### 1NC 1 XTN (3:38)

#### 1NC #1: society is becoming increasingly open to people with disabilities. Private and public corporations are investing and implementing universal design for architecture, community, business services and products – related areas. Because UD is for EVERYone and not JUST people with disabilities, a growing majority of the country is welcoming the concept – that’s Rowland

#### UD now

Sullivan (their card) ’11 Kathryn Sullivan Franklin W. Olin College of Engineering, 5/2/2011 [“The Prevalence of the Medical Model of Disability in Society”, Olin College, http://digitalcommons.olin.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1017&context=ahs\_capstone\_2011&sei-redir=1&referer=http%3A%2F%2Fscholar.google.com%2Fscholar%3Fstart%3D20%26q%3D%2522medical%2Bmodel%2522%2BAND%2Btransportation%2BAND%2B%2522universal%2Bdesign%2522%2BOR%2BUD%26hl%3Den%26as\_sdt%3D0%2C30%26as\_ylo%3D2008#search=%22medical%20model%20transportation%20universal%20design%20OR%20UD%22]

Many designers are now beginning to acknowledge the social model of disability by recognizing that in designing, they have the power to create or eliminate disability. A badly designed interface might unnecessarily create a population of users who are “disabled” with respect to that system (Mankoff 4). This lends to the importance of designing inclusively, to avoid marginalizing atypical users. Universal design seeks to design all products, buildings and interiors to be used by all people to the greatest extent possible regardless of their physical abilities (Bailey). Some key principles of Universal Design include equitability and flexibility in use, as well as avoiding the stigmatization or segregation of any set of users (1997 NC State University, The Center for Universal Design). These principles “provide designers with the tools to effectively eliminate disabilities caused from barriers within the environment” (Bailey). Examples of features in line with universal design principles include closed captioning on televisions, and visual and audio display of information in subway cars. When the needs of different people are considered in design, this is a step towards the social model of disability and towards acceptance of people with disabilities.

### 1NC 2 + 3 XTN

#### Group 1NC #2 + #3: THEY CAN’T SOLVE their terminal impact – the Universal Design can’t change the discriminatory mindset and medical models of all individuals in the world because it only increases funding for a certain program, not for evolving the broader mind AND the process of the plan inhibits its ultimate solvency. Disabled people MUST be included in the decision-making process to ensure that they are treated as active participants. The way the plan utilizes the government and patronizingly asserts that the federal government is the ONLY capable entity that can improve the lives of people with disabilities ultimately ignores them as people who don’t have the capacity to make their own decisions – that’s World Bank.

### 1NC 5 XTN

#### 1NC #5: efforts to include people with disabilities are happening now as part of a UN poverty alleviation initiative. The 2010 Convention on the “Rights of Persons with Disabilities” has led to many initiatives to incorporate disabled persons and to improve their economic opportunities – that’s Groce

### 1NC 7 XTN

#### 1NC #7: trying to include people with disabilities more than the status quo is an attempt to reinforce domination. Inclusionary attempts are efforts to reaffirm a hegemonic empire to which the marginalized are added to wield even more power over them and to justify more biopolitical discipline and oppression – that’s Dhamoon

### 1NC 9 XTN

#### 1NC #9: the plan perpetuates more inequality – the notion of inclusion implies a social contract in which people are considered “equal” only if they produce profit and keep with the pace of the “ideal society.” – means the aff’s logic of inclusion will ultimately fail – that’s Gulli

### ☺ Util Debate ☺

#### They say our utilitarianism excludes people with disabilities but UTIL is the WAY in which YOU evaluate the round. There is no reason why YOUR utilitarian calculus can’t include the disabled. Clapton’s version of util is the worst form of util and the reasons that it’s bad is just a reason why you shouldn’t view util in that manner.

#### AND consequences must be evaluated in order to prevent callousness to life. Lives WILL be lost and ignoring this crucial point is horrible and renders us insensitive to the loss of life. “Who will allow more death and excuse themselves on the ground that they did not intend the death?” Their anti-consequentialism allows much worse structural violence by enabling people to “avoid dirtying their hands” at the price of “moral failure” – that’s Nielson

#### \*\*Must evaluate consequences

Issac 2 [Jeffrey, professor of political science at Indiana University, Dissent, Spring, ebsco]

As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one’s intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics—as opposed to religion—pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with “good” may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of “good” that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one’s goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

### ☺ Predictions ☺

#### Aff turns itself – it’s essentially a prediction about solving discrimination about people with disabilities. AND Menand turns himself – he was making a prediction about predictions – so you should weigh the prediction of aff solvency against the predictions of the disad impacts

#### AND resisting prediction obliterate the rational basis for decision making and strategic choices. We need to build strategies that meet future challenges and take into account risks because otherwise we will not be prepared to defend ourselves against problems – that’s Fitzsimmons

#### Rejecting predictions leads to policy paralysis

Sarewitz et. al., ‘03

(Danil Sarewitz, Roger Pielke and Mojdeh Keykhah, Ph.D. in Geological Sciences, Cornell University, Professor in the Environmental Studies Program, University of Colorado, Post-Doctoral Fellow, Global Environmental Assessment Project, Aug 2003, International Journal, Vol. 23, Issue 4)

All decisions include some informal assessment of probabilities. If one lives on a flood plain it would probably be foolish to devote enormous resources to protecting against asteroid impacts. Thus, vulnerability management is implicitly underlain by some sense of what is reasonable and what is not. We might term this sense "naïve expectation," in that it is not informed by sophisticated quantitative predictions about specific risks. Rather, it may be informed by history, by general scientific insight (e.g., floods occur on flood plains), by judgment acquired through personal experience, by personal priorities (e.g., "any risk to my child is too much risk"), or other means. So our point is not that vulnerability is divorced from probability, but that vulnerability management does not depend on precise predictive quantification of specific future events or classes of events. To illustrate the importance of this argument, consider the following: research on sources of vulnerability to extreme weather events(2) indicates that over the next 50 years, economic losses from socioeconomic and demographic changes (economic growth; population growth and migration) will be from 20 to 60 times greater than losses due to increased incidence of extreme weather (see Fig. 1). The three short bars at the bottom of the figure show three different calculations (named for their respective authors) used by Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in its Second Assessment Report for the increase in tropical cyclone-related damage in 2050 (relative to 2000) resulting from changes in the climate, independent of any changes in society. The four longer bars at the top of the figure show the sensitivity of tropical cyclone-related damage in 2050 (relative to 2000) resulting from changes in society based on four different IPCC population and wealth scenarios used in its Third Assessment Report, independent of any changes in climate. At the heart of the problem of vulnerability lies the tension between individual action and collective consequence. Coastal migrations and urbanization are among the most conspicuous demographic trends of modernizing societies. Individuals are moving from inland to coastal locations, and from rural settings to cities, in search of economic opportunity, or perhaps better scenery, or even cultural opportunity. By moving to the coast, one is adding to one's individual vulnerability to extreme events in an incrementally tiny way. Given the increased opportunity for economic gain, it might be irrational not to move. But the collective impact of millions of such moves is the substantial augmentation of collective vulnerability to a wide variety of hazards. This is evidenced most conspicuously by the explosive growth of developing-world megacities, and seen as well in loss data from coastal disasters in the United States.5 Real events illustrate these issues more poignantly. Hurricane Mitch, which caused about 10,000 Nicaraguan and Honduran fatalities in October–November 1998, was proclaimed by environmentalists as a harbinger of what the world would be like under conditions of global warming. The world, however, is already like this. More to the point, the event was not unprecedented in Central America, and the losses were more or less in line with what would have been expected from a more holistic vision of increased population and development vulnerabilities in the region. In July 2000, the flank of a giant garbage dump near Manila, Philippines, collapsed and killed over 200 people after becoming saturated from monsoon rains. The extreme event itself was unprecedented, which is to say that risk could not have been accurately quantified beforehand. Yet the fact that thousands of people made their living, and their homes, on this mountain of garbage could be interpreted as prima facie evidence of vulnerability to all manner of disaster, from epidemic disease to the debris flow that actually did occur. In spite of these well-documented cases, the focus in the climate change debate seeks ever more accurate quantification of unverifiable greenhouse risks through predictive science. As we have argued elsewhere, such an approach likely fosters gridlock and inaction; meanwhile, climate-related losses mount around the world.(