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Abductive reasoning, 17, 33, 100, 122, 146, 241, 248 See also Inference to the best explanation.
  described, 136, 140
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Abelson, R.P., 111
Academic skepticism, 240
ACCEPTER
  described, 110
Action, 12, 21
  described, 162–163
penultimate, 130
Action-based alternating transition system,
  136, 157
Actos example, 50–51, 89
Ad baculum
  argumentum ad baculum, 261
fallacy, 261
Ad hominem
  attack, 205, 206
  Argumentum ad hominem,
  circumstantial ad hominem argument,
  scheme for, 204
  described, 205
Adversarial exchange, 204, 270
Advertisements,
  deceptive, 55–56
problem-solution strategy, 39
target audience, 65
visual, 60, 61
Advice-seeking intervals, 152
Advising dialogue, 224–226
  requirements for, 227
stages of, 228
Advocacy, 223 See also Burden of advocacy.
  requirements of, 223
AeroVelo example, 249
  ultimate goal, 250
Agent
  assumptions by, 135
capability of criticism, 29
characteristics of, 12–13, 29, 34–35, 252
communication by, 12
communication systems, 135
described, 1, 12
goals of, 3, 251, 252
plurality of, 20
intelligence of, 29
rational, 2, 234
requirements on, 15
Agent reasoning, 134
Akrasia. See Weakness of will.
Ambiguity, 132, 133, 230, 272
Anchored narrative, 139–140
Antagonist, 179
Appeal
  irrational, 61
to emotion, 62
ArguMed, 68, 72–74
Argument, 251, 255
  definition, 104
determination of, 120
  purpose of, 103, 104
Argument construction, 246
Argument defense, 68–71
Argument diagram, 39, 78
Argument framework, 69
Argument from consequences, 160
critical questions for, 25–26
negative consequences, 25, 50, 103,
  127, 202
  scheme for, 50, 126
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument from consequences (cont.)</th>
<th>Argument from expert opinion, 78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>positive consequences, 25</td>
<td>critical questions for, 83–84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>premise in, 130</td>
<td>defeasible, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument from correlation to cause</td>
<td>scheme for, 83, 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical questions for, 43</td>
<td>undercutter to, 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scheme for, 43</td>
<td>Argument from ignorance, 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument from evidence to a hypothesis, 144</td>
<td>Argument from inconsistent commitment, scheme for, 204, 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument from expert opinion, 78</td>
<td>Argument from instrumental practical reasoning (new version) scheme for, 92–93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical questions for, 83–84</td>
<td>defined, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defeasible, 244</td>
<td>Argument mapping tools, 63–64 described, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scheme for, 83, 85</td>
<td>Argumentation schemes, 39, 173, 178 defeasible, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undercutter to, 210</td>
<td>Aristotel, 233, 263–264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument from ignorance, 184</td>
<td>BDI model, 9–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument from inconsistent commitment, scheme for, 204, 205</td>
<td>deliberation, 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument from instrumental practical reasoning scheme for, 92–93</td>
<td>on practical reasoning, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defined, 78</td>
<td>practical inference, 3–4, 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument mapping tools, 63–64 described, 39</td>
<td>chaining of, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentation schemes, 39, 173, 178 defeasible, 40</td>
<td>practical wisdom (phronesis), 238, 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rationality (episteme), 238</td>
<td>refutation in, 49, 50, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araucaria, 39, 43, 64, 67, 87–89</td>
<td>ASPIC+, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characteristics, 69</td>
<td>Assertion, 107, 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption, 72, 265</td>
<td>Argument from motive to intention, 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closed world, 32, 41, 95–96, 184</td>
<td>Argument from negative value scheme for, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implicit, 54</td>
<td>Argument from positive value, 124 scheme for, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of intentions, 132</td>
<td>Argument from value-based practical reasoning scheme for, 92–93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>justified, 76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire, 8–11, 21, 31, 33–34, 133, 140, 252</td>
<td>determination of, 120, 128–129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialectical negation, 76–77</td>
<td>historical, 100–101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialectical shift, 41, 61, 164, 182, 195, 202</td>
<td>provisional, 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gradual, 207</td>
<td>purpose of, 103–104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illicit, 61</td>
<td>scientific, 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>stages of, 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>context of, 40</td>
<td>Explanation scheme, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multi-agent, 161</td>
<td>Facts (described), 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sequence of, 163</td>
<td>Falsifiability, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stages of, 40–41, 163</td>
<td>Fallacy, 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>types of, 33, 40–41, 267</td>
<td>Fallacy of affirming the consequent, 56–57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue rules, 42. See also Protocols.</td>
<td>Fallacy of jumping to a conclusion, 64, 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedural rules, 222</td>
<td>Fallacy of omission, 58, 59, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue structure, 65–66</td>
<td>Fallacy of relevance, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct to consumer health products</td>
<td>Feedback, 13, 105, 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advertisement example (DTCA), 23, 61, 182, 206. See also Individual examples.</td>
<td>Felicity condition, 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>central persuasion structure, 38</td>
<td>Flagpole example, 123, 145–146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>failure of, 58</td>
<td>argument from positive values, 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive, 4, 168–169</td>
<td>value in, 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute, 217</td>
<td>Formal dialectic, 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissent, 217</td>
<td>Framing the issue, 197, 214–215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragoni, A. F., 135</td>
<td>Generalization, 13, 114, 121, 237, 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dray, W., 101</td>
<td>defeasible, 114–115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dung, P. 76</td>
<td>Gilbert, M., 15–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economist, The</td>
<td>Giorgini, P., 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200, 207, 210, 215, 232, 254, 270</td>
<td>Girle, R., 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedding, 60, 61, 164, 198, 272</td>
<td>Goal, 12, 14, 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everyday language, 134, 148</td>
<td>conflicting, 172, 232, 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nature of, 228</td>
<td>connected to means, 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthymemes, 64</td>
<td>consistency, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>described, 39–40</td>
<td>described, 163, 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology of scientific evidence (ESE), 245</td>
<td>ethical, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eristic dialogue, 33, 272</td>
<td>identified, 33, 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error correction, 234</td>
<td>implicit, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errors of judgment, 234</td>
<td>impeded, 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence, 268</td>
<td>individual, 178, 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characteristic of, 210</td>
<td>multiple, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circumstantial, 137</td>
<td>primary, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based epistemology (EBE), 245</td>
<td>priorities, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination, 139</td>
<td>compared, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exception, 72</td>
<td>shared, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanadum, 99</td>
<td>subsidiary, 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation, 255</td>
<td>ultimate, 129–131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>argumentation combination, 119</td>
<td>Goal-directed reasoning, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>casual, 255</td>
<td>Gordon, T. F., 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defined, 110</td>
<td>Governing questions, 41, 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>described, 100, 109</td>
<td>Grice, H. P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversational principle, 262</td>
<td>Groarke, L., 56–58, 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Habitable hut example, 8
Hamblin, C.L., 105–107
rules of, 108
Hastie, R., 139
Hawk example, 117–118, 151
reasoning in, 119
Heated metal example, 115–116
Hempel, C., 100
Hitchcock, D., 9, 36, 41, 162, 164
MHP model, 148, 163
House purchase example, 168–169, 183–185
Hume’s law, 20
Hunter, A., 246
Hypothesis
provisional, 101
Inconsistency, 27, 139, 202–203, 238, 257, 259
apparent, 205
practical inconsistency, 254
pragmatic inconsistency, 258
Inference
abductive, 140
deductive, 236
lack of knowledge, 183–184
means-end, 130
Inference from an appearance to a conclusion, 241
Inference to the conclusion, 137
Inference to the best explanation (IBE), 17, 135, 140, 141, 256. See also Abductive reasoning.
criminal case, 144
critical questions for, 136, 140–141
scheme for, 136
Inferential link, 30, 64, 69, 80, 137, 170–171
attacked, 71
Information-seeking dialogue, 152, 226, 271
embedded, 60
standard of proof in, 271
Inuendo, 205
Inquiry dialogue, 217, 267
aim, 240
argument inquiry, 246
model, 246
nature of, 246
standard of proof, 267, 271
warrant inquiry, 246
Instrumental practical reasoning, 21, 37
scheme for, 124–125
Integrity, 205
Intent, 10, 15, 33, 132, 256
ascription of, 122, 256
defined, 133–134
described, 9
imputation of, 132, 138
principle of double effect, 143
Irrationality, 260, 262, 266, 272
Jackson v. Virginia, 144
Josephson, J. R., 140
Josephson, S. G., 140
Jumping to a conclusion, 96
Karacapilidis, N. I., 161
Kass, A., 111
Kaufeld, F. J., 169, 216–217
Knowledge
base, 180–181, 242
closed, 258
open, 149, 178, 189, 222, 232, 234
common, 189
discovery, 241
evidence-based model, 243
evidence relationship, 268
fallibilistic, 234, 235, 241, 243
of circumstances, 242
scientific, 240
transmission of, 244
veristic, 241
Kok, E., 175, 181, 216, 221
Krabbe, E. C. W., 61, 105–106, 246
Kukafka, R., 59
Labellings, 70
Lap-band example, 53–56, 87
Legal argumentation
circumstantial evidence, 143
intention in, 122
standards of proof
beyond reasonable doubt, 217
clear and convincing evidence, 217
preponderance of the evidence, 217
scintilla of evidence, 218
substantial evidence, 218
trials
burden of persuasion, 218
evidential burden, 218
Leonard, D. P., 137, 141, 142
Linked argument, 80, 92
described, 79
Index
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London train examples, 21
Lunesta example, 46–48, 57, 86–87
McBurney, P., 21, 31, 36, 41, 92, 162, 164
MHP model, 148, 163
Means
described, 7
Means-end reasoning, 1, 192, 239
Medical investigations, 246
Memory, 1, 13, 111
MHP dialogue model, 156, 167, 191–192
dialectical shifts in, 182
extended, 178
failure of, 166
governing question, 181
revisions, 181, 192–193
Miller, K., 15
Moore, J.D., 110
Motive, 137, 141, 142, 146, 231
described, 133
imputation of, 138
Mucinex example, 48–50, 57, 74–75, 87–88
Multi-agent systems, 135
Murder example, 137
Nakamoto, K., 58, 62
Natural language
negative terms, 202
Necessary condition, 7–8, 248
scheme, 7, 18
Negotiation dialogue, 262
shift to, 185
Network of argumentation, 154
computational framework, 187
Parmenides System, 162
Parsons, S., 36, 162, 164
MHP model, 148, 163
Peirce, C. S., 240
Pennington, N., 139
Perception, 12, 62, 207, 219
Persuasion, 41, 146, 270
Persuasion dialogue, 217, 271
adversarial nature of, 271
framing, 180
goal of, 167
Plan(s), 10, 173
alternative, 174

conflict of, 218
modification, 179
Plavix example, 50–53, 57
Policy
debate, 148–149, 156
modeling tool, 157
Political rhetoric, 200
Pollock, J.L.
undercutters, 94
Popper, K., 244
Positivism, 101
Post hoc fallacy, 44–45
Practical inconsistency, 203, 254
Practical inference
scheme for, 7–8
structure of, 6–7
three basic components of, 1–2
Practical irrationality, 254, 258, 266–267
Practical reasoning, 161, 212, 214
abductive use of, 6
attacked, 75
critical questions for, 30, 171
defeasible, 24, 29, 57, 58
described, 7–8, 39, 237, 238, 250–252
ethical notion of, 22
methods of criticizing, 29–30
problem with, 17
projective use of, 5, 6
requirements of, 35
scheme for, 48, 136
solitary notion of, 14
value-based variant, 185, 199, 212
with several alternative actions, 16–17
Practical reasoning for evidence to motive, 142
scheme for, 138
Prakken, H., 68
Premise, 68
accepted, 210
attacks, 64, 72
Premise types
alternatives premise, 18
enthymematic, 54
explicit, 53, 56
goal premise, 18, 22, 44, 53
implicit, 53, 64, 129
implicit value, 55
means, 65
practicality premise
selection premise
side effects premise, 18
values premise, 92
Presumption, 32, 72, 86, 191
Principle of rational mutual inquiry, 167
Printer example, 160, 196–197, 215, 226, 247, 264, 265, 266, 271
closure in, 197
extended, 149–151
Problem solving, 10, 14, 34, 117–118, 123, 149, 151, 191, 203
deliberation, 220, 264
everyday, 117–118
goal based, 206
value-based, 23
Procrastination, 165, 183
Proleptic argumentation, 50
described, 48
Proponent, 105, 227
goal of, 228
Proposal, 199, 215–217
attacked, 195
evaluated, 211
requirements of, 216
retracted, 216
structure of, 170
Proposing, 165, 168–169
characteristics of, 169
defined, 169
Protagonist, 179
Protocols, 179 See also Dialogue rules.
Radiators example, 111–114, 116, 119, 121
Rationality, 247, 262, 272
classical model of
weakness of, 20
defined, 235, 247–248, 250
described, 260
epistemic, 234, 235, 239, 269
classistics of, 244–245
defined, 245
epistemic scientific, 239
defined, 246
practical, 234, 269
classistics of, 263
defined, 235, 248
described, 252
paradigm of, 269
Syllogistic, 239
theoretical, 234
Real estate example, 160–161, 198, 226, 264, 265
explained, 153
Reasoning
backward, 140, 146
chain of, 268
deductive, 233, 251
defeasible, 184, 235
described, 250–251
evidential, 122, 137, 141, 144
epistemic, 238, 241, 271
modeled, 144
inductive, 233
legal, 139
theoretical, 236–237
Rebuttal, 50, 75, 79, 95, 159
described, 30
Rebutters
described, 71
Red light example, 71, 77
Refutation, 49, 50, 74
of a refutation, 89
Reframing the issue, 200
Rescher, N., 19, 235, 240
Respondent, 227
goal of, 228
Retraction, 290, 239, 246
Riesbeck, C. K.,
Rubinelli, S., 58, 61, 62
Satisficing, 17
Schulz, P. K., 58, 62
Script. See also Story.
described, 99, 109, 121, 139
Searle, J. R., 10, 11, 96
classification of speech acts, 168–169, 216, 226–227
on collective intention, 15
on Hume’s law, 20
on reasons, 33–34
Schank, R. C., 110, 111
Serafini, L., 135
Schafer, B., 136, 141
Shared agency, 11
Scientific inquiry, 235
Side effects argument, 89
Side effects critical question, 25	negative, 171
Skewed income distribution example, 201–202
Slade, C., 57
Smart car example, 21, 90
premises in, 91
value based reasoning in, 22
Social progress example, 208
ultimate conclusion in, 212, 214
ultimate goal in, 214
Socrates, 241
Solutions, 10, 214, 231
inconsistent, 205
Speech acts
rules governing, 135
turn-taking, 175
See also Legal argumentation.
State space explosion, 2, 29, 36, 147, 195
Statement
goal statement, 22
Story. See also Script.
judging, 139
Straw man fallacy, 40
Sufficient condition, 7
scheme, 7–8, 18
Sufficient condition value-based practical reasoning scheme
critical questions for, 31
Sycara, K., 172–174, 181

Teleological explanation, 120
Theory of reasons for action, 33–34
Threat, 261, 262
computational framework, 187
Town hall meeting example, 160, 199, 264, 265
Train to Arnhem example 4, 7
Trial and error, 265
Truth, 240
Tuomela, R., 15

Ultimate probandum
Umbrella example, 8
Undercutter, 73, 75, 145
described, 30, 71, 94, 160
Underlying argument, 63,
Understanding, 120
Universal quantifier, 99–110

Vagueness, 132
Value based practical reasoning, 37, 68, 207–208
critical questions for, 158, 159–160
goal, 157
scheme for, 21, 28–29, 125, 157, 158, 199
van Koppen, P.J., 139
Veracity principle, 240
Veristic principle, 243
Verheij, B., 72, 76
Vodka ad example, 56–58
Von Wright, G.H., 7–8

Wagenaar, W.A., 139
Walton, D., 6, 61, 141, 174, 176, 178, 219, 222, 230, 232
agent’s mental state, 136
argument from expert opinion, 83
argumentation scheme, 18
commitment model, 8
complications of practical reasoning, 17
computational framework, 187
critical questions, 84
dialogue system for explanation, 107
dialogue types, 246
IBE, 144
on goals, 16
on stories, 139
real estate example, 154

Warning
requirements of, 226–227
Water supply example, 174, 176, 178
Weakness of will, 11, 254, 263
Why? Dialogue System, 98, 107, 120
speech acts in, 108
Why-Because System with Questions, 106
Wigmore, J. H., 133, 141
Wooldridge, M., 192

Yogurt example, 42–46, 55, 89
premises in, 43
Zeno argumentation framework, 162