations to be dismissed, and only serve to further marginalize mentally disabled students by telling them they are in fact not welcome because their needs disrupt the processes of learning their peers deserve. In the most basic sense, accommodations are not about "safety," but about access to opportunity for a more livable life. When disability is denied because it is not understood or seen, or when access is denied because it is inconvenient or complicated, humanity is denied. While it is certainly possible to recognize trauma as a mental disability and still be hesitant toward trigger warnings as an accommodation practice,14 the content and tenor of that conversation would be far removed from the outright hostility and rejection that has reverberated most widely. When presented as an access measure, it becomes evident that trigger warnings do not provide a way to "opt out" of anything, nor do they offer protection from the realities of the world. Trigger warnings provide a way to "opt in" by lessening the power of the shock and the unexpectedness, and granting the traumatized individual agency to attend to the affect and effects of their trauma. Traumatized individuals know that trigger warnings will not save us. Such warnings simply allow us to do the work we need to do so that we can participate in the conversation or activity. They allow us to enter the conversation, just like automatic doors allow people who use wheelchairs to more easily enter a building.

#### Voters: Access is an independent voter – a) it’s a prior question to engaging in the space b) it’s a violation of the humanity of the opponent c) we are people before we’re debaters which makes it most intrinsic to the nature of the activity.

### Case Overview