

Annotation Guideline for Argumentation Structure in Political Debates Dataset

Haddadan, Shohreh
University of Luxembourg
`shohreh.haddadan@uni.lu`

Cabrio, Elena
Université Côte d’Azur, CNRS, Inria, I3S, France
`elena.cabrio@unice.fr`

Villata, Serena
Université Côte d’Azur, CNRS, Inria, I3S, France
`villata@i3s.unice.fr`

December 10, 2018

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	DataSet	4
2.1	Source	4
2.2	Size	4
3	Overview of Argument Annotation Process	5
4	Annotation of Argument Components	5
4.1	Annotation of claims	6
4.1.1	Claim Structures	7
4.1.2	Claim Indicators:	8
4.1.3	Claims without indicators	10
4.2	Annotation of premises	11
4.2.1	Premise Indicators	13
4.2.2	Premises between claims of the same subject:	14
4.2.3	Premises without indicators	15
4.3	Nested Arguments	15
4.4	Boundaries	16
4.5	Controversial Examples	17

1 Introduction

In recent years, the field of argumentation mining has gained a lot of attention in the computational linguistics research community in different domains which potentially contain arguments such as science, law and politics.

Automating the process of extracting arguments can be useful in numerous applications [lippi2016argumentation]. The extracted arguments can be exploited in development of reasoning engines over arguments on the Web, the automated evaluation of scientific essays for reviewers, analysis of social behavior in debates occurring in social networks, etc.

Argumentation Mining is an interdisciplinary field which is tangled with philosophy, computer science, linguistics, logic and knowledge representation. Most argumentation mining systems consist of a pipeline of Natural Language Processing (NLP) techniques and classification methods including the recognition of argumentative phrases, finding components of an argument and predicting the relation between these components and different arguments (for instance, if they support or attack each other).

Politics is an interesting application scenario for argument mining, the increasingly available data of online political debates, transcripts of televised debates or parliamentary debates can provide us with huge amount of textual argumentation data. As [Zarefsky] mentions the goal of political argumentation studies are two-fold. The first goal is artistic which identifies the dynamics of the text in sense of strength of argument, use of sentiment etc. The other goal would be historical as in investigating the role of the text in the historical timeline, tracking the stance of parties towards diverse topics discussed in the period and etc.

The goal of this study is to build a dataset for the input of an argumentation mining pipeline in the political domain as a prerequisite for automated argument recognition in a natural language processing pipeline. However, discerning an argumentative sentence and its components are not as intuitive for human as some Natural Language Understanding (NLU) tasks such as Word Sense Disambiguation or Named Entity Recognition. Hence, we hereby provide a guideline for annotators to follow for gathering an annotated dataset. In this guideline, we will focus on definitions, examples and structures for the annotators to facilitate the process.

This guideline is structured as followed. In section 2 we introduce the dataset. Section 3 illustrates a general overview of argument annotation. Moreover, section 4 gives a brief definition of the different components in argument claims (conclusions) and premises (evidences), each will be discussed in subsections 4.1 and 4.2 respectively. Each subsection contains instructions and examples to distinguish the different components of an argument for annotators.

2 DataSet

2.1 Source

The dataset is gathered from the Commission on Presidential Debates¹ (CPD) available debates between presidency and vice-presidency candidates of the United States of America.

The first political debates in this dataset dates back to the 1960 presidential elections between Kennedy and Nixon and the last debates are from 2016 between Clinton and Trump.

There were no debates for the elections on 1964, 1968 and 1972 due to candidates' refusal to participate in debates.

2.2 Size

There are 39 different transcriptions of debates including 33 Presidential and 6 vice-presidential debates. There are approximately 6600 speech turns (The turn each person takes to speak or answer in a debate) in all of the transcriptions which includes the parts where the debaters (candidates), the panelists (People invited to the debates for posing questions for the candidates) or the host is speaking.

¹<http://debates.org>

3 Overview of Argument Annotation Process

An argument is an utterance which is stated in order to persuade the audience. The audience could be readers of an essay or an opponent in a discussion or people watching a TV debate between different candidates in an election. In political debates, an argument could be laid out to justify a belief or a decision made by politician or a candidate's plan for the future.

As we have mentioned earlier in section 1, the annotation process consists of two different steps: In the first step, the components of an argument are annotated. In this study, we consider each argument as a combination of a claim and several premises. These components will be described in detail in section 4.

The second step of the annotation process is to find argument relations. Support or attack relations are annotated between arguments and also the components in each argument.

In this guideline we focus on the annotation of argument components.

4 Annotation of Argument Components

Components of an argument are claims and premises.

The simplest structure of an argument is a combination of premises which are conveyed to justify a certain claim. A crucial part of an argument is a claim or the conclusion. Asserting a claim is the main goal of an argument made by someone, which can be true or false.

The claim is usually supported by at least one evidence or premise. These premises are stated such that the claim of the argument is reasonable. One cannot expect the claim of their argument to be accepted by others if they do not have strong premises to justify the claim.

Thus, another important component of the argument are premises for backing the claim.

There are some structures that premises and claims may follow to form an argument. These structures are not definitive proof of existence of an argument and are not as common in oral debates than in written persuasive essays. However, they can be helpful to trace arguments. After detection of these structures we should investigate from the context, if the structure is used to develop an argument .

Example (1) gives some cue structure examples for detecting arguments.

- (1) 1.Premise, Premise, Premise,... **so** or **therefore** Claim.
- 2.Claim **because** premise.
- 3.**In my judgment**, Claim.

Annotation of claims and premises are explained in more details provided with examples in subsections 4.1 and 4.2 respectively.

Note: A clause cannot be annotated as a claim and a premise at the same time, either a statement is a premise to prove a claim or it is a claim itself or none of the two.

4.1 Annotation of claims

The first step of annotating an argument is to find its corresponding claim. Hence, the detection of a claim is supposed as detection of an argumentative structure.

A claim is a statement that the debater needs to justify by providing evidences to support it. Claims are statements which are not necessarily true but need investigation to be proven. On the other hand, claims might be refuted by contradictory evidences or other claims that attack them.

Stab and Gurevych [stab2014annotating] have provided the following questions which can facilitate the process of identifying a claim:

- Did the debater give a reason why this claim should be considered to be true?
- Is the statement supported by at least one other statement?(In the annotation process, in debates it is not always the case that claims are supported)
- Is the statement an assertion with respect to a certain aspect?

In the annotation process we should emphasis that in some cases, candidates (specifically in the opening an closing statements from the candidates) make claims without giving any premises to support them in its corresponding speech turn. Therefore, there are cases such that no clause is supporting a certain claim.

We should make a distinction between the facts that are certainly true or false and claims which construct an argument and need premises to be justified.

In political debates, a claim can be a policy advocated by a party or a candidate to be undertaken which needs to be justified in order to be accepted by the audience as in example (2), taking a stance towards a policy(3), or an opinion towards a specific issue as (4) and (6) or a personal judgment as (5). Claims can be also provided as an answer to a question asked from a certain candidate as in (7)

- (2) Nixon-Kennedy, October 13, 1960:
[**I feel that another effort should be made by a new Administration in January of 1961, to renew negotiations with the Soviet Union**] and [*see whether it's possible to come to some conclusion which will lessen the chances of contamination of the atmosphere*], and also [*lessen the chances that other powers will begin to possess a nuclear capacity*].
- (3) Reagan-Mondale, October 21, 1984:
[**In no area do we disagree more than this administration's policies on human rights**]. [*I went to the Philippines as Vice President*], [*pressed for human rights*], [*called for the release of Aquino*], and [*made progress that had been stalled on both the Subic and the Clark airfield bases*]
- (4) Nixon-Kennedy, October 13, 1960:
[**I favor higher salaries for teachers**].

- (5) Reagan-Mondale, October 21, 1984:
[George Bush, who I think is one of the finest Vice Presidents this country has ever had]
- (6) Nixon-Kennedy 26 September, 1960:
[I believe the programs that Senator Kennedy advocates will have a tendency to stifle those creative energies], [I believe in other words, that his program would lead to the stagnation of the motive power that we need in this country to get progress].
- (7) Nixon-Kennedy, September 26, 1960:
FLEMING: Senator, the Vice President in his campaign has said that you were naive and at times immature. He has raised the question of leadership. On this issue, why do you think people should vote for you rather than the Vice President?
KENNEDY: Well, [*the Vice President and I came to the Congress together 1946*]; [*we both served in the Labor Committee*]. [*I've been there now for fourteen years, the same period of time that he has*] so that [our experience in uh - government is comparable].

4.1.1 Claim Structures

The syntactic structure of a claim is not certain. A successor claim is the claim which is derived as a conclusion after some reasons and a preceding claim is asserted initially before the reasons. A successor claim is a clause asserting a claim which comes as a conclusion after a number of reasons for its justification, examples (8), (9) and (10) are samples of successor claims.²

- (8) Nixon-Kennedy, September 26, 1960:
Well, [*the Vice President and I came to the Congress together 1946*]; [*we both served in the Labor Committee*]. [*I've been there now for fourteen years, the same period of time that he has*] so that [our experience in uh - government is comparable].
- (9) Reagan-Mondale, October 7, 1984:
[*Net farm income is off 50 percent in the last 3 years, and every farmer knows it*]. [*And the effect of these economic policies is like a massive grain embargo, which has caused farm exports to drop 20 percent*]. [It's been a big failure]. [I opposed the grain embargo in my administration]. [I'm opposed to these policies as well].
- (10) Clinton-Bush-Perot, October 11, 1992:
[We have reduced the number of troops that are deployed and going to be deployed]. [I have cut defense spending]. And [*the reason we could do that is*]

²Claims are written in **bold** and premises are written in *italics* and the dashed underlines is used to depict discontinues annotated segments through the guideline. Component boundaries can be distinguished by [square brackets].

because of our fantastic success in winning the Cold War]. [*We never would have got there if we had gone for the nuclear freeze crowd*]; [**we never would have got there if we had listened to those that wanted to cut defense spending**]. [**I think it is important that the US stay in Europe and continue to guarantee the peace**].

A preceding claim, on the other hand, is the starting point of an argument, examples (11) and (12) are samples of preceding claims.

- (11) Bush-Ferraro, October 11, 1984:
[**I believe very, very sincerely in the separation of church and state**]. I'm taking it from the historical viewpoint, [*if you go back to the 1600s when people came here, the reason they came to this country was to escape religious persecution*], and [*that's the same reason why people are coming here today in the 1940s to escape Nazism*], [*now in the 1980s and 1984 when they can get out of the country to escape communism so they can come here and practice their religion*].
- (12) Clinton-Bush-Perot, October 11, 1992:
[**I've worked hard to create good jobs and to educate people**]. [*My state now ranks first in the country in job growth this year, fourth in income growth, fourth in reduction of poverty, third in overall economic performance, according to a major news magazine*].

Therefore, claims cannot be distinguished by their position. Thus, the content of a paragraph should be well understood before annotating a claim or conclusion.

However, the structure of the debates can lead the annotators to find the claims occurring through the debates.

The political debates are usually structured in a certain way so that each of the opponents have an equal share of time and chance to express their ideas surrounding a certain issue. In the specific data that we are working on the host customarily announces the procedure of the debate. There are some patterns in the debates that can lead to finding claims by either candidate: The host or the panelist makes an argument by putting forward a question on a specific topic, each candidate will be given some time to respond during which they will probably take a position for or against the said subject.

4.1.2 Claim Indicators:

In some cases, indicators can be helpful to find a reasoning process which leads to making a claim. (13) to (24) are examples of claims with indicators.

Note: Although the indicators provide the annotators with cues to look for claims, they do not guarantee the existence of a claim, therefore annotators should consider the context to make sure a claim is asserted or not.

- In my opinion

- In my judgment
- I believe
- I do not believe
- I am in favor of
- I think
- for this reason
- however
- so

Examples:

- (13) Nixon-Kennedy, September 26, 1960:
[I've been there now for fourteen years, the same period of time that he has], so that [our experience in uh - government is comparable].
- (14) Nixon-Kennedy, September 26, 1960:
[We did come forward with a program of students for the Congo of over three hundred which was more than the federal government had for all of Africa the previous year], so that [I don't think that uh - we have moved at least in those two areas with sufficient vigor].
- (15) Nixon-Kennedy, September 26, 1960:
for this reason: [we want higher teachers' salaries].
- (16) Reagan-Mondale, October 7, 1984:
Now, [I believe that our problem has not been that anybody in our country is undertaxed]; [it's that government is overfed].
- (17) Reagan-Mondale, October 7, 1984:
[I think our future requires a President to lead us in an all-out search to advance our education, our learning, and our science and training], because [this world is more complex and we're being pressed harder all the time].
- (18) Bush-Ferraro, October 11, 1984:
[I believe very, very sincerely in the separation of church and state]. I'm taking it from the historical viewpoint, [if you go back to the 1600s when people came here, the reason they came to this country was to escape religious persecution], [and that's the same reason why people are coming here today in the 1940s to escape Nazism], [now in the 1980s and 1984 when they can get out of the country to escape communism so they can come here and practice their religion]. [Our country is founded on the principle that our government should be neutral as far as religion is concerned].

- (19) Reagan-Mondale, October 21, 1984:
[**I object to that part of the Simpson-Mazzoli bill which I think is very unfair. and would prove to be so**].
- (20) Kennedy-Nixon, September 26, 1960:
[**In my judgment, a vigorous Democratic president supported by a Democratic majority in the House and Senate can win the support for these programs**].
- (21) Carter-Ford, September 23, 1976:
[**In my judgment, the best way to get jobs is to uh - expand the private sector**], [*where five out of six jobs today exist in our economy*].
- (22) Clinton-Dole, October 6, 1996:
[*We have ten and a half million more jobs, a faster job growth rate than under any Republican administration since the 1920s*]. [*Wages are goings up for the first time in a decade*]. [*We have record numbers of new small businesses*]. [*We have the biggest drop in the number of people in poverty in 27 years*]. [*All groups of people are growing*]. [*We had the biggest drop in income inequality in 27 years in 1995*]. [*The average family's income has gone up over \$1600 just since our economic plan passed*]. So [**I think it's clear that we're better off than we were four years ago**].
- (23) Trump-Clinton, 20 October, 2016:
[*When I was secretary of state, we actually increased American exports globally 30 percent. We increased them to China 50 percent*]. So [**I know how to really work to get new jobs and to get exports that helped to create more new jobs**].
- (24) Clinton-Bush-Perot, October 15, 1992:
[**I think medical care should go with the person**].

4.1.3 Claims without indicators

Claims may not contain any indicator, which is usually the case in an oral debate. In this case one can only distinguish a claim by the context. Examples (25) to (28) do not have any indicators, although they provide claims.

Examples:

- (25) Kennedy-Nixon, September 26, 1960:
[**The program that I have advocated is one which departs from the present program that we have in this respect**].
- (26) [There is only one threat to peace and one threat to freedom - that that is presented by the international Communist movement].
- (27) Trump-Clinton, 20 October, 2016:
She talks about solar panels. We invested in a solar company, our country. [**That was a disaster**]. [*They lost plenty of money on that one*]. Now, look,

[I'm a great believer in all forms of energy], but [we're putting a lot of people out of work].

- (28) Carter-Ford, September 23, 1976:
[**The present tax structure is a disgrace to this country**]. [**It's just a welfare program for the rich**]. *[As a matter of fact, uh - 25 percent of the total tax deductions, go for only 1 percent of the richest people in this country], and [over 50 percent of the tax uh credits go for the 14 percent of the richest people in this country].*

4.2 Annotation of premises

The second step in annotation of components of an argument is the detection of premises or evidences. This part of the argument is discussing whether the claim is plausible or not. In the simplest case of an argument structure a premise should be provided in order to support or attack a claim.

A premise is a reason or justification provided for a claim or given as a reason to refute a certain claim.

Thus, we already have the cue that a premise should exist if we have identified the claim in the previous step.

The following questions are mentioned by [stab2014annotating] in order to identify premises.

- Is the statement a reason or justification (or an attack) for the considered claim?
- Is the statement supporting another premise?
- Does the statement contribute to the confirmation of the claim?

The rules for annotating claims are also applied to premises such that in annotating claims punctuations and indicators are not annotated.

In Toulmin's model of Argumentation a premise can correspond to what he calls "ground". Grounds may consist of facts, statistics, quotations, reports or examples, findings, physical evidence, or other reasoning methods.

Example (29) includes a premise that is imply a fact about Carter's presidency in the past.

- (29) *[I've had to make thousands of decisions since I've been President, serving in the Oval Office]. And [with each one of those decisions that affect the future of my country, I have learned in the process]. [**I think I'm a much wiser and more experienced man than I was when I debated four years ago against President Ford**].*

In example (30), the debater claims that "there's been more growth in this Administration than in its predecessor", then he supports his claim by providing statistics as his premise.

- (30) Nixon-Kennedy, September 26, 1960:
We often hear gross national product discussed and in that respect may I say that when we compare the growth in this administration with that of the previous administration that then [*there was a total growth of eleven percent over seven years*]; [*in this Administration there has been a total growth of nineteen percent over seven years*]. That shows that [**there's been more growth in this Administration than in its predecessor**].

In example (31), The debater tries to bring some evidence with providing expert opinions by mentioning “every economic analysis... says that” as premise to his earlier claim that there is a huge deficit in the budget. Example (32) is another example of this case. (33) is also a premise in the form of a direct quote in order to justify the claim.

- (31) October 7, 1984

The First Reagan-Mondale Presidential Debate [**Every estimate by this administration about the size of the deficit has been off by billions and billions of dollars**]. As a matter of fact, [**over 4 years, they've missed the mark by nearly \$600 billion**]. [*We were told we would have a balanced budget in 1983*]. [*It was \$200 billion deficit instead*]. And now we have a major question facing the American people as to whether we'll deal with this deficit and get it down for the sake of a healthy recovery. [*Virtually every economic analysis that I've heard of, including the distinguished Congressional Budget Office, which is respected by, I think, almost everyone, says that even with historically high levels of economic growth, we will suffer a \$263 billion deficit*].

- (32) Reagan-Carter 28 October 1980:
[*I have submitted an economic plan that I have worked out in concert with a number of fine economists in this country, all of whom approve it*], and [**believe that over a five year projection, this plan can permit the extra spending for needed refurbishing of our defensive posture**], that [**it can provide for a balanced budget by 1983 if not earlier**]

- (33) Reagan-Carter 28 October 1980:
[**I've also learned that there are no simple answers to complicated questions**]. [*H. L. Mencken said that for every problem there's a simple answer. It would be neat and plausible and wrong*]

Premises can be stated as examples to justify the truth of a claim. In order to support a claim or come to a conclusion a debater may provide examples which will in our definition can be considered as premises. Examples of such premises are found in (34) and (37).

- (34) Trump-Clinton 26 September 2016:
[**Race remains a significant challenge in our country**]. [**Unfortunately, race still determines too much**], [*often determines where people live*], [*determines what kind of education in their public schools they can get*], and, yes, [*it determines how they're treated in the criminal justice system*]. [*We've just seen those*]

two tragic examples in both Tulsa and Charlotte].

4.2.1 Premise Indicators

Like mentioned in section 4.1.2, some cue words can help annotators find statements which express reasons. If the reasons are supporting (or attacking) a certain claim, it is considered as a premise or evidence.

- because
- for example
- since

(35) to (38) are examples of claims with indicators. As you can see in example (37), a premise is not necessarily in the same speech as the claim it is related to. The premise might be an attack to a claim which another person has asserted.

- (35) Nixon-Kennedy, September 26, 1960:
The Chinese Communists have always had a large population. But [**they are important and dangerous now**] , because [*they are mounting a major effort within their own country*].
- (36) Trump-Clinton 26 September 2016:
Well, [**I'm really calling for major jobs**] because [*the wealthy are going create tremendous jobs*]. [*They're going to expand their companies*]. [*They're going to do a tremendous job*].
- (37) Clinton-Bush-Perot, 11 October 1992:
VANOCUR: The thing that Mr. Truman didn't have to deal with is drugs. [**Americans are increasingly alarmed about drug-related crimes in cities and suburbs**]. And your administration is not the first to have grappled with this. And are you at all of a mind that maybe it ought to go to another level, if not to what's advocated by William F. Buckley, Jr. and Milton Friedman, legalization, somewhere between there and where we are now?
BUSH: No, I don't think that's the right answer. [**I don't believe legalizing narcotics is the answer**]. [**I just don't believe that's the answer**]. [**I do believe that there's some fairly good news out there**]. [*The use of cocaine, for example, by teenagers is dramatically down*].
- (38) Kennedy-Nixon, October 7, 1960:
... [**we would give statutory authority to the Committee on Government Contracts, which is an effective way of getting real progress made in this area**], since [*about one out of every four jobs is held by and is allotted by people who have government contracts*].

4.2.2 Premises between claims of the same subject:

Usually when the main point of a claim is repeated in other words by one person at a time, what comes between is the premises they provide for the aforementioned claim.

Examples:

- (39) Trump-Clinton 26 September 2016:
[**Your husband signed NAFTA, which was one of the worst things that ever happened to the manufacturing industry**]. [*You go to New England, you go to Ohio, Pennsylvania, you go anywhere you want, Secretary Clinton, and you will see devastation where manufacture is down 30, 40, sometimes 50 percent*]. [**NAFTA is the worst trade deal maybe ever signed anywhere, but certainly ever signed in this country**].
- (40) Trump-Clinton 26 September 2016:
[**Trickle-down did not work**]. [*It got us into the mess we were in, in 2008 and 2009*]. [*Slashing taxes on the wealthy hasn't worked. And a lot of really smart, wealthy people know that*]. [*And they are saying, hey, we need to do more to make the contributions we should be making to rebuild the middle class*]. [**I don't think top-down works in America**]
- (41) Bush-Ferraro, October 11, 1984:
[**I believe very, very sincerely in the separation of church and state**]. I'm taking it from the historical viewpoint, [*if you go back to the 1600s when people came here, the reason they came to this country was to escape religious persecution*], and [*that's the same reason why people are coming here today in the 1940s to escape Nazism*], [*now in the 1980s and 1984 when they can get out of the country to escape communism so they can come here and practice their religion*]. [**Our country is founded on the principle that our government should be neutral as far as religion is concerned**].
- (42) Gore-Bush, October 11, 2000:
[**I think the administration did the right thing in that case**]. I do. [*It was a horrible situation*], [*no one liked to see it on our TV screens*], [*but it's a case where we need to make sure we have an early warning system in place in places where there could be ethnic cleansing and genocide the way we saw it there in Rwanda*]. [*And that's a case where we need to use our influence to have countries in Africa come together and help deal with the situation*]. [*The administration, seems like we're having a great love fest tonight*], but [**the administration made the right decision on training Nigerian troops for situations just such as this in Rwanda**], and so [**I thought they made the right decision not to send U.S. troops into Rwanda**].

Note: These claims should be annotated separately. This is just a pattern suggested by the author in order to help annotators find the possible occurrences of a claim.

4.2.3 Premises without indicators

Premises like claims can be stated without any indicators. Example (43) is a premise without any indicators.

- (43) [I object to that part of the Simpson-Mazzoli bill which I think is very unfair and would prove to be so. That is the part that requires employers to determine the citizenship of an employee before they're hired]. [*I'm convinced that the result of this would be that people who are Hispanic, people who have different languages or speak with an accent, would find it difficult to be employed*].

4.3 Nested Arguments

The distinction between claims and premises are not always a straightforward task. The truth of an utterance made by someone as a premise to support his claim might be attacked then this premise is considered a claim that needs to be justified.

For every speech turn the annotator should start looking for claims in the speech, After annotating the claims start annotating the sentences that are the justifications of the given claims. So that the annotation of claims do not depend on whether there exists a premise for them but independent of the structure it is used in.

In example (44) the sentence "Communism is the enemy of all religions" is provided to support the claim why "we who do believe in God must join together". However, this should be annotated as a claim in spite of the debater not giving any reasons to justify it and the fact that it is used as a reason to justify his other statements.

- (44) Nixon-Kennedy- October 13 1960:
[Communism is the enemy of all religions]; and [we who do believe in God must join together]. [We must not be divided on this issue]

In example (45) the sentence "we're the only ones that can do it" is given as a reason to justify why "we cannot shirk our responsibility as a leader of the free world", but outside the context of argument it is something that needs to be justified, since here he used this as a premise to reason his argument it should be annotated as a premise.

- (45) Reagan-Carter 28 October 1980:
I'm only here to tell you that [I believe with all my heart that our first priority must be world peace], and that [*use of force is always and only a last resort, when everything else has failed, and then only with regard to our national security*]. Now, [I believe] , also, that this meeting this mission, [this responsibility for preserving the peace, which I believe is a responsibility peculiar to our country], and that [we cannot shirk our responsibility as a leader of the free world] because [*we're the only ones that can do it*]. Therefore, [the burden of maintaining the peace falls on us].

Examples (46) and (47) also contain nested arguments.

- (46) Reagan-Carter 28 October 1980:
[I have submitted an economic plan that I have worked out in concert with a number of fine economists in this country, all of whom approve it], and [believe that over a five year projection, this plan can permit the extra spending for needed refurbishing of our defensive posture], that [it can provide for a balanced budget by 1983 if not earlier], and that [we can afford - along with the cuts that I have proposed in Government spending - we can afford the tax cuts I have proposed] and probably mainly because *[Mr. Carter's economic policy has built into the next five years, and on beyond that, a tax increase that will be taking \$86 billion more out of the people's pockets than was taken this year]. And [my tax cut does not come close to eliminating that \$86 billion increase]. [I'm only reducing the amount of the increase].* In other words, *[what I'm talking about is not putting government back to getting less money than government's been getting, but simply cutting the increase in in spending]*
- (47) *[Every estimate by this administration about the size of the deficit has been off by billions and billions of dollars]. As a matter of fact, [over 4 years, they've missed the mark by nearly \$600 billion]. [We were told we would have a balanced budget in 1983]. [It was \$200 billion deficit instead].* And now we have a major question facing the American people as to whether we'll deal with this deficit and get it down for the sake of a healthy recovery. *[Virtually every economic analysis that I've heard of, including the distinguished Congressional Budget Office, which is respected by, I think, almost everyone, says that even with historically high levels of economic growth, we will suffer a \$263 billion deficit].*

4.4 Boundaries

Segmentation is an important issue in any annotation task. Each segment annotated as claim or premise should independently convey a meaning. The segmentation is not limited to sentences. In fact the annotated segments can be clauses. Examples of dividing a sentence to several segments of annotated clauses is shown in examples (48), (49) and (50) .

- (48) Nixon-Kennedy- September 26 1960:
[I want us to recapture that image].[I want people in Latin America and Africa and Asia to start to look to America]; [to see how we're doing things]; [to wonder what the resident of the United States is doing]; and [not to look at Khrushchev], or [look at the Chinese Communists]
- (49) Nixon-Kennedy- September 26 1960:
 Well, *[I'll just say that the question is of experience]* and *[the question also is uh - what our judgment is of the future], and [what our goals are for the United States], and [what ability we have to implement those goals]. [Abraham Lincoln came to the presidency in 1860 after a rather little known uh - session in the*

- House of Representatives and after being defeated for the Senate in fifty-eight and was a distinguished president]. [There's no certain road to the presidency]*
- (50) Nixon-Kennedy- September 26 1960:
[**In my judgment, the hard money, tight money policy, fiscal policy of this Administration has contributed to the slow-down in our economy**], [*which helped bring the recession of fifty-four*]; [*which made the recession of fifty-eight rather intense*], and [*which has slowed, somewhat, our economic activity in 1960*].

4.5 Controversial Examples

In order to start an argument, candidates state some claim made by a third party or another candidate. An example of such a claim is found in example (51):

- (51) Clinton-Bush-Perot, October 11, 1992:
[**There are many people who believe that the only way we can get this country turned around is to tax the middle class more and punish them more**], but [*the truth is that middle-class Americans are basically the only group of Americans who've been taxed more in the 1980s and during the last 12 years, even though their incomes have gone down*].

This is one of the cases where the claim and the premise which is attacking it are stated by the same speaker.