

is also rampant in South Asia.” This need to justify terms of the resolution is unique to the hypothesis testing paradigm.

Every argument offered by the negative team should be seen as offering an independent test of the truth of the hypothesis. A researcher in the social sciences would never claim that a hypothesis is true because it has passed a single test; it must be tested against all competing claims. A negative team could prove the hypothesis untrue by winning any one of the standard stock issues.

The hypothesis testing model has one other important implication: it is more forgiving of contradictory negative positions. The function of the negative team is to test the affirmative hypothesis against numerous competing possibilities. Because the negative team is assigned to provide these tests, there is no reason to worry about internal inconsistencies. If any one test disproves the hypothesis, the judge simply declares the hypothesis false. The negative team is under no obligation to support its own hypothesis. This is significantly different from the policy-making model in which the judge assumes that the affirmative policy is to be compared to the negative policy. If the negative team offers an inconsistent/contradictory policy alternative, the affirmative policy is more attractive by comparison. In hypothesis testing, negative inconsistency is forgiven.

There are other paradigms for debate, but the main three are stock issues, policy-making, and hypothesis testing. How will you know which model the judge will apply? In some tournaments you will have access to a written judge philosophy in which the judge describes the paradigm she brings to judging a debate. In other instances, the judge will tell you before the round begins about her expectations and assumptions. In many cases, however, you simply will not know the preferences of the judge until you hear or read the reasons for the judge’s decision. Other times the judge will say that her paradigm is *tabula rasa*—meaning a blank slate. In such cases, it will be left to the debaters to determine how arguments should be evaluated.

CASE STRUCTURES

The first affirmative constructive in policy debate is a fully written-out eight-minute speech. You must carefully design the structure of this speech and rehearse it to ensure that it will fit within the time limit. You won’t be able to change this speech to have one version for a stock issues judge and another for a policy-making or hypothesis testing judge. As a practical matter, this means your case must address the issues of significance of harm, inherency, and solvency. A stock issues judge would insist that those three stock issues be addressed in the first speech (as would a hypothesis testing judge). On the other hand, a policy-making judge would probably not pay very much