AI Large Practical: Assignment 3 ctd

Alan Smaill

School of Informatics

Nov 16 2016

School of **informatics**

▸ Remember that the hand-in date is Wednesday 21st December

▸ I will normally be available during drop-in sessions.

▸ You can use any additional programming tools and techniques that you think will help you –
remember to acknowledge the source of ideas and code in your report.

A motivating example from the paper:

> *Let us illustrate the concept of argumentation schemes
> with the scheme for arguments from expert opinion, as
> formulated in [49, p. 210], with some minor notational
> changes:*
>
> *Major Premise Source E is an expert in the subject
>   domain S containing proposition A.*
> *Minor Premise E asserts that proposition A in domain S
>   is true*
>   *Conclusion A may plausibly be taken as true.*
>
> *The six basic critical questions matching the appeal to
> expert opinion [49, p. 223] are the following.*
>
> *Gordon et al. p 5*

1. *How credible is E as an expert source?*
2. *Is E an expert in the field that A is in?*
3. *Does E's testimony imply A?*
4. *Is E reliable?*
5. *Is A consistent with the testimony of other experts?*
6. *Is A supported by evidence?*

Gordon et al. p 5

In this case, we have a list of the 6 basic critical questions for expert testimony. In fact, (4) is used in the paper we used as starting point for the python implementation.

In a dialogue, use the Carneades classification of statements in an argument to distinguish where the burden of proof lies:

▸ **ordinary premises**: that must always be supported with further grounds

▸ **assumptions**: that can be assumed until they are questioned

▸ **exceptions**: that do not hold in absence of evidence to the contrary.

see Gordon et al., p 7

informatics

From the paper:

> *"In the case of exceptions, sometimes only the burden of production rests on the defendant; once this burden is satisfied, the plaintiff has the burden of persuading the court that the exception does not hold. This is the case, for instance, with all exceptions in criminal law."*

> *Gordon et al. p 8*

– the *"burden of production"* here is the burden of proof, for our purposes:

> *"We now see that, when discussing above how critical questions affect the burden of proof, we meant the burden of production in particular."*

> *Gordon et al. p 9*

So the authors claim a strong link between types of premises (in Carneades), and the allocation of the burden of proof.

▸ If one side uses an argumentation scheme, then the burden is on that side to give evidence for:
  ▸ the ordinary premises,
  ▸ (and, if challenged, the assumptions involved; for assigment 3, it is not necessary to consider this case)

  after which the burden is on the other side to:
▸ defeat the argument by either:
  ▸ finding a counter-argument to the conclusion (rebutting), or
  ▸ pointing out exceptional circumstances

Alongside the association of burden of proof with types of premisses, the authors suggest starting with low proof standards assigned to statements of premisses:

> *The burden of production is distributed by dividing premisses into different types: evidence for ordinary premisses and (once challenged) assumptions must be produced by the proponent of the argument with these premisses, while evidence for exceptions must be produced by the respondent. In addition some initially low proof standard needs to be assigned to the statement of each premise*

> *Gordon et al., p 9*

We can think of a dialogue here as a sequence of steps where arguments are put forward into a public arena; the state of the partial argument can be checked with the version of Carneades already implemented.

Here the notion of "speech acts" is in the background, where the state of play of the dialogue is updated by presentation of new claims. For background on this, see Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy:

```
http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/speech-acts/
```

Thus:

> *Speech acts can be modeled as functions which map a state of the dialogue to another state.*
>
> *Gordon et al., p 11*

The state of the dialogue includes at least the set of arguments in play, and the current assignment of burden of proof.

Section 4 of Gordon et al. introduces some new proof standards and judgements; it is not required to implement these, but you may want to consider what role these may play in assigning burden of proof.

Sections 5 and 6 of Gordon et al. are important for the assignment. Section 5 discusses reasons for assigning premises as (ordinary) premises, assumptions or exceptions.
The argument scheme for expert opinion is then worked out, based on the earlier characterisation of critical questions.

The argument scheme:

Premise E is an expert in the subject domain S containing the proposition A.

Premise E asserts A.

Assumption E is a credible expert.

Exception E is not reliable.

Exception A is not consistent with the testimony of other experts.

Assumption A is based on evidence

Conclusion A.

Look at the example in section 6.

This shows a small example of combination of argument schemes following the ideas already presented.

1. First the prosecution gives an initial argument that murder has occurred;
   Carneades finds that on its own it is convincing.

2. Burden of proof passes to defence, who claim that self-defence is involved, and supply witness.
   This is enough at this stage to block the murder conclusion.

3. This is attacked in turn by the prosecution; however at this stage the evidence is not strong enough to establish murder.

School of **informatics**

Note that the defence put forward a combination of arguments, since it had a burden of proof to establish a premise of its own argument; only then does burden of proof pass to the prosecution.

So care is needed in setting out arguments.
The paper makes use of *argument schemes* – these are general patterns which then give particular arguments in different cases. A full implementation could make this explicit, but it's enough here to take care on particular instances.

▸ A sequence of dialogue states, which should be
▸ recorded in some form (as trace? how much info??)

In a given state, it should be clear what the current set of arguments is, and what the state of the top-level assertion is.

The different sides of the argument should start with some arguments they can bring to the table, and deploy them in a relevant way, following the burden of proof.

The example in Gordon et al., section 6, would be a good development example.

School of **informatics**

- ▶
  - ▶ Python as a scripting language is well placed to help you with running experiments and displaying results.
  - ▶ This is also potentially a good way to allow your system to be tested.
- ▶
  - ▶ Alternatively, shell scripts can be useful in helping to organise experimental runs, and keeping track of data.
  - ▶ Resources:
    - ▶ Bash Guide for Beginners
      `http://tldp.org/LDP/Bash-Beginners-Guide/html/`
    - ▶ Advanced Bash-Scripting Guide
      `http://tldp.org/LDP/abs/html/`

▸ There is a zip file on the course web page with LaTeX template for writing the report.

▸ You can use whatever you like to produce the report; but your submitted report must be in **PDF** format.
  Use pdflatex to produce PDF directly.

▸ Some resources for LaTeX:
  obvious place to look is the LaTeX project site:

  http://www.latex-project.org/

  — in particular the short introduction.

informatics

Look through the template; this should be self-explanatory.

There is a useful emacs mode for editing LaTeX source, auctex. To enable this, put the following in your .emacs

```
(load-library "auctex")
(TeX-PDF-mode 1)              ;turn on PDF mode
```

This will give helpful menus for compiling and viewing pdf documents.

You are recommended to use pdflatex to produce output pdf from LaTeX.

However you write your report, you should submit **pdf** document; just about any system you might use allows this.

- Modelling burden of proof in Carneades
- using LaTeX