Yes or No Philosophy
July 2020
by Elliot Temple

YesNo

- Brainstorming potential chart nodes:
  - Decision Charts
  - Library of Criticism
  - Digital vs. Analog & Error Correction
  - Excess capacity on most criteria
  - Binary factors
  - Breakpoints: convert continuum to digital/binary
  - Focus: bottlenecks/constraints, priorities
  - Clear goals enable decisive answers
  - specify success and failure criteria for goals.
  - Moving some judgment to which goals to have instead of which ideas are "better"
  - Evaluating "does this idea solve this specific goal?"
  - too few solutions (zero)? brainstorm. look for solutions to individual goals, or smaller sets of goals, instead of the full compound goals. find ways to drop some goals. meta recursive problem solving technique.
  - too many solutions? usually just pick any. alternatively, come up with some additional goals and AND them into the compound goals.
  - too many solutions **and** they contradict each other? if none can resolve the issue, reject them all for having an outstanding criticism which they fail to address. A refutes B and B refutes A and neither is good enough to deal with this. Try to come up with a variant which isn't refuted and also try normal ways to proceed with no solutions.
  - error bars on breakpoints
  - qualitative is more important than quantitative. should focus there. explanations and concepts are best. and, secondarily, quantitative converts via breakpoints.
  - YesNo helps people think objectively. Still need creativity and good judgment. But YesNo organizes things better and makes more objectivity easier.
  - compromise is bad, especially when dealing with explanations, concepts, principles, qualitative differences. those things don't mix. they aren't just matters of degree or different points on a particular continuum.
- Degree Arguments
  - "Strong" and "weak" arguments
  - Argue on many different non-convertible dimensions
    - Summed up in final score (numeric or not)
      - Scores of individual issues, and weightings to combine them, are (semi) arbitrary, hard to error correct and hard to objectively debate.
        - See also https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2011/02/14/the-order-of-things
  - Related to induction.
    - Induction claims basically that more evidence = stronger argument.
      - Solomonoff Induction and Occam's Razor. Shorter/simpler = better (allegedly). Harmless tiebreaker between ideas that solve the identical compound goal since ***any*** tiebreaker is OK for that. But clearly we shouldn't prefer X over Y due to brevity when X fails at a goal that Y succeeds at and we have that goal.
  - Can be positive or negative.
    - The positive arguments can be converted into negative arguments to be more rigorous. Praising a virtue converts to criticizing rival ideas for lacking the virtue.
  - Sometimes degree arguers focus on a single idea without the context of rival solutions. Then they praise its merits without considering whether alternatives would also have the identical merits. An idea can't be "better" without rivals (better than what?). The way an idea is "better" is actually that it works, while rivals don't, for some goal(s).
- Decisive Arguments
  - Already favored but people believe we can't come up with enough of them. Degree arguments sort out the non-refuted ideas left over from using decisive arguments.
  - Much easier to come up with when using clear goals with specific success/failure criteria.
  - Use compound goals (AND together sets of goals) instead of trying to convert many dimensions into a final score by deciding strength and weighting.
    - Converting to single result is non-problematic when everything being converted is YES or NO and the combining function is AND (either you have ***all*** yes's or you don't).
  - There are many ways to ask binary questions directly and bring up key qualitative issues, explanations, concepts and principles.
    - You can also convert non-binary issues via breakpoints.
      - Breakpoints use discontinuities/asymmetries to differentiate conceptual categories rather than merely numeric ranges.
        - You can also add evenly spaced arbitrary breakpoints, or use maximization, as a backup when having no breakpoint is inappropriate but you can't find one.
  - Do you know a reason this idea won't work to achieve this goal? Yes or no? If no one has a refutation, then as best we know it'll work, regardless of what positive arguments we have, and how much weight of evidence we have, allegedly supporting it.
    - If someone does have a refutation, then no amount of weight of evidence and wonderful supporting arguments mean its OK to ignore the refutation. The refutation should be considered and addressed: why will the idea in fact not fail? Is there an error in the refutation? Or can we modify the idea to not fail?
      - People's degree arguments often have value that can be salvaged. When they do, it should be possible to use them to help come up with refutations or rebuttals to refutations. If you can't do either of those, then the degree arguments aren't useful.
- Focus
  - We can only think about a few things at a time.
    - But we care about many issues.
      - Solution? Most issues must be easy (in context). In other words, they have excess capacity. Many issues are part of default/generic background context that usually doesn't need attention.
        - We focus attention on a few key issues (often 1-3, but we can go higher with effort or sequentially).
          - Where do we focus? Bottlenecks, hard parts, high priorities for us, major risks, major values, things we want to improve, things facing important criticism.
- Resolving Debates
  - People think criticism can go endlessly back and forth, and that's one reason decisive arguments are limited. They give on decisive resolution, look at the whole debate, and make an overall degree judgment.
    - Solutions?
      - Libraries of criticism. Find patterns in errors. Reuse criticism and answers.
        - Result: Any criticism is either already covered by your library or not in your library. If it's new to you, it's worth attention!
          - There aren't endless bad faith or dumb arguments because those fit patterns. If you can't figure out what patterns they fit, you don't understand them enough to reject the category. If you claim you recognize an argument as being one of the bad ones, then you're claiming to recognize its category. If you can't place it in any category, you don't recognize it and don't know anything is wrong with it.
      - Meta recursive problem solving method helps reach answers.
      - Clear goals (designed with success/failure criteria and to allow an objective binary answer) and structured discussion make it much easier to resolve issues.
        - View discussion as adding nodes to idea trees. Clearly explain the connections between every parent and child node if asked.
        - Decision chart structure (or YesNo approach without an explicit chart) lets us evaluate specifically if a particular idea solves a particular clearly-defined problem.
          - Look at how many cells there are in a decision chart. 400 in a 20x20 chart. You're splitting the debate into that many small chunks and enabling debate over each one individually. Debating well-defined small pieces is much easier. Normal debates sorta do everything at once. An argument often covers e.g. some vaguely-specified 25% of the issues and is also meant to help reach a final overall conclusion.