### 2AR

1. reflective equilibrium is the procedure for evaluating this debate and its 100 percent conceded.

2. Galloway 7—policy debate

3. static rules bad is NOT WARRANTED EVERYWHERE

go to floating PIks argument

### K

Perm

No floating PIKs—bad for kritikal education

### Theory

Counter interpretation: I don’t have to disclose a method of determining constitutionally protected speech unless the spec shell is a) disclosed on the NDCA LD wiki at least 10 minutes before the round, b) checked in CX or c) checked immediately before the round begins.

B. they did none of those things.

C. Prefer:

1. Solves their offense

1. Substantive education. Making sure I know the interp is a possibility ensures I can include a country specifically in the 1AC so you don’t have to read T against me. Unnecessary theory is bad for education since it crowds out substantive debate and doesn’t apply to the real world since we can’t read theory when we’re older but we do need to make ethical decisions and know about current events.

2. Stratskew. The aff is always subject to must spec, can’t spec and bidirectional interps. This means the neg always has a shell they can read against the aff and prep a ton of frontlines so they get an easy out every single round. Kills fairness because you’ll have the structural theory advantage against me. My interp solves since I can accept your interp and avoid you having to read spec against me.

Second counter interp: the aff doesn’t have to specify a method of determining constitutionally protected speech.

1. Constitutional education

2. Ground—could exclude neg offense