

Dear CCNW Debate Participants,

CCNW develops its Team Policy Debate Resolution with the expectation that debates conducted under it will address the specific policy areas covered by the selected topic. The words in the Resolution have been crafted to make the intent of the CCNW Board clear as to what are, and what are not, acceptable grounds for debate. The purpose of this letter is to further clarify the intent of the CCNW Board and assist participants to prepare for and engage in productive debates while avoiding unnecessary Topicality challenges.

The Resolution for the 2016-2017 CCNW Team Policy Debate Season is:

“Resolved: The United States Federal Government should substantially reform its ownership and/or management of western federal land administered by one or more of the following agencies: Bureau of Land Management, US Forest Service, US Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service.”

Special Supplemental Information: The Resolution above provides the basic topic framework. The following information clarifies the intent and shall be considered to be part of the resolution.

Substantially. The proposed reform should address important, big picture, issues. To achieve this it must address land areas (single or multiple locations) that are equal to or greater than 200 square miles (128,000 acres).

Western. For the purposes of this Resolution, "western" is defined to mean only the following states: Washington, Oregon, California, Idaho, Nevada, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico and Alaska.

The intent of this year's Resolution is to foster debate about the Federal Government's policy on ownership and management of federally owned land. With regard to ownership, debates should address the fundamental question of what land is appropriate for the federal government to own, in what quantities and for what purposes. Debates about management should address issues regarding the manner in which federally owned land is administered, including who may access the land, for what purposes, under what circumstances, lease conditions and costs, and other similar issues.

Judges Instructions

Judges will be instructed in the following manner regarding Topicality:

In order for an Affirmative Case to be found Topical, the Affirmative Team must demonstrate a legitimate and reasonable attempt to accomplish each of the items presented below. Furthermore, it is the responsibility of the Affirmative Team to be prepared to defend their position with respect to each of these points.

Affirmative Cases under this Resolution must:

1) Propose to “substantially reform”... The intent of this language is that the Affirmative proposal be important enough, of sufficient merit, that a diligent Negative could reasonably anticipate it and thus be prepared to debate it. Trivial, inconsequential changes should not be proposed. Furthermore, “substantially” is defined above to require the Affirmative Case to address areas consisting of at least 200 square miles. Simply changing a policy affecting 200 square miles does not necessarily make a reform substantial. The underlying issue must be shown to be important.

The goal of CCNW is for the debaters to engage in Topical debates (ones falling within the topic area intended by the League) over the Significance, Inherency and Solvency (the Policy issues) of the Affirmative Case. To be allowed to engage in a productive debate, the Affirmative Team must present a case that demonstrably fulfills all of the requirements listed above. In the event of a Topicality challenge it is the duty of the Affirmative Team to convince the judge that their case fulfills all of these requirements. It is not sufficient that the Affirmative Team believe their Case is Topical. They must address each point of the Topicality challenge and demonstrate to the judge they have satisfactorily fulfilled their responsibility.

Finally, with regard to the Negative Team, consistent with published CCNW rules, CCNW expects all Negative Teams to respect the Topicality ruling and raise Topicality challenges only when they are personally convinced that the Case being presented by the Affirmative Team truly fails to meet one or more of the requirements set forth above.

Respectfully Issued By,

The Christian Communicators Northwest Board