**A: Interpretation-** On the 2016 Jan/Feb resolution if the aff specifies an advocacy they must defend that they ban the private ownership of handguns for all individuals not just for X. To clarify you do not have to defend that you ban for police and security personnel you just may not spec a specific group you ban it for.

**B: Violation-** You specify that we ban handguns for X

**C: Standards-**

**1) Ground**—Specification on this topic functionally sidesteps the best disads and turns on the topic. The only disads that exist they can heavily prep out meaning even if you read them you lose because the aff has infinite pre round prep time. Additionally, this allows the aff to specify a plan where no literature exists, that is unburnable and self defense arguments don’t apply because everyone else can get handguns. For example, everyone agrees that IPV is a bad thing so it is functionally impossible for the negative to garner offense here. Err my way on this debate because it is the reason this aff is so common because it is ridiculously abusive. Additionally, disclosure does not solve, my arg is not that I cannot predict your arguments but rather that the lit against them is terrible. Also key to clash—they avoid the only debate over why gun ownership is generally good. My interp is always net beneficial—it allows them to garner offense off IPV, but must defend a ban for all private ownership so that I can read disads and we can weigh, which grants them offense to nuanced frameworks and solvency, but allows for equitable turn ground for clash and critical thinking. Key to substantive engagement.

#### And Substantive engagement outweighs:

#### It’s a prerequisite – I will concede that their forms of education are valuable, but it would logically follow that I need to be able to *engage* their arguments to begin with. Winning offense to substantive engagement as a voter means there’s a way to engage in your K to maximize the “good” discussion you isolate.

#### They could have read the exact same position without harms to substantive engagement; winning a violation and offense to theory just *perms* your advocacy with a net benefits and disadvantage to your methodology. They need to win a disad to the permutation, not just simply my advocacy.

#### Utilizing prefiat arguments against theory that questions the *way* they read prefiat arguments is non-sensical, substantive education is a question of having optimally good discussions, that’s intrinsic to the nature of debate. Also means I co-opt all of their offense, there’s a better understanding for both debaters and higher chance of arriving at the right side of the issue.

Drop the debater: a) They get to start the debate and it is not reactionary so they choose to be abusive so dropping the arg would not be sufficient b) dropping the dbeater on this shell makes 0 sense because it is about the entire advocacy so substance is already skewed And, don’t vote on the aff RVI **a)** you had six minutes of speech time to prempt theory claims **b)** your speech is not reactionary you had the choice to be abusive or not and you choose to be abusive

1. Competing interps: Reasonability encourages intervention: I have no idea where your “BS meter” is, so default to competing interpretations. Intervention is bad because it takes the debate out of the hands of the debaters, undermining the fundamental purpose of debate.
2. Competing interpretations creates better norms for debate, increasing the quality of debates in the long term.
3. Reasonability creates a race to the bottom since it motivates debaters to use increasingly unfair and uneducational strategies and get away with them by merely playing defense on theory.
4. Theory must be evaluated objectively like any other argument. Reasonability allows the debater losing arguments to win on a gut check. That destroys objectivity, making it impossible for the negative to ever win theory because my offense can always be ignored.

On camerons reasonability brightline:

You do not justify reasonability you just justify a brightline.

**On that it prevents unjustified wins** a) this begs the question of what it means to be marginally unfair, if I win abuse it proves that you are bing unfair b) Turn: if there was ever a case of marginal unfairness this is not it you destroy all turn and dis ad ground to the aff c) Turn: if you think the shell is weak you can go for an RVI or make no abuse claims

**On Increases substantive debate:** a) Turn: less substantive debate because the claim in my shell is I was not able to engage in the first place b) Turn: I asked you to defend whole res meaning that I can still make creative turns and get all the beneftis of the aff

**On Disclosed and read alot:** a) this argument still begs the question of if your aff is bad for substantive engagement, I can read non topical turns every round and disclose them but that does not mean they are not hard to answer or make are fair.

**On That I have debated it before:** a) I have never hit this aff as a plan b) cross apply all the args why this still begs the question of w