#### A. Interpretation: the affirmative must defend a handgun ban on all private ownership, not a specific group of people. Oxford dictionary[[1]](#footnote--1)

Officially or **legally prohibit**:
he was banned from driving for a year; **a proposal to ban all trade in ivory**

#### Private ownership in the context of the resolution is a generic noun, that means that plans with spesific groups of people aren’t T. Debois 15[[2]](#footnote-0)

On the last two topics, I was very receptive to the idea that **the resolution was about a principled question** about the nature of adolescent rights or how jurors should deal with our imperfect legal system, as opposed to a specific policy proposal. Unfortunately for the people who like to card my topic analyses instead of cutting prep against plans, I do actually think this topic does allow much more room for the aff to run plans. Given **that ban generally refers to a legal prohibition**, I do think the topic is referring to a state of affairs in which there are laws that seek to end private handgun use. That being said, I do not think this topic requires the aff to defend a plan (especially if they derive offense more from why the U.S. should take a principled stand against handgun ownership as opposed to policy advantages to handgun bans), but I do think this topic permits plans in a way that previous topics have not. 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 list1⁶ or domestic violence misdemeanants1⁷ adds a level of specification that means that the aff ’s offense does not prove the topic true.**

#### Semantics are an independent voter A pragmatic approach could say “I’ll give you a million dollars if bachelors are married.” Even though you want the money, the pragmatic approach only offers a reason to want the statement to be true, not an actual reason for it to be true

#### B. Violation: they only defend a handgun ban for people who have committed IPV.

#### C. Standards. Limits: There are limitless groups that they could specifiy to place a ban on that – its impossible for me to have prep on all of them. Limits are an independent voter large limits kill the activity, and ruin all discussion. Rowland 84[[3]](#footnote-1)

The first major problem identified by the work group as relating to topic selection is the decline in participation in the National Debate Tournament (NDT) policy debate. As Boman notes: There is a growing dissatisfaction with academic debate that utilizes a policy proposition. Programs which are oriented toward debating the national policy debate proposition, so-called “NDT” programs, are diminishing in scope and size.4 This **decline in policy debate is tied**, many in the work group believe, **to excessively broad topics**. The most obvious characteristic of some recent policy debate topics is extreme breath. A resolution calling for regulation of land use literally and figuratively covers a lot of ground. Naitonal debate topics have not always been so broad. Before the late 1960s the topic often specified a particular policy change.5 The move from narrow to broad topics has had, according to some, the effect of **limiting the number** of students **who participate** in policy debate. First, the **breadth of the topics has all but destroyed novice debate**. Paul Gaske argues that because the stock issues of policy debate are clearly defined, it is superior to value debate as a means of introducing students to the debate process.6 Despite this advantage of policy debate, Gaske belives that NDT debate is not the best vehicle for teaching beginners. The problem is that broad policy topics terrify novice debaters, especially those who lack high school debate experience**. They are unable to cope with the breadth** of the topic and experience “negophobia,”7 the fear of debating negative. As a consequence, the educational advantages associated with teaching novices through policy debate are lost: “Yet all of these benefits fly out the window as rookies in their formative stage quickly experience humiliation at being caugh without evidence or substantive awareness of the issues that confront them at a tournament.”8 The ultimate result is that fewer novices participate in NDT, thus lessening the educational value of the activity and limiting the number of debaters or eventually participate in more advanced divisions of policy debate. In addition to noting the effect on novices, participants argued that **broad topics** also **discourage experienced debaters from continued participation** in policy debate. Here, the claim is that it takes so much times and effort to be competitive on a broad topic that students who are concerned with doing more than just debate are forced out of the activity.9 Gaske notes, that “broad topics discourage participation because of insufficient time to do requisite research.”10 The final effect may be that entire **programs** either **cease functioning** or shift to value debate as a way to avoid unreasonable research burdens. Boman supports this point: “It is this expanding necessity of evidence, and thereby research, which has created a competitive imbalance between institutions that participate in academic debate.”11 In this view, it is the competitive imbalance resulting from the use of broad topics that has led some small schools to cancel their programs.

#### Topic Education: My interp ensures a discussion at the centre of the topic, which is a question of an absolute ban vs some restrictions. The aff dodges this by reading a plan functionally about backround checks. Debois 15[[4]](#footnote-2)

Beyond this grammatical argument, I also think **the literature** and current gun control movement **is clear in emphasizing a distinction** between two approaches to gun control. **One approach** (that the aff world is a part of) is essentially the “too many guns” approach—i.e. that **guns by their very nature pose risks**, and the only true solution to gun violence in America is to seriously and drastically reduce the rates of gun ownership. **A second approach is the “keep guns away from dangerous people”** approach, in **which** the focus **is** not on banning guns, but rather expanding **background checks** and other “commonsense” procedures **aimed at keeping guns away from people who are likely to use them in problematic ways, while letting law-abiding citizens still have access to guns.** This is currently the approach of Democrats and major liberal think tanks like the Center for American Progress, as it has the ability to unite liberals and moderates while making Republicans appear extreme. (For an excellent explanation of this divide in more detail, check out this Vox article: Vox. Vox, 07 Dec. 2015. Web. 08 Dec. 2015. http://www.vox.com/2015/12/7/9859802/democrats-gun-control.). **Given those two branches** of the gun control movement, it seems clear that **a topic that involves a ban on handguns should not allow the aff to defend bans for specific people, as that is essen-tially just a more comprehensive background checks system.** **Such plans ignore** and obfuscate **a fundamental question of gun control literature—can we stop guns through mere regulation and expanded background checks, or are more drastic measures like full-out bans required?**

D. Fairness is a voter because debate is a competitive activity and therefore requires the element of being fair in order to be legitimate. Education is a voter because it’s the portable purpose of debate.

Drop the debater because

1. The NC was skewed. I can’t redo it after the 1AR shifts.

2. Drop the debater is the strongest deterrent, so it sets the best norms for the activity.

3. It’s the only option; the argument would be the whole AC so they would functionally lose there.

Evaluate with competing interpretations, otherwise theory becomes arbitrary, and impossible to adjudicate.
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