# T

## NC

### Thing

#### Distinction between “ownership” and “carrying”

### On balance T

#### Interpretation— The Aff must defend that private ownership of handguns be banned for at least 50% of people in the United States. To clarify, the Aff may specify a plan, as long as it bans guns for the majority of people in the United States.

#### “Private ownership” without an article implies a general principle.

UltraLingua 11 writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

The definite article does not always precede nouns: sometimes indefinite articles or partitive articles will be used. Often, though, no article at all is necessary, as in the following cases: As a general rule, **the definite article is omitted before abstract nouns or nouns representing general categories.** It is often omitted after verbs expressing opinions or preferences:

#### Violation—They don’t.

#### Standards—

Clash— The Aff massively underlimits the topic by specifying to handgun bans for only one subcatgegory. This kills limits because otherwise the aff can cherry pick the best aff that’s the truest and skew out of neg ground—which kills fairness. My ground’s worse since it’s impossible to prep generics to millions of affs. Additionally, their model leads to infinite research burdens, which kills in depth education and participation.

Textuality— The resolution is an issue of banning private ownership on balance—not in one specific area. Textuality is the basis of all pre-round prep meaning it’s the only way to fairly ensure both debaters have access to the ballot. This is an independent voter for jurisdiction because you can only determine the better debater within the bounds of the topic because that is what we’re supposed to debate.

Also controls link to resolvability and all in round clash which is the educational function of debate.

#### Voter for fairness and education because they are the end-goals of debate.

Drop the debater— Dropping the argument doesn’t make sense in terms of T because she has the prima facie burden to be topical. Dropping the argument would mean dropping the advocacy which is the same as dropping the debater because without an aff world you can’t vote aff.

No RVI on T – **A)** burden of the aff is to be topical in the first place, don’t reward him with a win just for understanding what it means to affirm a statement. **B)** If T’s an RVI affs will just read non-topical ACs all the time and prep out the T debate to screw over negs. Creates structural problems because the neg is destroyed on the theory debate and the substance debate because they have no offense.

#### Prefer competing interpretations because reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention.

#### There’s a T version of the aff—<<explain>>

## NR

### 2NR—AT: real world education

#### My interpretation provides the best real world education—

#### The Aff can specify policies that include over 50% of the population--plans with less than 50% of the population can be read as counterplans on the neg—solves for all of their education claims.

#### Their interpretation is net worse for education—they explode the limits of the debate which kills in depth topic education.

1. UltraLingua (Language Software Company). “Definite Articles.” 2011. <http://www.ultralingua.com/onlinedictionary/references/english/38.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)