A. Interpretation: the aff must defend disarming the population of handguns.

Macmillan Dictionary defines ownership “ownership” <http://www.macmillandictionary.com/us/dictionary/american/ownership>

legal possession of something, usually something big and valuable

B. Violation: the aff doesn’t make possession of handguns illegal, they let people have them.

C. Standards:

1. Accuracy

a. your interp doesn’t account for the word “ownership”, the res doesn’t say ban sales or transfer, it is explicitly about the right to possess.

b. handgun bans are implemented through disarmament, otherwise it’s not truly a ban.

Jacobs 04 James (Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice New York University School of Law) Can Gun Control Work? “Prohibition and Disarmament” 2004 Oxford Scholarship Online JW

Prohibiting the Sale of Handguns All handgun prohibition proposals discussed in this chapter include a ban on the sale of handguns. A sales prohibition would necessarily have to prohibit every type of commercial transfer, lest the ban be circumvented by leasing and renting. But even that expanded proscription would be incomplete. Banning just commercial transfers would not prevent handguns from being transferred by nondealers to new owners as gifts or barter. Therefore, an effective “sales” prohibition should encompass a ban on gifts and lending as well. No doubt once a sales prohibition seemed like a realistic possibility, (p.162) some people (including profiteers and ideological opponents of the prohibition) would purchase large quantities of handguns in order to supply the post-sales prohibition demand. Prohibiting Possession of Handguns Proponents of handgun prohibition ought to see little point in banning the manufacture and sale of handguns without also banning possession. Failure to ban possession would leave the existing private sector stock of handguns intact. Moreover, if handgun possession was undisturbed, following the model of National Alcohol Prohibition, there would be a tremendous opportunity for blackmarketeers to meet the demand for handguns with weapons imported from abroad or produced in clandestine workshops. The new handguns and handgun possessors would blend in with the existing handguns and their possessors. The moral coherence of this form of prohibition would be weak; tens of millions of owners would be allowed lawfully to possess guns, while younger people would be treated as criminals for doing the same thing. Criminalizing the possession of handguns, along with the manufacture and sale, would conform the gun prohibition paradigm to the regime that currently covers illicit mind- and mood-altering drugs. Prohibition that includes a ban on possession would commit the country to disarming the citizenry. The Dellums and Bingham bills say that 180 days after the law becomes effective, it would be a crime to possess a handgun. In one fell swoop, tens of millions of Americans would be prosecutable, unless they surrendered or destroyed their arms.

Also means my interp conforms to how current bans on objects work- that means it’s most accurate because it takes into account legal context.

A few impacst:

#### A] Accuracy comes first-the topicality rule is superior and non uniques your offense.

Nebel 15 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 reason why LDers may be suspicious of my view is because they see topicality as just another theory argument. But unlike other theory arguments, **topicality** involves two “interpretations.” The first is an interpretation, in the ordinary sense of the word, of the resolution or of some part of it. The second **is a *rule***—namely, that **the aff**irmative **must defend the res**olution.[2](http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/#fn2) If we don’t distinguish between these two interpretations, then the negative’s view is merely that the affirmative must defend whatever proposition they think should be debated, not because it is the proposition expressed by the resolution, but rather because it would be good to debate. This failure to see **what is distinctive about** Topicality leads quickly to the pragmatic approach, by ignoring what the interpretation is supposed to be an interpretation *of*. By contrast, **the topicality rule**—i.e., that the affirmative must defend the resolution—**justifies the semantic approach**. This rule is justified by appeals to fairness and education: **it would be unfair to expect the neg**ative **to prep**are **against anything other than the res**olution, because **that is the only mutually acceptable basis for prep**aration; **the educational benefits** that are unique to debate **stem from clash** focused **on a proposition determined beforehand**. The inference to the priority of semantic considerations is simple. Consider the following argument: We ought to debate the resolution. The resolution means X. Therefore, We ought to debate X. The first premise is just the topicality rule. The second premise is that X is the semantically correct interpretation. **Pragmatic considerations** for or against X do not, in themselves, support or deny this second premise. They might **show that it would be better** or worse***if* the resolution meant X, but** **sentences do not** in general **mean what it would be best for them to mean**. At best, pragmatic considerations may show that we should debate some proposition other than the resolution. **They are** (if anything) **reasons to *change* the topic, contrary to the topicality rule**. Pragmatic considerations must, therefore, be weighed against the justifications for the topicality rule, *not* against the semantic considerations: they are objections to the first premise, not the second premise, in the argument above.

B] key to jurisdiction-the ballot asks you to endorse the better debater in the context of the resolution issued by the tournament rules-if you don’t defend the topic then it’s impossible to vote for you, that’s the most important voter.

#### 2. Ground, they cut out massive amounts of neg offense. Backlash turns about people not abiding by restrictions or causing substitution is extremely mitigated since you don’t take away guns, enforcement disads about stop and frisk don’t link because there are no federal agents doing the aff. You can also place strong defense on rights NCs by saying you still allow people to possess, just not purchase. Neg ground is key to fairness- I need generics to check back against infinite aff prep and ability to pick an area for the debate.

D. Voters. 1. Vote on fairness, debate’s a competitive activity with wins and losses-if the round is skewed towards once debater you can longer test debate skill. 2. Education is a voter since it’s the end goal of debate and provides portable skills-also why schools fund debate in the first place.

Drop the debater on T: 1. Drop the arg is severance from the position of the 1AC-you can just read new arguments in the 1AR or connect parts of the aff to whole res which is equivalent to kicking the aff and reading a new plan in the 1AR-skews my strat since I don’t know what you’ll argue for. 2. Drop the arg discourages the neg from reading T to check back abusive affs since they will lose the portion of the 1nc they spent arguing T, making it more strategic to let the aff get away with their non-topical affs which kills fairness and education since affs will get away with sketchy positions. 3. I had to spend time reading T to check back abuse-dropping the arg means a portion of my 1nc is moot which kills fairness and education.

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 reasons why reasonability is itself reasonable are circular and illogical.

No RVIs. 1. Illogical. Just because you are fair doesn’t mean you should win. If that were true, both debaters would win rounds without theory, which would be irresolvable, and resolvability comes first since every debate needs a winner. 2. Chilling effect. Either I read theory and you beat me with your 4 minute prep out or I don’t read theory and abusive practices prevail-both kill fairness. 3. Topical clash. RVIs kill substantive debate. Once theory is initiated we can never go back to substance, because it’s unnecessary so nobody will engage in the topic. 4. Norm setting. I can’t concede that the counter-interp is better even if I come to that realization in the middle of the round, so the RVI forces debaters to argue for bad debate practices, which is inimical to the most fair and educational interps in the long run.