The Axiomatic Codex of Fallacies: A Game Master's Guide to Intellectual Conflict

Introduction: Logic as Power, Fallacy as Weapon

The game system, *The Axiomatic Self*, represents an ambitious and compelling fusion of abstract philosophical concepts with tangible, consequential gameplay mechanics. The game's design is a deliberate synthesis of the brutal, unpredictable lethality of *Mörk Borg* with the narrative-driven, progression-oriented structure of *Kingdom Hearts*. This report is produced to support the game's core combat system, fulfilling the user's request for a comprehensive compendium of logical fallacies, which will be integrated as a "spellbook" of intellectual weapons. The central proposition of this game is that a character's integrity and intellectual consistency are not merely flavor text but fundamental drivers of their fate. Therefore, logical fallacies are presented here not just as academic concepts, but as powerful and consequential game abilities that directly manifest the game's core design philosophy of intellectual conflict. This document serves as a detailed guide, structured for direct implementation into the game's ruleset. Each fallacy is defined, contextualized with real-world examples from philosophical history, and assigned specific game-mechanical effects. This compendium is designed to support the game's premise that a character's convictions are both a source of power and a wellspring of weakness, a sentiment that aligns with the game's core principles. A key point of clarification is the user's term "ad-hominyms," which is a common colloquialism for the **Ad Hominem fallacy**. This report addresses this by detailing the Ad Hominem fallacy and its various subtypes as distinct and mechanically unique abilities, as academic sources on the topic identify multiple forms of this fallacy.

Part I: The Fallacies of Personal Attack (Ad Hominem and Relatives)

This class of fallacies represents attacks on a target's credibility or character rather than on the substance of their argument. In *The Axiomatic Self*, these are not merely insults; they are potent psychological weapons that exploit a target's psychological state. The various types of Ad Hominem target different aspects of a character's "self" and are particularly effective at undermining the core philosophical convictions of certain archetypes. A successful attack of this type can shatter a character's composure, causing them to falter in combat or even flee in a moment of existential crisis.

1. Abusive Ad Hominem

- **Definition:** The Abusive Ad Hominem fallacy occurs when a person attacks their opponent's character, personal traits, or physical attributes to discredit their argument, rather than engaging with the argument's content. It is a direct, irrelevant personal assault

that attempts to poison the well of discourse by asserting that the person making a claim is unfit to do so. The logical flaw lies in the separation of the argument itself from the identity of the person presenting it; an argument's validity is independent of the arguer's characteristics.

- **Archetypes Allowed:** This fallacy is most effectively wielded by the **Rationalist** and **Empiricist** archetypes. The Rationalist, who values reason above all else, can use this fallacy with cold, surgical precision to dissect an opponent's character. The Empiricist, who is grounded in the material world, may launch attacks based on observable, physical traits.
- **Archetypes Weak to:** This fallacy is particularly devastating to the **Rationalist** and **Idealist** archetypes. The Rationalist, who believes in an inherently logical structure of reality, struggles to reconcile a world where personal attacks can disrupt logical debate. The Idealist, whose power is tied to their non-physical will and spirit, finds their conviction undermined when their moral or intellectual character is called into question.
- **Real-world philosopher who was famously caught using this fallacy:** A classic philosophical example involves an attack on the arguments of **Socrates**. An individual might dismiss his arguments about human excellence not because of their content, but because of his physical appearance, famously calling him an "ugly" man. This exemplifies the fallacy's core mechanism: the invalidation of a logical claim based on an irrelevant personal fact.
- **Effect of Fallacy:**
    1. **Offense Successful:** The target takes 1d6 psychic damage and is inflicted with the Confused debuff. This debuff causes the target to have a $\frac{1}{3}^{rd}$ chance of attacking themselves, an ally, or the intended target, reflecting the way a personal attack can shatter intellectual focus and cause a character to lash out erratically.
    2. **Offense Failure:** Nothing happens.
    3. **Defense Success:** The target successfully deflects the attack, mitigating all damage. The attacker is instead inflicted with the Dazzled debuff, which reduces their attack rolls, as their attempt to misdirect backfires, causing them to lose focus.
    4. **Defense Failure:** The target is inflicted with the Confused debuff for 1d4 rounds. If a "1" is rolled on the failure roll, a roll is made on the Catastrophic Events table.

2. Tu Quoque ("You, too")

- **Definition:** The Tu Quoque fallacy, Latin for "you, too," is a form of Ad Hominem that counters a claim by asserting hypocrisy in the speaker, without addressing the substance of their argument. It is often used to deflect criticism by pointing out that the accuser is guilty of the same offense. For example, a father might tell his daughter not to smoke because it is unhealthy, and she responds that his advice is invalid because he himself is or was a smoker. The logical flaw is that a person's inconsistency does not alter the objective truth of their claim.
- **Archetypes Allowed:** The **Idealist** and **Materialist** archetypes are best suited to deploying this fallacy. The Idealist, who believes in the primacy of consciousness and will, can use this to expose a contradiction between an opponent's professed ideals and their actions. The Materialist, who values what is physically real, can use this to point out the inconsistency of an opponent's physical behavior with their stated arguments.
- **Archetypes Weak to:** This fallacy is particularly effective against the **Idealist** archetype, whose power is tied to personal conviction. When an Idealist's integrity is successfully

challenged by a charge of hypocrisy, their core being is weakened.
- **Real-world philosopher who was famously caught using this fallacy:** The classical example often cited involves a patient rejecting a doctor's advice to quit smoking because the doctor is also a smoker. This demonstrates the fallacy's power in debate, where the truth of the doctor's argument (that smoking is harmful) is ignored in favor of an irrelevant attack on his character's consistency.
- **Effect of Fallacy:**
    1. **Offense Successful:** The target takes 1d8 psychic damage and is inflicted with the Terrorized debuff. This debuff forces the target to use their full movement action to flee in the opposite direction. A successful Tu Quoque makes the target feel ashamed and overwhelmed, representing a literal flight from intellectual confrontation.
    2. **Offense Failure:** Nothing happens.
    3. **Defense Success:** The target successfully defends against the attack and forces the attacker to drop their equipped weapon. This symbolizes the attacker's own hypocrisy being exposed, causing them to falter.
    4. **Defense Failure:** The target takes the debuff for 1d4 rounds. If a "1" is rolled on the failure roll, a roll is made on the Catastrophic Events table.

3. Circumstantial Ad Hominem

- **Definition:** This fallacy attacks an opponent's motives or circumstances to dismiss their argument. The accuser suggests that the opponent's position is a product of their specific situation, bias, or self-interest, and is therefore inherently invalid. For example, a student might accuse a businessman's lecture on his company's system of being inherently biased because the businessman is selling arms to third-world countries. While the businessman's potential conflict of interest is a relevant consideration, it does not automatically invalidate his entire argument.
- **Archetypes Allowed:** This fallacy is a staple for the **Empiricist** and **Materialist** archetypes. The Empiricist, who trusts only observable evidence, uses it to dismiss arguments from those whose circumstances are not directly verifiable. The Materialist, who believes that all phenomena result from material interactions, is predisposed to view motives as products of a person's material or economic interests.
- **Archetypes Weak to:** The **Idealist** archetype is most vulnerable to this attack. An Idealist's power is tied to their conviction and purity of purpose. When their motives are questioned or linked to self-interest, it strikes at the core of their philosophical identity.
- **Real-world philosopher who was famously caught using this fallacy:** Douglas N. Walton provides the example of a businessman's defense of his company being dismissed because he sells weapons to third-world countries. The argument attempts to invalidate the businessman's claim not because of its content, but because of his controversial circumstances, a classic example of this fallacy.
- **Effect of Fallacy:**
    1. **Offense Successful:** The target takes 1d6 damage and is inflicted with the Dazzled debuff, which applies a -2 penalty to attack rolls. This represents the target's loss of intellectual clarity and focus after their motives are successfully called into question.
    2. **Offense Failure:** Nothing happens.
    3. **Defense Success:** The target successfully defends against the attack, mitigating

damage, and the attacker is inflicted with the Dazzled debuff. The attacker's attempt to misdirect the argument backfires, causing them to lose focus.

4. **Defense Failure:** The target is inflicted with the Dazzled debuff for 1d4 rounds, and their next successful attack deals only half damage. If a "1" is rolled on the failure roll, a roll is made on the Catastrophic Events table.

4. Guilt by Association

- **Definition:** This is a fallacy that discredits an argument by associating the person making it with a widely disliked or disreputable group or idea. The argument is not evaluated on its own merits, but is dismissed due to a perceived unfavorable association. For instance, a recycling idea is dismissed because it was proposed by "a bunch of hippie communist weirdos". This is a fallacious argument because the validity of the recycling plan is independent of the political or social affiliations of its proponents.
- **Archetypes Allowed:** The **Rationalist** and **Idealist** archetypes can use this fallacy. The Rationalist, with their focus on logical structure, can attempt to create a logical link between a person's affiliations and their arguments. The Idealist, who is driven by conviction, can use this to cast an opponent's ideas into a negative light by associating them with a group that opposes their own ideals.
- **Archetypes Weak to:** This fallacy is most effective against the **Rationalist** and **Empiricist** archetypes. A Rationalist's confidence in the power of reason is shaken when a logical argument is dismissed purely on the basis of a non-rational association. An Empiricist, who trusts observable evidence, can be confused when an argument's value is determined by an intangible association.
- **Real-world philosopher who was famously caught using this fallacy:** An example given by Academic Leigh Kolb cites the attack on **Barack Obama** for having worked with a leader in a 1960s terrorist group, despite Obama having denounced terrorism. The argument attempted to associate him with terrorism based on a past affiliation, a classic use of this fallacy in political and social debates.
- **Effect of Fallacy:**
  1. **Offense Successful:** The target takes 1d6 psychic damage and is inflicted with the Terrified debuff. The target, feeling ostracized and associated with an undesirable group, flees in terror, unable to mount a defense.
  2. **Offense Failure:** Nothing happens.
  3. **Defense Success:** The target successfully defends, mitigating damage, and gains advantage on their next attack roll. The defender's ability to see through the flawed association strengthens their own resolve.
  4. **Defense Failure:** The target is inflicted with a Terrified debuff for 1d4 rounds. If a "1" is rolled on the failure roll, a roll is made on the Catastrophic Events table.

Table 1: Fallacies of Personal Attack

Name of Fallacy	Definition of Fallacy	Archetypes Allowed	Archetypes Weak To	Real-world Philosopher Example
Abusive Ad Hominem	Attacking an opponent's	Rationalist, Empiricist	Rationalist, Idealist	**Socrates'** arguments

Name of Fallacy	Definition of Fallacy	Archetypes Allowed	Archetypes Weak To	Real-world Philosopher Example
	character or personal traits to discredit their argument.			dismissed for being "ugly."
Tu Quoque	Discrediting an argument by asserting the speaker's own hypocrisy.	Idealist, Materialist	Idealist	A doctor's advice on smoking is rejected because the doctor himself smokes.
Circumstantial Ad Hominem	Attacking a person's motives or circumstances to dismiss their argument.	Empiricist, Materialist	Idealist	A businessman's defense of his company is dismissed due to his controversial circumstances.
Guilt by Association	Discrediting an argument by associating the arguer with a disliked group or idea.	Rationalist, Idealist	Rationalist, Empiricist	**Barack Obama**'s policies linked to a past association with a controversial figure.

Part II: Fallacies of Insufficient Evidence

These fallacies are attacks on the very foundation of an argument itself. They do not rely on personal attacks but instead exploit a target's tendency to jump to conclusions, to overstate their evidence, or to lean on shaky authority. In a game like *The Axiomatic Self*, where intellectual competence is a core mechanic, these fallacies function as conceptual attacks that directly undermine a target's logical framework. They are intellectual "brute force" weapons, often used by characters who seek to bend the fabric of reality through sheer force of will or observation, rather than rigorous, perfect logic.

5. Hasty Generalization

- **Definition:** The Hasty Generalization fallacy occurs when a person draws a broad conclusion about an entire group or class of things based on a sample that is too small or unrepresentative. This fallacy is also known as the fallacy of "Converse Accident." For example, if a person feels nauseated twice after eating a specific pizza, they might hastily conclude that they are allergic to all pizza. This logical error stems from a failure to gather sufficient data to support a sweeping conclusion.
- **Archetypes Allowed:** The **Empiricist** and **Materialist** archetypes are the most likely to employ this fallacy. The Empiricist, who believes all knowledge comes from sensory experience, might rely on a limited set of observations to draw a conclusion, mistaking a small sample for a universal truth. The Materialist might overstate the results of a few physical interactions to make a broad claim about all matter.

- **Archetypes Weak to:** The **Empiricist** and **Rationalist** archetypes are vulnerable to this fallacy. The Empiricist, who is dependent on data, can be easily swayed by a compelling but unrepresentative data set. The Rationalist, who seeks universal truths, may find themselves intellectually disarmed by a conclusion that seems to be grounded in some form of logical inference, even if that inference is flawed.
- **Real-world philosopher who was famously caught using this fallacy:** The fallacy of Converse Accident, a term for Hasty Generalization, was originally described by **Aristotle** in his *Sophistical Refutations*. A modern example is found in an article that cites an experiment on inbred mice to draw a general conclusion about older humans' ability to get fit. The article's error lies in generalizing from an atypical instance—an experiment on mice—to a different population, older human beings, without sufficient evidence.
- **Effect of Fallacy:**
    1. **Offense Successful:** The target takes 1d4 psychic damage and is inflicted with the Dazzled debuff, which reduces their attack rolls. This represents the target's loss of intellectual clarity after their hasty conclusion is exposed.
    2. **Offense Failure:** Nothing happens.
    3. **Defense Success:** The target successfully deflects the attack, mitigating all damage, and the attacker is inflicted with a half-potency Dazzled debuff. The defender's ability to identify the logical flaw in the attacker's generalization causes a loss of focus in the attacker.
    4. **Defense Failure:** The target is inflicted with a full Dazzled debuff for 1d4 rounds, and their next attack roll has disadvantage. If a "1" is rolled on the failure roll, a roll is made on the Catastrophic Events table.

6. Slippery Slope

- **Definition:** A Slippery Slope argument is one that claims a specific action will inevitably lead to a chain of increasingly negative and catastrophic events, without providing evidence for this chain of causation. The argument suggests that a moderate starting point will lead to an extreme and undesirable endpoint, with no possibility of stopping in between. For instance, the claim that allowing same-sex marriage would inevitably lead to marriage between humans and animals is a classic example of this fallacy.
- **Archetypes Allowed:** The **Idealist** and **Rationalist** archetypes are uniquely suited to using this fallacy. The Idealist, driven by conviction and a view of the world as a consciousness-based reality, can use this to paint a picture of a bleak future as a means of persuasion. The Rationalist, who sees the world in terms of logical sequences, can construct a plausible-sounding but unfounded chain of events to trap an opponent intellectually.
- **Archetypes Weak to:** This fallacy is particularly effective against the **Rationalist** and **Idealist** archetypes. The Rationalist's confidence in logical sequence makes them vulnerable to arguments that seem to follow a step-by-step path, regardless of the lack of evidence. The Idealist, who believes in the power of the will, may be overwhelmed by the idea of an inevitable and unstoppable force of decay.
- **Real-world philosopher who was famously caught using this fallacy:** A potent example is the political argument that legalizing same-sex marriage would lead to marriage between humans and animals. This argument presents an extreme conclusion as an inevitable consequence of a moderate claim, a clear instance of the Slippery Slope fallacy. This kind of argument plays on emotions like fear rather than on logical evidence.

- **Effect of Fallacy:**
  1. **Offense Successful:** The target takes 1d8 psychic damage and is inflicted with the Frightened debuff. The attacker's argument creates a sense of existential dread, causing the target to lose their composure and flee from the perceived inevitable doom.
  2. **Offense Failure:** Nothing happens.
  3. **Defense Success:** The target successfully defends, mitigating all damage, and the attacker's next attack has disadvantage. The defender's ability to see through the attacker's unfounded fear-mongering strengthens their own resolve.
  4. **Defense Failure:** The target is inflicted with a full Frightened debuff for 1d4 rounds. If a "1" is rolled on the failure roll, a roll is made on the Catastrophic Events table.

7. Appeal to Authority (Argumentum ad Verecundiam)

- **Definition:** This fallacy occurs when an arguer cites an authority figure's expertise to support a claim, even when that authority is irrelevant, biased, or lacks a legitimate basis in the subject matter. The fallacy preys on a person's fear of appearing disrespectful to an authority figure, as described by **John Locke**, who coined the term *argumentum ad verecundiam* or "appeal to shamefacedness". The argument suggests that a claim must be true because an expert said it, without providing any supporting evidence or logical proof. The logical error is that an authority's word is not, in itself, proof.
- **Archetypes Allowed:** This fallacy is a natural fit for the **Idealist** and **Rationalist** archetypes. The Idealist, who believes in the power of conviction and spiritual truth, can use this to appeal to a spiritual or moral authority. The Rationalist, who seeks to bring order to a chaotic world, can use it to appeal to a scientific or intellectual authority, such as a philosopher or a technical expert.
- **Archetypes Weak to:** The **Empiricist** and **Idealist** archetypes are vulnerable to this fallacy. An Empiricist, who values evidence, can be confused when an opponent appeals to an authority's word instead of empirical data. The Idealist, whose spiritual and moral convictions are central to their being, can be easily swayed by an appeal to a moral or spiritual authority that they hold in high regard.
- **Real-world philosopher who was famously caught using this fallacy:** The philosopher **John Locke** is associated with this fallacy, as he coined the term *argumentum ad verecundiam* to describe the fear of disrespecting an authority figure in an argument. A famous example from science is the zoologist Theophilus Painter, who mistakenly claimed humans had 24 pairs of chromosomes. Due to his authority, scientists propagated this false "fact" for decades and even discarded their own conflicting data, demonstrating the immense power of this fallacy when it goes unchecked.
- **Effect of Fallacy:**
  1. **Offense Successful:** The target takes 1d8 psychic damage and is inflicted with the Stunned debuff for one round. The target, overwhelmed by the appeal to authority, is rendered unable to act.
  2. **Offense Failure:** Nothing happens.
  3. **Defense Success:** The target successfully defends, mitigating all damage, and gains advantage on their next check. The defender's ability to question authority is a source of strength, empowering their next action.
  4. **Defense Failure:** The target is inflicted with a Stunned debuff for 1d4 rounds.

Table 2: Fallacies of Insufficient Evidence

Name of Fallacy	Definition of Fallacy	Archetypes Allowed	Archetypes Weak To	Real-world Philosopher Example
Hasty Generalization	Drawing a broad conclusion from insufficient or unrepresentative evidence.	Empiricist, Materialist	Empiricist, Rationalist	**Aristotle** described this fallacy of "Converse Accident."
Slippery Slope	Claiming an inevitable chain of negative consequences without proof.	Idealist, Rationalist	Rationalist, Idealist	An argument that legalizing same-sex marriage would lead to marrying animals.
Appeal to Authority	Citing an irrelevant or biased authority to support a claim.	Idealist, Rationalist	Empiricist, Idealist	**John Locke** coined the term for this fallacy, *argumentum ad verecundiam*.

Part III: Fallacies of Irrelevance

These fallacies are attacks on the very topic of discussion, designed to distract and misdirect an opponent. They are particularly effective against archetypes that rely on focus and a clear line of thought. By introducing a new, irrelevant topic or by misrepresenting an opponent's argument entirely, a character can disrupt their enemy's intellectual coherence and gain a decisive advantage in combat. These fallacies are tools of cunning and misdirection, reflecting the darker side of debate.

8. Red Herring

- **Definition:** The Red Herring fallacy is a diversionary tactic that introduces an irrelevant topic into an argument to shift focus away from the original issue. The diversion is often a seemingly related but ultimately irrelevant point that is emotionally charged or controversial, drawing the opponent's attention away from the core debate. A famous example is the argument, "Losing a tooth can be scary, but have you heard about the Tooth Fairy?". The mention of the Tooth Fairy is an irrelevant point intended to shift the conversation from the unpleasant topic of losing a tooth.
- **Archetypes Allowed:** This fallacy is best employed by the **Idealist** and **Empiricist** archetypes. The Idealist can use this to introduce a new, emotionally compelling topic to steer a debate in a different direction. The Empiricist can use a seemingly related but irrelevant observation to lead an opponent down a false path of inquiry.
- **Archetypes Weak to:** The **Rationalist** and **Empiricist** archetypes are particularly vulnerable to the Red Herring. The Rationalist's focus on logic can be easily disrupted when the argument's core premise is suddenly replaced with a new, irrelevant one. The

Empiricist, whose mind is a "blank slate" on which experience makes its marks, can be led astray by a new, compelling piece of data, regardless of its relevance to the original topic.

- **Real-world philosopher who was famously caught using this fallacy: Aristotle** is associated with this fallacy through his discussion of rhetorical techniques designed to distract listeners from the core argument, which he considered a way to emotionally influence judgments. A classic example is a politician who, when asked about a controversial policy, changes the subject to an emotionally charged but irrelevant topic like national security.
- **Effect of Fallacy:**
  1. **Offense Successful:** The target takes 1d6 psychic damage and is inflicted with the Confused debuff. The target, now lost in the new, irrelevant topic introduced by the attacker, loses focus in combat and becomes intellectually disoriented.
  2. **Offense Failure:** Nothing happens.
  3. **Defense Success:** The target successfully defends, mitigating all damage, and gains advantage on their next Mind-based check. The defender's mental fortitude allows them to ignore the distraction and maintain their focus.
  4. **Defense Failure:** The target is inflicted with a Confused debuff for 1d4 rounds.

9. Strawman

- **Definition:** The Strawman fallacy occurs when an opponent's argument is deliberately misrepresented or distorted to make it easier to attack. The attacker constructs a "straw man"—a hyperbolic, inaccurate, or simplified version of the opponent's position—and then proceeds to refute that flimsy version instead of the actual argument. For example, claiming that an opponent who wants to "stop using all plastics" is a Strawman because their actual position is a more nuanced one is a classic instance of this fallacy.
- **Archetypes Allowed:** The **Rationalist** and **Materialist** archetypes are best suited for this fallacy. The Rationalist, who is adept at abstract thought, can easily create a simplified, easily debunked caricature of an opponent's position. The Materialist, who believes that all phenomena result from material interactions, may misrepresent a nuanced philosophical position as a purely physical one, making it easier to refute.
- **Archetypes Weak to:** The **Idealist** archetype is most vulnerable to this attack. An Idealist's power is tied to their non-physical will and conviction. When their beliefs are twisted and misrepresented, it can be a jarring experience that causes them to lose their footing in the debate, as the very foundation of their being is attacked.
- **Real-world philosopher who was famously caught using this fallacy:** The Strawman fallacy is a staple of political discourse. The most famous examples are not attributed to a single philosopher, but are found in the broader history of debate. The classic example of misrepresenting a nuanced environmental position as a call to "stop all plastics right now" is a clear example of this.
- **Effect of Fallacy:**
  1. **Offense Successful:** The target takes 1d6 damage and is inflicted with the Dazzled debuff. The target, finding their argument twisted and misconstrued, loses their footing in the debate, their intellectual clarity clouded by the misrepresentation.
  2. **Offense Failure:** Nothing happens.
  3. **Defense Success:** The target successfully defends, mitigating all damage, and gains advantage on their next attack roll. The defender's ability to see through the

misrepresentation and expose the flaw in the attack gives them a psychological advantage.

   4. **Defense Failure:** The target is inflicted with a Dazzled debuff for 1d4 rounds. If a "1" is rolled on the failure roll, a roll is made on the Catastrophic Events table.

10. Appeal to Emotion (Argumentum ad Passiones)

- **Definition:** This fallacy manipulates an opponent's emotions to win an argument, instead of using factual evidence or logic. The fallacy preys on feelings such as fear, pity, compassion, or anger to strengthen an argument's conclusion. It is a "red herring" that aims to sway a person's judgment away from rational consideration of the facts. For example, a student might argue for a passing grade by claiming they will lose their scholarship otherwise; the pity elicited is irrelevant to whether the student's work deserves a passing grade.
- **Archetypes Allowed:** This fallacy is best employed by the **Idealist** and **Empiricist** archetypes. The Idealist, who is driven by an emotional core of will and conviction, can use this to make a powerful and compelling emotional appeal. The Empiricist, who is pragmatic and trusts what they can feel and see, can use a convincing emotional story to sway an opponent.
- **Archetypes Weak to:** The **Rationalist** and **Materialist** archetypes are most vulnerable to this attack. The Rationalist, who struggles to reconcile their logical worldview with the "messy nature of emotion," is particularly susceptible to appeals to fear or charm. The Materialist, who believes that all phenomena result from physical interactions, can be overwhelmed by a powerful emotional attack that is not grounded in physical matter.
- **Real-world philosopher who was famously caught using this fallacy:** The philosopher **Aristotle**, in his treatise *Rhetoric*, identified this fallacy through his concept of *pathos*, noting that "the judgments we deliver are not the same when we are influenced by joy or sorrow, love or hate". While he described the power of emotional arousal, he also warned that emotions can distract from the facts of an argument, making them a potent weapon in debate.
- **Effect of Fallacy:**
   1. **Offense Successful:** The target takes 1d8 psychic damage and is inflicted with the Frightened or Charmed debuff (player's choice). This reflects the powerful psychological manipulation of the fallacy, which can either fill a person with dread or render them docile and compliant.
   2. **Offense Failure:** Nothing happens.
   3. **Defense Success:** The target successfully defends, mitigating all damage, and gains temporary hit points equal to their Heart score. The defender's emotional fortitude is a source of strength, turning the attacker's emotional manipulation into an act of self-empowerment.
   4. **Defense Failure:** The target is inflicted with a full Frightened or Charmed debuff for 1d4 rounds. If a "1" is rolled on the failure roll, a roll is made on the Catastrophic Events table.

Table 3: Fallacies of Irrelevance

Name of Fallacy	Definition of Fallacy	Archetypes Allowed	Archetypes Weak To	Real-world Philosopher Example
Red Herring	Diverting an argument to an irrelevant topic to shift focus from the main issue.	Idealist, Empiricist	Rationalist, Empiricist	A politician changes the subject to an irrelevant but emotionally charged topic.
Strawman	Misrepresenting an opponent's argument to make it easier to attack.	Rationalist, Materialist	Idealist	A nuanced position on the environment is misrepresented as a call to "stop all plastics."
Appeal to Emotion	Manipulating emotions instead of using a valid argument.	Idealist, Empiricist	Rationalist, Materialist	**Aristotle** described this fallacy through his concept of *pathos*.

Part IV: Fallacies of Faulty Reasoning

These fallacies are the most direct and pure forms of intellectual conflict. They attack the very structure of a target's reasoning, leading to intellectual collapse. Unlike fallacies of relevance or insufficient evidence, which are often used for distraction, these are the domains of the intellectually cunning, designed to trap an opponent in a self-defeating logical loop or a state of mental ambiguity. They are powerful, precise weapons that exploit a target's fundamental methods of thinking.

11. Circular Reasoning (Petitio Principii)

- **Definition:** Circular Reasoning, or *Petitio Principii*, is a fallacy where an argument assumes its own conclusion as a premise, providing no new information or justification for its truth. The argument essentially moves in a circle: A is true because B is true, and B is true because A is true. For example, "Peppers are the easiest vegetable to grow because I think peppers are the easiest vegetable to grow" is a circular argument.
- **Archetypes Allowed:** The **Rationalist** and **Idealist** archetypes are best suited to deploying this fallacy. The Rationalist, who relies on a logical framework, can construct a seemingly airtight but self-referential argument. The Idealist, who is driven by personal conviction, can use their own beliefs as both the premise and the conclusion of an argument, creating a closed-loop system of thought.
- **Archetypes Weak to:** This fallacy is particularly effective against the **Idealist** archetype. When an Idealist's mind is ensnared by a circular argument, they become trapped in a self-referential loop, unable to break free and act on new ideas.
- **Real-world philosopher who was famously caught using this fallacy:** The philosopher **René Descartes** is famously associated with the "Cartesian Circle". He argued that the existence of God is proven by the reliability of clear and distinct perceptions, which, in turn, are guaranteed by the existence of a benevolent God. This

circular argument uses the conclusion (God's existence) as a premise to justify the reliability of the perceptions used to prove the conclusion, a classic and powerful example of this fallacy.

- **Effect of Fallacy:**
  1. **Offense Successful:** The target takes 1d10 psychic damage and is inflicted with the Bound debuff. The target's mind is locked in a self-referential loop, preventing them from taking movement actions in a physical manifestation of their mental imprisonment.
  2. **Offense Failure:** Nothing happens.
  3. **Defense Success:** The target successfully defends, mitigating all damage, and the attacker is inflicted with a half-potency Bound debuff. The attacker's own flawed logic is turned against them, causing them to falter.
  4. **Defense Failure:** The target is inflicted with a full Bound debuff for 1d4 rounds. If a "1" is rolled on the failure roll, a roll is made on the Catastrophic Events table.

12. Equivocation

- **Definition:** The Equivocation fallacy is an error that uses a single ambiguous word or phrase with two different meanings within the same argument, leading to a misleading or invalid conclusion. The fallacy preys on the audience's assumption that a key term's meaning remains consistent throughout the argument, while the arguer subtly shifts its definition to suit their needs. For example, a sign reading "Free Parking" might be an example of equivocation if the parking is only "free" with a purchase. The word "free" is used in an ambiguous way to mislead.
- **Archetypes Allowed:** The **Rationalist** and **Materialist** archetypes are most likely to use this fallacy. The Rationalist, with their mastery of language, can use this to create an illusion of valid reasoning. The Materialist might use this to blur the lines between a literal and a figurative meaning of a word, as in the classic example of the word "headache" being used in both a literal and a figurative sense.
- **Archetypes Weak to:** The **Empiricist** archetype is most vulnerable to this attack. An Empiricist's mind is a "blank slate" on which experience makes its marks. When faced with a word that is intentionally ambiguous and open to multiple interpretations, they may struggle to find the single, empirical truth.
- **Real-world philosopher who was famously caught using this fallacy:** The philosopher **Aristotle**, in his *Sophistical Refutations*, addressed fallacies of ambiguity, which includes Equivocation. Equivocation is a form of sophistry, a rhetorical tactic that attempts to obscure the truth through a manipulation of language, a skill that the enemies of *The Axiomatic Self* might employ in their debates with the player.
- **Effect of Fallacy:**
  1. **Offense Successful:** The target takes 1d6 damage and is inflicted with the Dazzled debuff. The target's intellectual acuity is clouded by the intentional ambiguity of the attacker's words.
  2. **Offense Failure:** Nothing happens.
  3. **Defense Success:** The target successfully defends, mitigating all damage, and gains advantage on their next Mind-based roll. The defender's ability to see through the intentional ambiguity of the attacker's words is a source of strength.
  4. **Defense Failure:** The target is inflicted with a full Dazzled debuff for 1d4 rounds. If a "1" is rolled on the failure roll, a roll is made on the Catastrophic Events table.

Table 4: Fallacies of Faulty Reasoning

Name of Fallacy	Definition of Fallacy	Archetypes Allowed	Archetypes Weak To	Real-world Philosopher Example
Circular Reasoning	An argument that assumes its own conclusion as a premise, providing no new justification.	Rationalist, Idealist	Idealist	The **Cartesian Circle**, attributed to **René Descartes**, uses God to justify perception, which then justifies God.
Equivocation	Using an ambiguous word or phrase with two meanings in the same argument.	Rationalist, Materialist	Empiricist	**Aristotle** described this type of fallacy in his *Sophistical Refutations*.

Appendix I: The Game Mechanics of Fallacious Combat

The game's Effect of Fallacy mechanic is a direct and compelling manifestation of the game's core philosophical premise: that intellectual conflict has tangible, physical consequences. This system is a masterful synthesis of the user's research materials, blending the unpredictable lethality of *Mörk Borg* with the progression-oriented, high-stakes combat of *Kingdom Hearts*. The player's success or failure in a logical debate directly determines whether they land a strike or receive a blow. The following tables provide a compendium of debuffs and a series of catastrophic events to directly support this core game loop.

Table 5: Fallacious Debuffs Compendium

The following table provides a comprehensive list of status conditions and debuffs, synthesized from the user's research material. The debuffs are a key component of the game's combat system, representing the physical and psychological toll of a successful fallacy attack.

Name of Debuff	Effect on Target	Archetype(s) Most Vulnerable	Source
Confused	Target has a $\frac{1}{3}^{rd}$ chance to attack themselves, an ally, or the intended target.	Rationalist, Empiricist	
Dazzled	Target has a -2 penalty on attack rolls.	Rationalist, Empiricist	
Terrorized	Target must use their full move action to flee in the opposite	Idealist, Rationalist	

Name of Debuff	Effect on Target	Archetype(s) Most Vulnerable	Source
	direction.		
Bound	Target is incapable of taking move actions.	Idealist	
Stunned	Target immediately drops their weapon and is incapable of making actions besides saving throws for 1 round.	Idealist, Materialist	
Frightened	Target must use their full move action to flee in the opposite direction from the source of the fear.	Rationalist, Idealist	
Charmed	Target is manipulated by the opponent's emotions, becoming docile and compliant.	Rationalist, Materialist	
Despairing	Target has disadvantage on all rolls and sees no hope of winning the encounter.	Idealist	Derived from Mörk Borg's tone of "fathomless despair."
Corrupted	Target loses 1 point of Authenticity per round, a direct measure of their spiritual integrity.	All Archetypes	Derived from the *Mörk Borg* and *Kingdom Hearts* synthesis.

Table 6: Catastrophic Events on Failure

The user's system specifies that if a "1" is rolled for either an offense or defense failure, the player must roll on a table of catastrophic events. This mechanic is a direct implementation of the Calendar of Nechrubel from the *Mörk Borg* RPG, where a die roll at dawn determines a world-altering, fated corruption. This mechanic functions as the game's representation of Determinism, a cosmic, unavoidable force of decay that stands in opposition to the player's personal choices and Free Will. The "1" on the die roll is a moment of cosmic irony, signifying that despite a character's best efforts, their fate was already sealed.

Roll (d66)	Name of Event	World Effect
1-1	The City is Hollowed	The next major town or city the party visits is now a ghost town. All its inhabitants are gone, leaving only their possessions behind.
1-2	The Earth is Riven	A major landmark on the map, such as a mountain or a fortress, is destroyed by an earthquake, and from the

Roll (d66)	Name of Event	World Effect
		cracks, a poisonous mist rises to shroud the area for 1d12 days.
1-3	The Dead Walk	A nearby cemetery, such as Graven-Tosk , has now become an active crypt. The soil grows warm and the dead are made to walk, attacking anyone who enters.
1-4	The Kingdom Burns	A nearby kingdom or town is now burning, and a massive horde is rampaging through it. The party must now find a new home.
1-5	The Waters Turn to Tar	All water sources within a 10-mile radius, including lakes and brooks, blacken and become poisonous tar. Any creature that drinks from it must succeed on a DC 15 Constitution saving throw or become poisoned for 1d4 days.
1-6	A Great Stone Falls	A great stone plummets from the sky, landing somewhere on the map. Its gift is Death and madness is its herald. The area around the impact site is now an area of magical corruption.
2-1	The Last King Withers	The party's patron, a king or a queen, withers to dust before their eyes. The court is now in chaos, and the party must now serve a new master or be cast out.
2-2	The Liar Makes Knots of Hearts	The strongest bonds between the party members are sundered. The party's leader is now viewed with suspicion and their every word is doubted. This debuff lasts until the party completes a major quest together.
2-3	Hunger Comes Among You	The party's supplies are ruined, and food is scarce. The party must now roll on the forage table at a disadvantage, and

Roll (d66)	Name of Event	World Effect
		the gaunt prey upon the gaunt.
2-4	The Black Serpent Rises	The earth veins, bringing forth black serpents from within. These serpents attack without warning and are immune to all forms of magical damage.
2-5	Dreams of the Countess	The world begins to lose its color, becoming a pale, monochromatic image. This effect is a permanent debuff to all sight-based Perception checks, and is a thematic representation of the game's deterministic decay.
2-6	The world dies	The seventh misery, 7:7, is activated. The world finally dies, and the game ends here.

Appendix II: The Philosophical Alignment Matrix

This matrix is a critical document for game balance, explicitly linking a character's metaphysical identity to their mechanical strengths and weaknesses. The core concept of *The Axiomatic Self* is that "your beliefs are not just flavor text; they are a source of power and a wellspring of weakness". This table mechanizes that concept, ensuring that a player's choice of archetype at character creation has a direct and meaningful impact on their effectiveness in combat against a variety of logical foes. This is how the game's philosophical core becomes a fundamental strategic element of gameplay.

Table 7: Fallacy Archetype Matrix

Fallacy Name	Archetype(s) Allowed	Archetype(s) Weak to
Abusive Ad Hominem	Rationalist, Empiricist	Rationalist, Idealist
Tu Quoque	Idealist, Materialist	Idealist
Circumstantial Ad Hominem	Empiricist, Materialist	Idealist
Guilt by Association	Rationalist, Idealist	Rationalist, Empiricist
Hasty Generalization	Empiricist, Materialist	Empiricist, Rationalist
Slippery Slope	Idealist, Rationalist	Rationalist, Idealist
Appeal to Authority	Idealist, Rationalist	Empiricist, Idealist
Red Herring	Idealist, Empiricist	Rationalist, Empiricist
Strawman	Rationalist, Materialist	Idealist
Appeal to Emotion	Idealist, Empiricist	Rationalist, Materialist
Circular Reasoning	Rationalist, Idealist	Idealist
Equivocation	Rationalist, Materialist	Empiricist

Works cited

1. en.wikipedia.org,

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cartesian_circle#:~:text=The%20Cartesian%20circle%20(also%20known,is%20itself%20guaranteed%20by%20God. 2. Ad hominem | Research Starters - EBSCO, https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/religion-and-philosophy/ad-hominem 3. List of fallacies - Wikipedia, https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_fallacies 4. Ad Hominem : Department of Philosophy - Texas State University, https://www.txst.edu/philosophy/resources/fallacy-definitions/ad-hominem.html 5. Ad hominem - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ad_hominem 6. 15 Logical Fallacies to Know, With Definitions and Examples - Grammarly, https://www.grammarly.com/blog/rhetorical-devices/logical-fallacies/ 7. Converse Accident; Hasty Generalization, https://philosophy.lander.edu/logic/converse.html 8. Aristotle, the Fallacy of Accident, and the Nature of Predication: A Historical Inquiry - Project MUSE, https://muse.jhu.edu/article/226632/summary 9. Fallacies of composition and division - The Logical Place - WordPress.com, https://yandoo.wordpress.com/2014/04/07/fallacies-of-composition-and-division/ 10. Slippery Slope Fallacy | Definition & Examples - Scribbr, https://www.scribbr.com/fallacies/slippery-slope-fallacy/ 11. Appeal to Authority Fallacy | Definition & Examples - Scribbr, https://www.scribbr.com/fallacies/appeal-to-authority-fallacy/ 12. Argument from authority - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Argument_from_authority 13. Appeal to emotion - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Appeal_to_emotion 14. The Appeal to Emotion Fallacy: Arguing Through Feelings Rather than Facts - Effectiviology, https://effectiviology.com/appeal-to-emotion/ 15. Circular reasoning - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Circular_reasoning 16. Epistemic Circularity | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, https://iep.utm.edu/ep-circ/ 17. Cartesian circle - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cartesian_circle 18. Equivocation Fallacy | Definition & Examples - Scribbr, https://www.scribbr.com/fallacies/equivocation-fallacy/ 19. Equivocation - (Intro to Philosophy) - Vocab, Definition, Explanations | Fiveable, https://library.fiveable.me/key-terms/intro-philosophy/equivocation