**Interpretation: Debaters may not break new affirmatives without first disclosing them on the NDCA 2020-2021 wiki at least 30 minutes before the round**

**\*T 1. Accessibility:**

1. **Many debaters like myself have trouble flowing cases in general so the very nature of my disability. My EFD can make it hard to pay attention to speech and my dyslexia can make it hard to read text and makes it hard to understand you. The simple solution is to open sources which allows me to flow ahead of time.**
2. **My executive function disorder makes it hard for me to organize my files. During the round it’s harder for me to find my blocks. This is key to accessibility as without it I can’t read any off case positions.**
3. **Disclosing the aff allows me to put the case to put my carded responses to the aff case in accessible formatting. Key to accessibility as it allows me to actually read cards.**
4. **Endorse crip time. Different people at work at different speeds. Because of my EFD I tend to process things slower. Open sources gives me more time to process the 1ac.  This means that even if they win it’s net good for all debaters to not open source  you should still vote them own**
5. **Disclosing the aff beforehands allows for changes in the 1ac to avoid things that might trigger someone and also allow for other accommodations. Also means you don’t grant them reasonability for any other shells.**
6. **Disclosure reduces the chance grammar mishappening  for**
   1. **Allows for 2 people to check grammar of the 1 ac**
   2. **The 1nc is less likely to make spelling because they’re less likely to be rushed on the doc**

**And is key to accessibility, grammar is an example of obsession someone with ocd might have Baron 12**

(Dennis Baron, Professor of English and Linguistics at the University of Illinois., 8-18-2012, "Grammar Sticklers May Have Ocd," Oupblog, <https://blog.oup.com/2012/08/grammar-sticklers-may-have-ocd/>)

It used to be we thought that **people** who went around **correcting other people’s grammar** were just plain annoying. Now there’s evidence they **are actually** ill, suffering **(have)** from **a type of** obsessive-compulsive disorder/oppositional defiant disorder (**OCD**/ODD). Researchers are **call**ing**(ed)** it **Grammatical Pedantry Syndrom**e, or GPS.

Maybe you’ve heard of the **grammar gene** — its technical name is the FOXP2 gene — which may be responsible for a variety of grammatical ills, such as the inability to construct compound/complex sentences or to effectively deploy the passive voice. Now there’s evidence that a variant of that gene, FOXP2.1, **may actually cause us to obsessively correct other people’s grammar,** or should that be, to correct their grammar obsessively? The discovery of this gene, alongside new evidence from fMRI scans of brains exposed to real-time grammatical errors, has led some scientists to predict that soon we may be able to find a cure for GPS, for many sufferers a debilitating, off-putting, sociopathic syndrome

**And not accommodating for the obsession can make it impossible to focus which makes it key to accessibility ADAA 10**

(Adaa, international nonprofit organization dedicated to the prevention, treatment, and cure of anxiety, depression, OCD, PTSD, and co-occurring disorders, 2010, "OCD at School,"Adaa,

<https://adaa.org/understanding-anxiety/obsessive-compulsive-disorder/ocd-at-school>)

Even very **bright and motivated** **students** can struggle with OCD. Although students **with OCD** typically have average to above-average intelligence levels, they **may be unable to learn the same way others do because their focus is frequently on their obsessions or compulsions**. Depending on the severity of the symptoms, some students find it difficult to learn and, for some, it’s almost impossible to concentrate on and complete schoolwork.

**Although they want to pay attention**, participate in discussions or presentations, study, and complete homework, **they feel compelled to respond to their obsessions** or urges.

1. **Disclosure creates a predictable environment for those who are neurodivergent. To clarify  I don’t have autism but this is about norm setting.**

**Sinha et al. 14 - (Sinha, Pawan et al. Department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, 02139;   “Autism as a disorder of prediction.” Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America vol. 111,42 (2014): 15220-5. doi:10.1073/pnas.1416797111 – ED accessed 7/10/19** [**https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4210351/**](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4210351/) **)**

**Insistence on sameness (IoS) is a hallmark feature of autism. It is estimated that more than one-third of all individuals on the autism spectrum display some form of IoS (14). This trait** may **include** repetitive thoughts and actions, behavioral rigidity, **a reliance on routines, resistance to change, and obsessive adherence to rituals**. Underscoring the significance of IoS as an attribute of the autism phenotype, the DSM-5 (15) incorporates IoS into its diagnostic criteria for the condition. We can draw a compelling link between predictive impairments and insistence on rituals. Past research with diverse populations has shown that environmental unpredictability is strongly correlated with anxiety (16–20). **Predictability is a** fundamental **modulator of anxiety** in that reduction in the ability to predict events, even without any associated aversive consequence, enhances anxious responses (21, 22). **Anxiety, especially when it is elevated chronically, is known to give rise to ritualistic behavior. These behaviors may be** as benign as leg-swinging in school children who are working on a stressful math examination (23) or **alarming stereotypies that may cause self-injury** (24). Studies with neurologically healthy humans and animals reveal that the ritualistic behaviors that emerge under conditions of unpredictability serve as a calming response to an externally imposed stressor (25, 26). Taken together, these results suggest that rituals and an insistence on sameness may be a consequence of, and a way to mitigate, anxiety arising out of unpredictability.

**\*T Accessibility is key to fairness and education without accessibility debates not fair or educational for those who are excluded.**

**\*T And, Accessibility is an independent voter because if debate wasn’t accessible no one would join meaning access is a pre requisite to debate existing.**

**\*T And the interpretation is key, disclosing on a per round basis places the burden of access on the disabled. \*A Kroeger 10 \*C**

**(Sue, Associate Professor of Practice in the Dept. of Disability and Psychoeducational Studies at the University of Arizona “The Social Justice Perspective”, Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability:  Special Issue: Disability Studies, Volume 23, Number 1, 2010)**

Because **we** typically and mostly without thinking, **frame disability as** abnormal, **negative**, **and an individual problem**, then it follows that **our response** toit wouldbe **reactive rather than proactive.** In other words, we accommodate disability. While this is an improvement over institutionalization, sterilization, and euthanasia, accommodationsas a comprehensive response **maintains the notion that access is a disabled individual’s problem to solve.** On most college and university campuses, **disabled students spend an inordinate amount of time** establishing eligibility and **requesting accommodations**. Additionally, they are asked to perform a number of tasks to both schedule and receive accommodations. Oftentimes the rationale for this is self-determination and/or self- advocacy. While it is important for all students to learn to be responsible and assertive, identify issues, solve problems, and make decisions**, why should disabled students be required to take responsibility for** those **access issues that are institutional problems?** Why should the academic experience for disabled students be so different from their nondisabled peers?

**\*T And, this shell is a game over issue. Don’t let them stand up in the next speech and apologize for not knowing they were being ableist. This is a strategy used to distance themselves from the ableism they committed and exonerates them from responsibility. Individuals must actively resist ableism otherwise they are complicit in disguising it. \*A Dolmage 17 \*C**

**Jay Timothy Dolmage (Professor | Associate Chair, Undergraduate Communication Outcome Initiative (UCOI) .PhD, Miami University of Ohio MA, WindsorBA, British Columbia) Academic Ableism Disability and Higher Education 2017** [**https://quod.lib.umich.edu/u/ump/mpub9708722**](https://quod.lib.umich.edu/u/ump/mpub9708722) **Brackets are Original**

To end this introduction, I want to directly address a response that the book might well receive from many readers: for some reading right now, it may seem as though of course higher education is ableist. This could come in the form of a conscious response, or an unconscious feeling. Of course higher education is ableist. In response, I want to argue that academic ableism faces specific forces of disguise and submersion. Because the sentiment that of course higher education is ableist is rarely coupled with a concern about this state of our institutions, and it is the job of this book to show how this ableism is a problem, and what can be done. But within academia, this feeling that there can be nothing done about the ableism of education, and that perhaps it is not even a problem,needs to be interrogated. What I would call “**ableist apologia” describes a** genre or **category of statements and sentiments that distance the speaker from responsibility** for the selective, stratifying forces within higher education, selecting and stratifying functions that depend upon ableism and disablism to make sure that privilege is portioned out only along traditional lines: to ensure that students who move, think, or express themselves outside ofa narrow set ofnorms will notthrive orsurvive in college. Apologia is a specific genre and has been understood by rhetoricians—as far back as Aristotle and likely much earlier than that—as speeches given in defense. **Apologia** **are** also, notably, connected to statements of regret. This description of an “affect” or emotion for apologia is particularly appropriate, as ableist apologies are often **tinged with** a sense of regret or **fatigue**, with **the feeling that the apologizer is throwing their hands up in the air and saying: there’s nothing I can do**. Or **a feeling** that this is the last thing the apologizer is willing to do—**that they are asked to do so much, that they do so much, and now they are** also **being asked to do more, to be more diligent**. **Other times, the apology comes simply in the form of**: I didn’t know. **I’m sorry, I didn’t know I was being ableist**; I didn’t know that was ableist. This claimof not-knowingisalso, in a way, a claim that the ableism isn’t really happening, isn’t the case. **This claim of not-knowing is** also **a claim to being a good person**: **separating** the action or **the implication from the individual**. Because ableist apologia, as well, are rarely personal apologies—they are apologies for a state of affairs, not claims of individual responsibility. Too often, then, the emotion is not necessarily sincere and the apology is not exactly an apology at all. Often, in the end, **the apologies defend the apologizer and attempt to explain away their actions or inactions**. **Ableist apologia happen when people say: yes, this building is inaccessible, but it’s an old building** (access Titchkosky, Question). Professors might say that a building is old **as though they don’t actively**, currently teach and have an office with their name on it in that building. That one inhabits and **use**s a building every day means **the building** is alive. If it is an inaccessible building, it is

**\*T 2 Cross apply sinha 14 and baron 12 for safety standards.**

**\*T safety is a voter because if debate wasn’t safe no one would join.**

**\*T 3. Evidence Ethics: open source disclosure is the only way to verify you haven’t miscut evidence. In round is too late because**

**\*T  1)  Because of my executive functioning disorder I can’t pay attention to 2 things at once**

**\*T 2) Causes lag opening a bunch of arguments**

**\*T 3) Cause disorganization as we have to have 5 tabs open**

**\*T key to education two reasons**

**\*T 1) it teaches good academic practices**

**\*T 2) otherwise debaters can spread misinformation.**

**\*T key to Fairness two reasons**

**\*T 1) If I’m unable to verify your evidence you can shift in later speeches making my job impossible**

**\*T 2) allows you to overleverage cards and apply them in abusive ways**

**\*T Evidence ethics are an independent reason to vote them down because it encourages cheating.**

**\*T 4. Depth of clash: open source disclosure allows for nuanced warrant level debate. 2 Justifications**

**\*T 1) when I have access to your highlighted evidence I am able to identify the warrants you will go for and formulate direct responses rather than guessing what you will go for**

**\*T 2) it incentivizes thoughtful card cutting and forces debaters to think through warrants otherwise they’ll lose rounds.**

**\*T Controls the internal link to critical thinking absent warrant level debate we would just be making claims.**

**\*T Thinking on your feet is non-unique that’s what the rebuttals are for.**

**\*T Key to fairness because the aff has infinite prep to frontline warrants so the neg needs to contest them more thoroughly initially.**

**\*T D. Voters:**

**\*T Fairness is a voter it’s a gateway issue unfair rounds skew the judge’s ability to evaluate substance.**

**\*T Education is a voter it’s the benefit and reason debate is funded**

**\*T Drop the debater:**

**\*T 1) to deter future abuse**

**\*T 2) the round is already skewed.**

**\*T 3) Drop the argument is the same as drop the debater we indict the entirety of the AC**

**\*T No RVI:**

**\*T 1. RVIs lead to baiting theory**

**\*T 2. RVIs discourage theory which is self-defeating because theory is a check against abuse**

**\*T 3. they shouldn’t win for being fair**

**\*T Competing Interps:**

**\*T 1. reasonability leads to a race to the bottom**

**\*T 2. reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention.**

**\*T 3. reasonability collapses since we just debate about bright lines**

**\*T Aff can’t leverage case-**

**\*T 1) Truth is determined through contestation which fairness controls the internal link to; means we can’t adjudicate the truth of your warrants.**

**\*T 2) Preserve the sanctity of theory form substance; 2 reasons**

**\*T A) key to maintain theory as recourse against abuse; its impossible to check since extinction probably outweighs fairness.**

**\*T B) Conflates the pre and post-fiat distinction; EG. donating to charity doesn’t mean you should win if util is true.**

**1NC Accessible Cards**

**Interpretation: Debaters may not break new affirmatives without first disclosing them on the**

**NDCA 2020-2021 wiki at least 30 minutes before the round**

**\*T 1. Accessibility:**

1. **Many debaters like myself have trouble flowing cases in general so the very nature of my disability. My EFD can make it hard to pay attention to speech and my dyslexia can make it hard to read text and makes it hard to understand you. The simple solution is to open sources which allows me to flow ahead of time.**
2. **My executive function disorder makes it hard for me to organize my files. During the round it’s harder for me to find my blocks. This is key to accessibility as without it I can’t read any off case positions.**
3. **Disclosing the aff allows me to put the case to put my carded responses to the aff case in accessible formatting. Key to accessibility as it allows me to actually read cards.**
4. **Endorse crip time. Different people at work at different speeds. Because of my EFD I tend to process things slower. Open sources gives me more time to process the 1ac.**
5. **Disclosing the aff beforehands allows for changes in the 1ac to avoid things that might trigger someone and also allow for other accommodations. Also means you don’t grant them reasonability for any other shells.**

1. **Disclosure reduces the chance grammar mishappening  for**
   1. **Allows for 2 people to check grammar of the 1 ac**
   2. **The 1nc is less likely to make spelling because they’re less likely to be rushed on the doc**

**And is key to accessibility, grammar is an example of obsession someone with ocd might have Baron 12**

**people** **correcting other people’s grammar actually**  **(have)** **a type of**  **OCD** **call(ed)**  **Grammatical Pedantry Syndrom**e

**grammar gene** **may actually cause us to obsessively correct other people’s grammar,**

**And not accommodating for the obsession can make it impossible to focus which makes it key to accessibility ADAA 10**

**bright and motivated** **students** **with OCD may be unable to learn the same way others do because their focus is frequently on their obsessions or compulsions**.

**Although they want to pay attention**, **they feel compelled to respond to their obsessions**

1. **Disclosure creates a predictable environment for those who are neurodivergent. To clarify  I don’t have autism but this is about norm setting.**

**Sinha et al. 14 -**

**Insistence on sameness  is a feature of autism.  This trait include a reliance on routines, Predictability is a modulator of anxiety** **Anxiety,  is known to give rise to ritualistic behavior. These behaviors may be**  **alarming stereotypies that may cause self-injury**   rituals may be a consequence of unpredictability.

**\*T Accessibility is key to fairness and education without accessibility debates not fair or educational for those who are excluded.**

**\*T And, Accessibility is an independent voter because if debate wasn’t accessible no one would join meaning access is a pre requisite to debate existing.**

**And the interpretation is key, disclosing on a per round basis places the burden of access on the disabled. Kroeger 10**

we frame disability as negative and an individual problem our response reactive rather than proactive. maintains the notion that access is a disabled individual’s problem to solve. disabled students spend an inordinate amount of time requesting accommodations , why should disabled students be required to take responsibility for access issues that are institutional problems?

**And, this shell is a game over issue. Don’t let them stand up in the next speech and apologize for not knowing they were being ableist. This is a strategy used to distance themselves from the ableism they committed and exonerates them from responsibility. Individuals must actively resist ableism otherwise they are complicit in disguising it. Dolmage 2**

ableist apologia” describes a category of statements and sentiments that distance the speaker from responsibility Apologia are tinged with fatigue the feeling that the apologizer is throwing their hands up in the air and saying: there’s nothing I can do a feeling that they are asked to do so much, that they do so much, and now they are being asked to do more, to be more diligent Other times, the apology comes simply in the form of I’m sorry, I didn’t know I was being ableist This claim of not-knowing is a claim to being a good person separating the implication from the individual the apologies defend the apologizer and attempt to explain away their actions or inactions Ableist apologia happen when people say: yes, this building is inaccessible, but it’s an old building as though they don’t actively use the building every day It’s not solely an old building, it’s a living thing doing ableist work, and actively ignoring this allows it to do that work incredibly efficiently if stakeholders refuse to interrogate how these standards privilege particular bodies , they help ableism disguise itself;

**\*T 2 Cross apply sinha 14 for safety standards.**

**\*T safety is a voter because if debate wasn’t safe no one would join.**

**\*T 3. Evidence Ethics: open source disclosure is the only way to verify you haven’t miscut evidence. In round is too late because**

**\*T  1)  Because of my executive functioning disorder I can’t pay attention to 2 things at once**

**\*T 2) Causes lag opening a bunch of arguments**

**\*T 3) Cause disorganization as we have to have 5 tabs open**

**\*T key to education two reasons**

**\*T 1) it teaches good academic practices**

**\*T 2) otherwise debaters can spread misinformation.**

**\*T key to Fairness two reasons**

**\*T 1) If I’m unable to verify your evidence you can shift in later speeches making my job impossible**

**\*T 2) allows you to overleverage cards and apply them in abusive ways**

**\*T Evidence ethics are an independent reason to vote them down because it encourages cheating.**

**\*T 4. Depth of clash: open source disclosure allows for nuanced warrant level debate. 2 Justifications**

**\*T 1) when I have access to your highlighted evidence I am able to identify the warrants you will go for and formulate direct responses rather than guessing what you will go for**

**\*T 2) it incentivizes thoughtful card cutting and forces debaters to think through warrants otherwise they’ll lose rounds.**

**\*T Controls the internal link to critical thinking absent warrant level debate we would just be making claims.**

**\*T Thinking on your feet is non-unique that’s what the rebuttals are for.**

**\*T Key to fairness because the aff has infinite prep to frontline warrants so the neg needs to contest them more thoroughly initially.**

**\*T D. Voters:**

**\*T Fairness is a voter it’s a gateway issue unfair rounds skew the judge’s ability to evaluate substance.**

**\*T Education is a voter it’s the benefit and reason debate is funded**

**\*T Drop the debater:**

**\*T 1) to deter future abuse**

**\*T 2) the round is already skewed.**

**\*T 3) Drop the argument is the same as drop the debater we indict the entirety of the AC**

**\*T No RVI:**

**\*T 1. RVIs lead to baiting theory**

**\*T 2. RVIs discourage theory which is self-defeating because theory is a check against abuse**

**\*T 3. they shouldn’t win for being fair**

**\*T Competing Interps:**

**\*T 1. reasonability leads to a race to the bottom**

**\*T 2. reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention.**

**\*T 3. reasonability collapses since we just debate about bright lines**

**\*T Aff can’t leverage case-**

**\*T 1) Truth is determined through contestation which fairness controls the internal link to; means we can’t adjudicate the truth of your warrants.**

**\*T 2) Preserve the sanctity of theory form substance; 2 reasons**

**\*T A) key to maintain theory as recourse against abuse; its impossible to check since extinction probably outweighs fairness.**

**\*T B) Conflates the pre and post-fiat distinction; EG. donating to charity doesn’t mean you should win if util is true.**