

# Disclosure Theory

## Interpretation:

On their page of the NDCA 2021-2022 PF Wiki, debaters must disclose the full text of all cards for all previously broken case positions on the current topic at least 15 minutes before the round under the correct entry name.

## Violation:

They are not disclosed on the P.F. Wiki.

## Standards:

**First** → **Argument Quality** - two internal links:

- a. Pre-Round Knowledge. A world without disclosure gives debaters the upper hand for running arguments opponents won't know how to respond to, not for making good arguments. Disclosure means debaters are forced to make high-quality arguments, knowing that opponents have the time for preparation.
- b. Shared Information. Disclosure allows the sharing of resources and knowledge, since teams can use and modify the best points from each other's wikis.

**Second** → **Inclusion**

Without disclosure, big debate programs have a huge advantage over smaller-school teams due to shared prep among a program. With disclosure, these big schools must put their prep on the Wiki to be accessible to all.

**Third** → **Prep Skew.**

We disclose, meaning our opponents can check our evidence for misconstruction on the Wiki before the round. This means they don't have to use prep to read our evidence, while we have to, making it easier for them to misrepresent evidence and reducing the time we have to prepare in-round strategy.

## Voters:

**Education:**

Education is the only portable skill in debate, and is the sole reason programs fund the activity.

**Inclusion:**

Without inclusion, teams never gain any benefits of the debate in the first place.

Drop the Debater (2 Reasons):

**1:** A vote for us encourages a positive model of debate. Wins and losses dictate the direction of the activity, so teams losing for bad practice incentivises change.

**2:** Drop-the-argument becomes drop-the-debater, since none of their arguments are disclosed.

(R.V.I.)

This shell is not a *reverse voting issue*, meaning that they can't gain offense on an R.V.I. or a counter-interpretation for two reasons.

**A)** We should be able to check our opponent's legitimacy. If we lose just for being wrong, no one would ever risk checking back against abuse.

**B)** It encourages top debaters to be purposefully abusive, allowing them to bait theory and then win off of RVI's.