

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Preface</b>		V
<b>One</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	1
1.1	Argument Assistants	4
1.2	Defeasible Argumentation in the Field of Law	5
1.3	Theory Construction and the Application of Law to Cases	7
1.4	From Automated Reasoning to Argument Assistance: the Artificial Intelligence Perspective	10
1.5	Experimental Argument Assistants: ARGUE! and the ARGUMED Family	12
1.6	Related Research	14
1.7	An Example: A Case of Grievous Bodily Harm	15
<b>Two</b>	<b>The First Prototype: ARGUE!</b>	17
2.1	Argumentation Theory	19
2.2	The Grievous Bodily Harm Example	22
2.3	Program Design	25
<b>Three</b>	<b>Improved Naturalness: ARGUMED 2.0</b>	29
3.1	Argumentation Theory	31
3.1.1	Reasons, conclusions, exceptions	31
3.1.2	Warrants	33
3.1.3	Justification	36
3.2	The Grievous Bodily Harm Example	42
3.3	Program Design	44
3.3.1	Moves	44
3.3.2	Views	47
3.3.3	Algorithms	48
3.4	User Evaluation	50
<b>Four</b>	<b>A Logical Extension: ARGUMED 3.0 based on DEFLOG</b>	53
4.1	Argumentation Theory	55
4.1.1	The structure of dialectical arguments	55
4.1.2	Evaluating dialectical arguments	58

4.1.3	When can argumentation end?	61
4.1.4	DEFLOG: a theory of prima facie justified assumptions	63
4.2	The Grievous Bodily Harm Example	67
4.3	Program Design	70
4.4	User Evaluation	75
Five	<b>A Comparison of Argument Assistants and Mediators</b>	77
5.1	Belvedere	79
5.2	Convince Me	81
5.3	KIE's SenseMaker	83
5.4	Reason!Able	84
5.5	Room 5	88
5.6	Zeno and Hermes	89
5.7	Overview and Comparison	91
Six	<b>Theories of Defeasible Argumentation</b>	95
6.1	Toulmin's Argument Scheme	98
6.1.1	Arguing with pros and cons	99
6.1.2	Arguing with warrants	100
6.1.3	Argument evaluation	101
6.1.4	Theory construction	102
6.2	Reiter's Logic for Default Reasoning	102
6.2.1	Arguing with pros and cons	102
6.2.2	Arguing with warrants	103
6.2.3	Argument evaluation	103
6.2.4	Theory construction	104
6.3	Pollock's Rebutting and Undercutting Defeaters	104
6.3.1	Arguing with pros and cons	105
6.3.2	Arguing with warrants	106
6.3.3	Argument evaluation	107
6.3.4	Theory construction	108
6.4	Vreeswijk's Abstract Argumentation Systems	110
6.4.1	Arguing with pros and cons	111
6.4.2	Arguing with warrants	111
6.4.3	Argument evaluation	111
6.4.4	Theory construction	112
6.5	Prakken and Sartor's Winning Strategies	113
6.5.1	Arguing with pros and cons	113
6.5.2	Arguing with warrants	114

---

6.5.3	Argument evaluation	114
6.5.4	Theory construction	115
6.6	Dung's Admissible Sets of Arguments	115
6.6.1	Arguing with pros and cons	115
6.6.2	Arguing with warrants	115
6.6.3	Argument evaluation	116
6.6.4	Theory construction	116
6.7	CUMULA's Generalized Defeaters	117
6.7.1	Arguing with pros and cons	117
6.7.2	Arguing with warrants	117
6.7.3	Argument evaluation	118
6.7.4	Theory construction	118
6.8	Reason-Based Logic	118
6.8.1	Arguing with pros and cons	119
6.8.2	Arguing with warrants	119
6.8.3	Argument evaluation	119
6.8.4	Theory construction	119
6.9	ARGUE!, ARGUMED 2.0 and ARGUMED 3.0	120
6.9.1	Arguing with pros and cons	120
6.9.2	Arguing with warrants	121
6.9.3	Argument evaluation	121
6.9.4	Theory construction	122
Seven	<b>Argument Assistants: Conclusions and Prospects</b>	123
7.1	Overview of ARGUE!, ARGUMED 2.0 and ARGUMED 3.0	126
7.2	Contributions and Conclusions	127
7.3	Future Research and Prospects	128
<b>Appendix A</b> The test protocol of ARGUMED 2.0 (translated excerpt)		131
<b>Appendix B</b> Spin-off: the dialectical logic DEFLOG		135
B.1	Dialectically Justifying Arguments	135
B.2	The Existence and Multiplicity of Extensions	137
B.3	Dung's Argumentation Frameworks and Admissibility	140
<b>Literature</b>		145
<b>Web addresses</b>		155
<b>Index</b>		157