A Dataset of General-Purpose Rebuttal
Appendix

1 Introduction

This appendix contains the full guidelines used in the all annotation tasks described in the paper: GPR-KB-55 generation, assesing cross-topic relevancy, detecting usage in spoken content,identifying sentence in speeches, and validating rebuttal arguments.

Following the guidelines is a a table containing all 55 GP-claims and their matching rebuttal responses.

2 GPR-KB-55 authoring guidelines

- Please write pairs of texts, one being a claim, and the other a rebuttal argument to that claim.

- The claim should be short and general.

- It should be one that is likely to be made in debates on different topics.

- It should be one for which you can come up with a rebuttal argument similarly appropriate in different debates.

- After writing a claim, you should verify that it is general - if you can, rephrase it to be more so.

- Nonetheless, the claims should not be trivial, i.e. not appropriate for each and every debate.

3 Cross-Topic Relevancy

3.1 Overview

In this task you are given a topic, a list of potential claims, and asked to decide for each claim whether someone may be claiming it when discussing the topic.

3.2 Process

For each potential claim, assume someone is claiming it when deliberating the topic. Decide whether they are:

1. **Supporting** the topic.

2. **Contesting** the topic.

3. Being **unclear** / Making a claim which is **irrelevant** for the topic.

3.3 Rules and Tips

- If it is natural to say I think that ¡topic¿, because ¡claim¿, then you should probably select "Supports".

- If it is natural to say I dont think that ¡topic¿, because ¡claim¿, then you should probably select "Contests".

- Please use the comments box at the bottom of the page to write any comments you may have.

- If a claim may be used to support as well as contest the topic please mention it in the comments box (and specify the claim).

- If you are unfamiliar with the examined topic, please briefly read about it in a relevant data source like Wikipedia.

- Please ignore any casing issues in claims such as "making Physical education mandatory does not violate a basic right"

3.4 Examples

Topic: "We should ban the sale of violent video games to minors"

- **Supports** the topic:

- "Banning violent video games is the most practical way to solve the problem"

- **Opposes** the topic:
    - "Banning violent video games limits personal choice"

- **Unclear / Irrelevant** :
    - "Violent video games are a waste of public funds"
    - "We can't make the environment a priority right now"

4 Usage in Spoken Content

4.1 Overview

In the following task you are given a speech that supports or contests a controversial topic. You are asked to listen to the speech and/or read the transcription, then decide whether a list of potentially related claims were mentioned by the speaker explicitly, implicitly, or not at all.

4.2 Steps

1. Listen to the speech and/or read the transcription of the speech.

    - Note: some speeches are transcribed automatically and may contain errors.

2. Review the list of possibly relevant claims.

    - Note: few of the claims might not be full sentences. Please do your best to "complete" them to claims in a common-sense manner. If the claim doesn't make any sense, select "No mention".

3. Decide based on the speech only whether the speaker agrees with each claim, and choose the appropriate answer:

    - Agree - Explicitly
    - Agree - Implicitly
    - No Mention

4.3 Rules & Tips

You should ask yourself whether the statement "The speaker argued that ⟨claim⟩" is valid or not. Note, this statement can be valid even if the speaker was stating the claim using a somewhat different phrasing in her/his speech.

Agree - Explicitly

- The claim was mentioned by the speaker, but perhaps phrased differently.

- Examples:

    - If the speaker said: "organic food is simply healthier" then she explicitly agrees with the claim organic food products are better in health.
    - If in a speech about the topic We should ban boxing the speaker said: "we think regulation is simply better in this instance than a ban" then she explicitly agrees with the claim We should not ban boxing altogether, just regulate it.

Agree - Implicitly

- The claim was not mentioned by the speaker but it is clearly implied from the speech, and we know for sure that the speaker agrees with the claim.

- The claim will usually be implied in one of the following ways:

    1. The claim is a generalization of a claim mentioned by the speaker.
        - If the speaker said: "we allow people to make these decisions even if they might be physically bad for them" then she implicitly agrees with the claim: People should have the right to choose what to do with their bodies.
    2. The claim summarizes an argument made by the speaker.
        - If the speaker said: "It's essential that something is done to ensure that people don't have dental problems later in life. Water fluoridation is so cheap it's almost free. There are no proven side effects, the FDA and comparable groups in Europe have done lots and lots of tests and found that water fluoridation is actually a net health good, that there's no real risk to it" then she implicitly agrees with the claim: water fluoridation is safe and effective.
    3. The claim can be deduced from an argument made by the speaker.

– If the speaker said "without the needle exchange program people are still going to do heroin or other kinds of drugs anyway with dirty or less safe needles. This does lead to things like HIV getting transmitted, it leads to other diseases as well, being more likely to get transmitted" then she implicitly agrees that needle exchange programs could reduce the spread of disease.

- The text itself must contain some indication of the implied claim. Don't choose this option if you need to make an extra logical step to conclude that the speaker agrees with the claim. For example, if the speaker said "International aid has problems, but is still valuable", then you should not conclude that she agrees with the claim We should fix international aid, and not get rid of it since she did not argue that the problems should be fixed.

No Mention

- The claim is not part of the speech. For example, if the speaker said "and, yes, feminism has its flaws in the status quo ... but it can be reformed, and the tenets of equality that feminism stands for ... those tenets certainly should not be abandoned, and feminism has done a fantastic job, both historically and in the modern day, of championing those tenets." then it can not be inferred that she agrees with the claim We should try to fix the issues with feminism because people support it. Although she suggests to fix the issues with feminism, she does not claim that people support it.

IMPORTANT NOTE: This task does not contain test questions, but your answers will be reviewed after the job is complete. We trust you to perform the task thoroughly, while carefully following the guidelines. Once your answers are determined as acceptable per our review, you might receive a bonus of up to $0.35 per question. Note that the bonus is given to contributors who complete at least 5 pages per job, and a higher bonus may be given to contributors who complete at least 50 pages.

Please use the comments box at the bottom of the page to let us know if the audio is not working or if it is of poor quality. You may write any other comment you have about the speech and the claims or about the task in general.

5 Identifying Sentences in Speeches

5.1 Overview

In this job, you are given a controversial topic, and a text segment, extracted from a speech about the topic. Each text segment is followed by a rebuttal text, quoting an opponent claim. You will be asked to decide whether the rebuttal text can be used to rebut the text segment - specifically - whether it is reasonable to quote the text segment using the opponent claim.

5.2 Process

1. Read the controversial topic. If you are unfamiliar with the topic, please read about it online, for example in Wikipedia.

2. Read the text segment.

3. Decide whether the rebuttal text can be used to rebut the text segment - specifically - whether it is reasonable to quote the text segment using the opponent claim.

4. If you think your choice requires explanation, please write your feedback in the comments box.

5. You can ignore any small grammar or phrasing errors, when making your decision.

5.3 Rules and Tips

- The text segments are transcripts of spontaneous speeches. Therefore they might contain minor grammar and spelling mistakes, or broken words, which can be ignored.

- For a positive answer, we don't expect the opponent claim to be perfectly present in the in the text segment, as long as its main idea is expressed by in the text segment. For clarification, please see the examples below.

IMPORTANT NOTE: This task does not contain test questions, but your answers will be reviewed after the job is complete. We trust you to perform the task thoroughly, while carefully following the guidelines.

5.4 Examples

The underlined segments are the parts of the text that express the opponent claim main idea(s).

Example A

Topic: We should ban boxing

1) the reason we believe that this is the case is because we respect personal freedom and we it we and we respect the right to choose behaviors even those that are harmful or come with risks associated .

Can the following text be used to rebut the text segment?

— My opponent argued that people have the right to make their own choices, including bad ones, but I disagree.

Answer: Yes, the text segment says "we respect the right to choose", even when its a bad choice ("harmful or come with risks ");

2) boxing is a sport where , in definition , the opponent must hurt the other person in order to win .

Can the following text be used to rebut the text segment?

— My opponent argued that people have the right to make their own choices, including bad ones, but I disagree.

Answer: No, the text describes a fact about boxing, and the opponent claim is not mentioned at all.

Example B

Topic: We should ban smoking

1) we don't think that the government will be able to effectively enforce prohibition, and as an example, just look to the fact that the united states tried to ban alcohol and was unable to do so, in the early twentieth century.

Can the following text be used to rebut the text segment?

text segment?

— My opponent argued that avoiding banning, and sticking with rules and regulations, will reduce harm and protect individuals, but I disagree.

Answer: No, the text segment claims that bans are ineffective, while the opponent claim suggests regulation is better than banning.

2) we think that making that information more available through regulation is ultimately going to do more to help people, that a ban would.

Can the following text be used to rebut the text segment?

— My opponent argued that avoiding banning, and sticking with rules and regulations, will reduce harm and protect individuals, but I disagree.

Answer: Yes, the text segment says regulation is preferred to banning and is "going to do more to help people".

6 Validity of Rebuttal Arguments

6.1 Overview

In the following task you are given a speech in which a single speaker is arguing for or against a controversial topic. The speech is followed by a list of relevant claims. You will be asked to decide, for each claim, whether it was mentioned by the speaker (explicitly, implicitly or not at all). For mentioned claims (either explicitly or implicitly), you will be shown an argument and asked to decide whether it could be claimed in response to the claim.

6.2 Steps

1. Listen to the speech and/or read the transcription of the speech.

   - Note: some speeches are transcribed automatically and may contain errors.

2. Review the list of mentioned claims.

3. Mark – based only on the speech – the claims mentioned by the speaker, by choosing the appropriate answer:

- Mentioned - Explicitly
- Mentioned - Implicitly
- Not Mentioned

4. Read the argument showed after each mentioned claim (explicit or implicit), and decide whether it could be claimed in response to the claim.

6.3 Rules & Tips

IMPORTANT NOTE: This task does not contain test questions, but your answers will be reviewed after the job is complete. We trust you to perform the task thoroughly, while carefully following the guidelines. Once your answers are determined as acceptable per our review, you might receive a bonus of up to $0.35 per question. Note that the bonus is given to contributors who complete at least 5 pages per job, and a higher bonus may be given to contributors who complete at least 50 pages.

Please use the comments box at the bottom of the page to write any other comment you have about the speech and the claims or about the task in general.

6.4 Examples (new: including response arguments)

Mentioned - Explicitly
The claim was mentioned by the speaker, but perhaps phrased differently.

Example 1

Topic: Organic food brings more harm than good

Speaker said: "organic food is simply healthier"

Claim: organic food products are better in health

Is claim mentioned answer: The speaker explicitly mentions the claim.

Response: Humans are not a separate entity to the environment. For millenia the world has learned to adapt itself to its inhabitants, weather changes, and everything else that can affect its well-being. We can't stop ourselves from developing and furthering humanity in the name of the environment.

Response answer: This response is not plausible.

Example 2

Topic: We should ban boxing

Speaker said: "we think regulation is simply better in this instance than a ban"

Claim: We should not ban boxing altogether, just regulate it.

Is claim mentioned answer: The speaker explicitly mentions the claim.

Response: Trying to regulate the system is more complicated than simply banning boxing. Such complexity, when it comes to a government policy, unfortunately means that many cases will fall through the cracks. This is not a legitimate risk to take and full prevention is preferred.

Response answer: This response is plausible.

Mentioned - Implicitly

The claim was not mentioned by the speaker but it is clearly implied from the speech, and we know for sure that the speaker agrees with the claim.

The claim will usually be implied in one of the three following ways:

Example 3

– The claim is a generalization of a claim mentioned by the speaker.

Topic: We should ban smoking

Speaker said: "we allow people to make these decisions even if they might be physically bad for them"

Claim: People should have the right to choose what to do with their bodies..

Is claim mentioned answer: The speaker implicitly agrees with the claim.

Response: Individual liberty is meaningful when it is an expression of an individual's agency. However, society must restrict it in some case. Specifically when it comes to health, we can't allow everyone to do what they want, because the stakes are too high.

Response answer: This response is plausible.

Example 4

– The claim summarizes an argument made by the speaker.

Topic: Water fluoridation brings more good than harm

Speaker said: "It's essential that something is done to ensure that people don't have dental problems later in life. Water fluoridation is so cheap it's almost free. There are no proven side effects, the FDA and comparable groups in Europe have done lots and lots of tests and found that water fluoridation is actually a net health good, that there's no real risk to it"

Claim: Water fluoridation is safe and effective

Is claim mentioned answer: The speaker implicitly agrees with the claim.

Response: This may be true but it doesn't mean we shouldn't take this step. The benefits involved outweigh this concern, and perhaps those who will be deterred aren't suited for this field to begin with.

Response answer: This response is not plausible.

Example 5

– The claim can be deduced from an argument made by the speaker.

Topic: We should encourage needle exchange programs

Speaker said: "without the needle exchange program people are still going to do heroin or other kinds of drugs anyway with dirty or less safe needles. This does lead to things like HIV getting transmitted, it leads to other diseases as well, being more likely to get transmitted"

Claim: Needle exchange programs could reduce the spread of disease

Is claim mentioned answer: The speaker implicitly agrees with the claim.

Note: The text itself must contain some indication of the implied claim. Don't choose this option if you need to make an extra logical step to conclude that the speaker agrees with the claim. For example, if the speaker said "International aid has problems, but is still valuable", then you should not conclude that she implies the claim We should fix international aid, and not get rid of it since she did not argue that the problems should be fixed.

Not Mentioned

Example 6

Topic: We should abandon feminism

Speaker said: "and, yes, feminism has its flaws in the status quo ... but it can be reformed, and the tenets of equality that feminism stands for ... those tenets certainly should not be abandoned, and feminism has done a fantastic job, both historically and in the modern day, of championing those tenets."

Is claim mentioned answer: We should try to fix the issues with feminism because people support it

Answer: The claim is not mentioned by the speaker – it can not be inferred that the speaker agrees with the claim. Although the speaker suggests to fix the issues with feminism, she does not claim that people support it.

GP-Claim	Rebuttal
We need to think about how this affects us right now.	It is necessary to balance short-term and long-term concerns. The long-term effects in this case greatly outweigh the short-term ones.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] will benefit us in the future.	There are many things that could theoretically benefit us in the future. Unfortunately we have to look realistically at our available resources and deal with the immediate needs of the people.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] will lead to greater problems in the future.	Governments have an obligation to their citizens in the here and now. The better off society is today, the more resources we will have to make the future better when it comes.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] will not solve the problem.	Rarely is it possible to completely solve a problem. We are aiming to make the situation better for society and to send a clear message, which this policy does.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] is the most practical way to solve the problem.	We cannot make decisions based solely on practicality. We cannot justify unfair and heavy-handed means based on a desired result.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] is not the most practical way to solve the problem.	Practicality is not the only consideration. Our goal should be to find an approach that is equitable and sends the right message, not a quick and dirty fix.
Alternative methods exist to deal with this problem.	True, there are some alternatives, but this method is effective and has minimal harms and as such is the most suitable for implementation.
If there are problems we can fix them.	The problems are significant enough that a band-aid solution just won't work. We need a completely different approach.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] will harm others.	While some risk of harm may exist, the value of this policy greatly outweighs those harms.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] puts society at risk.	Some risks will always exist, we cannot eliminate risk entirely from our lives. The benefits involved outweigh the risks.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] does not put society at risk.	[ACTION] [TOPIC] may not lead to the immediate demise of civilization, but that doesn't mean it is a good idea. [ACTION] [TOPIC] still entails harms that should not be taken lightly.
[TOPIC] [involves/involve] risks to the individual.	We allow individuals to take risks as long as they are fully informed and rational.
[TOPIC] [has/have] many benefits.	While [TOPIC] [has/have] some benefits, they are outweighed by the risks.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] is what is best for individuals.	We cannot make decisions for individuals in society, even if we think we know what is right and wrong. In a democracy we must let people make their own decisions, even if they make bad decisions.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] limits personal choice.	While governments strive to afford citizens as much personal choice as possible, those choices must be limited when there is a clash with a more important right or clear harms to society at large. This case falls under those criteria.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] protects personal choice.	While governments strive to afford citizens as much personal choice as possible, those choices must be limited when there is a clash with a more important right or clear harms to society at large. This case falls under those criteria.
This is a legitimate choice to make.	While we wish we could always allow everyone full freedom of choice, we need to recognize the risks to individuals and those around them and take measures to protect those individuals.

Table 1: First part of GP-claims and matching rebuttals.

GP-Claim	Rebuttal
We must limit personal choice in this case.	The greater good means nothing if the rights of individuals are being violated. It doesn't make sense to violate rights in order to protect them.
People don't always make rational choices.	The real question is whether most people make rational choices most of the time in this situation, and the answer to that is yes.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] violates a basic right.	We cannot look at each right in a vacuum. We need to see how they intersect with other rights and other needs. In cases such as this, some rights must be compromised.
[TOPIC] [violates/violate] a basic right.	We cannot look at each right in a vacuum. We need to see how they intersect with other rights and other needs. In cases such as this, some rights must be compromised.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] does not violate a basic right.	The question of which rights are basic and which are not is subjective, and is beside the point. Policies like [ACTION] [TOPIC] lead to an erosion of societal rights and values.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] sends a negative message to society.	People tend to hear what they want to hear and while some people may hear a negative message from this policy, the government needs to do what is right and just.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] sends a positive message to society.	People tend to hear what they want to hear. The goal should be to do the right thing, not to send a message that some people might like.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] will encourage better choices.	There are other ways to encourage better choices that don't require such a forceful government intervention.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] will not encourage better choices.	Policies are not always meant to encourage and educate, but also to lay down guidelines and rules for a better functioning society. [ACTION] [TOPIC] is necessary from both a principled and a practical point of view.
[TOPIC] [is/are] impossible to regulate.	Even if regulation is difficult we cannot simply abandon a good and just law. The message alone is enough to justify [ACTION] [TOPIC].
The government is bad at making these kind of decisions.	The government knows what its citizens need and is held accountable by the public, making it the best-placed body to make these decisions.
The government knows how to make these kind of decisions.	Unfortunately, the government is actually very bad at making such decisions, because it is weighed down by bureaucracy, inefficiency and corruption.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] gives the government too much power.	It is easy to scare people with the idea of abuse of power, but the fact is that the government is held accountable by the public to ensure that it is doing a good job. While a government is in power, we need to afford it the tools to protect and serve the public.
[TOPIC] [gives/give] the government too much power.	It is easy to scare people with the idea of abuse of power, but the fact is that the government is held accountable by the public to ensure that it is doing a good job. While a government is in power, we need to afford it the tools to protect and serve the public.
We need to send a strong message.	There are many ways to send a strong message to society. The harmful effects of this particular method make it a bad choice.
We need to protect the weakest members of society.	A truly fair society is one where different people are afforded similar rights and are also trusted to look after themselves. While weaker segments of society can be more vulnerable, this does not justify paternalistic policies that are not beneficial for society as a whole.

Table 2: Second part of GP-claims and matching rebuttals.

GP-Claim	Rebuttal
[ACTION] [TOPIC] disproportionately harms minorities.	Most policies carry extra burdens on minorities because of burdens we carry from historical injustices. This is a separate issue that should be addressed on a wide scale. As far as [ACTION] [TOPIC] is concerned, the focus should be on the overall effects of the policy on society as a whole.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] particularly benefits minorities.	Helping minorities is a positive goal, but it is also important to look at the big picture. Overall, the harms of [ACTION] [TOPIC] outweigh the potential benefits.
[TOPIC] only [benefits/benefit] a small segment of society.	Strengthening small segments of society has a ripple effect and does good for society as a whole.
The private sector is profit-driven and therefore unable to serve the public.	For-profit companies have an interest to care about their customers and want to ensure high quality products so they can sell as much as possible. They have the resources to satisfy the public's needs in a way that the public sector cannot compete with.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] is good for the economy.	While we need to take the economy into account when making decisions, it cannot be the sole consideration or even the top priority in many cases. In this case, the harms outweigh any benefits there may be to the economy.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] is bad for the economy.	While we need to take the economy into account when making decisions, it cannot be the sole consideration or even the top priority in many cases. In this case, the long-term benefits outweigh any immediate harms there may be to the economy.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] will save the government a lot of money.	Money cannot be our primary concern in this case. There are other concerns that far outweigh the potential monetary gain.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] will cost too much.	There is always a way to find funding for things we deem important. The real question is whether or not we see value in this policy, and in this case it is clear that we do.
[TOPIC] [is/are] a waste of public funds.	Nothing is free in this world. The benefits of this policy are well worth the cost.
[TOPIC] [is/are] a good use of public funds.	There are certainly more important things than [TOPIC] to spend money on. In any case, it is unfair to burden the taxpayers with these costs.
This will make it harder for new people to enter the field.	This may be true, but it doesn't mean we shouldn't take this step. The benefits involved outweigh this concern, and perhaps those who will be deterred aren't suited for this field to begin with.
This will make it easier for new people to enter the field.	This may be true, but it doesn't mean we should take this step. The harms involved outweigh this consideration, and perhaps those who will enter the field aren't suited for it to begin with.
Adopting this proposal will lead to backlash.	Some amount of backlash will always exist. We cannot allow a small and vocal minority to dictate the choices we make as a society.
These risks exist elsewhere as well.	Indeed there are some similar cases out there and we should look at those cases as well, and see if they fit the same criteria and should be dealt with accordingly.
Animals have rights.	A system of rights is based on reciprocity. Without the ability to contribute to society and fulfill certain duties, you have no rights.
Animals don't have rights.	Just because humans have certain intellectual advantages over other animals, this does not justify treating them as mere property. Morality dictates that the basic interests of animals must be given due consideration.

Table 3: Third part of GP-claims and matching rebuttals.

GP-Claim	Rebuttal
Animals deserve protection.	The animal kingdom is all about hierarchy. Humans are at the top of the food chain and using animals for our own needs is only natural.
Animals do not deserve protection.	In order to maintain our own morality, humans should protect those weaker than themselves, not treat them cruelly.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] harms the environment.	Humans are not a separate entity to the environment. For millennia the world has learned to adapt itself to its inhabitants, weather changes, and everything else that can affect its well-being. We can't stop ourselves from developing and furthering humanity in the name of the environment.
[ACTION] [TOPIC] benefits the environment.	Humans are not a separate entity to the environment. For millennia the world has learned to adapt itself to its inhabitants, weather changes, and everything else that can affect its well-being. Our decision should be based on developing and furthering humanity, not on some obscure environmental risk or benefit.
We can't make the environment a priority right now.	We have a duty to future generations to do as much as we can to protect the environment and make it livable for them.
We must make the environment a priority right now.	Our priority should be taking care of current human needs and interests. Placing excessive focus on theoretical environmental concerns comes at the direct expense of the population and its immediate well-being.

Table 4: Fourth part of GP-claims and matching rebuttals.