Framework/Pre-Emptive Theory:   
  
Interpretation: The Affirmative must set the ground for the round, but none of the ground can be mutually exclusive to the Affirmative.

Possible Violations:

1. The Affirmative tries to extend offense out of the framework
2. The Affirmative tries to win on presumption
3. The Affirmative makes the claim that the resolution is descriptively always affirming

Standards:

Better Debate: Lately debates have just broken down into a competition of framework debates where both debaters try to frame each other out of the round. Because frameworks have become ever more important to accessing the ballot many debaters just ignore the contention level debate entirely and try to find ways to win through an offensive framework. Most of the education of the round comes from actually discussing the topic at the contention level because that’s where we see real world impacts and the vast majority of topical literature coming from.

Fairness: The Affirmative needs a way to fight back the time skew inherent to Lincoln Douglas Debate by being able to set the ground, this is how Policy debate solved for this problem. However, we can’t allow the rules of the game to be set unfairly. It wouldn’t make sense if a Soccer game started out 10-Nill for the Home team, so everyone has to start with equitable access to the win, thus a 0-0 start occurs. The same thing needs to happen in LD where the framework is equitable and easily accessible by both sides. If anything in the framework is mutually exclusive to the Affirmative that then it would obviously break down that equity.

Voters:

Education: Better contention debate allows us to access the most topical literature and the real world examples that can be applied outside of the magical realm of debate. Debate is not just a game, but also an educational activity. Even if the highest levels of debate run away from those values, we don’t want to risk losing the activity for not only those who see LD as a game, i.e. TOC debaters, but also local and novice debaters who want to use this event as a vehicle for academic pursuits.

Fairness: Without rules to the game no one plays them. Plus the judge just ethically should prefer a fair round to an unfair round, unless you know you’re like a proctor of a Presidential Debate.