

## Guidelines for “Normative (Justification Type)” (2020-06-21)

The goal of this annotation task is to identify what types of reasons people use to support or attack a normative claim. You will be given short arguments, each of which consists of a conclusion and a supporting/attacking premise. Each argument has the following information:

- What action/situation the conclusion advocates for or objects to.
- Whether the premise supports or attacks the conclusion.

For each argument, you need to choose the type of justification used by the premise from (i) norm/desire, (ii) consequence, (iii) property, and (iv) else.

## ANNOTATION DETAILS

For each argument, the annotation field looks as follows:

• ID	2762#1_2762#2078	• The action/situation advocated for or objected to
• Conclusion	CON: All humans should be vegan. (Advocates for "All humans be vegan")	
• Premise	PRE: Growing and producing meat consumes more fossil fuel energy than plant-based food.	
• Whether the premise supports or attacks the conclusion		
PRE supports CON's advocacy because of		
<div><input type="radio"/> norm/desire <input type="radio"/> consequence <input type="radio"/> property <input type="radio"/> else</div> <div></div>		
• Which type of justification is used by the premise?		• What is the norm/desire, consequence, or property (if any)? • Copy-paste relevant parts from the premise.

The definitions and examples of justification types are explained below.

### (A) Norm/Desire

The premise **explicitly states a norm/need/desire** as a justification, usually expressed through the words “should”, “need”, “duty/right”, “important”, “want”. In this case, **the premise’s logic is generally that supporting or attacking the conclusion’s stance is a way to achieve the stated norm/desire.** That is, this norm/desire is something that the premise believes should be achieved as a goal.

**Note.** Norm/desire is **not** merely stating that something may happen **nor that the conclusion’s advocacy should not happen.** Norm/desire is something presented as a goal to achieve, **not** merely something inevitable (see the “What a Norm/Desire is Not” section).

(1) CON: “All drugs should be legalized.” (Advocates for “All drugs be legalized”)

PRE: “The decision to use drugs should rest solely with individuals.”

→ “The decision to use drugs should rest solely with individuals” is presented as a norm facilitated by “All drugs be legalized”.

- (2) **CON:** “The government should not be bothered with what people consume in private, as they are not affecting other people publicly.” (Objects to “The government be bothered with what people consume in private”)  
**PRE:** 🚫 “**The government has a duty to care for the well-being of its citizens.**” Allowing any kind of drug to be consumed privately would infringe upon this duty.”  
 ➔ *“The government has a duty to care for the well-being of its citizens” is presented as a norm obstructed by the objection to “The government be bothered with what people consume in private”.*
- (3) **CON:** “Wealthy people should have more decision-making power over who runs the government.” (Advocates for “Wealthy people have more decision-making power over who runs the government”)  
**PRE:** 👍 “**Wealthy people** are a minority and **need a stronger voice in the elections.**”  
 ➔ *“Wealthy people need a stronger voice in the elections” is presented as a norm facilitated by “Wealthy people have more decision-making power over who runs the government”.*
- (4) **CON:** “Diversity in humans should be embraced.” (Advocates for “Diversity in humans be embraced”)  
**PRE:** 👍 “Instead of becoming colorblind **we should learn to respect each other despite our differences.**”  
 ➔ *“We should learn to respect each other despite our differences” is presented as a norm facilitated by “Diversity in humans be embraced”.*
- (5) **CON:** “Pregnant people should have the right to choose abortion.” (Advocates for “Pregnant people have the right to choose abortion”)  
**PRE:** 🚫 “**It shouldn’t be the mother’s choice to kill the fetus.**”  
 ➔ *“It shouldn’t be the mother’s choice to kill the fetus” is a norm obstructed by “Pregnant people have the right to choose abortion”.*
- (6) **CON:** “In countering terrorism, the state should never infringe on individual human rights.” (Objects to “In countering terrorism, the state infringe on individual human rights”)  
**PRE:** 👍 “It may infringe **the right to a fair trial and due process.**”  
 ➔ *“the right to a fair trial and due process” is a norm obstructed by “In countering terrorism, the state infringe on individual human rights”.*

## (B) Consequence

The premise states a (potential) positive or negative consequence as a justification, which is often (but not always) expressed through the words “can”, “may”. **In other words, the premise’s justification addresses a benefit or a side-effect that had come in the past or is expected to come, as a result of promoting/prohibiting the conclusion’s stance.**

Note. Consequence is **not** a norm/desire (which directly **states the need or desire** for something to be brought about); rather, a consequence is an end result.

- (1) **CON:** “Public health care systems should cover the costs of homeopathic treatment.” (Advocates for “Public health care systems cover the costs of homeopathic treatment”)  
**PRE:** 👍 “**Homeopathy could be used in specific circumstances where conventional medical treatments do not work.**”  
 ➔ *“Homeopathy could be used in specific circumstances where conventional medical treatments do*

- not work” is a potential positive consequence facilitated by “Public health care systems cover the costs of homeopathic treatment”.*
- (2) **CON:** “People should marry outside their religious faith.” (Advocates for “marry outside their religious faith”)  
**PRE:** 🟢 **“The children of interfaith marriages are likely to be well rounded and happy people.”**  
*→ “The children of interfaith marriages are likely to be well rounded and happy people” is a potential positive consequence facilitated by “marry outside their religious faith”.*
- (3) **CON:** “The US should adopt a single-payer health care system.” (Advocates for "The US adopt a single-payer health care system")  
**PRE:** 🟡 **“Moving to a single-payer healthcare system would not bring about enough improvements to justify the massive changes that its implementation would entail.”**  
*→ “Moving to a single-payer healthcare system would not bring about enough improvements to justify ...” is a potential negative consequence facilitated by “The US adopt a single-payer health care system”.*
- (4) **CON:** “Kneel to protest.” (Advocates for “Kneel”)  
**PRE:** 🟡 **“Its effect has been more net negative than positive, because it was not coordinated.”**  
*→ “Its effect has not been more net negative than positive” is a negative consequence caused by “Kneel to protest”.*
- (5) **CON:** “The West should build working autonomous killing machines (AKMs)” (Advocates for “The West build working autonomous killing machines (AKMs)”)  
**PRE:** 🟢 **“More missions and wars could be carried out** if the military had AKMs at its disposal.”  
*→ “More missions and wars could be carried out” is a potential positive consequence facilitated by “The West build working autonomous killing machines (AKMs)”.*
- (6) **CON:** “All humans should be vegan.” (Advocates for "All humans be vegan")  
**PRE:** 🟡 **“Crops' co-products and plants that cannot be eaten by humans can convert to animal feed.”**  
*→ “Crops' co-products and plants that cannot be eaten by humans can convert to animal feed” is a potential positive consequence facilitated by avoiding “All humans be vegan”.*
- (7) **CON:** “Copyright should be abolished.” (Objects to “Copyright”)  
**PRE:** 🟢 **“Copyright corrupts art.”**  
*→ “Copyright corrupts art” is a potential negative consequence facilitated by “Copyright”.*
- (8) **CON:** “Climate change stands to cause substantial economic, and ecological damage to the world, and we should try to diminish its effects.” (Advocates for "we try to diminish Climate change effects")  
**PRE:** 🟡 **“Photovoltaic cell production on a scale may have a massive environmental consequence for third world communities where PV cell manufacturing is largely unregulated.** Solar cell production must come with environmental safeguards..  
*→ “Photovoltaic cell production on a scale may have a massive environmental consequence” is a potential negative consequence by “we try to diminish Climate change effects” (i.e., developing solar energy).*

### (C) Property

The premise states an inherent property of the advocacy/objection as a justification, often expressed as “is good/bad”, “does good/bad”. In this case, the premise’s logic is generally that the conclusion’s stance has a positive/negative property that may be inherent to the stance itself or in a component of the stance. Common examples include **infeasibility, moral values, and (dis)qualifications**.

**Note.** A property is different from a consequence in that it is an **intrinsic justification**. In contrast, a consequence is an **extrinsic justification** by addressing what benefit or side-effect may be brought about.

- (1) **CON:** “A flat ‘Asset Tax’ is all the tax we should ever pay.” (Advocates for “A flat Asset Tax”)  
**PRE:** 👍 **“An asset tax is the most fair system of taxing citizens.”**  
→ “An asset tax is the most fair system of taxing citizens” is a positive property inherent to “A flat Asset Tax”.
- (2) **CON:** “It would be preferable but should not be legally enforced.” (Objects to “It be legally enforced”)  
**PRE:** 👍 **“Leading by example is enough if good examples are distributed widely enough.”**  
→ “Leading by example is enough ...” is a positive property inherent to the objection to “It be legally enforced”.
- (3) **CON:** “Internet Access Should Be a Basic Human Right.” (Advocates for “Internet Access Be a Basic Human Right”)  
**PRE:** 🗑️ **“Internet access requires infrastructure which is not available everywhere: electricity, physical layer, and end devices.”**  
→ “Internet access requires infrastructure which is not available everywhere ...” (i.e., infeasibility) is a negative property inherent in “Internet access be a basic human right”.
- (4) **CON:** “The values expressed in the UDHR should not be forced upon them.” (Objects to “The values expressed in the UDHR be forced upon them”)  
**PRE:** 👍 **“The UDHR values reflect an outdated postwar mentality.”**  
→ “The UDHR values reflect an outdated postwar mentality” is a negative property inherent to the UDHR values in “The values expressed in the UDHR be forced upon them”.
- (5) **CON:** “Zoos should be forbidden.” (Objects to “Zoos”)  
**PRE:** 👍 **“Looking to animals or displaying them isn’t ethical.”**  
→ “Looking to animals or displaying them isn’t ethical” is a negative property inherent to “Zoos”.
- (6) **CON:** “A felon should not be part of the processes through which this society governs itself.” (Objects to “A felon be part of the processes through which this society governs itself”)  
**PRE:** 👍 **“A felon has shown an inability to follow laws.”**  
→ “A felon has shown an inability to follow laws” is a negative property (impotence) inherent to a felon in “A felon be part of the processes through which this society governs itself”.
- (7) **CON:** “The government should never permit actions which cannot be consented to and are antithetical to accepted societal values.” (Objects to “The government permit actions which cannot be consented to and are antithetical to accepted societal values”)  
**PRE:** 👍 **“It is difficult to ascertain proper consent to compete in these games..”**  
→ “The difficulty of ascertaining proper consent to compete in these games” is a negative property inherent in “The government permit actions which cannot be consented to ...”.

#### (D) Else

- The premise simply explains a problem that motivates the conclusion.
  - **CON:** “We should recycle more”  
**PRE:** 🍏 “We do not have enough landfills.”
- The premise proposes an alternative action or an alternative solution to the problem.
  - **CON:** “A maximum wage should be introduced.” (Advocates for "A maximum wage")  
**PRE:** 🍏 “The government could reduce the income of those who earn an excessive amount of money by raising taxes on high-earners instead.”  
→ *The premise is proposing raising taxes as an alternative solution to achieve the same goal.*
  - **CON:** “Burning the US flag should be against the law.” (Advocates for "Burning the US flag be against the law")  
**PRE:** 🍏 “There are other ways to voice disapproval without burning the flag.”  
→ *The premise is suggesting that there are other methods.*
  - **CON:** “Placing the onus on the state removes responsibility from the individual. Individuals should be responsible to demonstrate and prove that they are responsible and fit for gun ownership.” (Advocates for "Individuals be responsible to demonstrate and prove that they are responsible and fit for gun ownership")  
**PRE:** 🍏 “These can go hand in hand. The government can set norms and promote training and regulations that lead people to be responsible gun owners on their own.”  
→ *The premise is not giving a reason why the advocacy should be avoided. Instead, it is simply suggesting an alternative action.*
- The premise uses proof by contradiction, that is, “If A was true, then B should be true. But B is not true, so A is not true”.
  - **CON:** “Humans should not procreate.” (Objects to "Humans procreate")  
**PRE:** 🍏 “If life was such suffering as to not be worth living, any rational population would choose suicide. People are animals, but even the greatest minds we value have clearly not chosen this option.”  
→ *The premise is essentially saying that “if life was really not worth living, then rational population would choose suicide. But that has not happened, so life is worth living”. This argument has a similar form to a consequence, but the logic is very different.*
- The premise’s justification is “everyone does that too”.
  - **CON:** “Teachers should have the freedom to express themselves through their appearance.” (Advocates for "Teachers have the freedom to express themselves through their appearance")  
**PRE:** 🍏 “Many businesses have dress codes that may limit freedom of expression.”  
→ *The premise’s justification is simply “other businesses do that too”.*
- The premise attacks the conclusion for its irrelevancy to the discussion topic.
  - **CON:** “If children are that fragile and easily influenced, we must also monitor whether teachers have their hair colored or other chemical treatments. And we must insist that clothing teachers wear is made in the US. And clothes must be sold by companies that

use models of all shapes and sizes because we can't have body shaming..." (Advocates for "monitor whether teachers have their hair colored or other chemical treatments")

**PRE:** 🍷 "There are many such arguments - teachers should not drive cars -- but here the discussion is about wearing religious symbols- So this argument should be deleted."

➔ *The premise is attacking the irrelevancy of the conclusion to the topic.*

- The premise supports or attacks a part of the conclusion that is not the advocacy/objection.

## Summary

Norm/Desire	Consequence	Property
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that something is needed/desired as a goal.</li> <li>• This need/desire is facilitated or obstructed by the advocacy/objection in the conclusion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States a potential benefit or side-effect as a justification.</li> <li>• Extrinsic justification.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States a property as a justification, such as infeasibility, moral values, and (dis)qualifications.</li> <li>• Intrinsic justification.</li> </ul>

## Tips

- If the premise expresses its stance first and then provides a reason, annotate only the reason part.
- Even for a poor argument, make your best guess instead of choosing "else".

## Multiple Reasons in a Premise

When the premise seems to have multiple reasons, choose the main reason that most directly justifies the premise. If there are many main reasons, choose the first. To check if a reason is main or not, it would be helpful to see if the reason is for supporting another reason or the premise's stance directly and if removing the reason significantly weakens the premise.

- **CON:** "Physician-assisted death should never be allowed, no matter what the circumstances are." (Objects to "Physician-assisted death be allowed")

**PRE:** 🍷 "A human owns himself. Forcing other people to stay alive for the benefit of your personal subjective moral imperative is enslavement."

➔ *The main reason in this premise seems to be the second sentence "Forcing other people to stay alive ... is enslavement". Removing the first sentence seems to have little effect on the premise's strength.*

- **CON:** "Sensitive social and political topics should be discussed in school. (Advocates for "Sensitive social and political topics be discussed in school")

**PRE:** 🍷 "In our days, because of the free and easy information its impossible to keep children away from some sensitive topics. There is no better way to learn how to cope with them than the ordereded discussion in school where they can see both sides and different arguments than those in their family environment"

➔ *The main reason seems to be the second sentence "there is no better way to learn ...". Removing the first sentence has little effect on the premise.*

- **CON:** "As rehabilitation is harder to objectively measure than a reasoned length of punishment, it is necessary to focus primarily on the more concrete concept, i.e. punishment." (Advocates for "focus primariily on the more concrete concept, i.e., punishment")



**PRE:** 🍌 “If we turn to rehabilitation instead of punishment, someone has to decide when an individual is rehabilitated. We've seen to many cases where this someone has argued that the inmate has been rehabilitated and then released the criminal, who start committing the same felonies as before going to prison.”

➔ *The first sentence seems to be the main. The second sentence seems to justify the first sentence — why “someone has to decide when an individual is rehabilitated” is bad.*

## Consequence vs. Property

- **CON:** “As rehabilitation is harder to objectively measure than a reasoned length of punishment, it is necessary to focus primarily on the more concrete concept, i.e. punishment.” (Advocates for "focus primarily on the more concrete concept, i.e., punishment")

**PRE:** 🍌 “If we turn to rehabilitation instead of punishment, someone has to decide when an individual is rehabilitated.”

➔ *“someone has to decide ...” is a consequence rather than a property, because it results from not “focusing on punishment” and may not happen if the situation in the advocacy is brought about.*

- **CON:** “Public schools (primary and secondary) should have religion as a required (not elective) course.” (Advocates for "Public schools (primary and secondary) have religion as a required (not elective) course")

**PRE:** 🍌 “The forced study of religion in school tramples on the rights of atheist students.”

➔ *“The forced study of religion in school tramples on the rights of atheist students” is a consequence rather than a property, because it may not happen if the situation in the advocacy is not brought about.*

- **CON:** “A higher gas tax should be introduced to pay for infrastructure so that income tax can be reduced accordingly.” (Advocates for "A higher gas tax be introduced to pay for infrastructure")

**PRE:** 🍌 “Heavier vehicles do more damage to roads and use more gas.”

➔ *“Heavier vehicles do more damage to roads and use more gas” is a fact and an inherent negative property of heavier vehicles, rather than a consequence influenced by “a higher gas tax be introduced to pay for infrastructure”.*

## What a Norm/Desire is Not

In this annotation task, the “norm/desire” is something that the premise believes should be achieved as a goal, not merely something inevitable. The following examples are NOT a norm in this sense.

- **CON:** “Congress and the Senate should impose term limits on Representatives” (Advocates for "Congress and the Senate impose term limits on Representatives")

**PRE:** 🍌 “It is unconstitutional, as ruled by the Supreme Court in 1995.”

➔ *The conclusion's advocacy being not unconstitutional is not a norm for our annotation purpose. This is simply a negative property of the advocacy.*

- **CON:** “As rehabilitation is harder to objectively measure than a reasoned length of punishment, it is necessary to focus primarily on the more concrete concept, i.e. punishment.” (Advocates for "focus primarily on the more concrete concept, i.e., punishment")

**PRE:** 🍌 “If we turn to rehabilitation instead of punishment, someone has to decide when an individual is rehabilitated. We've seen to many cases where this someone has argued that the inmate has been rehabilitated and then released the criminal, who start committing the same felonies as before going to prison.”

➔ *“someone has to decide when an individual is rehabilitated” is not a norm presented as a goal to achieve. Instead, this is some negative property that is inevitable.*

- **CON:** “Maybe humanity should be better in that regard, and start protecting the environment better, instead of being completely wiped out.” (Advocates for "humanity be better")

**PRE:** 📢 “There is a certain inevitable cost to human existence. Humans can try to minimize that, but it isn't immediately clear that they can support a population of their size without damaging the environment in some way.”

➔ *“There is a certain inevitable cost to human existence” is not a norm presented as a goal to achieve. Instead, this is some negative property of that is inevitable.*



## ANNOTATION EXAMPLES

7100#1\_7100#2381

**CON:** All drugs should be legalised.

(Advocates for "All drugs be legalised")

**PRE:** The decision to use drugs should rest solely with individuals.



PRE **supports** CON's advocacy because of

the

- ☒ norm/desire
- ☐ consequence
- ☐ property
- ☐ else

The decision to use drugs should rest solely with individuals

12945#1\_12945#220

**CON:** The US should adopt a single-payer health care system.

(Advocates for "The US adopt a single-payer health care system")

**PRE:** Moving to a single-payer healthcare system would not bring about enough improvements to justify the massive changes that its implementation would entail.



PRE **attacks** CON's advocacy because of

the

- ☐ norm/desire
- ☒ consequence
- ☐ property
- ☐ else

Moving to a single-payer healthcare system would not bring about enough improvements to justify the massive changes that its implementation would entail

30884#11\_30884#128

**CON:** The values expressed in the UDHR do not apply to every culture and should not be forced upon them.

(Objects to "The values expressed in the UDHR be forced upon them")

**PRE:** The UDHR values reflect a postwar mentality and should be updated for the modern world.



PRE **supports** CON's objection because of

the

- ☐ norm/desire
- ☐ consequence
- ☒ property
- ☐ else

The UDHR values reflect a postwar mentality

23850#302\_23850#313

**CON:** Cases often come to the Supreme Court precisely because there is no clear legal answer, and justices have to use their judgement and understanding of the structure and history of the Constitution to come up with a new workable legal rule.

(Advocates for "justices use their judgement and understanding of the structure and history of the Constitution to come up with a new workable legal rule")

**PRE:** Understanding of the structure and history of the Constitution often comes with legal experience.



PRE **attacks** CON's advocacy because of

the

- ☐ norm/desire
- ☐ consequence
- ☐ property
- ☒ else