# Contingent Spikes Bad

1. Interpretation: Debaters may not read preemptive theory arguments that are contingent on losing another preemptive theory argument in order to be relevant in the round.
2. Violation: You read justifications for Aff RVI’s *and* drop the arg on Neg theory. However, RVI’s are irrelevant if it’s just a reason to drop the arg—this means the RVI spike is contingent on losing that we drop the arg on Neg theory.
3. Standards
4. Strategy skew

I am forced to overallocate on both spikes because I don’t know how much argumentation is enough to preclude the possibility of you just kicking and triggering the contingent spike, but if I spend too much time on the contingent spike and you don’t trigger it, this renders all that time useless—you’ll just go for the one I underallocate on, placing me in a strategic double-bind. Strat skew hurts fairnessbecause I need to be able to form a coherent strategy giving me access to the ballot.

1. Clash

You can shift out of my responses whenever you want and trigger the contingent theoretical argument. And, the higher quality my responses are, the more likely you’ll just kick it. Clash key to education because it’s the root of argument engagement and substantive education.

1. Destroys normsetting

The rule you create is conditional, and provides additional justifications for a competing rule. Norm-setting is a good thing: it outweighs on time frame, since otherwise each interp is round-specific—overall as norms become established, we have less theory debates overall.

1. Fairness and education