

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 2014-2015 CCNW Team Policy Debate Season is:

"Resolved: The United States Federal Government should substantially reform its counter-terrorism policy governing the domestic surveillance of U.S. citizens by the United States Federal Government."

The intent of this year's Resolution is to foster debate about current US Federal Government policy that is:

- 1) directed towards counter-terrorism
- 2) implemented as domestic surveillance by the US Federal Government
- 3) targeted towards US citizens as the object(s) of domestic surveillance

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. To ensure no confusion arises on the matter, complete abolishment of a particular policy can be considered a substantial change and is permissible.
- 2) The reform must be to United States Federal Government policy. For the purposes of CCNW debate “**policy**” shall refer to the whole or any sub-portion of the subject policy. A reform to a sub-portion of the policy is considered to result in a reform to the whole.

3) Be directed toward “**Counter-terrorism**”. “**Terrorism**” is defined in the Code of Federal Regulations as “...the unlawful use of force and violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives.” (28 C.F.R Section 0.85) “**Counter**” shall be understood in its plain meaning as represented by Black’s Law Dictionary, 6th Edition (Adverse; antagonistic, opposing or contradicting; contrary). Thus “**counter-terrorism**” is to be understood as working to oppose terrorism.

4) “**Domestic**” is defined as “existing or occurring inside a particular country; not foreign or international” which shall mean occurring “entirely within the United States or its territories” [as drawn from the FBI Terrorism Assessment Guidelines and Policy 1999]

5) “**by the United States Federal Government**”. The surveillance activity to be debated must be that which is undertaken by the United States Federal Government. Surveillance activities undertaken by private entities or organizations working directly for the United States Federal Government are included within the intent of the Resolution. Surveillance activities undertaken by other jurisdictions (State or Local) are not included within the intent of the Resolution.

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