

PROCEEDINGS

Computational dialectics:

Models of Argumentation,
Negotiation and Decision Making

Third International Workshop

Tuesday, August 22th, 2000

Humboldt University

Berlin, Germany

Organization Gerd Brewka, University of Leipzig; Nick Jennings,
University of Southampton; Gerard Vreeswijk, Utrecht University.

Program committee Trevor Bench-Capon, Liverpool; Thomas Gordon,
GMD; Hadassa Jakobovits, Brussels; Ron Loui, St. Louis; Charlie Ortiz,
SRI; Simon Parsons, Liverpool; Henry Prakken, Utrecht; Chris Reed,
Dundee; Giovanni Sartor, Belfast; Carles Sierra, Barcelona; Bart Verheij,
Maastricht.

Summary

The last ten years have seen a marked increase of interest in inter-agent decision making on the basis of argument and negotiation. This has led to “Computational Dialectics”—an area of AI which investigates computational models of the processes by which groups of natural or artificial agents construct judgement, agreement, or other forms of social choice. Special emphasis lies on methods for recognizing or achieving an outcome in a fair and effective way or to persuade other computational agents to behave in a manner that we want.

High-level protocols for multi-agent rational decision making are expected to become significant conditions for computational cooperation in the 21st century, and it is crucial that both academics and industrialists within Europe have access to a forum at which current research and application issues are presented and discussed. The aim of this workshop is to encourage and support activity in the research and development of multi-agent rational decision making, in both academia and industry. The proposed workshop will discuss inter-agent argumentation and negotiation protocols as well as approaches that model group decision making processes.

This workshop is the third of its kind, the first one organised at AAAI’94 in Seattle, and the second one at FAPR’96 in Bonn.

Table of contents

Leila Amgoud and Simon Parsons, <i>An Argumentation Framework for Merging Conflicting Knowledge Bases</i>	7
Leila Amgoud and Laurent Perrussel, <i>Arguments and Contextual Preferences</i>	19
Trevor Bench-Capon and Giovanni Sartor, <i>Theory Based Dialectics for Resolving Disagreement in Law</i>	29
Marco De Boni, Alec Grierson, Dave Moore, Dominic Palmer-Brown, <i>Proposed enhancements to a Debating System</i>	43
Sylvie Doutre and Jérôme Mengin, <i>An Algorithm that Computes the Preferred Extensions of Argumentation Frameworks</i>	55
ChingMiin Duh and John A.A. Sillince, <i>A Web-Based Computer Supported Collaborative Argumentation System</i>	63
Sylvia Johnigk, <i>Argumentation Protocols with Security Policies</i>	71
Peter McBurney and Simon Parsons, <i>Tenacious Tortoises: A Formalism for Argument over Rules of Inference</i>	77
Henry Prakken, <i>An Exercise in Formalising Teleological Case-Based Reasoning (Extended Abstract)</i>	85
Gernot Richter, <i>Conceptual Model Building for Dialectical Scenarios</i>	93

