A. Interpretation – In the AC, aff must unconditionally defend implementation of a rehabilitative policy. He doesn’t need a plan to meet the interp. He just needs a stable government action that I can link disads to.

B. Violation – aff refuses to specify a real-world policy or general clash of policies.

Spirit of the law is what matters. Don’t let the aff exploit loopholes in interp wording. It doesn’t matter if he technically meets the text as long as he violates the clear intention of the interp because that’s where the abuse comes from.

C. Standards

1. **Textuality** – textuality is a prima facie voter for the neg. It doesn’t matter how fair the aff is; if the case doesn’t affirm the topic, then he hasn’t met the aff burden. Also, textuality link turns other theory standards because it is the basis for claims to predictability and ground. Aff isn’t textual, two reasons:

**Little a.** He violates the word “in.” “In” as a preposition requires an action.

**Oxford Dictionary 09** writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

Definition of **in [means]** *preposition* expressing the situation of something that is or appears to be enclosed or surrounded by something else: *I’m living in London dressed in their Sunday best she saw the bus in the rear-view mirror*

**expressing motion with the result that something ends up within** or surrounded by **something else**: *don’t put coal in the bath he got in his car and drove off*

**Little b**. He violates the word “Resolved.” “Resolved” requires the aff to enact a specific legal statute, not just an abstract philosophical ideal.

**Words and Phrases 64** writes[[2]](#footnote-2)

**Definition of** the word **“resolve,”** given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It **is** of **similar** force **to the word “enact,”** which is defined by Bouvier as **meaning “to establish by law”.**

**Little c.** He violates the word “ought.” “Ought” can only refer to action, even when used in the context of “ought to be.” **Prichard 12** writes[[3]](#footnote-3)

But this argument, if it is to restore the sense of obligation to act, must presuppose an intermediate link, viz., the further thesis that what is good ought to be. The necessity of this link is obvious. An "ought," if it is to be derived at all, can only be derived from another "ought." Moreover this link tacitly presupposes another, viz., that the apprehension that something good which is not an action ought to be involves just the feeling of imperativeness or obligation which is to be aroused by the thought of the action which will originate it. Otherwise the argument will not lead us to feel the obligation to produce it by the action. And, surely, both this link and its implication are false.[1](http://www.ditext.com/prichard/mistake.html#1) **The word "ought" refers to actions and to actions alone. The proper language is never** "So and so **ought to** be," but "I ought to do so and so." **Even if we** are sometimes moved to **say** that the world or **something** in it **is not what it ought to be, what we really mean is that** God or **some human** being **has not made something what he [or she] ought to have made it.** And it is merely stating another side of this fact to urge that **we can only feel the imperativeness** upon us **of something which is in our power; for** it is **actions and actions alone** which, directly at least, **are in our power.**

2. **Real-World Policy Making Education**

Aff forces us to debate about philosophy in the abstract instead of real world implementation concerns. That kills education. 90% of policymaking is deciding on implementation. **Elmore 80**[[4]](#footnote-4)

The emergence of implementation as a subject for policy analysis coincides closely with the discovery by **policy** analysts that **decisions are not self-executing.** Analysis of policy choices matter very little if the mechanism for implementing those choices is poorly understood in answering **the** question, "What **percentage of** the **work** of achieving a desired governmental action is **done when the preferred** analytic **alternative has been identified**?" Allison estimated that in the normal case, it **was about 10 percent, leaving the remaining 90 percent in the realm of implementation**.

D. Voter – Education comes first because it’s the end goal of debate and the only portable skill. Substance doesn’t matter unless there’s an educational benefit to discussing it. Dropping the argument doesn’t solve because it’s too late to restart from the AC and have an educational debate. Also, the ballot has to set good norms for future rounds because debaters care first and foremost about winning, meaning voting on theory is the only way to deter bad arguments.

Prefer competing interpretations because reasonability is arbitrary and requires judge intervention.

Real-world policy making education is the largest out-of-round impact. Public debates about US policy are key to national security. **Walt 91** writes[[5]](#footnote-5)

A recurring theme of this essay has been the twin dangers of separating the study of security affairs from the academic world or of shifting the focus of academic scholarship too far from real-world issues. The danger of war will be with us for some time to come, and states will continue to acquire military forces for a variety of purposes. Unless one believes that ignorance is preferable to expertise, the value of independent national security scholars should be apparent. Indeed, **history suggests that countries that suppress debate on national security** matters are more likely to **blunder into disaster, because misguided policies cannot be evaluated and stopped in time.** As in other areas of public policy, academic experts in security studies can help in several ways. In the short term, **academics are well placed to evaluate current programs, because they face less pressure to support official policy.** 41 The long-term effects of academic involvement may be even more significant: academic research can help states learn from past mistakes and can provide the theoretical innovations that produce better policy choices in the future. **Furthermore, their role in training the new generation academics of experts gives academics** an additional avenue of **influence.** Assuming they perform these tasks responsibly, **will have a[n]** positive albeit gradual-**impact on how states deal with** the problem of **war in the future.**

Philosophy focus is bad. It has no real world impact and trades off with topic-specific education. **Lawrence 12** writes[[6]](#footnote-6)

The most obvious benefit of embracing AEC is that we get to avoid the same deontology vs. utilitarianism vs. contractualism debate that populates almost every LD round. To some, this may seem like a disadvantage rather than a benefit, but consider the following. **First, the ethics debate has been going on for several hundred years and has not** come even close to **be[en]**ing **resolved. To think that** the **discussion** that happens **in a** 45 minute **debate has any educational value on an issue that is so** deep, nuanced, and **irresolvable is delusional. Any education**to be derived **from this issue is best accessed by** just **reading articles.**To call the dilapidated ethical discussions that currently occur in most LD rounds “good debate” is a giant misnomer. **Second, the ethics debate trades off** with a discussion of **the resolution. Since debaters have** a **limited** window of **opportunity to debate the topic, we should prefer topic-specific discussions** over generic ethics. Squads should not be able to run the same argument(s) for five years on the negative in LD instead of making new arguments on each resolution. What is more, if debate is supposed to educate its participants to become better-informed citizens and critical thinkers. An ivory tower discussion of meta-ethics has little practical value[.] for high school debaters moving forward into college and beyond.

And, **no Aff offense** on philosophical education. Even when the aff defends implementation, the framework isn’t ignored entirely. And, allowing for Neg offense under util is best for philosophical education. Under my interp, negs get to learn how to do util calc, which informs them about how the theory functions and what conclusions it can come to.

I control the terminal impact of philosophy education. Real-world application is the only way to make philosophy meaningful. **Edet 03**[[7]](#footnote-7)

**Too much class time is occupied with questions like** ‘’What did Hegel mean by …?’’ and ‘**’What was your** third **criticism of util**itarianism**?’’** While such an approach may have paedeutic value its relevance is nonetheless questionable. The students must be encouraged to develop independent thinking ability and form opinions of their own. Pedagogical techniques, including small group discussions, debates, films and ‘’clever’’ essay examination need to be employed to illustrate the difference between knowledge by acquaintance and knowledge by description. Also practical computer and information technology (IT) training needs to be made compulsory. The students may be asked to go on a compulsory period of attachment in a computer school and show evidence of successful completion of the training before resuming their philosophical studies.

The point made here is that **philosophy must be** ‘’problem focused’’ and attempt to be **“problem solving” in socially important problems** and establish its integrative function with other disciplines**.** By so doing philosophy will affirm its relevance, significance and value with the fresh insights and perspectives it reveals to these other disciplines. The philosopher’s skills and attitude which makes him far-sighted and extra perceptive will earn him recognition and respect. The non-philosophy major groomed in the inter-disciplinary approach and who has properly cultivated the critical skills and attitude of Philosophy will bring this to bear on his major disciplines and then ultimately come to the realization that habitually and persistently he must keep an open-mind and rethink the possibilities of his discipline, he might well come to accept as legitimate some new ways of relating to other disciplines –ways which would be consistent with and employ insights of the traditions of his major discipline but still would allow a more fruitful complementary existence. The philosophy major properly groomed in the interdisciplinary approach to studying philosophy and having adequately cultivated the necessary skills and attitude is pragmatic, dynamic, mobile and versatile. He it is who can “bake bread’’. It is to this calibre of trained philosophers that Ozumba states, ‘’can work any where’’ (Ozumba;2002:3). Ozumba’s work, *A Philosophy Handbook for Beginners: Value Application and Career Opportunities for Philosophers* is a ‘’must read’’ for Nigerian undergraduates of philosophy. Conclusion So far I have distinguished between ‘’Ivory tower’’ Philosophy and ‘’market place’’ Philosophy. **Ivory tower Philosophy** is academic Philosophy which **insists that Philosophy must** be done in the traditional professional manner with systematicity, analytic rigour, logical coherence, and technicality, mainly **address**ing **problems** and issues **in the classical traditions** of Philosophy**.** **“Market place” Philosophy**, on the other hand, though not discountenancing the need for rigorousness and systematicity, **maintains that academic Philosophy can** be done in the non-traditional manner and made to **address concrete existential problems** within our cultural circumstance **which encourages the** professional **philosopher to participate in public debate of issues of contemporary relevance.** I have also maintained that **“ivory tower” philosophy is the reason for** the **isolation**, alienation, marginalization **and perceived irrelevance of academic philosophy today.** I posit that professionalism in philosophy and its teaching should be reconceived and restructured. I propose that the interdisciplinary strategy for teaching philosophy should be promoted so as to establish the integrative function of philosophy and its integral connection with other disciplines and ultimately interdisciplinary integration. This approach, I maintain, should also stress the utilitarian aspects of the study of philosophy.

Roleplaying as a policy maker is key to create informed political advocates.

**SCHAAP 2005** writes[[8]](#footnote-8)

**Learning political theory is largely about acquiring a vocabulary** that enables one **to reflect** more **critically and precisely** about the terms on which human beings (do and should) co-operate for and compete over public goods, symbolic and material. As such, political theory is necessarily abstract and general. But, **competency in political theory requires an ability to move from the general to the particular and back again**, not simply by applying general principles to particular events and experiences but **by reflecting on and rearticulating concepts in the light of the particular. Role play is an effective technique for teaching political theory because it requires that students employ political concepts in a particular context so that learning takes place as students try out new vocabularies** together with their peers and a lifelong learner in the subject: their teacher.
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