### Extra T

#### Interpretation: the affirmative debater must only defend a handgun ban. They may not defend compensation for individuals whose guns are confiscated.

B:

C.

Precision: Merriam Webster defines “ban” http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ban

**to prohibit especially by legal means**<ban discrimination>; also :  to prohibit **the use, performance, or distribution of**<ban a book> <ban a pesticide>

#### Banning guns does not mandate compensation- that’s an external policy option. Court precedents prove

SGL 13. Claiming That, 9-9-2013, "The Takings Clause: Not An Obstacle To Smart Gun Laws," Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence, http://smartgunlaws.org/the-takings-clause-not-an-obstacle-to-smart-gun-laws/, accessed 2-3-2016. NP.

Laws banning dangerous guns—such as assault weapons—and large capacity ammunition magazines are not takings and do not require compensation. The Supreme Court and lower courts have long made a distinction between takings of property for public usage, which are takings, and legitimate exercises of state police power that result in a ban or limitation on property that is a threat to public safety or health, which are not takings.3 Recognizing this distinction, several courts have rejected Takings Clause challenges to laws banning the possession of dangerous weapons. For example, in Fesjian v. Jefferson, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals upheld a District of Columbia law that effectively banned machine guns.4 The court found that “the statute in question is an exercise of legislative police power and not of eminent domain” and therefore did not constitute a taking, even though it contained no “grandfather clause.”5 Similarly, the Eleventh Circuit in Gun South, Inc. v. Brady rejected a Takings Clause challenge to a temporary suspension on the importation of certain assault weapons, noting that the government in that case was acting “in a purely regulatory capacity and d[id] not profit from its actions.”6 Courts have also upheld such laws on the grounds that they do not deprive the owners of the entire value of these weapons. For example, in Quilici v. Village of Morton Grove, the court rejected a takings challenge to an ordinance banning handgun possession within a city, noting that “gun owners who wish to may sell or otherwise dispose of their handguns outside of” the city.7 In Silvera v. Lockyer, the Ninth Circuit upheld California’s assault weapons ban, noting that the banned weapons still retained some value.8 In short, because laws banning dangerous guns and ammunition seek to protect the public rather than to confiscate private property for public use, they are perfectly consistent with the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

SGL outweighs – A. historical precedent – courts reference compensation as a separate policy from buyback, which means most of the topic literature is on them as separate policies. B. legal context – any policy would be passed by governmental actors – this evidence takes into account the way they perceive the relation between the two policies policies. C. Even your authors acknowledges a distinction between the ban and the buyback program – they don’t use the rhetoric “banned guns by implementing a buyback program.” Precision’s is key: A. A vague topic means that what counts as a topical aff is unclear which kills preround prep and clash. This kills education – engagement with high quality arguments lets us question our arguments, and fairness since inability to engage means aff always wins since they have infinite prep and leeway to interpret the resolution. B. Resolvability- debaters lose and win arguments, having a precise res is the only way to determine which ones implicate the ballot, which is key to fairness since judges will otherwise vote randomly. C. Precise interpretations of the resolution are key – otherwise the affirmative can constantly shift the resolution’s meaning, preventing engagement

Nebel 4 Jake Nebel (debate coach his students have won the TOC, NDCA, Glenbrooks, Bronx, Emory, TFA State, and the Harvard Round Robin. As a debater, he won six octos-bid championships and was top speaker at the TOC and ten other major tournaments) “The Priority of Resolutional Semantics by Jake Nebel” VBriefly February 20th 2015 <http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/> JW 2/20/15

One way admits that such pragmatic considerations are relevant—i.e., they are reasons to change the topic—but holds that they are outweighed by the reasons for the topicality rule. It would be better if everyone debated the resolution as worded, whatever it is, than if everyone debated whatever subtle variation on the resolution they favored. Affirmatives would unfairly abuse (and have already abused) the entitlement **to choose their own unpredictable adventure,** and negatives would respond (and have already responded) with strategies that are designed to avoid clash—including an essentially vigilantist approach to topicality in which debaters enforce their own pet resolutions on an arbitrary, round-by-round basis. Think here of the utilitarian case for internalizing rules against lying, murder, and other intuitively wrong acts. As the great utilitarian Henry Sidgwick argued, wellbeing is maximized not by everyone doing what they think maximizes wellbeing, but rather (in general) by people sticking to the rules of common sense morality. Otherwise, people are more likely to act on mistaken utility calculations and engage in self-serving violations of useful rules, thereby undermining social practices that promote wellbeing in the long run. That is exactly what happens if we reject the topicality rule in favor of direct appeals to pragmatic considerations. Sticking to a rule that applies regardless of the topic, of the debaters’ preferred variations on the topic, and of debaters’ familiarity with the national circuit’s flavor of the week, avoids these problems.

2. Substantive engagement – A. you can nullify disads about illicit gun usage by using funding to argue people will give up guns, which is key neg ground since I need access to solvency indicts to solve back for infinite aff prep, which kills my ability to engge the aff. B. You get offense about how Australia’s policy was super successful even though success didn’t link to the handgun ban, but other aspects of it, which means you shift discussion away from most relevant ground since lit on bans in general unifies the topic literature, which is key to fairness and education since access to lit gives us equal ability to prepare for round and make high quality arguments.

# 2nr

### A2 Generics Solve

1. Granting the aff ability to manipulate and expand the topic kills ground-you can fiat the aff and any other policy to avoid disads and turns to the aff and make your offense hyper specific and viable.
2. There’s no way to prepare for the aff if you don’t defend the resolution-you have infinite time to frontline offense and come up with new things to defend. This fairness-I can’t structurally engage in the aff-I don’t know it’s coming.