# T – Implementation

## 1NC Shell

#### interpretation: Oxford Dictionary defines ban:

http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american\_english/ban

Officially or legally prohibit:

#### So the aff must defend the implementation of a policy that bans private ownership of handguns. Official is equivalent to legal since the government is the only official authority in the US.

#### Violation:

#### Standards:

#### Precision –

#### top result on oxford dictionary which proves this is how words are actually defined.

#### the OED is constantly updated and since meaning and language are constantly being changed my source most accurately captures their meaning.

#### Ground –

#### Gun bans are policies, not a philosophical theory, so it has to considered by what the policy would look like, imagining the world under that policy. There is literally no way to debate it in the abstract since it assumes real-world constructs like governments, guns, the constitution etc.

#### they exclude all arguments about why gun control could lead to bad consequences like the creation of an black market, politics disads, or how it causes more innocent deaths. this is straight up ALL of the topic lit.

Kopel 95 – david b., Copyright © 1995 Quarterly Journal of Ideology; . Originally published as 18 Qty. J of Ideology 3-34.

In the United States, serious discussion of gun control has taken two primary approaches: the criminological and the legal. Criminologists have asked whether various gun controls would reduce gun crime and other gun misuse, or whether restrictive gun control laws would deprive innocent victims of an efficacious means of self-defense. Legal scholars of gun control have studied whether the right to arms guarantees in the federal constitution and most state constitutions pose legal barriers to restrictions or gun confiscation. This essay has an entirely different purpose: to examine the ideological frameworks of the American gun control debate. The criminological and legal approaches tend to evaluate guns realistically. That is, they look at the benefits and harms (and the legal response thereto) of persons possessing objects which can send a lead bullet downrange. It is clearly true that much of the importance of firearms (for good or ill) depends on their physical characteristics. In this regard, the gun in America is properly understood from the position of realism, in that the most important feature of the gun is its actual physical characteristics: because a gun can shoot a lead projectile at an attacker from a distance, a smaller person can effectively defend herself against an attacker. If the gun is easily portable (as is a handgun), the gun provides an ability to project force (and thereby protect oneself) matched by no other physical object (Snyder, 1993). Conversely, in the hands of some criminals (such as an undersized 15-year-old), the gun also offers an ability to project force that no other object offers.(p.4)

#### *Extra offense if you’re going for education as well*

#### *no constitution nc – a violation would only occur if they defended a policy change since thinking about passing gun bans doesn’t violate the constitution.*

#### *1. a lot of debaters go on to become lawyers.*

*Do Debaters Make Better Lawyers?¶ 10/03/2013 James Marshall Crotty*

*Given this backdrop, it is no surprise that many former policy debaters become successful lawyers. Notable among these are David Boies (of Bush V. Gore fame), Justice Samuel Alito, and Justice Stephen Breyer. In my own circle of friends, I include several former high school debate partners or team members who went on to successful legal careers, including Yale Law school grad — and former Senior Legal Adviser in the Clinton State Department — James C. O’Brien, principal author of the Bosnian constitution.*

#### *2. learning about the constitution. has a real impact on our rights.*

*Failing to read this instruction manual has cost us dearly. Many of our rights have been stolen because of our inadequate knowledge of how to maintain them. We became indifferent in our attitudes, and thus, victims of our ignorance.¶ Even though most history books today don't say much specifically about the Preamble, it's still not that difficult to get a copy of it for your own study. In fact, one of my favorite books, Original Intent by David Barton, has a copy of the entire Constitution in the back of the book.*

#### *Optional education offense:*

#### *2. Limits – my interp doesn’t exclude any ground but it allows for policies – critical thinking also requires examining policies, not principles in isolation – educational activities should foster an informed citizenry*

*Harwood 5 [(Karey, associate professor in the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies) “Teaching Bioethics through Participation and Policy-Making” Essays on Teaching Excellence Toward the Best in the Academy Vol. 16, No. 4, 2004-2005 A publication of The Professional & Organizational Development Network in Higher Education] AT*

*Teaching bioethics to undergraduate students in the humanities and social sciences differs from teaching ethics to medical students or residents. One primary difference is that undergraduates are removed from the clinical setting, where a clinically-based case method of teaching is widely practiced and where students can develop their decision-making skills "at the bedside" through the mentoring of more senior physicians. Another difference is that undergraduates are not in training to join a profession, in this case a profession that has developed a fairly stable body of principles that are "applied" to real-life moral dilemmas (Jonsen, Siegler, & Winslade, 2002; Wear, 2002). Instead, as part of a liberal arts education, an undergraduate course in bioethics should aim to prepare students for life as an engaged citizen in a democratic society (Callahan & Bok, 1980; Kohlberg, 1981) by developing skills in critical thinking and encouraging active engagement in the deliberation of issues in the areas of medicine and biotechnology. Critical thinking, most plainly, is the ability to make well-considered judgments. Critical thinking involves the analysis of concepts and arguments and the interpretation of concrete data or evidence (APA, 1990); but it also requires capacities for self-criticism, moral imagination, and empathy (Momeyer, 2002). It enables the discernment of better and worse arguments or better and worse courses of action, and thus rests on the premise that such judgments of value are possible. It is an essential set of skills, not because it is immediately applicable to a chosen career, but because "wide-awake, careful, thorough habits of thinking" (Dewey, 1933, p. 274) are important in all areas of human life, both individual and social. How to Teach Bioethics One way to foster the development of critical reasoning skills in the undergraduate setting is to provide groups of students with the opportunity to research, analyze, discuss, and propose public policy on emerging topics in bioethics. This type of activity simulates the work of a national bioethics commission and encourages students to view themselves as participants in a significant public debate. For example, a group of students might study stem cell research or international research on AIDS, acquiring enough scientific, medical, and historical background on these topics to be able to identify potential ethical questions. Some questions that might be considered include: Do the benefits of stem cell research justify the use of human embryos? Are all sources of human stem cells morally equivalent? Are the existing safeguards to protect human subjects adequate for international research on AIDS? Should developing countries be able to benefit from AIDS research when their citizens serve as research subjects? Without necessarily working to achieve complete agreement, students try to reach enough of a consensus to propose a policy or regulation. A group might decide that allowing stem cell research from "leftover" embryos created in the context of in vitro fertilization is acceptable, for example, but that creating embryos for the sole purpose of research is not. Students must give reasons for their regulations; and, in searching for and articulating these reasons, students are encouraged to examine the moral values and commitments that underlie their positions. An in-class presentation of the group’s work serves as the culminating exercise, and other students are invited to challenge and contribute to the debate about what ought to be done. Students typically relish this opportunity, seeing themselves not as a passive audience to be fed neutral information but as participants in a debate that matters. In other words, they exhibit the traits of engaged citizens. These activities are highly participatory and inquiry-guided, which means the learning is driven by the task of solving a problem: devising a public policy. Students are invested in and motivated by the group’s task and discover together what they need to learn about their topic. Included in this learning process is the integration of abstract ethical theories and concepts — ideally studied throughout the entirety of the course — into the concrete details of the case at hand. It is not a matter of simply "applying" the principle of justice to the topic of international research on AIDS, for example, just for the sake of getting something done (Evans, 2000). Students must ask: what does justice look like in this case? Does conducting an experiment to see how cheaply an individual in a developing country can be treated for AIDS promote justice, as we understand it? In asking these substantive questions, students in an undergraduate bioethics course are engaged in what Callahan calls "foundational" bioethics (Callahan, 1999). They are not merely engaged in means-end reasoning: how best to achieve an already settled goal (Wear, 2002). They are examining the goals themselves, and thus considering "a multiplicity of ultimate values" (Momeyer, 2002). Developing a Wide-awake Citizenry As any teacher of undergraduate ethics can attest, this kind of substantive discussion of "ultimate values" or "the good" can be murky territory. The allure of moral relativism is strong and the resources for challenging it seem limited. As Momeyer observed, "Students frequently arrive in our classrooms with very limited ways of morally engaging problematic situations, by, for instance, appealing to religious dogmas or a relentless subjectivism and/or relativism, or by privileging – as well enculturated Americans seemingly must, – the exercise of individual autonomy over all other values"(p. 412). Regardless of how one explains the allure of relativism, what is clear is that undergraduates need to develop skills in critical thinking if they are to be able to make the well-considered judgments that are inevitable and necessary in life. One benefit of a simulated bioethics commission is that it directs students’ attention toward a problem of public policy, which is to say a problem of societal significance. Discussing classic cases in medical ethics that focus on an individual patient’s dilemma, such as, famously, whether Dax Cowart’s requests to die after suffering severe burns over most of his body should have been honored by his physicians, provide essential occasions to learn about important concepts like informed consent, competence, and respect for autonomy. Indeed, effective teaching of ethics in any setting arguably requires a dynamic balance between conceptual analysis and concrete engagement of cases. But undergraduates also need opportunities to learn that their critical thinking skills will be needed in shaping the social policies of the future. Why is critical thinking a legitimate and valuable goal? And why is active engagement or participation in shaping social policies important? As Dewey once argued, the point of education is to teach students to think on their own because conscious thinking and participation are the hallmarks of democratic citizenship. Others have followed Dewey’s pragmatic sensibilities, including the developmental psychologist, Lawrence Kohlberg, whose "just community" schools were an outgrowth of his belief that democratic participation in the making of rules for everyone in a community fosters students’ moral development. The writings of Jürgen Habermas (1995) on discourse ethics have also influenced legions of teachers to examine anew the value of a consensus-seeking dialogue that is widely inclusive and highly participatory. Conclusion If we are to avoid living in an "administered society," where we passively receive what is handed down to us from others, it is important to develop a sense of engagement in the social policies that are made and to practice the critical reasoning skills necessary to make well-considered judgments*