

ARGUMENTS, STORIES AND CRIMINAL EVIDENCE

A Formal Hybrid Theory

by

Floris J. Bex

University of Dundee, UK

 Springer

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Rational Theories of the Process of Proof	1
1.2	Making Sense of Evidence	4
1.3	Reasoning with Evidence in Artificial Intelligence and Law	5
1.4	Research Goals	7
1.5	Book Outline	9
2	Reasoning with Criminal Evidence	11
2.1	Facts, Evidence and General Knowledge	11
2.1.1	Facta Probanda and Facta Explananda	12
2.1.2	Evidence	13
2.1.3	General Knowledge and Generalizations	17
2.2	The Process of Proof: Discovery, Pursuit and Justification	20
2.2.1	Investigation, Trial and the Process of Proof	23
2.3	Reasoning in the Process of Proof	24
2.3.1	Abductive Reasoning and Inference to the Best Explanation	25
2.3.2	Causal Reasoning with Evidence	27
2.3.3	Reasoning About Motives and Actions	29
3	Two Approaches to Reasoning with Evidence: Arguments and Stories	33
3.1	Evidential Arguments	34
3.1.1	The Structure of Evidential Arguments	36
3.1.2	The Dialectical Nature of Argumentation: Attack and Defeat	41
3.1.3	Generalizations and General Knowledge in Evidential Reasoning	46
3.1.4	Summary and Evaluation	53
3.2	Stories	57
3.2.1	The Causal Structure of Stories	59
3.2.2	Episodic Structures and Story Schemes	63
3.2.3	Explaining the Evidence	69
3.2.4	Choosing the Best Explanatory Story for the Evidence	73
3.2.5	Summary and Evaluation	77

4	A Hybrid Theory of Stories and Arguments	83
4.1	Combining Stories and Arguments	85
4.2	Evidential Support, Contradiction and Gaps	87
4.3	Story Coherence in the Hybrid Approach	89
4.3.1	The Plausibility and Consistency of a Story	90
4.3.2	The Completeness of a Story	92
4.4	Assessing and Comparing Stories	93
4.4.1	Comparing Stories	95
4.4.2	A Game for Inquiry Dialogue	98
4.5	Evaluation	100
5	A Formal Logical Hybrid Theory of Argumentation and Explanation	101
5.1	A Defeasible Logic	102
5.2	A Formal Theory for Argumentation	109
5.2.1	A Defeasible Logic for Evidential Arguments	109
5.2.2	Evidential Arguments	113
5.2.3	Attacking Arguments	116
5.2.4	Defeat and the Status of Arguments	118
5.3	A Formal Theory for Explanatory Stories	120
5.3.1	A Causal Theory for Explanations	120
5.3.2	Causal Stories	121
5.3.3	Stories as Explanations	123
5.3.4	Story Schemes	128
5.4	A Hybrid Theory of Argumentation and Explanation	132
5.4.1	Supporting and Contradicting Stories	133
5.4.2	The Coherence of Stories: Plausibility and Implausibility	136
5.4.3	The Coherence of Stories: Story Schemes and Completeness	138
5.4.4	Assessing and Comparing Stories	140
5.5	Dialogues About Proof	141
5.5.1	Framework for a Formal Dialogue Game	142
5.5.2	Players, Language and Moves	143
5.5.3	The Hybrid Theory in a Dialogue	145
5.5.4	Commitments	146
5.5.5	Comparing Explanations	147
5.5.6	Current Winner and Turntaking	149
5.5.7	The Protocol	151
5.6	An Example of the Dialogue Game	154
5.7	Evaluation	160
6	Case Study: Murder in Anjum	163
6.1	The Murder of Leo de Jager	164
6.1.1	Before the 24th: The Cannabis-Growing Operation and Bank Fraud	166
6.1.2	The Evidence in the Investigation into Leo's Death	167

6.2	An Analysis of the Case: Constructing Stories and Arguments	176
6.3	Cause of Death, Murder Weapon and Leo’s State	178
6.3.1	The Murder Weapon	179
6.3.2	The Location Where Leo Died	186
6.3.3	Leo’s Drugged State	188
6.3.4	Summary	189
6.3.5	Initial Evaluation	190
6.4	The Judiciary’s View: Marjan Drugged and Killed Leo	193
6.4.1	Marjan’s Motives for Drugging Leo	195
6.4.2	Marjan’s Motives for Leo’s Death	200
6.4.3	Leo’s Death and the Events Afterwards	205
6.4.4	Summary of the Improved Judiciary’s Story	213
6.5	Alternatives to the Judiciary’s Story	215
6.5.1	Leo Took the Temazepam Himself	215
6.5.2	Beekman As the Killer	219
6.6	Comparing the Alternatives	224
6.7	Evaluation	225
7	Related Research on Reasoning with Criminal Evidence	229
7.1	Reasoning with Stories	230
7.1.1	Bennett and Feldman and Pennington and Hastie	230
7.1.2	The Anchored Narratives Theory	234
7.1.3	Evaluation	238
7.2	Wigmore and the New Evidence Theorists	240
7.2.1	Wigmore and the Science of Judicial Proof	240
7.2.2	Modified Wigmorean Analysis	244
7.2.3	Evaluation	248
7.3	Theoretical Models of Inference to the Best Explanation	250
7.3.1	Thagard’s Explanatory Coherence	250
7.3.2	Josephson’s Logical Model of Abduction	251
7.3.3	Evaluation	252
7.4	Keppens and Colleagues’ Decision Support System for Police Investigation	254
7.4.1	Evaluation	255
7.5	Probabilistic Reasoning and Bayesian Belief Networks	256
7.5.1	Kadane and Schum’s Analysis of the Sacco and Vanzetti Case	257
7.5.2	Bayesian Belief Networks and Sensitivity Analysis	259
7.5.3	Evaluation of Bayesian Approaches	262
8	Conclusions	265
8.1	Summary	265

8.2	Results	269
8.2.1	Reasoning with Criminal Evidence	269
8.2.2	Formal Theories of Defeasible Reasoning	272
8.3	Suggested Topics for Further Research	274
	References	277
	Name Index	285
	Subject Index	289