**“Why status quo disclosure sucks**

Current disclosure practices consist of a few words that are like “we’re reading x acroynm, and these advantages.” This defeats the purposes of disclosure, which is to encourage better debates by allowing teams to read each others evidence and prepare detailed neg strategies. At the bare minimum a plan text should be posted if the current practices are maintained because the wording of the plan text such as mechanism, actor, etc vastly change the nature of the entire affirmative. Similarly, naming advantages doesn’t really do much it begs questions such as “What are the internal links,?” “What impact evidence do they read?,” and “How does the plan solve them?” These are all important questions that should be thought about when one is putting together case frontlines to specific affs. Current disclosure practices make it almost impossible to do quality specific aff work and leads to more generic, worse debates overall. From a practical standpoint the current system is useless—threads are filled with jokes, people whining about other people not disclosing, and less than ~10% people actually disclosing.   
  
**The alternative**  
People should post pages on the national wiki. This allows better preparation for everyone. Posting cites on the wiki encourages better debate practices by providing checks against teams cutting articles out of context, or outright fabricating evidence. Teams if partners change a lot can make a single wiki page like “Little Rock Central All Teams” and post cites to all the school’s affs there.   
Now this begs the question of what people should post the cites to? You should post 1AC cites to any aff you have read at past tournaments and ideally common neg positions but I doubt that will occur. 1AC disclosure should be the minimum standard.” – Daniel Schexnayder

**“BUT BUT BUT ALEX. WE LIKE THE ELEMENT OF SURPRISE.” or “WE’LL LOSE IF WE DISCLOSE.”**

Actually, not disclosing guarantees that you’ll have a worse educational experience than those who do disclose. If debate is an educational game, and fairness is a requisite to the purpose of education, not disclosing not only eliminates the fairness/reciprocity aspect of the game, but also ensures shallow debates. Perhaps what plagues the Arkansas circuit is shallow debating, shadow extensions of just claim and no warrant, and not enough evidence comparison. The ONLY way to combat this is to disclose, so people can read your evidence. But you’ll be at a disadvantage you say? WRONG. You never get better unless you’re challenged. The more people challenge your ideas, the more you question them yourself and develop your own responses, solidifying your position. THAT’S what debate is all about. A discourse to find truth.

**Good debaters can win a round regardless of whether they’ve disclosed or not.** They know their evidence and have researched the literature base to possible negative positions and have blocked out negative strategies to common aff responses. Wiki disclosure can ONLY incentivize these educational practices, by creating the necessity to dig deeper into the literature. The only way to move forward in the Arkansas circuit is to put down this petty “competitive power struggle” for circuit dominance and just disclose for the purpose of education. After all, what’s the point? Shallow debate precludes in-depth and topic specific education.

Sure, not having wikis has been usual for the majority of the Arkansas circuit in the last decade. And while this may fly in-state, it certainly doesn’t out of state. Yet if you take a look, the best debaters and the ONLY debaters from the Arkansas circuit that have ever reached the national TOC have had wiki’s. I wonder why.

Further, it also encourages cutting new arguments for the sake of showing that you do work. If debate is a meritocracy, wiki disclosure can only reinforce the idea that doing more work and showing that you do it gives you more credibility.

I plead you to disclose through the ndca wiki website, as it encourages a competitive forum that focuses not just on competition but also on critical thinking skills, evidence comparison, and warrant analysis. The Arkansas circuit has made great strides in the last few years in terms of integration of theoretical practices and argumentative styles from the national circuit (attributed to the increase of debaters who participate in out of state camps). But the only way forward is to make wiki disclosure ubiquitous.