

## **Introduction**

I present this defense against the allegation that my Proof of Humanity profile violates the policy due to the submission of a mirrored image. This challenge hinges on a narrow and, I argue, incorrect interpretation of the policy, particularly concerning the prohibition of image rotation. I contend that labeling mirroring as a form of prohibited rotation not only misinterprets the policy's intent but also imposes unreasonable expectations on users, undermining the spirit of the Proof of Humanity initiative.

### **Argument 1: Misinterpretation of Policy**

The challenger's argument rests on a misinterpretation of the policy, equating mirroring—a reflection operation—to rotation. This stance is flawed for several reasons. First, it overlooks the context within which the policy was formulated and applied, specifically in the realm of 2D computer imaging. By introducing an unnecessary layer of mathematical formalism, the challenger diverts from the policy's practical application to its theoretical extremes, a maneuver more performative than substantive.

To draw a parallel, consider a hypothetical guessing game involving marbles. The rules stipulate players can "add" marbles to their jar, aiming to guess the opponent's total. If I were to follow the challenger's logic, subtracting marbles would ostensibly be permissible as "adding a negative number." This is clearly not the game's intent, emphasizing that policy interpretation must align with common understanding and practical application, not contrived mathematical constructs.

### **Argument 2: Reasonableness and Practical Implications**

Legal interpretations, especially in novel frameworks like decentralized arbitration, must prioritize reasonableness and practicality. It's not sufficient to retrofit policies into rigid semantic frameworks that detach from the users' reasonable understanding. In the context of the PoH, expecting users to infer that mirroring—an often automatic feature of front-facing cameras—is banned under a "no rotation" rule is neither fair nor practical. Most users, upon reading the policy, would not equate mirroring with prohibited rotation. Moreover, the challenger fails to demonstrate how mirrored images detrimentally affect the registry, further weakening their position.

### **Argument 3: Practical Considerations and the Specificity of Mirroring Effects**

The case at hand, where the only indicative factor of mirroring is the hair, underscores a crucial point for consideration. If the sole evidence of an image being mirrored is a change in hair orientation, this opens the door to an unreasonable standard for challenge. It's conceivable that a person could submit multiple photos with their hair styled differently across each, effectively making it a challenge for jurors to ascertain which, if any, are mirrored based on this criterion alone. This scenario perfectly illustrates the impracticality of disqualifying a profile for mirroring when the distinguishing factor does not compromise the submission's integrity or its compliance with the Proof of Humanity's objectives.

If jurors are unable to consistently identify mirrored images based solely on hair orientation, it stands to reason that such a criterion should not form the basis for disqualification. This approach aligns with a practical and fair application of the policy, focusing on the essence of what the policy seeks to prevent—misrepresentation and fraud—rather than on arbitrary technicalities that do not affect the authenticity or the verifiability of the submission.

## **Conclusion**

In light of the argument presented, this defense posits that the challenge against our my profile, based on the allegation of image mirroring where the only indication is hair orientation, does not hold up under scrutiny. This situation closely matches the current case, illustrating the need for a practical and reasonable interpretation of the policy. The inability of jurors to definitively determine mirroring based on hair alone highlights the absurdity of using such a criterion as grounds for disqualification.

Therefore, I advocate for the dismissal of the challenge and voting **Yes: Accept the request to register the entry.**, emphasizing the importance of aligning policy enforcement with the Proof of Humanity's foundational goals: ensuring authenticity and integrity without imposing undue burdens on participants. This case presents an opportunity to refine our understanding and application of the rules, fostering a more just, equitable, and practical approach to maintaining the registry's integrity. By focusing on the substantive impact of alleged policy violations rather than on inconsequential technicalities, I uphold the spirit and purpose of the Proof of Humanity initiative, ensuring it remains accessible and fair to all participants.