insurance for all U.S. citizens. So topicality remains a concern regardless of the paradigm. But what about the stock issues of significance of harm, inherency, and solvency? The significance of harm stock issue focuses on what is wrong now. Is it really possible to show that a totally new approach to helping sub-Saharan Africa is desirable without discussing the human suffering now plaguing sub-Saharan Africa? The inherency stock issue focuses on whether present system efforts are already addressing the problem. Can we meaningfully discuss whether a new approach is desirable without uncovering the deficiencies in the present approach? The solvency stock issue focuses on whether the affirmative plan would truly solve some of the problems cited in the case. Can we discuss desirability of change without showing that the change would work as claimed? The policy-making model simply takes the issues of harm, inherency, and solvency and packages them all within the final stock issue of desirability.

The main difference with a policy-making model is that the stock issues are no longer seen as independent of one another—they are not independent voting issues. Instead, they must be considered as factors in a formula. This formula is essentially as follows: desirability (advantage) = the amount of harm for which the plan can solve - the amount of harm for which the present system can solve. The amount of the affirmative advantage (assuming it is a positive amount) must then be weighed against the disadvantages suggested by the negative team.

It is significant, however, that the policy-making model does away with presumption. If the affirmative team offers a topical affirmative case and shows any excess of advantage over disadvantage, the judge will vote affirmative. The present system carries no presumption of innocence requiring a beyond-a-reasonable-doubt threshold.

The hypothesis testing paradigm is based on a *social science model*. The assumption of the hypothesis testing paradigm is that the debate resolution is like a scientific hypothesis; the affirmative team is offering its affirmative plan in an effort to prove the truth of the hypothesis. In hypothesis testing, the notion of presumption returns in an even stronger form than in the stock issues model. The scientific method would never allow a researcher to suppose the truth of a hypothesis; it must be proven true against all challenges.

In the hypothesis testing model, it is especially important that the affirmative plan offer a topical example of the resolution. One could not prove the truth of a hypothesis (the resolution) by offering an example that is atypical. The need to show that the affirmative plan is typical of the resolution gives rise to a justification argument. Consider the resolution calling for the United States to increase public health assistance to sub-Saharan Africa. The negative team might argue that there is no "justification for increasing HIV/AIDS assistance just in sub-Saharan Africa considering that the disease