

# Norms and Arguments

Leendert van der Torre

University of Luxembourg

## Abstract

In this talk I discuss two relations between normative reasoning and formal argumentation. First I consider formal argumentation as a kind of normative reasoning. An attack of argument  $A$  on argument  $B$  is interpreted either as “either  $A$  is not accepted or  $B$  should be accepted” or as “ $A$  and  $B$  cannot both be accepted, and it is preferred to accept  $A$  over  $B$ ”. The difference between the two interpretations is analyzed for higher order attack (where attacks can be attacked) and for contrary to duty argumentation (where arguments that should be rejected are accepted). Second, I apply a theory of structured argumentation to normative reasoning. In an ASPIC+ style setting, I discuss the definition of argument, the role of constitutive and permissive norms, and hierarchical normative systems.

---

*Copyright © by the paper's authors. Copying permitted for private and academic purposes.*

In: T. Ågotnes, B. Liao, Y.N. Wang (eds.): Proceedings of the first Chinese Conference on Logic and Argumentation (CLAR 2016), Hangzhou, China, 2-3 April 2016, published at <http://ceur-ws.org>