### Burden of Proof, Presumption and Argumentation

The notion of burden of proof and its companion notion of presumption are central to argumentation studies. This book argues that we can learn a lot from how the courts have developed procedures over the years for allocating and reasoning with presumptions and burdens of proof, and from how artificial intelligence has built precise formal and computational systems to represent this kind of reasoning. The book provides a model of reasoning with burden of proof and presumption based on analyses of many clearly explained legal and nonlegal examples. The model is shown to fit cases of everyday conversational argumentation as well as argumentation in legal cases. Burden of proof determines (1) under what conditions an arguer is obliged to support a claim with an argument that backs it up and (2) how strong that argument needs to be to prove the claim in question.

Douglas Walton holds the Assumption Chair in Argumentation Studies and is Distinguished Research Fellow of the Centre for Research in Reasoning, Argumentation and Rhetoric at the University of Windsor, Canada. His most recent book is *Methods of Argumentation* (Cambridge University Press, 2013). Walton's work has been used to prepare better legal arguments and to help develop artificial intelligence. His books have been translated worldwide and he attracts students from many countries to study with him. A festschrift honoring his contributions, *Dialectics, Dialogue and Argumentation: An Examination of Douglas Walton's Theories of Reasoning and Argument*, edited by C. Reed and C. W. Tindale (2010), shows how his theories are increasingly finding applications in computer science.

# Burden of Proof, Presumption and Argumentation

DOUGLAS WALTON University of Windsor, Canada





#### **CAMBRIDGE** UNIVERSITY PRESS

32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107678828

© Douglas Walton 2014

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2014

Printed in the United States of America

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication data Walton, Douglas N., author. Burden of proof, presumption and argumentation / Douglas Walton, University of Windsor, Canada. pages cm Includes bibliographical references and index. ISBN 978-1-107-04662-7 (hardback) – ISBN 978-1-107-67882-8 (paperback) 1. Burden of proof. 2. Proof theory. I. Title. K2263.W348 2014 347'.06–dc23 2014014939 ISBN 978-1-107-04662-7 Hardback ISBN 978-1-107-67882-8 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

For Karen, with love.

## Contents

Acknowledgments		
1	Introduction to Basic Concepts and Methods	1
	1. Problems and Objections	2
	2. Arguments from Ignorance	6
	3. Three Examples of Burden of Proof Problems	9
	4. Survey of Theories of Presumption and Burden of Proof	
	in Argumentation	13
	5. Presumption and Burden of Proof in Legal Argumentation	19
	6. Shifting of Burden Proof and Critical Questioning	23
	7. The Carneades Argumentation System	26
	8. Dialogue Models of Argumentation	31
	9. Formal Dialogue Models for Legal Argumentation	38
	10. A Formal Model of Burden of Proof in the Critical Discussion	n 42
2	Burdens of Proof in Legal Reasoning	49
	1. The Normal Default Rule	50
	2. Burden of Persuasion and Evidential Burden	52
	3. Standards of Proof	57
	4. Stages of Dialogue and Legal Burden of Proof	61
	5. Other Legal Burdens of Proof	65
	6. The Link between Burden of Persuasion and Production	68
	7. The Abstract Argumentation Model	70
	8. The Self-Defense Example	73
	9. How Carneades Models the Self-Defense Case	77
	10. Conclusions	83
3	Presumption in Legal Reasoning	85
	1. The Five Components of Argumentation in a Trial	86
	2. Presumption in Law and Everyday Reasoning	89

viii	Contents	
4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	Rules and Inferences The Logical Component The Dialogical Component The Letter and the Dark Stairway Combining the Inferential and Dialogical Components Application of the Dialogical Theory to Examples Conclusions Directions for Future Research	91 94 97 101 105 109 114 118
4 Sh	ifting the Burden of Proof in Witness Testimony	122
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	Witness Testimony in the Carneades Argumentation System The Case of the <i>State v. Classen</i> Scientific Evidence on the Fallibility of Witness Testimony The <i>State of Oregon v. Lawson</i> The Change Made in Oregon Law Reconfiguring the Argumentation Schemes The Critical Questions Matching the Scheme Admissibility, Bias and Burden of Proof Admissibility, Relevance and Examination Conclusions	123 126 128 131 133 135 137 139 140 142
5 Bu	rden of Proof in Dialogue Systems	145
2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9.	Hamblin's Why-Because System with Questions An Example Argument Burden of Proof in Dialogue Situating Support Requests in Types of Dialogue Specifications for a Why-Because System with Questions Analysis of the Argumentation in the Example Solution to the Problem of Evasion and Shifting of Burden of Proof Speech Acts in Dialogue Systems The Dialogue Systems CB1 and CB1CK Dialogue Systems with Argument and Explanation	$146 \\ 149 \\ 150 \\ 152 \\ 155 \\ 158 \\ 162 \\ 164 \\ 167 \\ 173 \\ 173$
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.	<b>Iving the Problems of Burden of Proof</b> Problems To Be Solved Meta-Arguments and Metadialogues in Logic and AI Theoretical Problems of Metadialogues Analyzing the Los Gatos Example Using Carneades Analyzing the Los Gatos Example Using Abstract Argumentation Arguments from Ignorance Revisited	177 178 181 183 187 190
	The Nonfallaciousness of Argument from Ignorance When Should a Persuasion Dialogue Be Closed?	196 200

		Contents	ix	
		A Solution to These Problems	203	
	10.	An Explanation-Based Approach to Modeling Standards of Proof	205	
7	Bu	rdens of Proof in Different Types of Dialogue	.211	
	1.	Some Examples	212	
		The Formal Structure of Deliberation Dialogue	216	
		Deliberation versus Persuasion Over Action	218	
	4.	Analysis of the No-Fault Insurance Example	224	
	5.	Analysis of the Wigmore, FDA and Precautionary Principle		
		Examples	229	
		The Persuasion Interval in Deliberation	232	
		Conclusions on Burden of Proof in Deliberation	234	
		Burden of Proof in Inquiry and Discovery Dialogues	236	
	9.	Information-Seeking Dialogue, Negotiation and Eristic		
		Dialogue	240	
	10.	The Contextual Nature of Burden of Proof	241	
<b>8 Conclusions</b>				
	1.	The Allegation of Hasty Transference	246	
	2.	Comparing Legal and Nonlegal Burden of Proof	249	
	3.	Normative Models and Everyday Conversational Arguments	252	
	4.	The Dialogue on Tipping	256	
	5.	Burdens of Proof in the Dialogue on Tipping	263	
	6.	Burdens of Proof in a Forensic Debate	269	
	7.	The Connection between Burden of Proof and Presumption	273	
		Dialectical Refinements of the Theory of Presumption	277	
		The Legal and the Everyday Notions of Presumption	279	
	10.	Conclusions and Suggestions for Further Research	281	
Bi	Bibliography			
In	dex		297	

## Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Springer-Verlag GmbH for permission to reprint three of my previously published papers. My paper "A Dialogical Theory of Presumption," originally published in Artificial Intelligence and Law (16 (2), 2008, 209–243), now appears in revised form as Chapter 3 of this book. A substantially revised version of my paper "Metadialogues for Resolving Burden of Proof Disputes," which appeared originally in Argumentation (21, 2007, 291-316), comprises parts of Chapter 6. My keynote lecture for the Sixth International Workshop on Argumentation in Multi-Agent Systems, originally published as "Burden of Proof in Deliberation Dialogs," in Argumentation in Multi-Agent Systems, ed. P. McBurney, I. Rahwan, S. Parsons and N. Maudet, Berlin, Springer, 2010, 1-22, has been reprinted in substantially revised form in this book, making up parts of Chapter 7. Finally, I would also like to thank the editors of Informal Logic for their permission to reprint materials from my paper, "Burden of Proof in a Modified Hamblin Dialogue System," which was originally published in Informal Logic, 31(4), 2011, 279-304.

I would like to thank Katie Atkinson and Tom Gordon for trenchant comments that were extremely helpful in making revisions. I would like to thank Henry Prakken for many detailed comments and corrections on technical matters in Chapter 2, and Erik Krabbe for helpful suggestions and comments on Chapter 5. I would also like to thank Joseph Laronge, Senior Assistant Attorney General of the State of Oregon, for drawing the ruling in the Lawson case to my attention, and for making many helpful comments and corrections.

The research for this book was supported by Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Insight Grant 435–2012–0104: The Carneades Argumentation System. I am especially thankful to the members of the Centre for Research in Reasoning, Argumentation and Rhetoric (CRRAR) at the University of Windsor. They made many helpful comments when parts of some chapters were presented at CRRAR colloquia.