So during the practice of 11/7, I noticed that we collectively lacked a few skills that prevented us from having productive scrimmages.

1. Lack of case making skills
2. Missing overviews
3. Missing frontlines

### Case making

Beyond the SHITS (Solvency, Harms, Inherency, Topicality, Significance), each of your contentions should follow a basic format that defines an independent reason to vote for you. I think that it’s best for each contention to have three elements:

1. Inherency – a description of what’s going on in the status quo
2. Impact – why that’s a bad thing
3. Solvency – how affirming/negating solves the bad thing

Here’s an example of an old case that I ran freshman year. The topic was: the USFG should substantially increase its exploration and or development of space beyond the Earth’s mesosphere; and our plan was to send people to Mars. I truncated the cards to make it easier to read.

#### Contention 2 – Space Colonization

#### Extinction is inevitable – first, dramatic environmental changes threaten existence on Earth and there is no framework for adaptation.

Cairns 10 (John Cairns, Dept of Biological Science at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, “Global Crisis Collaboration: The Key to the Survival of Civilization in the 21st Century,” in Asian J. Exp. Sci. Vol. 24, No. 1, 33-38)

#### Second, an asteroid strike is inevitable – it categorically outweighs every impact.

Globus 11 (Al Globus, curator for NASA, “Why Build Orbital Space Colonies?” http://space.alglobus.net/Basics/why.html,)

#### The window is closing – we must colonize space now.

Tierney 7 (John Tierney, New York Times Columnist, “A Survival Imperative for Space Colonization”, <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/07/17/science/17tier.html>)

#### US Space leadership is in decline and a new policy is needed to rally the country: a mission to mars is not only feasible within 10 years but the technology currently exists.

Zubrin, 6/29/2011, president of the Mars Society and the aerospace R&D firm Pioneer Astronautics, which does research and development for NASA and other agencies, and author of the book “The Case for Mars: The Plan to Settle the Red Planet and Why We Must” (Robert, “To replace the shuttle: A mission to Mars” <http://www.cnn.com/2011/OPINION/06/29/zubrin.mars/>, Acc 7/25/2011) NH

So the abstracted format is this:

1. Inherency/impact 1
2. Inherency/impact 2
3. Impact timeframe modifier
4. Solvency

So yeah, the abstracted form deviates a little, but the basic format is there; bad things are going to happen, and we solve them. Ideally, you’d write out the outline and all you need to do is to copy and paste the taglines and find the evidence online.

Common mistakes/atrocities you will commit:

You will research evidence for your case before you write the outline. This will result in aimless card-searching, and you will have extra cards you don’t need and a bunch of cards you will need that you don’t have. Note: it’s ok (and recommended) that you do topic research first; just don’t look for evidence before making an outline.

### Overviews

Overviews give the judge an idea of what the focus of the debate should be about. Usually, you begin by extending your case; this requires a quick explanation of your contention, and maybe some extra work done for understanding your impact. Here’s an example:

**We are all going to die; our Cairns evidence isolates five independent extinction events that we are unprepared to handle: (1) global climate change, (2) acidification of oceans, (3) overpopulation, (4) ecological overshoot, (5) damage to the biospheric life support system. We have no framework to deal with these impacts. Furthermore, our Globus 11 evidence indicates that an asteroid strike strong enough to wipe out humanity is inevitable; it’s just a question of when. In the face of all these extinction impacts our only option for survival is to get off the rock; our Tierney evidence highlights that the plan must be executed NOW or we won’t be able to EVER execute it because our window is closing. There’s no question of solvency because we have the tools and the expertise needed to get onto Mars in 10 years.**

Granted, this is formatted for policy so it’s a little hard and fast, but the basic format is there; it explains the argument, and references certain cards; it NEVER says “extend our x card”, and always has an EXPLANATION to go along with any extensions. Keep in mind this shouldn’t take long; for policy you get 8-minute constructives, so obviously my overviews would be longer compared to LD or Pofo. For Pofo, I’d recommend an overview no longer than 20-30 seconds for a 4 minutes speech.

Variations:

Sometimes, you may have thick overviews with framing cards and such. The probability of this happening in Pofo is pretty low though

Sometimes, you can replace the global overview with smaller overviews per contention. This is particularly useful if you plan on kicking a contention, so obviously there’s no point of extending a contention that you’re going to toss. Personally, I think this is the best type since it can be dynamically applied, and it makes intuitive sense to extend stuff as you go along your case as opposed to extending everything at once.

Atrocities you will commit:

They will be too long.

You will not properly explain your impact’s link chain

You will not properly distill the debate to its important arguments

### Frontlines

Frontlines are your bread and butter; they are your go-to responses to 99% of the arguments that you encounter. You should have frontlines for every generic and common answer to your case. They include a mixture of analytics, extensions, and actual cards. These should be timed and fine-tuned over time. Here’s an example:

### A2 Warming not real

#### 1. Our GSA evidence cites 5 different historical indicators that warming is real and anthropogenic.

#### 2. More evidence

Howden et al, 14~Philip Kokic, senior statistician, Mark and Steven Crimp, are research scientists, all at the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation in Australia, "With 99.999 certainty, humans cause global warming",<http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20140905132430646~~> TYBG

#### 3. 97% of climate experts believe in anthropogenic warming

Cook, Climate Communication Fellow for the Global Change Institute at the University of Queensland, et al 13

(John, 5/15/13, IOP Publishing Ltd, “Quantifying the Consensus on Anthropogenic Global Warming in the Scientific Literature” <http://iopscience.iop.org/1748-9326/8/2/024024/pdf/1748-9326_8_2_024024.pdf>, Accessed: 6/24/14) //AMM

So this consists of an extension, and two distinct pieces of evidence that is responsive to the argument. This isn’t particularly extensive, so there’s still much to improve.

Atrocities you will commit:

You will not improve them after initially making them

You will only use cards

You will run them without making adjustments on the fly to match the argument being run (if your block is making an argument you don’t need for that particular round… don’t run it!)