

Cooperative Dilemmas in Rational Debate

Toby Handfield, Julián García, Christian Hilbe, Shang Long Yeo*

8 April 2025

Abstract

As an epistemic activity, rational debate and discussion requires cooperation, yet involves a tension between collective and individual interests. While all participants benefit from collective outcomes like reaching consensus on true beliefs, individuals face personal costs when changing their minds. This creates an incentive for each debater to let others bear the cognitive burden of exploring alternative perspectives. We present a model to examine the strategic dynamics between debaters motivated by two competing goals: discovering truth and minimizing belief revisions. Our model demonstrates that this tension creates social dilemmas where strategies that are optimal for individuals systematically undermine the collective pursuit of truth. Paradoxically, our analysis reveals that increasing debaters' motivation to seek truth can sometimes produce equilibria with worse outcomes for collective truth discovery. These findings illuminate why rational debate can fail to achieve optimal epistemic outcomes, even when participants genuinely value truth.

*JG and TH: Monash University; CH: IT:U; SL:Y: National University of Singapore. Corresponding author: toby.handfield@monash.edu.

1 Background

Rational debate is widely celebrated as an epistemic practice through which individuals and communities advance knowledge and refine beliefs. While some debates are artificially designed to be purely competitive, most discussions offer opportunities for intellectual cooperation across domains ranging from scientific inquiry to policy development. Yet even as participants work toward shared epistemic goals, they face a persistent tension: the collective aim of discovering truth may conflict with the individual preference for maintaining stable beliefs. This tension creates a potential cooperative dilemma where individual rational choices might undermine collective epistemic achievements.

Substantial evidence indicates that human reasoning evolved primarily as a social rather than individual cognitive adaptation. The architecture of human reasoning appears specifically designed for exchanging and evaluating arguments in group settings (1, 2), with even the fundamental structures of logic potentially emerging from dialectical practices rather than solitary contemplation (3). Cross-cultural studies demonstrate remarkably consistent patterns of argumentative sensitivity across diverse societies (4), while developmental research shows that children evaluate argument quality from a young age (5). These findings align with philosophical perspectives on social epistemology, which recognize the essential role of testimony and collaborative inquiry in knowledge acquisition (6–9). Contemporary work in this area highlights the strategic dimensions of collective knowledge production, acknowledging that epistemic cooperation involves navigating both shared and competing interests (10–12).

The strategic aspects of debate create the conditions for what have been termed “epistemic dilemmas”—situations where individually rational epistemic choices lead to collectively suboptimal outcomes (13). When engaged in rational discourse, participants typically balance at least two competing motivations: the desire to hold true beliefs and the desire to minimize cognitive disruption by maintaining stable beliefs. This creates a situation analogous to other social dilemmas, where individual incentives may pull against collective benefit. While individuals benefit from collectively identifying truth, each participant might prefer that others do more of the cognitive work of exploring alternative perspectives. These dynamics may help explain various phenomena, including confirmation bias, polarization in public discourse, and the varying speeds at which different epistemic communities converge on accurate beliefs. Understanding these dynamics requires formal analysis of how different argumentation strategies interact and how they relate to both individual and collective epistemic goals.

This work addresses three key questions about rational debate. First, we develop a framework that models different debate strategies and explores what makes someone a cooperative discussion partner. For instance, a cooperative debater might help others discover truth while minimizing unnecessary disruption to their beliefs, while an uncooperative one might refuse to engage, or might needlessly force others to repeatedly revise their positions. Second, we examine whether rational debate can create strategic dilemmas: situations where debaters’ individually optimal choices lead to outcomes that frustrate everyone’s goals. We approach this question both from the perspective of individual debaters, who care about both finding truth and maintaining stable beliefs, and from the perspective of a hypothetical social planner who cares only about the group’s overall accuracy. Finally, we study which debate strategies occur in equilibrium, depending on the motivations of the debaters, and examine whether groups always achieve more accurate beliefs when individuals are more strongly motivated to seek truth.

2 Model and results

Drawing on a framework developed by Gregor Betz (14), we model a rational debate using a pair of debaters who occupy positions in logical space. A position in logical space is simply an assignment of truth values to the propositions being debated. So for instance, in a 3-proposition debate, there are 8 complete positions that might be occupied, corresponding to the 2^3 ways of assigning truth values to the three propositions.

At any point in the debate, some subset of the logically possible positions remain *tenable*: these are the positions that have not been refuted by any earlier arguments. Debaters take turns introducing new arguments, which have the effect of reducing the space of tenable positions.

An argument makes positions untenable in the following way: consider two propositions, p and q . There are four logically possible combinations of truth values for these propositions. The argument “ p , therefore q ” does not tell us anything about what is the case if p is false, so it leaves the not- p positions untouched. What the argument does say is that if p is true, then q is true also. So it renders untenable all the positions at which p is true and q is false.

We adopt classical logic rather than non-monotonic reasoning systems, meaning that once an argument eliminates a position, that position remains eliminated regardless of what other propositions might be introduced. While real-world argumentation often involves defeasible reasoning (where $p \rightarrow r$ but $p \& q \rightarrow \neg r$), our focus on the dialectical dynamics

of debate justifies this simplification. Future work could explore more complex logical frameworks, but for our present purposes, classical logic provides a cleaner basis for understanding the strategic choices debaters face.

If a debater's present position is removed by a new argument, they move to a new position. We assume debaters are reluctant to revise beliefs any more than necessary, so they adopt a position that requires changing opinion on as few propositions as possible. Using a spatial metaphor, we can say that they prefer to move the smallest possible distance in logical space.

For purposes of visualization, it can be helpful to think of the space of tenable positions as a graph, where each node is a tenable position, which assigns a truth value to every proposition in the debate. We can get a sense for the structure of the tenable positions by drawing edges between any two positions that differ with respect to precisely one proposition. In Figure 1 we illustrate the evolution of a brief debate over three propositions.




Figure 1: Evolution of a debate over three propositions. The debater positions are indicated by the red and blue nodes, while the truth is the yellow node (A). Red introduces an argument which forces Blue to adopt a new position (B). Blue produces an argument which affects an unoccupied position (C). At the end of the debate, Red has 2 true beliefs and Blue has one true belief (D).

Additionally, we choose one node at random to be the factually true position. In our baseline model, we initially assume that debaters only produce valid arguments—those that don't eliminate the true position. This represents ideally rational agents who respect logical constraints. This approach establishes a baseline for understanding debate dynamics, though we later extend the model to include an error parameter (α) that allows for invalid arguments that might accidentally rule out truth. It is also important to note that, unlike some philosophical accounts of argumentation, our model treats propositions as atomic and logically independent of each other. This deliberate simplification allows us to focus on the

strategic, dialectical aspects of debate rather than on the substantive logical relationships between propositions.

2.1 The process of debate

We model a debate with two agents, and n propositions under debate. The two debaters are initially assigned random positions.

At each timestep of the debate, we randomize whose turn it is to produce an argument. If the debater’s strategy can produce one or more valid arguments, then it is further randomized which of those arguments will be introduced. The space of tenable positions is then updated to reflect the positions that have been eliminated by the argument. If either debater’s position is eliminated by an argument, that debater moves to a remaining node that minimizes the number of belief changes required.

To evaluate how well different debate strategies help people discover truth, we track what proportion of each debater’s beliefs are actually correct. For instance, if there are four propositions under debate, and a debater correctly believes three of them but is wrong about the fourth, their accuracy score would be 0.75. We are interested not just in individual performance, but also in how well the debaters do as a group. This collective accuracy – which we calculate by averaging the individual accuracy scores – represents what a hypothetical impartial observer would care about if their only concern was maximizing the number of true beliefs across all participants. We also examine how often debaters come to agree with each other, measuring consensus by counting the proportion of issues on which they share the same view. This helps us understand whether certain debate strategies are better at promoting agreement, regardless of whether that agreement is on true or false beliefs.

Real-world debates can end for many reasons: participants might run out of time or energy, lose interest, or simply need to move on to other activities. To reflect this in our model, we include a random chance that the debate will end at any point. This chance is controlled by a parameter for continuation probability (δ) that we can adjust to simulate shorter or longer debates. For example, with a low δ , debates tend to be brief, while a high δ allows for extended discussions. Debates can also end in two other ways. First, if the debaters have successfully eliminated all false positions through their arguments, they will both arrive at the true position, and no further progress is possible. Second, debates might reach a deadlock: given the particular strategies the debaters are using, there might be no more valid arguments available to either participant, even though multiple positions remain tenable.

2.2 Argumentation strategies

Throughout a debate, participants follow consistent strategies for constructing their arguments. Each strategy has two components: a rule for choosing premises (the starting points of an argument) and a rule for choosing conclusions (what the argument aims to establish). When choosing premises, a debater has four options: they can use statements that they themselves believe to be true, statements at least one of which they believe to be false, statements their opponent believes to be true, or statements at least one of which their opponent believes to be false. Similarly, when choosing conclusions, they again have these same four options. Combining these rules for premises and conclusions creates sixteen possible strategies.

We label these choices using simple abbreviations: “Self-Accept” (**S+**) means using statements the debater believes, “Self-Reject” (**S-**) means using at least one statement the debater disbelieves, “Other-Accept” (**O+**) means using statements their opponent believes, and “Other-Reject” (**O-**) means using at least one statement their opponent disbelieves. For example, a debater using the strategy “**O+S-**” builds arguments by taking premises their opponent believes (**O+**) to argue for conclusions that they themselves disbelieve (**S-**).

In addition to these 16 strategies, an additional strategy, “Exit” represents the complete refusal to enter debate, terminating the exchange for both players. “Exit” captures a variety of non-epistemically motivated ways to respond to the prospect of a debate. (See Supplementary Information (**SI**) for full enumeration of strategies.)

To help understand the broad patterns in our model, we can categorize the sixteen possible strategies into four groups: *bold*, *conservative*, *compromising*, and *refusenik*. While this categorization is not essential to how the model works, it helps illuminate the key differences in how combinations of strategies affect debate outcomes. These four categories can be grouped into two higher classes: monadic strategies (including bold and conservative) and dyadic strategies (including compromising and refusenik).

Monadic strategies are those where a debater builds arguments using only one person’s beliefs – either their own beliefs or their opponent’s, but not both. Among these monadic strategies, we distinguish two important types. The *bold* strategies (**S+S-** and **O+O-**) force at least one debater to change their position with each argument, unless they already hold true beliefs. These strategies are highly effective at finding truth but create significant disruption by requiring frequent belief revision. In contrast, *conservative* strategies have the opposite property: at least one debater will never be forced to change their position by a

conservative strategy – they either use premises the debater rejects or argue for conclusions the debater accepts. While these strategies minimize the uncomfortable experience of changing one’s mind, they do so at the cost of making it harder to discover truth.

The remaining strategies combine beliefs from both debaters in constructing arguments – we call these “*dyadic*” strategies because they involve both participants’ views. These strategies show more varied patterns in their outcomes than the monadic strategies. Within this group, two strategies stand out because they never force anyone to change their mind: **S–O+** and **O–S+**. These strategies work by taking premises that one debater disbelieves and using them to argue for conclusions that the other debater accepts. Since neither debater needs to revise any beliefs when faced with such arguments, we call these the “*refusenik*” strategies. We include in this category the “Exit” strategy, where a debater simply refuses to participate in the debate – this achieves the same effect of avoiding belief revision, but more directly, and denies the debate partner the opportunity to make any arguments. All other dyadic strategies can potentially cause at least one debater to change their position, so we call them “*compromising*” strategies. These compromising strategies often lead to interesting dynamics: since they incorporate both debaters’ viewpoints, some of them help debaters quickly reach agreement. However, this isn’t universally true – some compromising strategies can actually keep debaters in disagreement for long periods.

To illustrate how combinations of these strategies give rise to very different collective epistemic outcomes, in Figure 2 we plot the expected levels of collective accuracy for various strategy profiles (pairs of debater strategies). As the plots illustrate, strategy profiles in which at least one strategy is bold tend to maximize collective accuracy. When both strategies are conservative, or both are refusenik, the collective epistemic performance is much worse. The final category of profiles – where at least one strategy is compromising and no strategy is bold, is much more heterogeneous, including both strong and weak outcomes for truth. (See **SI** for analogous plots regarding the effect of various strategy profiles on consensus.)

2.3 Debater error

To model the possibility that debaters sometimes are less than perfectly rational, we extend our baseline model to include an error parameter α which represents the probability that an invalid argument is mistakenly (or indeed, deceptively) accepted. See **SI** for details on precisely how the probability of argument selection is calculated when $\alpha > 0$.

When invalid arguments are accepted, this entails that the truth is removed. Once this happens the monotonic approach towards truth that is observed in the baseline model is




Figure 2: Expected collective accuracy over debate length, for all strategy profiles grouped by type. **A:** ≥ 1 bold strategy **B:** both conservative **C:** both refusenik **D:** ≥ 1 compromising, none bold. $n = 3$.

undermined: additional arguments can take debaters further from truth (see Figure 3).




Figure 3: Expected collective accuracy over debate length, for varying levels of α . Profiles from Table 1 are identified in the legend. At $\alpha = 0$, the strategy profile ($\mathbf{S+S-}, \mathbf{S+S-}$) is truth maximizing for all levels of δ , but at non-zero α , other, less argumentative strategies, fare better in long debates.

2.4 What agents want

We assume agents want to have beliefs that are as close as possible to the truth, but are reluctant to change their mind (accuracy, obstinacy). These payoffs reflect a familiar tension akin to the “explore/exploit” tradeoff in learning systems: agents must weigh the potential benefits of discovering new truths (exploration) against the comfort and efficiency of maintaining their current beliefs (exploitation) (15–17). While not a direct parallel—our model concerns refutation rather than active experimentation—both situations involve an agent deciding whether to incur immediate costs for potential future epistemic gains. Just as an algorithm might stick with a known reward source rather than sample a new option that could be better, our debaters may resist changing their beliefs even when doing so might lead them closer to the truth.

We make the tradeoff between these motivations precise by using the following utility function:

$$u(v, d) = w \cdot v - d$$

$v \in [0, n]$ is the number of beliefs that the agent has which are true by the end of the debate. d is the aggregate number of times that the debater changed their mind on any particular proposition. w is a term to reflect the weight the agent places on the desirability of gaining a new true belief versus the undesirability of changing one’s mind: an agent weakly prefers a new true belief if they can obtain it with w or fewer changes of mind.

2.4.1 The Ideal Cooperative Debater

To begin getting an intuition for what a cooperative argumentation strategy is, consider an ideally altruistic debate partner. Such a partner would enhance the accuracy of one's beliefs while minimizing unnecessary changes of mind. They would systematically eliminate false positions from logical space, preserving only the participant's current position and the objectively true position. Once this stage is reached, a final argument could target the participant's false beliefs, allowing for maximum truth acquisition with minimal cognitive disruption. This scenario effectively allows the beneficiary to free-ride, as their partner does the challenging work of eliminating false options, leaving the free-rider to make only the most necessary belief changes to maximize truth.

While our strategy space does not permit such finely targeted dialectical altruism, this ideal serves as a useful limiting case. Generally, agents in our model prefer partners who balance two traits: they should minimize unnecessary refutations of one's position to avoid excessive changes of mind, while also being epistemically efficient in rapidly eliminating false positions. As we adjust model parameters to represent debaters with greater concern for truth, the importance of this second trait increases: non-disruptiveness becomes less crucial, while epistemic efficiency gains prominence.

The strategic landscape also changes when debates are expected to be short-lived. In brief exchanges, the ideal approach of systematically ruling out all false positions before altering one's own beliefs becomes less practical because the debate might end prematurely. As a result, a debater who places a high value on discovering the truth might actually prefer a partner who challenges their beliefs more aggressively. While this approach may lead to more frequent changes of mind, it also offers the potential for rapid improvements in the accuracy of one's beliefs.

2.4.2 Formal Definition of Cooperation and cooperative dilemmas

We can formally define what constitutes cooperation in debate as follows, extending the framework of Peña and Nöldeke (18). A pair of actions or strategies C (cooperation) and D (defection) represent a *cooperate-defect pair* iff:

1. Mutual cooperation is preferred to mutual defection: $E(C, C) > E(D, D)$
2. The payoff from cooperation creates positive externalities:
 - The payoff to a cooperator against a cooperator is at least as great as the payoff to a cooperator against a defector: $E(C, C) \geq E(C, D)$
 - The payoff to a defector against a cooperator is at least as great as the payoff

to a defector against a defector $E(D, C) \geq E(D, D)$

- And at least one of these two inequalities must be strict

We say a game is a *cooperative dilemma* if it has two actions C, D , such that:

- C is part of a socially optimal profile (i.e. maximizes average payoff), and
- D is played in an equilibrium profile that is suboptimal, and
- C, D are a cooperate–defect action pair.

We can then categorize these cooperative dilemmas as prisoner’s dilemmas, stag hunts, or snowdrift games, being the three types of cooperative dilemma possible in a 2×2 game.

With this definition, we survey the space of games, and observe that there are numerous cooperative dilemmas. In Table 1 we give a representative illustration, holding δ fixed at 0.8, and sampling a variety of truth weights. Observe that at very low truth weights, the cooperative actions are *Compromise* strategies, and the defect action is a *Conservative* strategy. At higher truth weights, the cooperative actions are *Bold* strategies, and the defect action is a *Compromise* strategy. This pattern, whereby the cooperative action in a cooperative pair is the more epistemically productive of the pair, is observed across a wide range of parameters.

Representative cooperative dilemmas arising across parameter space, ($\delta = 0.8$). For simplicity we only present the pure strategy equilibria in the table, as these suffice to demonstrate the existence of the relevant “Defect” strategies.

Regime	Social optima	Pure strategy equilibria	Cooperative dilemmas
Very low truth weight (2.5)	(S–O–,S–O–) or (O–S–,O–S–)	(Exit,Exit) and (Exit,S+S+)	Prisoner’s Dilemma: S–O– v S+S+
Low truth weight (3.5)	(S–O–,O+O–) or (O–S–,S+S–)	(Exit,Exit) and (S+S–,S+O+)	Stag Hunt: S–O– v S+O+; Snowdrift: O+O–/S+S– v S+O+
Moderate truth weight (4.5)	(O+O–,O+S+) or (S+S–,S+O+)	(Exit,Exit) and (S+S–,S+O+)	Snowdrift: O+O–/S+S– v S+O+
High truth weight (9.5)	(O+O–,O+O–) or (S+S–,S+S–)	(Exit,Exit) and (S+S–,S+S–)	No dilemmas

2.5 Measuring conflict and harmony between the debaters

If debate is a zero sum activity, then hoping for cooperation to occur is naive. On the other hand, if debate is a pure coordination game then cooperation should be relatively trivial. To convey the scope for possible cooperation across parameter space, in Figure 4 we plot the rank correlation between the players payoffs as a measure of the degree of harmony/conflict between them (19). Where payoffs are strictly anti-correlated, the game is competitive and we expect no cooperation, where the payoffs are strictly aligned, cooperation is straightforward. As the figure illustrates, there are always possibilities for cooperation: the index is always positive – but cooperation is apparently easier in longer debates, and in a narrow range of truth weights that varies depending on the length of the debate.




Figure 4: Harmony/conflict index (rank correlation of players’ payoffs) across parameter space. To focus the analysis on the most relevant payoff differences, we have first removed dominated strategies. In white areas, the conflict index is undefined, because there is only one dominant strategy.

2.6 Identifying equilibria

To study what behaviors are likely to emerge in actual debates, we use the familiar Nash equilibrium concept from game theory. For small debates ($n = 3$) we use numerical methods

to calculate the expected outcome of any two debating strategies being used, and assign utilities to the outcome using the above utility function. For larger debates we rely on simulations. We then identify pairs of strategies that are mutual best responses: where neither debater has a reason to unilaterally shift to an alternative strategy.

We prefer to use the Nash concept rather than the ESS concept (20), which assumes symmetric equilibria, because we anticipate an important possibility is that debaters might employ asymmetric strategy profiles, where one uses a more cooperative strategy, while the other uses a less cooperative one. Indeed, we observe this, particularly at intermediate truth weights (see, e.g. Table 1).

What equilibria we observe is highly sensitive to the parameters being studied. Whether the debate is long or short, whether the debaters care about truth, and whether the debaters make frequent errors, all change the nature of the underlying game substantially.

There is often an abundance of equilibria at any given point in parameter space. As a way of focusing our discussion on a salient set of results, we introduce the idea of an *epistemic planner* as an equilibrium selection device. We assume that the epistemic planner steers the debaters to the equilibrium that is most truth-conducive. While this is an obvious idealization, it seems an apt choice to highlight what emerges from the tension between ideally epistemic concerns and the debaters' more mixed motives. As a robustness check we also examine the results when the equilibrium selection uses a utilitarian criterion, to simply maximize the debaters' payoffs (see **SI**).

In Figure 5, upper panels, we plot the types of strategies that appear in the truth-optimal equilibrium, at a range of parameters. In the lower panels. We observe that at $\alpha = 0$, there are broadly four regimes: an all-bold regime in the upper left; a refusenik regime in the lower left; a bold/compromise regime that dominates the parameter space, and a borderline region between the refusenik and the bold/compromise regions, where conservative strategies appear.

Below we make some observations about these regimes and the way the results change as we increase the error parameter α .

2.6.1 “Agreeing to disagree” is an equilibrium at low truth weight (Refusenik regime)

In the upper left plot in Figure 5, where $\alpha = 0$, we observe that there are broadly three regimes. Across all debate lengths, and particularly when debates are short, if the truth-weight is low, the equilibrium involves a refusenik strategy, especially Exit. Indeed, manual




Figure 5: Upper panels: overview of equilibrium types at various levels of α . **Lower panels:** Collective accuracy of beliefs (normalized) as a function of debaters’ truth-weight in the utility function, at various levels of α, δ .

inspection reveals that almost invariably these equilibria involve (Exit,Exit). In such cases, the debaters refuse to produce arguments, and so will have expected accuracy scores of 0.5. This is an equilibrium, because at such low truth weights, debaters prefer to avoid any change of mind, even if it means forgoing any epistemic gains. We can describe this equilibrium as an “agreement to disagree”.

2.6.2 For high truth-motivated agents in short debates, there is a unique equilibrium (Bold regime)

In the blue region indicating that the equilibrium involves only Bold strategies, one strategy weakly dominates all others: $\mathbf{S}+\mathbf{S}-$. The strategy profile in which both debaters use this strategy is the only equilibrium, after removing dominated strategies. Even considering all strategy profiles, it is also the truth optimal profile for almost all values of delta, provided $\alpha = 0$ (see Figure 3). This is thus the most epistemically favourable region of parameter space.

2.6.3 For high truth-motivated agents in longer debates, the equilibrium is not truth-optimal (Bold/compromise regime)

At slightly lower truth motivation, or in somewhat longer debates, however, the best response to a debater using $\mathbf{S}+\mathbf{S}-$ is to adopt a compromise strategy, such as $\mathbf{S}+\mathbf{O}+$.

This sort of strategy is capable of forcing the proponent to change their mind, but is not guaranteed to do so: it will only force a change of mind if the conclusion is a proposition on which the two debaters disagree.

This results in a modest loss of collective accuracy, and generates a social dilemma that can be classed as a snowdrift game. The desire for accurate beliefs is strong enough that if one debater is using a compromise strategy, the other’s best response is to use $\mathbf{S}+\mathbf{S}-$. So we don’t get mutual defection as an equilibrium. But while the two debaters could solve the epistemic problem more efficiently if both contributed maximally (both use $\mathbf{S}+\mathbf{S}-$), there is a temptation for one agent to free ride on the labor of the other by adopting a compromise strategy that is less likely to disrupt their own opinions. Hence we get the asymmetric bold–compromise equilibrium.

2.6.4 Increasing debater error increases strategic disengagement

As the second and third upper panels in Figure 5 dramatically illustrate, if there are substantial error rates, refusenik strategies come to dominate in equilibria. Indeed, closer inspection reveals that Exit dominates all other strategies for large parts of parameter space. This is straightforward to explain, as per the results illustrated in Figure 3: because making arguments in these environments is much less reliable as a way of approaching the truth, debaters need to be much more motivated by truth-goals to make the risk of engaging in debate worthwhile.

We also observe that in the regions where debaters do still engage, the mixture of strategies changes: compromise and conservative strategies arise much more often in equilibria, especially in longer debates. This is also explicable in terms of the results shown in Figure 3, where other strategy profiles overtake $(\mathbf{S}+\mathbf{S}-, \mathbf{S}+\mathbf{S}-)$ in longer debates. Bold strategies are distinctive in that they relentlessly produce new arguments until there is only one position remaining. Other strategies give rise to the possibility of stalemate, depending on the relative positions of the debaters. In a long debate where error is possible, this stalemate can be epistemically valuable: it is better to stop producing arguments at some point, rather than to persevere and incur a greater risk of removing the truth.

2.6.5 Collective accuracy does not increase monotonically with accuracy motives of the debaters (Borderline region)

In the lower panels of Figure 5, for $\alpha = 0.0, 0.1$, we observe that collective accuracy does not monotonically increase with the truth-weight in the debater’s utility functions. This is paradoxical, especially given that we are using an equilibrium selection criterion that

favours the truth when multiple equilibria are available.

This phenomenon corresponds to the borderline region of parameter space, where Conservative strategies appear in the equilibria. In this region of parameter space, we find no pure strategy equilibria where players consistently use a single strategy. Instead, the game dynamics resemble those of “matching pennies” or “rock, paper, scissors,” where no single approach always wins.

In these situations, players in equilibrium use mixed strategies, randomly choosing between different approaches. Counterintuitively, as players become more invested in finding the truth (i.e., as the truth weight increases), they use strategies that are less likely to help their opponents reach accurate conclusions. This leads to less accurate outcomes overall when the game reaches equilibrium. This is because of a key requirement in mixed strategy equilibria: each player must adopt a randomization strategy which make their opponent equally willing to use any of their available strategies. As a player becomes more eager to achieve a particular outcome (e.g. true belief), their opponent must therefore more frequently use strategies to frustrate that outcome. The result is that the strategy a player most wants to use – the one that leads to their preferred outcome – actually gets used less often as their opponent cares more about that outcome.

3 Discussion

In other well-studied models of collective inquiry, knowledge advances through both positive and negative evidence (21–23). Scientists might discover a promising new experimental method, engineers might develop a more efficient process, or researchers might find evidence supporting a novel theory. These discoveries provide signals that help others infer whether new approaches are better or worse than current practices. The framework we study here, however, highlights a fundamental asymmetry in rational argumentation: while we can conclusively prove that certain combinations of beliefs are false, we can never definitively prove that any particular theory is true through purely logical means.

This asymmetry echoes a profound insight from the philosophy of science, most famously articulated by Karl Popper (24). While we can never conclusively verify universal statements through observation – no matter how many white swans we observe, we cannot prove that all swans are white – we can definitively falsify such claims by finding a single black swan. This limitation of inductive reasoning has far-reaching implications for how knowledge progresses. Our model captures this fundamental feature of rational inquiry: debaters can eliminate positions from consideration by showing them to be logically inconsistent,

but they cannot definitively establish the truth of any position through argument alone. While not all intellectual progress follows this pattern – scientific practice often relies on accumulating positive evidence that provides strong but defeasible justification for theories – the logic of falsification plays a crucial role in both formal argumentation and empirical investigation. Understanding how this asymmetry affects strategic choices in debate may therefore shed light on broader questions about the social dynamics of knowledge production, from scientific collaboration to public discourse about complex policy issues.

This asymmetry in rational argumentation also helps explain why agents in our model exhibit inherent obstinacy. In settings where knowledge advances through positive evidence, agents can be more confident that changing their position represents genuine epistemic progress – they move toward better-justified beliefs based on accumulated evidence. However, in a framework centered on deductive refutation, the situation is markedly different. When forced to abandon a position by a valid argument, agents have no way to determine which of the remaining unrefuted positions is closest to truth. They might, in revising their beliefs to accommodate a new argument, actually move further from the truth. This fundamental uncertainty about the epistemic value of belief revision makes reluctance to change one’s mind – what we call obstinacy – a rational response to the nature of deductive inquiry itself. This echoes philosophical arguments (25) that when faced with evidence that contradicts our beliefs, it is often rational to maintain most of our belief system while making minimal adjustments to accommodate the new information.

Our model offers a simplified way to study a fundamental tension in collective truth-seeking: while society benefits when people work together to discover truth, individuals often prefer to minimize changes to their own beliefs. This connects to several important research traditions. Evolutionary psychologists argue that human reasoning evolved primarily as a social tool – helping us to learn from others while remaining vigilant to the threat of deception (2). Similarly, sociologists of science have long studied how scientific communities balance cooperation and competition in knowledge production (26). Our model provides new insights into these dynamics. While our debaters aren’t trying to deceive each other or directly influence their opponent’s beliefs, they still face pressures that can lead them to debate in ways that make finding truth harder for everyone. This happens because their arguments shape which positions remain available to both participants. This framework could be further generalized to help explain several widespread phenomena: why people tend to favor evidence supporting their existing beliefs (confirmation bias), why expert communities sometimes maintain mistaken consensus (27), and why some topics become increasingly polarized in public debate. The model might also illuminate how social media

and online forums affect the quality of public discourse (28) and why scientific fields differ in how quickly they converge on correct theories (29).

4 Analytic methods

For small debates with $n = 3$ propositions, we represented the debate process using a Markov chain. Each state in the Markov chain consists of three elements: the set of tenable positions (T), and the current positions of both debaters (p' and p''). Since one of the $2^n = 8$ positions must be the truth and always remains tenable, there are 2^7 possible sets of tenable positions. For each set, both debaters must occupy tenable positions, yielding 2,816 possible states overall.

We computed transition probabilities between states by considering: (i) which debater makes the next argument (randomized), (ii) what arguments are feasible given their strategy, and (iii) how these arguments affect the tenable positions and potentially force position changes. For each strategy profile, we calculated the expected payoffs by determining the probability distribution over final states and the expected number of belief revisions during the debate.

Debaters' payoffs follow $u(v, d) = w \cdot v - d$, where v is the accuracy (number of true beliefs at debate end), d is the total number of belief revisions, and w represents the relative weight placed on accuracy versus obstinacy. Debates end probabilistically with parameter δ controlling expected debate length.

For larger n , where exact Markov analysis becomes computationally infeasible (at $n = 4$, the state space grows to ~ 2.5 million), we relied on simulations with ensembles of 200,000+ debates per strategy profile.

We extended the baseline model by introducing an error parameter α representing the probability that invalid arguments (those eliminating the truth) are accepted. This parameter allowed us to explore how debate outcomes change when perfect rationality is relaxed. When we extend the model to allow invalid arguments, the transition matrix must accommodate additional states in which the truth has been removed from the set of tenable positions, leading to over 4,000 states.

For each combination of parameters (δ, w, α), we identified Nash equilibria—strategy profiles where neither debater can improve their payoff by unilaterally changing strategy. We then analyzed how these equilibria and the resulting collective accuracy varied across parameter space, with particular attention to cases where individual incentives create cooperative dilemmas.

Equilibrium refinement: We iteratively removed dominated strategies to simplify the strategic landscape. Because the Exit strategy induces ties between all other strategies, no strategy is strictly dominated. Although iterative removal of weakly dominated strategies is generally avoided because it can violate order-invariance, in symmetric games this is not the case. So we first iteratively removed weakly dominated strategies, and if a multiplicity of equilibria remained we

then chose the equilibrium that was truth-optimal for closer study.

References

1. H. Mercier, H. Landemore, Reasoning is for arguing: Understanding the successes and failures of deliberation. *Political Psychology* **33**, 243–258 (2012).
2. H. Mercier, D. Sperber, *The Enigma of Reason* (Harvard University Press, 2017).
3. C. D. Novaes, *The dialogical roots of deduction: Historical, cognitive, and philosophical perspectives on reasoning* (Cambridge University Press, 2020).
4. T. Castelain, V. Girotto, F. Jamet, H. Mercier, Evidence for benefits of argumentation in a Mayan indigenous population. *Evolution and Human Behavior* **37**, 337–342 (2016).
5. T. Castelain, S. Bernard, H. Mercier, Evidence that Two-Year-Old Children are Sensitive to Information Presented in Arguments. *Infancy* **23**, 124–135 (2018).
6. J. Hardwig, Epistemic Dependence. *The Journal of Philosophy* **82**, 335–349 (1985).
7. A. I. Goldman, *Knowledge in a Social World* (Oxford University Press, 1999).
8. J. Habermas, *The theory of communicative action: Volume 1: Reason and the rationalization of society* (Beacon press, 1985).
9. H. E. Longino, *Science as social knowledge: Values and objectivity in scientific inquiry* (Princeton University Press, 1990).
10. C. List, P. Pettit, “An epistemic free-riding problem?” in *Karl Popper: Critical Appraisals*, P. Catton, G. MacDonald, Eds. (Routledge, 2004), pp. 128–158.
11. J. Dunn, “Epistemic Free Riding” in *Epistemic Consequentialism*, H. K. Ahlstrom-Vij, J. Dunn, Eds. (Oxford University Press, 2018).
12. K. J. S. Zollman, The theory of games as a tool for the social epistemologist. *Philosophical Studies* (2020).
13. C. Mayo-Wilson, K. J. S. Zollman, D. Danks, The independence thesis: When individual and social epistemology diverge. *Philosophy of Science* **78**, 653–677 (2011).
14. G. Betz, *Debate dynamics: How controversy improves our beliefs* (Springer Netherlands, 2013).
15. J. H. Holland, *Adaptation in Natural and Artificial Systems: An Introductory Analysis with Applications to Biology, Control, and Artificial Intelligence* (MIT Press, 1992).
16. J. D. Cohen, S. M. McClure, A. J. Yu, Should I stay or should I go? How the human brain manages the trade-off between exploitation and exploration. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **362**, 933–942 (2007).

17. T. T. Hills, P. M. Todd, D. Lazer, A. D. Redish, I. D. Couzin, Exploration versus exploitation in space, mind, and society. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* **19**, 46–54 (2015).
18. J. Peña, G. Nöldeke, Cooperative dilemmas with binary actions and multiple players. *Dynamic Games and Applications* **13**, 1156–1193 (2023).
19. J. H. W. Tan, D. J. Zizzo, Groups, cooperation and conflict in games. *The Journal of Socio-Economics* **37**, 1–17 (2008).
20. J. Maynard Smith, Game Theory and the Evolution of Behaviour. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* **205**, 475–488 (1979).
21. V. Bala, S. Goyal, Learning from Neighbours. *The Review of Economic Studies* **65**, 595–621 (1998).
22. L. Hong, S. E. Page, Groups of diverse problem solvers can outperform groups of high-ability problem solvers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA* **101**, 16385–16389 (2004).
23. K. J. S. Zollman, The Communication Structure of Epistemic Communities. *Philosophy of Science* **74**, 574–587 (2007).
24. K. R. Popper, *The logic of scientific discovery* (Hutchinson, 1959).
25. W. V. O. Quine, Two dogmas of empiricism. *Philosophical Review* (1951).
26. R. K. Merton, *The sociology of science: Theoretical and empirical investigations* (University of Chicago Press, 1974).
27. K. J. S. Zollman, The epistemic benefit of transient diversity. *Erkenntnis* **72**, 17–35 (2010).
28. C. A. Bail, *et al.*, Exposure to opposing views on social media can increase political polarization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **115**, 9216–9221 (2018).
29. U. Shwed, P. S. Bearman, The Temporal Structure of Scientific Consensus Formation. *American Sociological Review* **75**, 817–840 (2010).

Supplementary Information

A How deductive arguments affect logical space




Figure 6: An argument makes positions untenable in the following way: consider two propositions, p and q . There are four logically possible combinations of truth values for these propositions. The argument " p , therefore q " does not tell us anything about what is the case if p is false, so it leaves the not- p positions untouched. What the argument does say is that if p is true, then q is true also. So it renders untenable all the positions at which p is true and q is false.

B Description of strategy space

Enumeration of strategies studied

Monadic/dyadic	Group	Name	Abbreviation
Monadic	Bold	Self-accept, Self-reject	S+S−
		Other-accept, Other-reject	O+O−
	Conservative	Self-reject, Self-Reject	S−S−
		Self-reject, Self-accept	O−O+
		Other-reject, Other-reject	O−O−
		Other-reject, Other-accept	O−O+
		Self-accept, Self-accept	S+S+
		Other-accept, Other-accept	O+O+
Dyadic	Compromising	Self-reject, Other-reject	S−O−
		Self-accept, Other-reject	S+O−
		Self-accept, Other-accept	S+O+
		Other-reject, Self-reject	O−S−
		Other-accept, Self-reject	O+S−
		Other-accept, Self-accept	O+S+
	Refusenik	Other-reject, Self-accept	O−S+
		Self-reject, Other-accept	S−O+
		Exit	Exit

B.1 Comparison with other strategy spaces studied

In (1), four strategies are studied: Convert, Fortify, Attack, and Undercut. These strategies, like the strategies studied here, are defined by rules for choosing premises and conclusions of arguments.

- The **Convert** strategy uses premises accepted by opponent and a conclusion accepted by proponent, thus it closely resembles Other-accept, Self-accept (**O+S+**) in our model.
- The **Fortify** strategy uses premises accepted by proponent and a conclusion accepted by the proponent, thus it closely resembles Self-accept, Self-accept (**S+S+**) in our model.

The Attack and Undercut strategies are special cases of the Fortify and Convert strategies, respectively, in that each uses only conclusions that satisfy a further restriction that the opponent *rejects* the conclusion. So the number of valid arguments that can be generated

by these strategies is a proper subset of the arguments that can be generated by Convert and Fortify. These strategies have no direct analogue in our framework.

In Betz’s model, debaters resort to random argumentation strategies when they can no longer produce an argument using their prescribed strategy. This is an important difference from our framework since we strictly limit debaters to arguments consistent with their defining rule, and permit debates to reach stalemate thereafter.

Two other differences to note. In Betz’s original simulations:

1. Turns strictly alternate between debaters. In the present work, we randomize who may generate an argument with each turn. This enables us to keep the size of the state space smaller by a factor of 2, because no record needs to be kept of whose turn it is.
2. All debates are terminated once the space of logical positions is reduced beyond a fixed threshold. In contrast, we allow a continuously variable parameter, δ , to affect the expected length of the debate.

C Detailed methods

In the following, we give a formal account of the model. We describe the debaters' possible positions, their possible arguments, and how we formalize the state of the debate at each point in time. Thereafter, we specify among which strategies the debaters can choose to formulate arguments. If the state space is sufficiently small, we show that the expected dynamics of a debate can be computed exactly. To this end, we represent the debate as a Markov chain.

C.1 A description of the debating process

C.1.1 Positions

We consider a slightly more general model than in the main text. We consider two debaters who hold opinions on n different *propositions* P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n . Each of these propositions is either true or false. We describe a possible opinion on all these propositions by a vector $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_n) \in \{0, 1\}^n$. An entry $p_i = 1$ indicates that the respective debater considers proposition P_i to be true. Conversely, $p_i = 0$ means the debater considers P_i to be false (or equivalently, the debater considers the negation $\neg P_i$ to be true). It is sometimes useful to have an explicit enumeration of possible views. To this end, we think of each vector \mathbf{p} as an n -digit binary number. That is, we use the representations $\mathbf{p}^0 = (0, 0, \dots, 0, 0)$, $\mathbf{p}^1 = (0, 0, \dots, 0, 1)$, $\mathbf{p}^2 = (0, 0, \dots, 1, 0)$, and so on. We refer to each tuple \mathbf{p}^k as a *position*, and to the set of all such positions as \mathcal{P} . The set \mathcal{P} contains 2^n elements. Without loss of generality, we assume that the last element $(1, \dots, 1)$ represents the factual truth (unknownst to the debaters).

C.1.2 Arguments

We model a debate as a dynamical process during which the debaters put forward arguments. An argument consists of a premise and a conclusion. Each premise is a combination of propositions (P_1, \dots, P_n) and negations of propositions $(\neg P_1, \dots, \neg P_n)$. These are statements that are all taken for granted for the sake of the argument. The conclusion is a single proposition (or negation of a proposition) that is argued to be true if the premise holds. For example, one possible argument is

$$A_1: \text{If } P_1 \text{ is true and } P_2 \text{ is false, then } P_3 \text{ is false.} \quad (1)$$

To write this argument in a compact manner, we use the notation

$$P_1, \neg P_2 \vdash \neg P_3. \quad (2)$$

We assume arguments satisfy basic syntactic rules. First, if some proposition P_i is in the argument (either as premise or conclusion), $\neg P_i$ cannot be in the argument, and vice versa. This rule prevents self-contradicting arguments, such as $P_1, P_2 \vdash \neg P_1$. Similarly, we rule out arguments in which the same proposition P_i appears twice (for example, once as a premise, and once as a conclusion). Finally, we do not allow debaters to make an argument that would rule out the truth. That is, we do not permit arguments for which the set of positions that satisfy all the premises and the negation of the conclusion is a superset of the true position. Given that herein, we defined the truth to be the position $(1, \dots, 1)$, this condition rules out arguments like $P_1, P_2 \vdash \neg P_3$. We refer to arguments that satisfy the above basic rules as *valid*. In the following we assume for simplicity that premises consist of two propositions; but the basic framework could easily be generalized to allow for more complex arguments.

For counting the number of possible arguments, we note that two arguments can be syntactically different, while having the same effect on the dialectical space of positions. For example, for $n=3$ propositions, all of the following arguments have the same effect of ruling out position $(1,1,0)$,

$$\begin{array}{ll} P_1, P_2 \vdash P_3, & P_2, P_1 \vdash P_3, \\ P_1, \neg P_3 \vdash \neg P_2, & \neg P_3, P_1 \vdash \neg P_2, \\ P_2, \neg P_3 \vdash \neg P_1, & \neg P_3, P_2 \vdash \neg P_1. \end{array} \quad (3)$$

In the following, we identify such arguments with each other. Two arguments A_1 and A_2 are considered equivalent if they eliminate the same set of positions. That is, A_1 and A_2 belong to the same equivalence class if, for every position $p \in P$, the position is ruled out by A_1 if and only if it is ruled out by A_2 . We denote this by $[A_1] = [A_2]$. Here, $[A]$ represents the equivalence class containing all arguments that have the same eliminative effect on the debate. For n propositions and all arguments having two premises, there are $8n(n-1)(n-2)/6$ such equivalence classes (the factor $8=2^3$ captures that for each of the three propositions, we also need to consider their negations; the factor 6 captures the number of elements in each class).

C.1.3 Tenable positions

Over the course of a debate, arguments may rule out certain positions. We say a position is *tenable* if it has not been ruled out yet by any of the previously given arguments. Accordingly, let $T(t)$ describe the set of all tenable positions after the first t arguments have been made. It follows that the set of possible tenable positions is non-increasing, $T(t+1) \subseteq T(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$. Initially, we set $T(0) = \mathcal{P}$, the set of all possible positions. As an example, consider a debate with three propositions, and suppose a debater uses the argument A_1 defined above, $P_1, \neg P_2 \vdash \neg P_3$. For that debate, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T(0) &= \{(0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1), (1, 0, 0), (1, 0, 1), (1, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1)\}, \\ T(1) &= \{(0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1), (0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1), (1, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

That is, argument A_1 eliminates the position $(1, 0, 1)$ from the set of tenable positions. In principle, any subset of \mathcal{P} that contains the truth $(1, \dots, 1)$ is a possible set of tenable positions that could arise during a debate. We refer to the set of all such subsets as \mathcal{T} . In total, \mathcal{T} has 2^{2^n-1} elements (it corresponds to the power set of all $2^n - 1$ positions in $\mathcal{P} \setminus \{(1, \dots, 1)\}$, with the truth $(1, \dots, 1)$ then being added to each element). For example, if there are only two propositions, the respective set has eight elements,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T} = \{ & \{(1, 1)\}, \{(0, 0), (1, 1)\}, \{(0, 1), (1, 1)\}, \{(1, 0), (1, 1)\}, \{(0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1)\}, \dots \\ & \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (1, 1)\}, \{(0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 1)\}, \{(0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 1)\} \} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

As illustrated in the main text, the set of possible positions can be represented by a hypercube. There, a corner of the hypercube is colored black if the respective position is tenable, and it is colored as grey otherwise. The corner $(1, \dots, 1)$ is always colored black.

C.1.4 A model of the debating process

The state of a debate after the exchange of t arguments can be defined as a triplet $\omega(t) = (T(t), \mathbf{p}'(t), \mathbf{p}''(t))$; we sometimes drop the time-dependence and write $\omega = (T, \mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}'')$. The first entry $T \in \mathcal{T}$ describes the set of positions that are still tenable. The entries $\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}''$ describe the two debaters' current positions. In particular, both positions need to be tenable, $\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}'' \in T$. We refer to the set of all such states ω as Ω .

At the beginning, we assume the players' initial positions $\mathbf{p}'(0)$ and $\mathbf{p}''(0)$ are independently chosen uniformly at random from all positions in $T(0) = \mathcal{P}$. Over the course of a debate, the two debaters exchange arguments. To this end, in each round, one of the two debaters is chosen at random. This debater is then permitted to put forward an argument (which

might depend on the debater's strategy, as defined further below). If there is no valid argument consistent with the debater's strategy, the debater passes and the state ω does not change. If the debater produces a valid argument, the set of tenable positions T may decrease. As a result, a debater's current position may become untenable. In that case, we assume the debater moves to the closest position that is still tenable. If there are multiple tenable positions that are equally close, one of them is chosen randomly. To quantify the closeness of two positions \mathbf{p} and $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}$, we use the Hamming distance – which is equivalent to counting the number of propositions on which the two positions disagree:

$$\|\mathbf{p} - \tilde{\mathbf{p}}\| = \sum_{i=1}^n |p_i - \tilde{p}_i|. \quad (6)$$

After each argument, the debate ends with probability δ . In particular, the debate's final round τ is a random variable with a geometric distribution. A realization of a debate is a sequence of states $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\omega(0), \dots, \omega(\tau))$, such that each entry is a possible successor of the previous entry given the rules of the game outlined above.

C.1.5 The debaters' payoffs

We assume debaters have two objectives, accuracy and obstinacy. Accuracy means debaters prefer to be close to the truth eventually. Obstinacy means they prefer to change their position as rarely as possible.

To quantify these objectives, consider a particular realization of a debate, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\omega(0), \dots, \omega(\tau))$. If a debater's last position is $\mathbf{p}(\tau)$, we define the debater's accuracy as

$$v_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} = n - \|\mathbf{p}(\tau) - (1, \dots, 1)\| = \|\mathbf{p}(\tau)\|. \quad (7)$$

This accuracy is a number between 0 and n . It reflects how many of the debater's views are correct by the time the debate ends. A debater's obstinacy penalty $d_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ is the aggregated number of changes in the debater's position (for each proposition) over the course of the debate. Formally, we define it as the sum of the hamming distances,

$$d_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} = \sum_{t=1}^{\tau} \|\mathbf{p}(t) - \mathbf{p}(t-1)\|. \quad (8)$$

Taken together, we define the debater's payoff as

$$u_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} = w \cdot v_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} - d_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}. \quad (9)$$

Here, w reflects the relative weight the debater places on being accurate.

C.2 A description of the players' strategies

C.2.1 Strategies

When it is their turn, debaters need to decide which arguments to make. To do so, each debater employs a *strategy*. A strategy is a rule that tells the debater which argument to choose, at each possible occasion. In general, this choice might depend on all previously made arguments, and on the two debaters' positions. In the following, we assume strategies only depend on the debaters' current positions. More specifically, we consider strategies that can be represented by a pair $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2)$. The first component q_1 encodes what kind of propositions are used as the premise of the argument. We allow four possibilities: (i) When $q_1 = S^+$, the premise set only contains propositions the proponent accepts. (ii) When $q_1 = S^-$, the premise set contains at least one proposition the proponent rejects. (iii) When $q_1 = O^+$, the premise set only contains propositions the opponent accepts. (iv) When $q_1 = O^-$, the premise set contains at least one proposition that the opponent rejects. Analogously, $q_2 \in \{S^+, S^-, O^+, O^-\}$ encodes what kinds of propositions are used as the conclusion of the argument, with the added restriction that the conclusion set is always a singleton.

We call an argument “feasible” for a given proponent if it is valid and if it is consistent with the proponent's strategy. We call an equivalence class of arguments feasible if it contains at least one feasible argument. When during the debate, there are several feasible classes of arguments, we assume the proponent chooses one of them uniformly at random. When there is no feasible class of arguments, the proponent passes. Such a case could occur, for example, if the proponent's current position is the truth, $(1, \dots, 1)$ and the proponent's strategy is (S^+, S^-) . All arguments consistent with that strategy would refute the truth; hence, they are invalid by definition. We give an example of a possible debating dynamics in **Example 1**.

We note that the choice of a strategy affects how likely debaters are to change their positions over time. As an example, consider again the strategy (S^+, S^-) . Debaters with that strategy aim to falsify their own position: they take a premise they accept while trying to argue for a conclusion they disagree with. As long as the resulting argument is valid (e.g., it does not rule out the truth), it makes the proponent's position untenable. Thus, such a strategy potentially induces the debater to frequently change positions over time. At the same time, it may be an effective means to eventually reach the true position.

Example 1. As an example of a possible debating dynamics, consider a debate with three propositions. Suppose the current state is $\omega = (T, \mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}'')$, where the set of tenable positions is

$$T = \{(0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1), (1, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1)\},$$

and the players' positions are $\mathbf{p}' = (0, 1, 1)$ and $\mathbf{p}'' = (1, 1, 1)$. Moreover, suppose the first debater is randomly chosen to make the next argument, and this debater uses strategy $\mathbf{q}' = (S^+, O^-)$. Given the first debater's position and strategy, a possible premise may consist of the propositions $\neg P_1$ and P_2 . Similarly, given the opponent's position, $\neg P_3$ is a possible conclusion. Since the respective argument $\neg P_1, P_2 \vdash \neg P_3$ does not reject the truth, it is feasible. If the first debater makes that argument, it rules out the position $(0, 1, 1)$, which happens to be the debater's own position. This debater then randomly switches to a close-by position, such as the factually true position $(1, 1, 1)$, which is a Hamming distance of 1 away from the original position. In that case, the next state is

$$\tilde{T} = \{(0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1)\}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}' = \tilde{\mathbf{p}}'' = (1, 1, 1). \quad (10)$$

In addition to the sixteen strategies of the form $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, q_2)$, we allow for an additional strategy called 'Exit'.

This strategy may be interpreted as a complete refusal to engage in the debate. If one of the debaters employs this strategy, the debate ends immediately; the final state of the debate is equal to the initial state.

C.2.2 Payoffs of strategies

When two debaters with strategies \mathbf{q}' and \mathbf{q}'' interact, they naturally induce a probability distribution $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{q}', \mathbf{q}'') = (x_\sigma)$ over the space of all possible sequences $\sigma = (\omega(0), \dots, \omega(\tau))$. Here, each entry x_σ is the likelihood of observing the realized debate σ , depending on the players' debating strategies. We define the player's overall payoffs as their expected payoff,

$$u(\mathbf{q}', \mathbf{q}'') = \mathbb{E}_\sigma[u_\sigma] = \sum_\sigma x_\sigma \cdot u_\sigma. \quad (11)$$

That is, the payoff is the weighted average over all possible realized payoffs u_σ as defined by (9), weighted by how likely that realization is observed given the debaters' strategies. Given the above rules and the debaters' strategies, it is straightforward to approximate the resulting payoffs with simulations. To this end, it suffices to generate sufficiently many realizations $\sigma = (\omega(0), \dots, \omega(\tau))$, and to compute the average of the realized payoffs. We provide an implementation of such a simulation in our code repository.

C.3 A Markov chain representation of the debate

In the following, we describe a method that allows an explicit computation of payoffs when the number of positions is sufficiently small (for the results in the main text, $n=3$). We note that if one of the two debaters adopts the Exit strategy, the payoffs are straightforward to compute. In that case, both of the debaters obtain a payoff of $u=w \times n/2$ (a priori, both of the debaters are correct on any single proposition with probability $1/2$). In the following, we thus assume that neither player adopts the Exit strategy.

C.3.1 Computing the debaters' expected accuracy

To compute payoffs, we represent the dynamics of the debate as a Markov chain. The possible states of the Markov chain are given by the possible states of the debate, $\Omega = \{\omega^1, \dots, \omega^m\}$. Given the current state ω^i and the debaters' strategies \mathbf{q}' and \mathbf{q}'' , we can compute the transition probability M_{ij} that after the next argument, the state is ω^j .

To this end, let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(\omega^i, \mathbf{q})$ denote the set of feasible classes of arguments that a debater with strategy \mathbf{q} could produce in state ω^i . To refer to these sets for the two respective players, we write $\mathcal{A}' = \mathcal{A}(\omega^i, \mathbf{q}')$ and $\mathcal{A}'' = \mathcal{A}(\omega^i, \mathbf{q}'')$. We use $|\mathcal{A}|$ to refer to the number of elements in \mathcal{A} (i.e., the number of distinct arguments a debater could produce). For a given class $[A]$ of arguments, let $\mathbb{P}'([A] \mid \omega^i, \mathbf{q}')$ denote the probability that an argument in that class would be produced by the first debater with strategy \mathbf{q}' in state ω^i . Because arguments are chosen uniformly at random across all feasible equivalence classes,

$$\mathbb{P}'([A] \mid \omega^i, \mathbf{q}') = \begin{cases} 1/|\mathcal{A}'(\omega^i, \mathbf{q}')| & \text{if } [A] \in \mathcal{A}'(\omega^i, \mathbf{q}') \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

An analogous definition applies to the respective quantity $\mathbb{P}''([A] \mid \omega^i, \mathbf{q}'')$ for the second debater. Given an argument in class $[A]$ has been produced, we define an indicator function with $e(\omega^j \mid \omega^i, [A])$ that indicates whether or not the argument can induce the state to change from ω^i to ω^j ,

$$e(\omega^j \mid \omega^i, [A]) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if the state } \omega^j \text{ can be reached from } \omega^i \text{ after an argument in } [A] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Based on this notation, we define the combined probability that when the first debater with strategy \mathbf{q}' is to make an argument in state ω^i , the argument will be in class $[A]$

leading to the new state ω^j ,

$$\mathbb{P}'(\omega^j, [A] \mid \omega^i, \mathbf{q}') = \begin{cases} \frac{e(\omega^j \mid \omega^i, [A]) \cdot \mathbb{P}'([A] \mid \omega^i, \mathbf{q}')}{\sum_{\omega} e(\omega \mid \omega^i, [A]) \cdot \mathbb{P}'([A] \mid \omega^i, \mathbf{q}')} & \text{if } [A] \in \mathcal{A}'(\omega^i, \mathbf{q}') \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Again, an analogous definition applies to the second debater's probability $\mathbb{P}''(\omega^j, [A] \mid \omega^i, \mathbf{q}'')$. After these preparations, we can formally define the Markov chain's transition probability from state ω^i to $\omega^j \neq \omega^i$ as

$$M_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{[A]} \mathbb{P}'(\omega^j, [A] \mid \omega^i, \mathbf{q}') + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{[A]} \mathbb{P}''(\omega^j, [A] \mid \omega^i, \mathbf{q}'') \quad (15)$$

Here, the factor $1/2$ represents that each of the two debaters has the same chance to make the next argument. In **Example 2**, we illustrate the computations necessary to derive such a transition probability M_{ij} for one particular case. For the remaining transition probability M_{ii} , we obtain

$$M_{ii} = 1 - \sum_{j \neq i} M_{ij}. \quad (16)$$

This probability covers the cases that either a debater was not able to produce a feasible argument, or that a debater made an argument that led to no change (possibly because it was already made before).

We can collect these probabilities to move from state ω^i to ω^j in an $m \times m$ transition matrix $M = (M_{ij})$. Let $\mathbf{y}(t) = (y_i(t))$ be the probability distribution that reflects how likely players are in state ω^i at time t . For the initial probability distribution $\mathbf{y}(0)$, we consider all states for which the set of tenable positions coincides with the set of all positions. There are 2^{2n} such states (they only differ in the initial positions assigned to the two debaters). Hence, it follows that

$$y_i(0) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2^{2n}} & \text{if } \omega^i = (T, \mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}''), \text{ with } T = \mathcal{P} \text{ and } \mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}'' \text{ arbitrary} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

For all subsequent probability distributions, it follows from the theory of Markov chains that $\mathbf{y}(t) = \mathbf{y}(0)M^t$. In particular, because the length of the debate is geometrically distributed, we can compute the expected final state of the debate as

$$\mathbf{y} := \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta^t (1-\delta) \mathbf{y}(t) = (1-\delta) \mathbf{y}(0) \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta^t M^t = (1-\delta) \mathbf{y}(0) (I_m - \delta M)^{-1}. \quad (18)$$

Here, I_m is the $m \times m$ identity matrix, and $(I_m - \delta \cdot M)^{-1}$ refers to the respective inverse

matrix (which is guaranteed to exist for all $\delta < 1$). Based on this final state, we can compute the debater's expected accuracy v . To this end, we take the probability y_ω that a given state $\omega = (T, \mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}'')$ is the final state of the debate, times the accuracy of the debater's position, according to Eq. (7), $\|\mathbf{p}'\|$. By summing up, we obtain the following formulas for the expected accuracies of the two players,

$$v' = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} y_\omega \cdot \|\mathbf{p}'\|, \quad v'' = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} y_\omega \cdot \|\mathbf{p}''\|. \quad (19)$$

C.3.2 Computing the debaters' expected obstinacy penalty

To compute the expected obstinacy penalty, we first compute a vector $\mathbf{z} = (z_\omega)$ that indicates how often we visit state ω on average during the course of a debate. By summing over all possible time steps in which we might visit the respective state, we obtain

$$\mathbf{z} := \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta^t \mathbf{y}(t) = \mathbf{y}(0) \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta^t M^t = \mathbf{y}(0) (I_m - \delta M)^{-1}. \quad (20)$$

In addition, we define matrices $Q' = (Q'_{ij})$ and $Q'' = (Q''_{ij})$ that record the hamming distance for the two debaters, respectively, between state $\omega^i = (T, \mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}'')$ and $\omega^j = (\tilde{T}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}', \tilde{\mathbf{p}}'')$. We obtain

$$Q'_{ij} = \|\tilde{\mathbf{p}}' - \mathbf{p}'\| \quad \text{and} \quad Q''_{ij} = \|\tilde{\mathbf{p}}'' - \mathbf{p}''\|. \quad (21)$$

To compute the debater's expected obstinacy penalty d , we multiply the expected number z_{ω^i} of visits to each state ω^i by the cost Q_{ij} of the subsequent transition to state ω^j . This cost needs to be weighted by the probability δM_{ij} of the respective transition happening (δ is the probability that there is another transition at all). By summing up over all possible initial states ω^i and subsequent states ω^j , we obtain

$$d' = \delta \sum_{i,j} z_{\omega^i} \cdot M_{ij} \cdot Q'_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad d'' = \delta \sum_{i,j} z_{\omega^i} \cdot M_{ij} \cdot Q''_{ij}. \quad (22)$$

Based on the above formulas for the players' accuracy and their obstinacy penalty, we can explicitly compute the players' payoffs according to Eq. (9). Again, we provide an implementation of this payoff computation in our code repository. We have checked the implementation's accuracy by comparing its results to simulations.

Example 2. We illustrate how to compute transition probabilities based on Eq. (15) by discussing a special case. Following up on **Example 3**, the current state $\omega^i = (T, \mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}'')$ is again

$$T = \{(0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1), (1, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1)\}, \quad \mathbf{p}' = (0, 1, 1), \quad \mathbf{p}'' = (1, 1, 1). \quad (23)$$

Moreover, the debaters' strategies are $\mathbf{q}' = (S^+, O^-)$ and $\mathbf{q}'' = (S^+, S^-)$. We ask how likely it is to make the transition towards state $\omega^j = (\tilde{T}, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}', \tilde{\mathbf{p}}'')$ given by

$$\tilde{T} = \{(0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1)\}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{p}}' = \tilde{\mathbf{p}}'' = (1, 1, 1). \quad (24)$$

That is, we ask how likely the position $(0, 0, 1)$ becomes untenable, and the first debater moves to $(1, 1, 1)$ as a result. To this end, we consider two cases, depending on which debater is chosen to make the next argument.

Case 1: First debater makes next argument. Given the current positions \mathbf{p}' and \mathbf{p}'' of the two debaters, the following arguments are consistent with the first debater's strategy,

$$\begin{array}{ll} \neg P_1, P_2 \vdash \neg P_3, & P_2, \neg P_1 \vdash \neg P_3, \\ \neg P_1, P_3 \vdash \neg P_2, & P_3, \neg P_1 \vdash \neg P_2, \\ P_2, P_3 \vdash \neg P_1, & P_3, P_2 \vdash \neg P_1. \end{array}$$

We note that the two arguments in the last row rule out the truth $(1, 1, 1)$. Hence they are infeasible. The other four arguments all rule out the same position $(0, 1, 1)$, and hence they are in the same equivalence class $[A^*]$, with $A^* := (\neg P_1, P_2 \vdash \neg P_3)$. That is, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}'([A^*] \mid \omega^i, \mathbf{q}') = 1. \quad (25)$$

As the next step, we need to identify the possible next states, once the argument A^* has been made. Given A^* , it follows that \tilde{T} is the next set of tenable states. However, given that the first debater's position has been removed, there are two possibilities for what the debater's next position could be, $(0, 1, 0)$ and $(1, 1, 1)$ [both have Hamming distance one to the debater's original position; the remaining position with Hamming distance one, $(0, 0, 1)$, is not tenable]. This means there are two possible states that might succeed ω^i after argument A^* : the intended target state ω^j as defined above, and an alternative state ω^k that is identical to ω^j except that $\mathbf{p}' = (0, 1, 0)$. Using our notation in Eq. (13), we get

$$e(\omega^j \mid \omega^i, [A^*]) = e(\omega^k \mid \omega^i, [A^*]) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad e(\omega \mid \omega^i, [A^*]) = 0 \text{ for all } \omega \notin \{\omega^i, \omega^j, \omega^k\} \quad (26)$$

By combining Eqs. (25) and (26), we obtain the overall probability that debater would choose an argument in class $[A^*]$ and end up in the desired state ω^j as

$$\mathbb{P}'(\omega^j, [A^*] \mid \omega^i, \mathbf{q}') = 1/2. \quad (27)$$

Case 2: Second debater makes next argument. Given the second debater's strategy and current position, this debater is unable to produce a feasible argument. Any argument would refute the debater's current position, which happens to be the true state. Any such argument is invalid by definition. In particular, this debater cannot produce an argument that would reduce the set of tenable positions. Hence,

$$\mathbb{P}''(\omega^j, [A^*] \mid \omega^i, \mathbf{q}'') = 0. \quad (28)$$

Combining these two cases, we use Eq. (15) to compute the overall transition probability from state ω^i to ω^j ,

$$M_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot 0 = \frac{1}{4}. \quad (29)$$

C.4 An extension to the debate model: debater error

In the model described above, debaters always choose arguments that are valid, consistent with their strategy, and feasible given the current state of the debate. This represents ideal debaters who never make mistakes in their argumentation. However, real-world debaters may occasionally employ invalid arguments, either due to logical errors, misunderstandings, or strategic attempts to confuse the debate.

To capture this aspect of real-world debates, we extend our model to incorporate the possibility of debaters using invalid arguments. We introduce a parameter $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ that represents the probability that a debater employs an invalid argument when no valid arguments are available, or the weight given to invalid arguments when both valid and invalid arguments exist. As we model it, when a debater makes an invalid argument, the truth is eliminated from the set of tenable positions. We can still measure epistemic performance in the same way as previously: the number of true beliefs a debater has. But in such a world, the debaters will be doomed never to achieve the complete truth, because they have rejected the corresponding position.

C.4.1 Noisy transitions

We modify the transition probability calculations to account for both valid and invalid arguments. For a debater with strategy \mathbf{q} , we define $\mathcal{A}^{\text{valid}}(\omega^i, \mathbf{q})$ as the set of feasible and valid argument classes, and $\mathcal{A}^{\text{invalid}}(\omega^i, \mathbf{q})$ as the set of arguments that are consistent with the debater's strategy but invalid (for instance, because they would rule out the truth).

Given the current state ω^i , we compute the transition probabilities as follows:

Case 1: Valid arguments exist, invalid arguments do not exist. The debater selects a valid argument uniformly at random from $\mathcal{A}^{\text{valid}}(\omega^i, \mathbf{q})$. The transition probabilities are the same as in the original model:

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{noisy}}(\omega^j | \omega^i, \mathbf{q}) = \sum_{[A] \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{valid}}} \mathbb{P}(\omega^j, [A] | \omega^i, \mathbf{q}) \quad (30)$$

Case 2: Both valid and invalid arguments exist. The debater selects from valid arguments with full weight, and from invalid arguments with weight α . These contributions are then normalized:

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{noisy}}(\omega^j | \omega^i, \mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{Z} \left[\sum_{[A] \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{valid}}} \mathbb{P}(\omega^j, [A] | \omega^i, \mathbf{q}) + \alpha \cdot \sum_{[A] \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{invalid}}} \mathbb{P}(\omega^j, [A] | \omega^i, \mathbf{q}) \right] \quad (31)$$

where Z is a normalization constant ensuring that probabilities sum to 1.

Case 3: No valid arguments, but invalid arguments exist. With probability $1 - \alpha$, the debater passes and the state remains unchanged. With probability α , the debater selects an invalid argument uniformly at random:

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{noisy}}(\omega^j | \omega^i, \mathbf{q}) = (1 - \alpha) \cdot \delta_{ij} + \alpha \cdot \sum_{[A] \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{invalid}}} \mathbb{P}(\omega^j, [A] | \omega^i, \mathbf{q}) \quad (32)$$

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta, equal to 1 if $i = j$ and 0 otherwise.

These modified transition probabilities are then used to construct the Markov transition matrix M in the same manner as described previously. The resulting Markov process captures not only the strategic choices of debaters but also their potential errors or strategic violations of debate norms.

D Supplementary results

D.1 Impact of different strategy profiles on consensus




Figure 7: Expected consensus over debate length, for all strategy profiles, grouped by type. **A:** ≥ 1 bold strategy **B:** both conservative **C:** both refusenik **D:** ≥ 1 consensus-building, none bold. $n = 3$.

D.2 Impact of changing size of the debate on equilibria




Figure 8: Types of strategy in the truth-optimal equilibrium, for various n . For $n = 3$, results are derived from a Markov process calculation. For larger n , results are based on a simulation, with at least 200,000 trials per strategy profile and delta value.

D.3 Alternative equilibrium selection criterion




Figure 9: Collective accuracy, for $n = 3$ and various delta, plotted as a function of debaters' truth-weights. We compare the result of using the epistemic equilibrium selection criterion versus a more familiar utilitarian criterion. Aside from the broad similarity of the results, this also verifies that the non-monotonicity of accuracy as a function of truth-weight is not an artefact of our equilibrium selection criterion.

Supplementary References

1. G. Betz, *Debate dynamics: How controversy improves our beliefs* (Springer Netherlands, 2013).