### T – no spec

#### A. is the interpretation – The affirmative may not defend that handguns be banned only for a specific group of individuals. They must defend that handguns be banned for all Americans. Google defines ban as

Oxford Dictionaries, "ban," <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american_english/ban>
Officially or **legally prohibit:**he was banned from driving for a year; a proposal to ban all trade in ivoryAnd prohibition is distinct from controls – the aff must defend a blanket ban, **Kates ‘82:**

Don B. Kates Jr (practices law with O'Brien and Hallisey in San Francisco), "Gun control versus gun prohibition," American Bar Association Journal, September 1982 AZ
Indicative of the state of social science learning on this question is the reaction elicited when I presented these points at length to the 1981 annual meeting of **the American Society of Criminology**. The panelist had been chosen precisely because of his advocacy of gun control. He responded by **distinguish**ing **"control" from "prohibition,"** which he **characterized as an "extrem[e]**ist **proposal"** that simply did not deserve as protracted a discussion as I had given. **Not only is prohibition legally very different** from control, **but**, as a matter of political reality, **prohibitionist advocacy is the primary impediment to effective control.**
To clarify you can read plans – you can talk about enforcement mechanisms for example, but whatever you defend, it has to actually be a *ban.* Courts contrast handgun bans, which apply to all people, with gun restrictions, **Scalia:**

http://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2008/06/07-290.pdf

**D**istrict of **C**olumbia **law bans handgun possession** by **making it a crime to carry** an unregistered firearm and **prohibiting** the **registration of handguns**; provides separately that **no person may carry an unlicensed handgun,** but authorizes the police chief to issue 1-year licenses; and requires residents to keep lawfully owned firearms unloaded and dissembled or bound by a trigger lock or similar device. Respondent Heller, a D. C. special policeman, applied to register a handgun he wished to keep at home, but the District refused. He filed this suit seeking, on Second Amendment grounds, to enjoin the city from enforcing the bar on handgun registration, the licensing requirement insofar as it prohibits carrying an unlicensed firearm in the home, and the trigger-lock requirement insofar as it prohibits the use of functional firearms in the home. The District Court dismissed the suit, but **the** **D. C. Circuit reversed**, holding that the Second Amendment protects an individual’s right to possess firearms and that **the city’s total ban** on handguns, as well as its requirement that firearms in the home be kept nonfunctional even when necessary for self-defense, violated that right. Held: 1. The Second Amendment protects an individual right to possess a firearm unconnected with service in a militia, and to use that arm for traditionally lawful purposes, such as self-defense within the home.

#### B. is the violation – 1. As per the AC plan text the aff defends limiting access to handguns for a section of the population, just (\_), which is not a ban but gun control 2. CX clarifies

#### C. is the standards –

1. Limits – allowing specification explodes the topic – there are virtually infinite combinations of places to ban handguns, people to ban them for, and types to ban, so I have no way to prep, killing my ability to have a chance at fairly winning the round or garnering clash which is the unique education from a round. *Terminal defense on the role of the ballot – means we get no access to discursive or educational benefits. Also turns inclusion claims since lack of limits means only those who have the capacity to research literally everything can partake,* ***Harris:[[1]](#footnote-1)***

*Debates about what kinds of arguments we should or should not be making in debates are not insignificant either. The limits debate is an argument that has real pragmatic consequences. I found myself earlier this year judging Harvard’s eco-pedagogy aff and thought to myself—I could stay up tonight and put a strategy together on eco-pedagogy, but then I thought to myself—why should I have to? Yes, I could put together a strategy against any random argument somebody makes employing an energy metaphor but the reality is there are only so many nights to stay up all night researching. I would like to actually spend time playing catch with my children occasionally or maybe even read a book or go to a movie or spend some time with my wife. A world [with] where there are an infinite number of aff[s]irmatives is a world where [and] the demand to have a specific strategy and not run framework is a world that says this community doesn’t care whether its participants have a life or do well in school or spend time with their families. I know there is a new call abounding for interpreting this NDT as a mandate for broader more diverse topics. The reality is that will create more work to prepare for the teams that choose to debate the topic but will have little to no effect on the teams that refuse to debate the topic.*

2. Textuality – “Handguns” is a generic noun phrase, Debois ’15:

Dnny Debois (TOC Champ). Danny DeBois: Topic Analysis. Victory Briefs. 2015. HW.

There is one instance in which I still think generics apply to this topic. “Private ownership of handguns” seems to be a generic noun, as opposed to referring to handgun ownership for specific agents. Narrowing the topic down to just people on **the FBI’s terror watch list or** domestic violence misdemeanants adds a level of specification that means that the aff’s offense does not prove the topic true**.**

Jurisdiction is a prima facie reason to reject the aff since if it’s non-textual so the judge literally can’t affirm the resolution – precludes the rest of the theory debate, even if a case about microbiology is educational that’s not a reason it indicates good debating. *Further the text of the resolution is the basis of our prep so it’s key to fairness and clash.*

3. Field context – I read evidence from a criminological conference and a Supreme Court Justice and specifically compare prohibition vs. control and restrictions. Key to fair predictability since my prep’s based on the topic lit. Also filters your educational benefits since discussion is useless if it’s not grounded in a coherent understanding of how terms and policies are actually utilized to in the real world*, so I’m key to advocacy skills as well.*

4. Ground – if you specify you can defend trivially true affs, such as banning handguns for all serial killers, infinitely abusive since I cannot possibly engage. You also deny me core generic neg ground – I lose access to Constitutionality and deontology since you don’t violate property rights, just regulate them. Generic neg ground is key since aff flex means the neg needs something to rely on against even the most creative unbroken affs.

*5. Topical version of the aff – just defend the whole res, you can still read your advantages, so there’s no possible educational or critical net benefit to spec since that discussion is included in my world.*

#### D. is the voters –

Fairness, *Education*. Competing interps 1. T debate is about the best understanding of the resolution – otherwise no way to understand how our prep applies round to round 2. Reasonability is arbitrary and invites intervention 3. Rules and norms for T prevent skews on a broader scope in more rounds which outweighs. Drop the debater on T 1. You have no more advocacy there is literally no way for you to win at worst presume neg 2. Any turns you make are non-unique since you don’t have an advocacy and would rely on severance from you delinking out of your plan 3. This shell specifically needs drop the debater since the alternative is redefining the aff to be whole-res which means there is functionally no punishment since your offense is entirely preserved, but the only way to deter abuse is to punish it. No RVIs on T since it’s illogical to vote for you just cause you know what the resolution means – that’s your job.
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