**A: Interpretation-** On The affirmative must prove the intrinsic value of a handgun ban. To clarify, the aff may lead to actions that lead to a better state of affairs, but the stated goal of the policy must ban handguns because they are inherently disvaluable. **Braman and Kahan:** Donald Braman professor at George Washington University and Dan Kahan Professor at Yale Law; “Overcoming The Fear Of Guns”; <http://scholarship.law.gwu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1028&context=faculty_publications>; 2006; Accessed 4/25/16; PE

**So what is the gun debate about**? If one peruses academic journals or tunes in to the debates that pervade legislative chambers, **the gun debate appears to** **hinge on a narrow factual** **question: whether more guns make society less safe or more.** Control supporters. we are told, believe that the ready availability of guns diminishes public safety by facilitating violent crimes and accidental shootings; opponents, that such availability enhances public safety by enabling potential crime victims to ward off violent predation. **Hoping to settle this disagreement social scientists employ** a wide array of **empirical methods**—rnultivariate regression models, **contingent valuation studies** public- health risk factor analyses-to investigate these conflicting claims? **But so long as statistics continue to fund the parties‘ arguments, the gun debate, we believe, will remain bankrupt.** Purely **instrumental arguments lack the power to persuade because they ignore what really motivates individuals to favor or oppose gun control-—namely their cultural worldviews.’** Their prominent (and in many respects fabled) role in American history imbues guns with a surfeit of social meanings. **For one segment** of American society. **guns symbolize** honor, human mastery over nature, and individual **self-sufficiency**. By opposing gun control. individuals affirm the value of these meanings and the vision of the good society that they construct. **For another segment** of American society, however. **guns connote** something else: the perpetuation of illicit social hierarchies. **the elevation of force over reason. and the expression of collective indifference** to the well—being of strangers. **These individuals instinctively support gun control as a means of** repudiating these significations and of **promotion** an alternative vision of the good society that features equality, **[of] social solidarity**, and civilized non-aggresion.

**B: Violation-** 1) You say you ban handguns to reduce homicide, IPV, etc. 2) you don’t show why handguns are intrinsically disvaluable.

**C: Standards-**

1) Limits- your interp allows plans that have any positive impact- putting me at a huge disadvantage. I don’t overlimit there’s a topical version of the aff- you could still talk about those benefits but you must derive offense directly from guns as objects being bad.

2) This means your aff is effects topical since it prioritizes external impacts, not ones that are inherent to handguns. This also means your aff cant create solvency because consequentialist debate isn’t going anywhere, policies get forever lost in dominant opinions. **Braman and Kahan:** Donald Braman professor at George Washington University and Dan Kahan Professor at Yale Law; “Overcoming The Fear Of Guns”; <http://scholarship.law.gwu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1028&context=faculty_publications>; 2006; Accessed 4/25/16; PE

Even more impressively, the **cultural orientation** measures, when combined, **had a bigger impact on gun** control **attitudes than did any other** individual **characteristic**. Indeed. after controlling for cultural orientations, **there was no longer any difference in the attitudes of whites and blacks,** southemers and nonherners, or urbanites and counuy dwellers.” As it does for other risk-regulation conflicts, the cultural theory implies that **consequentialist** modes of **analysis are bound to be** politically **inert in the gun debate.** To begin, individuals’ beliefs about the signiﬁcance of competing gun risks, like their beliefs about other societal hazards, will be cognitively derivative of their cultural orientations. **To avoid cognitive dissonance**. egalitarians and **conimunitarians** **will** **more readily take note of and credit evidence that insufficient gun control diminishes public safety; hierarchists and individualists will do the same for evidence that excessive gun control makes society less safe.** **Following** the lead of **socially constructed emotions**, egalitarians **and** communitarians will **instinctively recoil from guns in fear (as** **well as disgust**), while feelings of security and confident self-sufficiency will impel hierarchists and individualists to reach out for them. And looking to those they trust to tell them whom to believe—the analysts and **policymakers who say** "**more guns. less crime" or the ones who say "more guns, more crime**" —individuals gravitate toward and **become ever more firmly entrenched in the opinions dominant within** **their** respective **cultural group.**”

This means policy making good offense is not competitive a) just because policy making debate is good does not mean that it is the most effective form of discussion in the specific case of gun control b) even if we try to have policy analysis it will fail.

**D-Voter**: Fairness is a **voter** because unfair arguments arbitrarily skew your evaluation of the round and it precedes substance because it frames its evaluation. Drop the debater **a)** to set a precedent for the best norms of debate, **b)** to deter future abuse, **c)** to rectify time lost running theory, and **d)** the round has been irreversibly skewed so we can’t return to substance fairly. **At worst,** drop the arg means reject all aff offense **a)** my shell is about the entire aff advocacy being abusive, not just a particular argument, so you reject all aff arguments since even turns to the NC will still link into their advocacy, **b)** my shell criticizes an omission that the aff made so dropping the argument can only mean rejecting their advocacy because the aff cant compensate by reading a new text in the 1ar in the same way that they can cross an argument off the flow if its abusive. Use **competing interps** because **a)** what is reasonably fair is arbitrary and **b)** reasonability encourages debaters to get away with increasingly unfair strategies through defense on theory. And, don’t vote on the RVI **a)** both debaters have the burden of being fair, and no one deserves to win for just meeting that burden, **b)** to prevent the deterrence of legitimate theory, **c)** to prevent abusive debaters from winning with huge scripts,