# Must Disclose Solv Adv

1. Interpretation: If the Aff discloses multiple possible plan texts prior to the round, then Aff must disclose tags and citations for a solvency advocate for each potential advocacy.
2. Violation:
3. Standards
4. Research burdens

You can make up a million different phony plan texts and disclose them on the wiki, forcing me to research and prep out positions that don’t even exist, which disproportionately explodes my research burdens. A solvency advocate proves that the plan is in the literature, which makes it fair and predictable Aff ground that Neg should be responsible for prepping. Equal research burdens key to fairness because otherwise one debater can do less work to win.

1. Academic integrity

The purpose of the wiki is to disclose real positions debaters are reading to make the activity more equitable and rounds more mutually engaging. If Aff can disclose false, made-up positions, that’s a form of cheating that intentionally misleads their opponents and exploits the wiki. Lack of academic integrity definitionally violates fairness*.*

1. Voter: Fairness

This is uniquely drop the debater because the abuse has already happened—the round has been irreparably skewed since I knew I was hitting you. And, it would be logically incoherent to drop the arg anyway, since the shell indicts something you *didn’t* do, so there’s no arg to drop. You’ll say I could’ve just messaged you before the round and you would’ve told me the plan text you’ll read, but my interp is always net preferable because it sets a better publically accessible norm.