A. Interpretation: on the January February 2016 topic, if affirmatives read a parametricized advocacy that does not have a solvency advocate, they must accept disad and counterplan links to the entire resolution. To clarify, a solvency advocate must be an author in the literature that advocates for implementation of the entirety of the aff plan.

*Interpretation: on the January February 2016 topic, parametricized advocacies must have a solvency advocate, an author in the literature that advocacies for the implementation of the entirety of the aff plan.*

B. Violation:

C. Standards:

1. Limits-without a solvency advocate they can defend any random permutation of groups that the ban applies to, geographical locations in the US, and types of handguns. The topic lit should indicate direction of preparation so that I don’t have to prep in the dark. A few impacts: A) you kill fairness-if your aff isn’t rooted in the lit then you’ll always have a prep advantage since you can frontline your made up advocacy super hard and I’ll have no way to predict it-gives you a structural prep advantage. B) key to education-I can’t engage in the aff if I can’t predict it. There’s no policy discussion to be had since your plan is entirely made up-that precludes all education based counter interp offense, we can’t have a constructive debate in the first place.

2. Qualitative ground-if there’s no solvency advocate then there’s no *counter-*solvency advocate that says the opposite of the plan is good-critics haven’t wasted their time writing responses to advocacies that don’t exist. If you have authors that merely mention things related to the plan in passing you’ll always be able to generate better offense than me, allowing you to cherry pick a plan that delinks core neg ground. Kills fairness because we both need arguments to win.