

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 prepare for and engage in productive debates while avoiding unnecessary Topicality rulings.

The Resolution for the 2010-2011 CCNW Team Policy Debate Season is:

“Resolved: The United States Federal Government should substantially reform its policy governing marine resources off state coastlines within the Territorial Sea and Exclusive Economic Zone, but excluding state waters, to improve long term resource availability.”

The intent of this year’s Resolution is to foster debate about the US Federal Government’s management of marine resources within the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone outside state jurisdiction. The area of interest is limited to ocean waters off state coastlines to reduce the overall scope of the topic. The requirement to improve long term resource availability is intended to generate debates over resources rather than general environmental changes that can’t be specifically be shown to affect the ocean’s usefulness to the United States.

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 its policy governing”...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.

2) “marine resources”...The intent is to debate policy directed toward specific marine resources, whether living or non-living. A living “marine resource” would include entities such as fish, mammals, birds, crustaceans, and other living marine beings all the way down to and including single-celled organisms. A non-living “marine resource” would include such things as oil and natural gas, minerals extracted from the water, seabed, or below the seabed, or the harnessing of the ocean for energy or other productive use.

3) “off state coastlines within the Territorial Sea and Exclusive Economic Zone, but excluding state waters” ...The intent is to debate US Federal Government policy within an area that the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction over these types of resources. The requirement to be off state coastlines results in the exclusion of waters under the jurisdiction of the US Federal government such as the territories of Puerto Rico and Guam, and all other such non-state areas. To be specific, the policy must apply to the US EEZ from Maine to Texas, California to Washington, Alaska, or Hawaii. The Great Lakes are excluded.

4) “to improve long term resource availability” ...The intent is that debates center on policy that produces valuable identifiable benefits to the United States, and the continuation of those benefits into the future. CCNW recognizes that reducing pollution is generally desirable. However, for the purposes of this resolution, environmental benefits that are not linked to a demonstrable long term availability of a marine resource are not Topical.

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 come with 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