

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 rulings.

The Resolution for the 2012-2013 CCNW Team Policy Debate Season is:

"Resolved: The United States Federal Government should substantially reform or replace OASDI and/or Medicare."

The intent of this year's Resolution is to foster debate about the structure and administration of two significant federal programs, OASDI and Medicare. These programs affect every American in some way.

OASDI. Federal Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Benefits, which are defined by Title II of the Social Security Act. Title II of the Social Security Act is administered by the Social Security Administration. Title II appears in the United States Code as §§401-433, subchapter II, chapter 7, Title 42. Regulations relating to Title II are contained in chapter III, Title 20, Code of Federal Regulations.

Medicare. Health Insurance for the Aged and Disabled, which is defined by Title XVIII of the Social Security Act. Title XVIII of the Social Security Act is administered by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Title XVIII appears in the United States Code as §§1395-1395ccc, subchapter XVIII, chapter 7, Title 42. Regulations of the Secretary of Health and Human Services relating to Title XVIII are contained in chapter IV, Title 42, and in subtitle A, Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations.

The CCNW Board recognizes that there may be various interconnected relationships between OASDI and/or Medicare and various other federal programs. Fiat power under this resolution is strictly limited to actions directed toward OASDI and/or Medicare. Fiat power does not extend to any other program or entity that may directly or indirectly affect OASDI or Medicare.

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 or replace”...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. To ensure no confusion arises on the matter, complete abolishment of OASDI, Medicare, or both can be considered a substantial reform and is permissible.

2) “OASDI and/or Medicare”...The intent of this wording is to require debates over either one or both of the listed programs. These terms are to be used in their strict, literal sense as defined in U.S. law.

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