### A-Spec

#### A. Interpretation: the aff must specify the actor or group of actors that implements the aff advocacy in a delineated text in the AC.
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Still, a government ban can come from different places. I can think of at least four that are used in debate on occasion. First, and most obviously, a legal ban can come from the legislative branch, i.e. Congress. This would take the form of a law formally passed and ratified. Second, a legal ban can come from the executive branch, in the form of an executive order. It is unclear exactly how much power presidents have to do whatever they want through legislative orders, but this could be part of it. Third, a legal ban can come from the judicial branch, which would just be the Supreme Court. This would take the form of the Court overruling a previous decision, or passing judgment on some case and using as its justification as something that affects handgun ownership. Fourth, a legal ban can come from a confluence of state and local government bans.

#### B. Violation: this isn’t specified in the AC.

#### C. The standard is weighing ground: generalized debate about without agent spec is impossible.

A) different actors have different obligations- Obama is a single person who has different frameworks apply to him-util might make sense for congress but not for individual use. The different branches are appropriated different amounts of power for a system of checks and balances that changes what kinds of decisions they make-also means you exclude philosophical education about how different people should act. That’s key to education-we all have to make decisions in the real world when we’re older.

B) effects of the aff policy change- politics links to congress and elections to XO and congress, but supreme court and states avoid these. Supreme court also takes out constitutionality NCs since they determine the scope of the constitution, also get access to backlash disads about checks and balances of other groups.

C) implementation-there’s no agency that traditionally does the plan-aff advocacy is entirely hypothetical until you explain who does the aff.
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Who would enforce handgun disarmament and with what degree of vigor? National Alcohol Prohibition was enforced by a small number of US. Treasury Department agents and by state and local police departments. Criminal justice and organized crime scholar Humbert S. Nelli writes that “Prohibition overburdened the criminal justice system and undermined respect for the nation’s law.” Another author recalled that “organization and methods . . . were hopelessly inadequate.”20 Professor McBain of Co- lumbia Law School wrote in 1928 that “the large-liquor drinking public has been indifferent to, if not positively in favor of, the corruption that helps to keep the stimulating stream flowing without interruption . . . the [police] force from the beginning has been thoroughly spoils-ridden.”21 In many cities, the police were contemptuous of alcohol prohibition and did not enforce it; corruption flourished. History has repeated itself with the contemporary drug war. After the Supreme Court’s decision in Printz, rejecting federal authority to order state and local officials to conduct background checks, National Handgun Prohibition might have to be a completely federal program.22 What kind of a federal enforcement agency would be needed to investigate and deter unlawful handgun possession? Currently, most illegal handguns are seized as a consequence of street or car stops made by local law en- forcement agents; a frisk reveals the gun.23 Routine car and street stops are not the province of federal agents, who lack general street-level policing authority and experience. Perhaps BATF could be expanded into a super nationwide street-level police agency with tens of thousands of new agents? Such a move would have to overcome the opposition of the NRA, gun owners, some members of Congress, and others who excoriate BATF agents as “jack-booted minions.”\* It would also have to overcome those who oppose expanding federal power and expending a great deal of federal funds. Undoubtedly, there would be opposition and resistance from fringe elements, who for years have warned of a colossal and despotic federal government. The number of militia groups would probably grow, with the potential for Waco-type standoffs and shootouts.24

#### That’s a substantive reason to vote neg- plan in the abstract as you defend it is impossible to implement or even happen which means only the status quo can have value.

#### Three impacts to weighing ground:

A) Debatability- there’s no aff advocacy so no way to determine what impacts matter or how to weigh between conflicting pieces of offense since there’s no agreed upon framework for any kind of debate. That controls the link to all voters- we need to be able to debate before we access other pragmatic benefits.

B) Stable advocacy-I’m deterred from reading my best offense because I don’t know if it will link to the aff’s specific implementation, that’s real abuse not potential. Key to fairness and education-if you’re shifty then I can’t engage in or answer the aff.

C) Policy education- agent spec is key to nuanced debates over the merits of the aff policy.
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Defenders of agent specification claim that permitting detailed designation of the part of the government which will implement the plan makes for better comparison. When the affirmative specifies the Bureau of Prisons as their implementing agent, debate is instantly made more concrete and focused on the benefits and consequences of certain action. And of course there is often a rich literature assessing the relative merits of this agency over that when it comes to mental health or oceans policy. Such literatures range from discussion of the respective costs of regulatory action as opposed to judicial enforcement to very detailed discussions about the problems likely to arise when one agency or an another undertakes enforcement actions in the area of the plan’s mandates. Whole academic disciplines concentrate their energies on the mechanics of regulatory process, and so no one should be surprised to find treasure troves of evidence defending the courts or regulatory agencies or various taxation mechanisms as best equipped to accomplish certain legislated outcomes.

That’s key to education- ensures we’re learning about current events and how impacts function in the real world.

D. Voters. Fairness is a voter- debate’s a competitive activity so you can’t assess the better debater if the round’s skewed. Educations a voter- it’s why schools fund debate and provides portable skills for the real world.

Drop the debater: 1. Substance is permanently skewed, I’ve had to invest time and alter 1N strategy to check abuse which shouldn’t have occurred in the first place so going back to substance skews my strategy. 2. Deterrence-a loss discourages them from engaging in future unfair practices for fear of losing the round.

Competing interps since 1. Reasonability causes a race to the bottom where we read increasingly unfair practices that minimally fit the brightline. Competing interps maximizes fairness and education by fostering good norms for the activity. 2. Reasonability collapses to competing interps-you use an offense-defense paradigm to determine reasonability being good which concedes the authority of competing interps-also means your arguments are infinitely regressive since saying reasonability is reasonable is circular.

No RVIs: 1. Illogical- being fair doesn’t mean you should win- otherwise both debaters would win without theory, which would be irresolvable- comes first since every debate needs a winner. 2. Topical clash- once theory is initiated we never go back to substance because its unnecessary so no one engages in the topic. 3. Norm setting- RVIs force me to defend a norm that I might realize is bad in the middle of the debate, if I win then an incorrect norm is set. 4. Chilling effect- debaters will be scared to read theory for fear of losing to a prepped out counter interp, proliferating abuse.