this is what i'm rebunking:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1KjF_LThvg1nk3bnKhJvC3Uqz4WeS5DV0U6Ef9Fegz0Y/edit?tab=t.0
when i write "**page 1, 2, 3, etc**" i'm referring to the pages in the debunk doc above. if something is --- *italic* --- then i'm quoting the debunker/OP

page 1:

Xorpaw's latest reply shows a pattern that he is exhausted from the exchange and has already trimmed down almost all the exaggerations from his original document, yet he tries to save face by redefining words and accusing me of misinterpreting him.
Remember that he started by attributing deep psychological profiling, anticipation, reputation sacrifice, practically 360° spatial awareness, and total control of the conversation to Honami; now he summarizes the entire feat by saying that she "simply got information about Kiyotaka out of her." And that is the point we want to reach. In fact, let's start with the progress we have made across these 4 rounds of offense and defense, taking the original doc as the baseline.

Aside from the exhaustion and accusation of misinterpreting me remarks, no i didn't do anything of the sort. i'll start with the "360° spatial awareness" thing, because i think OP's criticism there are easier to address; it's a complete nothing burger of a so-called "over-interpretation"
the sensory in question was never meant to be anything beyond holding the logistics of the scene. if anything i don't highlight any specific sense in the document or how far it went, but it's logical to assume she was listening


Despite the extremely high likelihood that Honami was already conscious of her surroundings given what was said beforehand and Hona's social awareness being one of her often-highlighted attributes, the narrator stated that Hona broke eye contact with Ichika for the first time right before when she said that there were no more secret between her and Kiyotaka. Basically, Honami's awareness should extend to whatever is behind her and doesn't need to look around to sense gazes or people approaching. This normally would be difficult to believe, but within the verse, it's not unprecedented at all. For instance, there's Kiyo who has unrealistic sensory feats every other chapter. He can detect the shapes and sizes of objects meters behind him without even looking. He can detect if someone is looking at him from 100 meters away, every gaze pointed at him, any kind of smell or sound from far away with nearly zero effort.

Other characters such as Tokinari, Tsubasa and Asuka have similar abilities albeit on a lower scale, so Kiyotaka or White Roomers in general aren't entirely unique in that regard. Considering the narrative around Honami being conscious of her

even average humans can do this to an extent, so it's not unnatural. obviously, usually we use our hearing to do that and i'll assume she did the same for that reason. it's also implied in Y3V3 that hona has great hearing: scan. the accompanying image for the scene showed she force herself to listen to the hand gestures from a radio (which is something average human can't "listen" to): scan

this is basically the almighty “over-interpretation” of honami sensory:

- honami’s hearing capacities can distinguish the sound of an approaching walk in a large crowd we can assume created more noise that may make this more difficult
- she and ichika were certainly in a public space, but they were never interrupted by other people, hindered in some other form or implied to be attracting attention. it can therefore be assumed that there was much space between the two and whoever was the closest person to getting an ear on their talk, making it much easier to hear anyone approaching
- there are several hints that honami’s an exceptionally attentive person with neat hearing, such as the examples i gave in previous rebunk you didn’t deny and the aforementioned y3v3 moment when she heard hand gestures through the radio

a character established many times in the narrative as abnormally attentive with a great hearing can listen to people approaching from a distance even if the crowd is a bit noisy

i “summarized” the feat as honami getting information out of ichika because that was her aim, not because she didn’t show a wide variety of skills to get said information
the psychological profiling is still deep for the speed it was performed and the limited & indirect information she had regarding ichika and background circumstances. hona still had total control of the conversation beginning before the “carried away” line but after ichika’s joke confession

you’re trying to extract concessions i never made by twisting my words again, despite me calling you out many times on this

page 2-3:

In the original Ichinose document, Honami deduced Ichika's link to the White Room, her disconnection from Tsukishiro/Shiba after Yagami's expulsion, and her own ambitions before the mask drop. However, that changed in his previous replies—more specifically in Round 3:
"of course, honami didn’t have to know everything… honami needed to know *enough*" *and he acknowledges that she acted under uncertainty regarding her intentions, just as I explained in Round 3. Which means it was a basic real-time attitude read, not prior profiling as he described it in his doc. Of course, he tries to deny it in his new reply, but we will get to that.*
---
in the original document but also in each and every single rebunks. although it should be noted that “deduced” isn’t the word i’d ever use, since that conclusion was reached through abductive reasoning or so i argue/argued. this clarification is key, because a difference between deductive reasoning and either inductive or abductive reasoning is that in a deduction, the conclusion **has** to be true if all the premises are true, whereas this is not so with either inductive or abductive. it is why many people in SCD argue profiling cannot be built from deductive reasoning. profiling by definition are general conclusions from incomplete information and thus can’t be 100% certain. i now think you don’t understand what “profiling” even entails

page 4-7:

do you not understand the difference between sacrifice and risk? you seem to use those words interchangeably, but they have different meaning, which i already clarified in previous rebunks. anyway, not gonna repeat myself

---
Therefore, if there was no real sacrifice and no prior intention to manufacture credibility, his credibility-exchange hypothesis collapses. His argument here is that accepting it gave validity to "I'm not lying to you," yet if she never admitted it and simply didn't deny it, that means she wasn't being sincere and was merely dodging the subject—an attitude that would make anyone suspicious, the exact opposite of what the doc says when it claims Honami admitted it and used it as credibility.
---
facepalm just because you're taking a risk, doesn't mean you have to amplify the risk factor unnecessarily. honami doesn't directly states the admission (as i said, similar to kakeru in that late y1v5 scene) to avoid potential trouble with the school in the slimmest of chance ichika were to report it with a recording. If ichika were to be too forceful on getting the exact words out, hona could just not bother with anything else or bare minimum, not bite the bait. however, her answer can still be processed as an admission, because she didn't say no, which is what happened

---
In the original doc, he compared Honami to Kiyotaka, Tsukishiro, Tsubasa, and Asuka to claim that she detected what was happening behind her back without looking.
And later he reduces it to "it is an exaggeration" or simple social observation like in Y2V12. This happens in his defense in Round 3 when he rebuts page 11.
---
sense (the word used in the document) =/= see
Y2v12 demonstrated honami's social awareness, and that relates strongly to relevant sensory assets in this situation (we are speaking of a crowd of people around them). it's partly why i use the term "narrative correlation"

The doc proclaimed that this moment was practically a one-sided domination and trap executed from start to finish by Honami. And just by reading the doc, you realize that is the entire purpose of the feat by exaggerating so many points. However, as the rounds went on, Xorpaw shifted to an opinion of: "She simply got information about Kiyotaka out of her" (This in Round 3)
---
this shift didn't take place, this is the position posited by the document. you just don't get what "gathering information" entailed. you spoke of the doc saying honami neutralized ichika earlier, i just said the doc never presented this objective at all, you made that up and that honami wanted to gather information. she did so through a trap and manipulation. my opinion didn't shift, you just don't keep up with our back and forth and misinterpreted my words as a result

---

[...] *and connecting that in seconds to a stray word she heard over a year ago in Y2V4—is a display of Cold Reading, abduction, and real-time adaptability. It is a decent feat, something real that fits Ichinose's current character and canon,* ***much more so than carrying a pre-written script beforehand like he claimed in his doc regarding prior profiling***

---

i never said anything of the sort in the document. in fact, i said the exact opposite



as for the rest i didn't bother quote, you can shove your "compliments" of honami's performance up you know where. you're trying to downplay her performance in this scene to something you judge to be more "reasonable" based on your re-write of the lines in the source (translated) text which i have called you out on over and over again throughout this debunk-rebunk exchange

page 8

The problem with this is that saying Ichika's intention "wasn't clear" or "wasn't confirmed" produces the exact same logical effect as saying that at the moment Honami decides not to deny the sexual relationship, she still doesn't know what Ichika is after nor has she deduced any link to the word "White Room" that she heard in Y2V4.
The narrator explicitly explains why Honami didn't deny the question at that instant: "Keeping up a smile until the very end and being kind was easy, but even if the true intention of the claim wasn't clear, she decided it was better to face it head-on without running away."
The deduction about the White Room happens three pages later, when Ichika brags about knowing Kiyotaka's secrets better than anyone: "from Amasawa's attitude suggesting that she knew something about Ayanokouji that others didn't, she deduced that there was a possible connection to the White Room."
It is chronologically impossible to use a sexual admission as "credibility" to back up a lie about the White Room that does not even exist in the character's mind yet.

I already answered to each and every single one of those arguments in previous rebunks, some like the "*Amasawa's attitude*" point, multiple times in prior rebunks. i have to assume you don't have any counter to those counterarguments

page 9

The narrator never states that Honami predicted Ichika's question. The text literally says: "It was unlikely that Ichinose could've anticipated such a question beforehand, but if Ichinose really hadn't, she appeared too calm—that was how Amasawa analyzed the situation." Even within Ichika's own monologue, she herself considers it improbable ("unlikely") and poses it merely as a conditional hypothesis in the face of her senpai's composure.

OP has gone from claiming "the narrator makes it clear Ichinose was puzzled" (at a completely different and earlier line) to claiming ichika's analysis is subjective, it's an assumption ~ and now OP claims honami didn't anticipate the carried away line because ichika herself thought it was "unlikely"... only to think/state "but" honami's reaction was too unnatural if she didn't anticipate it is it really that important to deny the undeniable of honami anticipating ichika"s "carried away" remark for your debunking? that really says a lot

It's just incredibly disingenuous to claim it's a conditional hypothesis when you have literally nothing whatsoever to support it other than your wishful thinking. that's why you keep changing your tune

---
By the time Ichika finally dropped the mask, Honami was already on guard and braced for hostility. Being alert after detecting probing is not equivalent to predicting the opponent's exact words.

Yet again, op twists the source text. the narrator (or ichika's analysis if you want to insist) states honami anticipating her ***question*** not her "hostility" as OP tries to portray

> It was unlikely that Ichinose could've anticipated such a question beforehand, but if Ichinose really hadn't, she appeared too calm—that was how Amasawa analyzed the situation.

the wording doesn't matter, honami anticipated the meaning of what ichika was about to say, it is all that matters

honestly, i'll end this rebunk on this note, on OP's page 10 of 19, with me pointing out OP twisting the anticipation line from ichika's analysis

there's no compromise to be made on my side, especially when this so-called "compromise" is the agenda OP tried to push from the start

this entire back and forth has consisted of OP completely mischaracterizing everything written in the original analysis for the feat, re-writing the translated lines from the source text to give them meaning that doesn't exist & performing mental gymnastic in an attempt to negate the statement of honami anticipating ichika's carried away line. and then i have to say "no that's a blatant lie"

i'm tired of having to constantly correct OP. if the debunk relies on constant dishonesty, outright lying, maybe there's nothing to debunk in the first place, eh?

anyway to check out previous entries for context

d/r	debunks	rebunks
1	click	click
2	click	click
3	click	click
4	click	click
5	click	here