**1nc Accessible Formatting Version**

**\*T A] Interpretation: Debaters must disclose their case  in an accessible format  before their debate round.**

**\*T B] Violation: While they did disclose the aff he told me to look on the wiki which is cut in inaccessible manner**

**Their document is difficult for visually impaired people to access. They only disclose a copy of their documents with “cut” cards where they read the parts of evidence they have highlighted. This is inaccessible for two reasons.**

**\*T 1] Their formatting is inaccessible for people like me , with ADD or ADHD,like myself,  because the parts of evidence that are not being read distract them from the parts being read.**

**\*T 2] digital magnification limits the amount of on screen text and requires copious amounts of horizontal and vertical scrolling. It becomes difficult to track position when not reading some text and simultaneously looking for the next highlighted section.**

**\*T 3] screen reader users read documents audibly, but there is no way to read only the tags and highlighted parts due to their formatting.**

**\*T C] Standard: Accessibility**

**\*T The violation clearly lays out why the interpretation is key to accessibility.**

**\*T Look at my in round or disclosed documents for an example of accessible formatting. They can’t complain about not knowing how to format their positions because there are examples and I literally have an explanatory how to posted on my wiki.**

**\*T To clarify they should have sent their speech doc with  a version of the document with ‘cut’ cards and a version formatted as demonstrated below and on my wiki. By sending both styles of formatting it allows for better access while being able to check for evidence ethics violations if needed.**

**And, simply disclosing the document absent accessible formatting beforehand isn’t enough, if opponents want engagement they must take steps to make their arguments accessible. Dolmage 17**

to actually engage with ideas (and to have them engaged with rather than simply recording them the work needs to be made accessible We have not yet taken the responsibility of making texts] easily readable this is also true of digital texts making it free is barely half the battle To have an accessible dissemination of research the reading of texts needs to be considered in terms of accessibility—this expands the author’s responsibility the fact that there is little proactive action about a problem disenfranchising a huge segment of the world population speaks to how little most people think about accessibility believing instead that open and free is all that matters

**And the interpretation is key, changing formatting on a per round basis places the burden of access on the disabled and treats disability reactively rather then proactively. 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 And, Accessibility is key to fairness and education because debate is never fair or educational for those who can’t access the round.**

**\*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.**

**D. Voters:**

**Fairness is a voter it’s a gateway issue unfair rounds skew the judge’s ability to evaluate substance.**

**Education is a voter it’s the benefit and reason debate is funded**

**Drop the Debater.**

**1] Debaters pay attention to who and what is and isn’t winning so voting for the shell helps set a norm**

**2] to deter future violations**

**3] Drop the Argument is the same because we indict the entirety of the AC**

**No RVI’s:**

**1. RVIs lead to baiting theory**

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

**3. they shouldn’t win just for being accessible**

**Competing Interpretations:**

**1] reasonability leads to a race to the bottom**

**2] We shouldn’t settle for making debate “reasonably” accessible, make them prove why their interpretation is more accessible.**

**3] Reasonability collapses since we just debate about brightlines**

**4] Reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention**

**Aff can’t leverage case-**

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

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

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

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

**Case**

**1NC Typical Formatting**

**\*T A] Interpretation: If asked for ahead of time, or on the wiki, debates must put their speech doc of the 1nc in accessible formatting in conjunction with the typical formatting.**

**\*T B] Violation:  While they did disclose the aff he told me to look on the wiki which is cut in an inaccessible manner**

Graphical user interface, text, application, email, Teams

Description automatically generated

**Their document is difficult for visually impaired people to access. They only disclose a copy of their documents with “cut” cards where they read the parts of evidence they have highlighted. This is inaccessible for two reasons.**

**\*T 1] Their formatting is inaccessible for people like me , with ADD or ADHD,like myself,  because the parts of evidence that are not being read distract them from the parts being read.**

**\*T 2] digital magnification limits the amount of on screen text and requires copious amounts of horizontal and vertical scrolling. It becomes difficult to track position when not reading some text and simultaneously looking for the next highlighted section.**

**\*T 3] screen reader users read documents audibly, but there is no way to read only the tags and highlighted parts due to their formatting.**

**\*T C] Standard: Accessibility**

**\*T The violation clearly lays out why the interpretation is key to accessibility.**

**\*T Look at my in round or disclosed documents for an example of accessible formatting. They can’t complain about not knowing how to format their positions because there are examples and I literally have an explanatory how to posted on my wiki.**

**\*T To clarify they should have sent their speech doc both a version of the document with ‘cut’ cards and a version formatted as demonstrated below and on my wiki. By sending both styles of formatting it allows for better access while being able to check for evidence ethics violations if needed.**

**\*T And, simply disclosing the document absent accessible formatting beforehand isn’t enough, if opponents want engagement they must take steps to make their arguments accessible. \*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**

In this same spirit, then, the book will be offered in an open access format. The book will be entirely free and offered in easily accessible digital format. The cost of academic publishing is a huge barrier that creates steep steps and ornate gates; insiders and outsiders. Further, print formats are difficult to access for many readers with disabilities. Making the book available for free in a digital format matters, and publishing the book in any other format would invalidate so many of its arguments. The (now canonical) Bethesda Statement on the issue suggests that open access means anyone can access research on the public internet, for free, and “copy, use, distribute, transmit and display the work publicly and to make and distribute derivative works, in any digital medium for any responsible purpose, subject to proper attribution of authorship” (Suber et al., n.p.). Open access also centers the philosophy of the human “right to know” and “right to be known” (Willinsky, 7). That is, open access is a way of formatting and copyrighting scholarship, but it is also a philosophy: that information should be free and that if one hopes **to actually engage with ideas (and to have them engaged with** by others), **rather than simply recording them** on paper, **the work needs to be made accessible**. That said, as Elizabeth Brewer, Melanie Yergeau, and Cynthia Selfe argue, “**We have not**, as **yet**, **taken** on **the** professional **responsibility of making** sure that all . . . [**texts]** are **easily readable**. . . . **this is also true**, of course, **of** many **digital texts**” (151). The truth is that in the push for open access, too much of the accessibility that comes along with it is just by chance and not by design—**making it free is** already halfthe battle, but it is also **barely half the battle**. So, in this spirit, this book will be offered in an open access and accessible format. **To have an accessible dissemination** or movement **of research**, **the** reception and **reading of texts needs to be considered in terms of accessibility—this expands the author’s responsibility**. But the means of distribution and reproduction also need to be reconsidered in terms of accessibility. You’re printing a book? How much does it cost and how easy is it to read, for all possible readers? How freely do our ideas really move, and how difficult is it for some to access them and use them? Which bodies can take up texts and move (with) them? How does research get to those who have been excluded from the academy? If we understand rhetoric as the circulation of power and discourse through the body, then we need to ask how some of the “products” of academia do and do not move or circulate through a wide range of possible bodies.9 How could this conversation move through the widest range of possible bodies? Lessons about inclusion and exclusion extend from the physical spaces of the university, to its virtual spaces and movements. When we think about access, we also need to understand that most of the scholarly conversation in academia is not at all accessible. Further, most of the web is not at all accessible. Just as one means of illustrating this, in 2007, Thompson et al., using fairly robust criteria, tested a huge sample of government and education websites from hundreds of countries, internationally, to try and assess their accessibility. In the United States, only 45 percent of these pages even used text equivalents to describe visual elements and images, only 50 percent followed HTML standards, and only 24 percent “passed” basic navigational criteria.10 The research is a bit old now—but **the fact that there is** very **little** knowledge or **proactive action about** what is **a** huge **problem**, **disenfranchising** such **a huge segment of the world population**, **speaks to how little most people** ever **think about accessibility**, **believing instead that** the web is generally **open and free** and that **is all that matters**. As just one example of this accessibility, the images in this book will be fully and carefully described and given alt text in their digital format. Too often, books and articles skip adding in these additional descriptions, making the images, charts, graphs, and figures that may be central to their argument inaccessible to many members of their audience. In fact, in this book, sometimes all I will offer is a thick visual description of an image, as a means of highlighting the rhetorical and translational value of doing this describing

**\*T And the interpretation is key, changing formatting on a per round basis places the burden of access on the disabled and treats disability reactively rather then proactively. \*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 2 \*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 alive and working to physically filter students out of the university **every** single **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**. Likewise, teachers apologize for ableism and refusals to accommodate by saying things like “I need to impose standards” or “I am preparing students for future classes” or even “I would be doing them a disservice if I didn’t prepare them for what will come.” But **if stakeholders refuse to interrogate how these standards privilege particular bodies** and minds**, they help ableism disguise itself;** they disguise it to themselves and to their students.

**\*T And, Accessibility is key to fairness and education because debate is never fair or educational for those who can’t access the round.**

**\*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.**

**D. Voters:**

**Fairness is a voter it’s a gateway issue unfair rounds skew the judge’s ability to evaluate substance.**

**Education is a voter it’s the benefit and reason debate is funded**

**Drop the Debater.**

**1] Debaters pay attention to who and what is and isn’t winning so voting for the shell helps set a norm**

**2] to deter future violations**

**3] Drop the Argument is the same because we indict the entirety of the AC**

**No RVI’s:**

**1. RVIs lead to baiting theory**

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

**3. they shouldn’t win just for being accessible**

**Competing Interpretations:**

**1] reasonability leads to a race to the bottom**

**2] We shouldn’t settle for making debate “reasonably” accessible, make them prove why their interpretation is more accessible.**

**3] Reasonability collapses since we just debate about brightlines**

**4] Reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention**

**Aff can’t leverage case-**

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

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

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

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