# CD – Condo Bad Example

## Shell with Notes

In a real round, you would read all the bolded material – the red text is just explanation of what they mean.

#### Interpretation: The neg must not defend a conditional advocacy.

^ This is the interpretation, or the proposed model that debate should have. In this case, it is saying that the neg shouldn’t be allowed to have conditional advocacies.

#### Violation: They said in CX that [position] was condo.

^ Usually, conditionality is checked in CX – in a real round you would replace “[position]” with the name of their conditional advocacy to indicate to the judge that this is why they fail to meet your interpretation.

#### Standards:

#### [1] Strat skew – splits the 1ar by forcing me to argue against multiple worlds with different uniqueness conditions which precludes taking advantage of strategic interactions and contradictions

#### [2] Clash – incentivizes reading many short advocacies and going for the least covered which moots 1ar responses and prevents going in-depth on their position’s nuances. Outweighs because external education and multiple rounds solve their education impacts but clash only occurs in-round

^ Strat skew and clash are the standards – these are reasons why reading conditional advocacies harm debate. Notice how they are labelled with a brief summary of why the practice is bad e.g., “Strat Skew,” and are followed with a more detailed explanation of why conditional advocacies are bad e.g., “splits the 1ar by forcing me to argue against multiple worlds with different uniqueness conditions which precludes taking advantage of strategic interactions and contradictions.”

#### Voters:

#### Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

^ Fairness and education explain why the judge should value your impacts and punish your opponent for abuse.

#### Drop the debater – a) the 1AR is too short for theory and covering substance so a ballot implication is key, b) only dropping the debater deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

^ What should the judge do if you win the theory shell? Drop the debater provides a “punishment” that the judge should give to the person losing the shell.

#### Use competing interps – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter.

^ Competing interps is how the judge should evaluate arguments under theory. See “Competing Interps/Reasonability” for an explanation on how this works.

#### No RVI’s – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) they can stick me with 6min of answers to a short arg and make the 2AR impossible, c) topic ed – incentivizes negs to bait theory and read 2N scripts which avoids substance

^ This is a preemptive argument explaining why your opponent shouldn’t win for proving that their norm is good.

## Shell without Notes

#### Interpretation: The neg must not defend a conditional advocacy.

#### Violation: They said in CX that [position] was condo.

#### Standards:

#### [1] Strat skew – splits the 1ar by forcing me to argue against multiple worlds with different uniqueness conditions which precludes taking advantage of strategic interactions and contradictions

#### [2] Clash – incentivizes reading many short advocacies and going for the least covered which moots 1ar responses and prevents going in-depth on their position’s nuances. Outweighs because external education and multiple rounds solve their education impacts but clash only occurs in-round

#### Voters:

#### Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

#### Drop the debater – a) the 1AR is too short for theory and covering substance so a ballot implication is key, b) only dropping the debater deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

#### Use competing interps – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter.

#### No RVI’s – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) they can stick me with 6min of answers to a short arg and make the 2AR impossible, c) topic ed – incentivizes negs to bait theory and read 2N scripts which avoids substance