AIF Use Case: Iraq Debate

This use case presents a scenario in which a number of stakeholders (e.g. students, researchers, policy analysts) are able to share their argument analysis work (of the legitimacy of the 2003 invasion of Iraq) across a diverse set of tools, interoperable via the AIF.

Each tool is tuned to supporting different aspects of the sensemaking lifecycle, from foraging for material, classifying and linking it, discussing it in meetings and online, and evaluating specific points in more depth. Implications for AIF are highlighted as the scenario unfolds.

Foraging for relevant material

Two analysts work together using Cohere (http://cohere.open.ac.uk) with its web browser extension, highlighting relevant clips of source material, which serve as grounding for what may eventually become nodes in the argument analysis:

AIF requirement: support the grounding of nodes in a source document via a URI

They then begin to connect these nodes using whatever relationships make most sense to them at that point:
AIF requirement: sensemaking may entail the creation of a rich set of semantic relationships between notes. As long as the tool provides for a broad classification into supportive or negative, these relationships can be passed via AIF as RA-nodes or CA-nodes, respectively.

As the analysts work, they can see in Cohere or via Twitter what nodes, connections and websites each is adding. The arguments are part of an integrated sensemaking environment supporting multiple views: semantically filterable visualizations enable them to browse different sets of connections between argumentation nodes, view the semantic connections between people in a social network view, map mashups showing those nodes tagged with geolocation data, and timeline views showing nodes with temporal data.

Another analyst is using Compendium (http://compendium.open.ac.uk/institute) to build maps of the narrative structure in policy articles as she reads them:
These maps are relatively informal hybrids of concept maps, issue maps and argument maps: the analyst mixes issues, arguments, notes and whatever ontology of relations she feels is needed to capture the article's key contributions (http://projects.kmi.open.ac.uk/compendium/iraq). However, the analyst is aware that other tools may only recognise a subset of argumentative relations, so when mapping argumentative relations, she tries to ensure that she uses relation types that will be converted (supports and objects-to).

This activity is building material around many themes, including the legality of the war, e.g. zooming on the above article map (top-right), we see:

Through tagging, these and other thematically related nodes from other authors are collated into views to provide an overview of different authors’ positions, e.g.:
To make sense of these different statements from different authors around the legitimacy of the invasion under international law, a more detailed analysis is required, so the analysts switch to Rationale (http://rationale.austhink.com) to tease apart the structure of the debate in more detail:
Argument Mapping in this mode of analysis focuses the analyst on making explicit some of the implicit premises, grouping them together, and validating them in turn to ensure that the claims made are grounded appropriately.

In order to do a more detailed evaluation of the argument, the map is then imported into Carneades (http://carneades.berlios.de):

Carneades enables the user to evaluate the arguments by assigning proof standards (e.g. scintilla of evidence, preponderance of evidence), weighing arguments (from 0-1.0) and by accepting or rejecting statements, which the user is willing to accept as being true or false without further argument. Carneades can automatically compute the acceptability of other statements in the map, informing the user whether accepting a statement would be justified given the arguments. In this example, there are no competing pro and con arguments for a given issue, so the weighing feature does not play a role.

Finally, this series of increasingly fine-grained, formal examinations of some of the claims opens up new issues requiring a broader spectrum of expertise, which the analyst wishes an international team to explore online over the next month. She circulates the Rationale and Carneades maps as seeds for a new set of issues, which the team will deliberate over using the more conversational IBIS format. The analysis, discussion and evaluation of the arguments is opened up to wider synchronous and asynchronous deliberation online via Debategraph (http://debategraph.org). This platform allows users to switch, as they prefer, between a self-organising graphical argument map, and a more structured version of the conventional outline threaded discussion forum:
The Legal Status of the War on Iraq

Could threat to peace from Iraq be averted by means short of force?

Is the CIL legal under international law?

Is there an actual threat to peace from Iraq?

Would a war on Iraq be authorized by the UNSC?

Would war on Iraq meet definition of self-defense?

Coalition War on Iraq would not be self-defense

CIL is legal under international law

CIL would violate international law

There is an actual threat to peace from Iraq

There is no threat to peace from Iraq

Coalition has legal right to wage war to enforce UNSC resolutions

Coalition not yet presented any persuasive arguments

Coalition war would cause widespread harm to Iraq population

Criteria for UNSC authorization not met

Evidence from US Under-Secretary of State

Findings of UN chief weapons inspector

Harms would be akin to offensive in relation to the military objective of UN

Harms due to comply reassigned in 17 UNSC resolutions over 12 years

Iraq’s regime thus has no legitimacy