

Case 424 - Requester

Initial disclaimer: The author of 424 case meme is the same as the author of this apology, alas, me. I would like for the meme to be added so that I do not lose my collateral and get a small reward. I have made memes before and they have been added to Storytelling. I am biased, so is challenger, so judge the arguments and evidence as objectively as possible and please avoid playing majority games.

Challenger posted the following claim concerning the meme and Storytelling:

General Court policy: Jurors should not rule in favor of a side who have engaged in immoral activities

Jurors should attempt to interpret disputes according to the "spirit of the dispute"

Spirit of Kleros Storytelling Standard Impact Submissions: Submissions should help to promote Kleros through content, explainers, memes, gifs, video, infographics and so forth.

Kleros related rule:

"In addition all submissions should: ► Be mainly related to Kleros or dapps relying on it."

The meme does not help to promote Kleros because it is low quality and trolling Kleros, violating the spirit of the program. It says: "This is so stupid, did you even read the tokenomics? No one will use Kleros to decide real things. Your money should go to real projects that provide value such as 0xBTC". It violates the rule that content should be mainly related to Kleros, because it promotes other projects. It could also be immoral to claim storytelling rewards while trolling Kleros.

[Submitted Sun, 11 Oct 2020 20:54:53 GMT](#) by [0x726f...FA3F](#)

I will color code so that I can synthesize each argument into short statements, non color coded statements would purposely be ignored: the focus of this synthesis is to extract arguments, not evidence. However, as some policy clauses are being cherrypicked and transformed deliberately to set a narrative, I will be exhaustive and classify everything. In other words, evidence has been transformed into arguments so they will have to be debunked as well.

>General Court policy: Jurors should not rule in favor of a side who have engaged in immoral activities

This clause is cherrypicked. This is part of the 2nd guideline in General Court. Let us see it fully.

GC.2 : Jurors should not rule in favor of a side who have engaged in immoral activities (example: rule reject on "revenge porn" images even if they would otherwise fit into the category).

Closer inspection of the guidelines lets us see some objectivity on the meaning of *immoral activities*:

GC.4 : Immoral activities include: Murder, slavery, rape, violence, theft and perjury.

Include does not mean *are exclusively*, but provide good context on what kind of immorality GC is referring to. Not the antithesis of virtue, but objective manifestations of aggression.

>Jurors should attempt to interpret disputes according to the "spirit of the dispute"

This is cherrypicked as well. Let us read the full, actual clause:

GC.5 : Jurors should attempt to interpret disputes according to the "spirit of the dispute" unless the arbitrable contract or the policies of the subcourt state otherwise.

Just because I do not want to feel forced to debunk more whacky challenger's points, I will be specific on what I mean by this reply: *the spirit of the dispute* is subordinated to objective policies of the subcourt. A quick examination on Curation shows us two points. Under 'Accept submissions that', the 5th point "Are memes related to Kleros or its dapps", the submission qualifies. Kleros is mentioned, and the submission is a meme comic. Also, "In addition all submissions should be mainly related to Kleros or dapps relying on it", also qualifies.

>Spirit of Kleros Storytelling Standard Impact Submissions: Submissions should help to promote Kleros through content, explainers, memes, gifs, video, infographics and so forth.

Two points: 1st, nowhere in the document it is stated that that statement is the Spirit of Kleros Storytelling Standard Impact Submissions. I feel inclined to think challenger made it up. Still, let us assume it is, so that it can the absurdity of the claim can be proven:

2nd, the submission is a meme, which is listed as an example of submission. Also, the submission could help to promote Kleros:

- It is a meme, it was posted in 4chan's /biz/ and got two positive reactions.
- /biz/ main way of transmission of data is memes
- It is of absurd humor and purpose bad quality, a genre that had not been explored until submission. One of the reactions praised the format.

- /biz/ main concern is speculation, 'pumps', 'dumps'. The mindset is simpler, and discussing those points may be an introduction of the project. Discussion of value is not immoral, and all projects on /biz/ are discussed in these terms first, no exceptions. Hiding this submission from Curate just because it shows the speculative side of Kleros is outright negating reality, and frankly absurd. How does avoiding confrontation of reality benefit a project in any way? Why is immoral to look for profit?

>Kleros related rule:

"In addition all submissions should: ► Be mainly related to Kleros or dapps relying on it."

Challenger is implying submission is infringing this clause. This has been discussed before, but let us see what this refers to in next quote.

>The meme does not help to promote Kleros because it is low quality and trolling Kleros, violating the spirit of the program.

Being low quality is not necessarily a bad trait. In this case, this meme was intentionally bad quality. A quick inspection will show this author's wallet (me) has already made other submissions on Storytelling Standard Impact of, if I dare so, decent quality. At least, not this kind of low. The motive why this had bad quality was to explore a different kind of humor, more meta, humor about how humor is made, or how memes are made, while keeping the point to be about Kleros. This meme was directly referring to how discussions are often occurring on /biz/ and the absurdity of the discussions. What the characters in this meme discuss could very well be found unironically on the forums, and the viewer can enjoy that contrast between reality and absurdity.

A serious accusation of 'trolling' has been made. Even though this meme could very well be crossing the line between trolling and helping, my criteria made me create it as to fill a niche that should have been explored long ago. Absurd humor, or purposely bad quality has happened many times in Kleros already. Kleros' Discord posts non-stop about fictitious Indians raiding 4chan to convince others of buying Kleros in order to 'save their village'. The absurdity is what makes it funny. Also, they refer to real accusations that happened over 4chan, that targeted Kleros promoters as Indian activists, the community found it funny and decided to make humor off it.

This comic was an attempt to show the absurdity in an explicit way, and the author feels like it was done properly, maybe too well, as it raised a non-meta reaction for it to be rejected.

>The meme does not help to promote Kleros because it is low quality and trolling Kleros, violating the spirit of the program. It says: "This is so stupid, did you even read the tokenomics? No one will use Kleros to decide real things. Your money should go to real projects that provide value such as 0xBTC". It violates the rule that content should be mainly related to Kleros, because it promotes other projects. It could also be immoral to claim storytelling rewards while trolling Kleros.

'Trolling' accusation has already been answered, so let us go with 2nd accusation that claims that, because there is a mention of "OxBTC", the content has stopped be mainly about Kleros.

I urge the challenger to look 'mainly' up. Just so that it is answered and I do not have to spend further gas on this discussion, the fact that there is a brief mention by one of the characters of another project, which is contextually referred to be fraudulent or not comparable in quality to Kleros, does not make the comic to be mainly related to this project.

Challenger claims it would be immoral to reap Kleros' rewards while trolling Kleros. So, we got two issues here: 1st, challenger did not prove, just accuse, this submission to be trolling Kleros. 2nd, even if it was trolling Kleros, how does that compare to the aggressive nature of immorality as defined in general terms in GC?

All in all, all challenger's points have been debunked. This author will NOT make further replies, it is up for the jurors now to decide. I learnt in 408 that it makes no sense to clutter Evidence with arguments.

There are two further points I would like to make. Even though Case Law < Policy, I recommend the jurors to check cases 421, 425, 426. They are related to this and have been raised by the same challenger. That way maybe you can get a wider view on challenger reasoning. Small synthesis of each case:

In 421, challenger claims meme is proclaiming Trump to be endorsing Kleros, and that that is immoral and false.

In 425, challenger claims meme is offensive and immoral as there is a character raising the middle finger.

In 426, challenger claims meme is not promoting Kleros because it talks about its price lowering, and that it is immoral because it is depicting a son stealing from his mother's purse.

Do not change your vote on this case because other cases might seem absurd. Focus on the task at hand. This information is provided so that jurors can maybe understand challenger's points better.

I forgot the 2nd point, so it probably was not too important. Anyway, if the jurors want further information, I am in Telegram juror heated discussion, so I might provide further insight if you have further questions. I will not post more Evidence to avoid clutter and to save precious gas.