

Annotating Opinions in Newspaper Articles: Example Passages with Annotations

Theresa Wilson

September 22, 2002

1 Introduction

Each sentence used in our examples is identified by a bracketed ID at the start of the sentence. Usually, a particular sentence is the focus of a given example, and we list the annotations for only that sentence, with its ID, in italics at the end of the passage. The following example illustrates our formatting.

Example: [M1.13] Near the head of the queue at Highlands, Martha, a 19-year-old middle-class black student, had waited more than 13 hours for her chance to vote for the first time. [M1.14] “They cannot close the polling station,” she said.

M1.14 (*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes*)(*writer, Martha, on=said, onlyfactive=no, strength=low, ES=cannot*)

Two sentences compose the example passage above, M1.13 and M1.14. The annotations for M1.14 are given. The tags for each private state/speech event in the sentence are listed separately within sets of parentheses. For each private state/speech event, the nested source is listed first, then the word or phrase that expresses the private state/speech event, followed by onlyfactive yes or no, the strength of the private state/speech event, then any expressive subjectivity (ES) attributed to the source of the private state/speech event, and ending with an indicator of negative or positive attitude, if one is clearly being expressed within the scope of the private state/speech event. A negative or positive attitude is marked by neg – > target or pos – > target if one is being expressed.

The passages used as examples in this document are real-world examples from the world press. These sentences are not only often syntactically complex but have deeply nested and complex expressions of private states and speech events. Because of this complexity, the portion of a sentence that is the focus of each example is in bold.

2 Explicitly mentioned private states and speech events

The Instructions for Annotations Opinions in Newspaper Articles states that for a private state or speech event to be annotated, it must be explicitly mentioned or must be very intimately related to an action that is explicitly mentioned. Private states and speech events that can only be inferred should not be annotated.

2.1 Examples of possible private state or speech events not explicit enough to annotate

Below are examples where private states could possibly be inferred from the actions of sources. For these and other examples where a private state or speech event is not explicitly mentioned, you should not introduce nested levels.

a. [HR16.4] Since **Israel suffers from terrorist attacks**, the report says, it has been forced to take counter-terrorism measures, making its rights abuses understandable.

(writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes)(writer, report, on=says, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium, ES=suffers, forced, understandable)

The word “suffer”, may or may not indicate a private state, depending on how it is used. Here for Israel, because “terrorist attacks” is an action happening to Israel, there is not a private state. In contrast, if the example was “suffers from melancholy”, there would be a private state.

b. [HR16.8] In exchange for support for its war on terror, the US is tacitly agreeing to ignore abuses by other members of the anti-terror coalition. [HR16.9] **The most glaring examples are Russia’s suppression of**

resistance to its rule in Chechnya, China’s suppression of independence advocates in Xinjiang and the Falun Gong movement, and Israel’s treatment of Palestinians.

HR16.9 (*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium, ES=most glaring*)

Although you may be able to infer private states for Russia, China, and Israel based on “suppression of resistance,” “suppression of independence advocates,” and “treatment of Palestinians,” these are actions, and we do not introduce nested levels for actions.

c. [HR38.12] Belarus, under authoritarian President Alyaksandr Lukashenka, is also singled out as being grossly remiss on human rights and democracy. [HR38.13] The survey says **Lukashenka has taken no steps** to solve four politically motivated disappearances dating to 1999 that may have involved senior government officials.

HR38.13 (*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes*)(*writer, survey, on=says, onlyfactive=no, strength=low, ES=may have involved*)

The phrase, “has taken no steps,” has a feel like it is trying to describe a private state for Lukashenka. However, this is just an example describing a lack of action taken – not a private state. While it is possible that a lack of action could be described in such a way as to indicate a private state, that is not the case for this example.

d. [HR10.2] Foreign Ministry Spokesman Kong Quan criticized **the United States for turning a blind eye to its own human rights abuses** and said Muslim separatists in China’s northwestern region of Xinjiang were legitimate targets of the campaign against terror.

(*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes*)(*writer, Kong, on=criticized, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium, ES=turning a blind eye, neg - > United States*)(*writer, Kong, on=said, onlyfactive=no strength=medium, ES=legitimate, campaign against terror*)

In this sentence, the United States “turning a blind eye” is similar to Lukashenka “has taken no steps” in the previous example

(HR38.13). The phrase may seem to be indicating something about the private state of the United States, but it is just not explicit enough to warrant introducing a nested level for the United States.

e. [HR38.7] In presenting the report – which does not include an assessment of the United States itself – Powell said it is in **U.S. interests** to promote freedom and democracy because they bring about prosperity and stability and kill the impetus for terrorism.

(writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes)(writer, Powell, on=said, onlyfactive=no, strength=low, ES=because)

There is no nested level introduced in this example for “U.S. interests”. In this case, “interests” is not indicating a private state – it is just a thing. Contrast this example with “the U.S. fear of another attack” or “America’s concern for peace,” both for which you would annotate a nested source.

Also note that there is no nested level for the report in HR38.7. Here we are told what the report does not talk about, rather than what it does talk about. Examples like this are not uncommon. Consider, “The President did not comment on the bill.”

f. [HR37.4] **Russian security forces in Chechnya have “demonstrated little respect** for basic human rights and there were credible reports of serious violations, including numerous reports of extrajudicial killings by both the government and Chechen fighters,” the report said.

(writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes)(writer, report, on=said, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium, neg - > Russian security forces)(writer, report, implicit, on=reports of, onlyfactive=yes)(writer, report, implicit, on=reports of, onlyfactive=yes)

As with earlier examples, a private state for Russian security forces can be inferred from “demonstrated little respect,” but it is not explicit, so we do not create a nested level for Russian security forces.

On the other hand, what if the sentence had been, “Russian security forces demonstrated great respect for ...”? The phrase,

“demonstrated great respect,” now becomes a private state action and would be annotated. Why the difference? It is harder to attribute private states to non-actions such as “turn a blind eye” (HR10.2), “take no steps” (HR38.13), and in this example, “demonstrate little respect.” To say a person shows respect for authority definitely tells us something about that person’s private state, that she respects authority. In contrast, to say a person doesn’t show respect (or shows little respect) for authority does not necessarily mean she respects or doesn’t respect authority, only that from her actions there is little or no evidence of her respect for authority.

2.2 Examples of explicit private states and speech events

2.2.1 A few different examples

Each of the following examples caused difficulty for one annotator or another.

a. [HR38.19] State Department officials **were asked by reporters** how the U.S. could reconcile its scathing human rights criticisms of countries such as Uzbekistan, while at the same time making them key allies in the war on terrorism.

(writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes)(writer, reporters, on=were asked by, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium, ES=scathing)(writer, reporters, U.S., on=scathing human rights criticisms of, onlyfactive=no, strength=high)

Note in this example that “asked” is a speech event, as are the “scathing human rights criticisms” from U.S.

b. [HR10.3] “This report is full of fabrications,” he said. [HR10.4] “It confuses right and wrong and **attacks China’s legal system, ethnic policies and human rights conditions.**”

HR10.4 *(writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes)(writer, Kong, on=implicit, onlyfactive=no, strength=high. ES=confuses right and wrong, attacks)(writer, Kong, report, on=attacks, onlyfactive=no, strength=high)*

Out of four annotators, only one did not miss the nested level for writer, Kong, report in sentence HR10.4. This is an example where the action, “attacks,” is actually a speech event.

c. [HR37.4] Russian security forces in Chechnya have “demonstrated little respect for basic human rights and there were credible **reports of serious violations**, including numerous reports of extrajudicial killings by both the government and Chechen fighters,” the report said.

(writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes)(writer, report, on=said, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium, neg - > Russian security forces)(writer, report, implicit, on=reports of, onlyfactive=yes)(writer, report, implicit, on=reports of, onlyfactive=yes)

Noun phrases like, “reports of” and “accounts of” are speech events and should be annotated, even when the source of the report or account is implicit and not stated.

2.2.2 Closely related sources

In the following examples, there are explicit private states and speech events that have closely related or even the same source. For these cases, follow the syntax and introduce nested levels for each explicit private state and speech event.

a. [HR6.30] The US human rights report also accuses China of taking advantage of anti-terrorism campaigns to crackdown on ethnic group people living in the Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region. [HR6.31] It said the United States fears “a spillover from the anti-terrorist campaign in Afghanistan and a perceived opportunity to legitimize measures against the Muslim Uighur activists under the anti-terrorism umbrella.”

HR6.31 *(writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes)(writer, report, on=said, onlyfactive=yes)(writer, report, US, on=fears, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium, ES=spillover, legitimize)*

Follow the syntax and introduce nested sources for both the implicit report (“it”), and the United States.

b. [HR38.3] U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell released the State Department’s annual report on human rights around the world yesterday, **saying America’s concern for world freedom** helps fight terrorism, instability, and conflict.

(writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes)(writer, Powell, on=saying, onlyfactive=yes)(writer, Powell, America, on=concern for, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium)

c. [HR38.7] In presenting the report – which does not include an assessment of the United States itself – Powell said it is in U.S. interests to promote freedom and democracy because they bring about prosperity and stability and kill the impetus for terrorism. [HR38.8] “Experience has shown that countries which demonstrate high degrees of respect for human rights are also the most secure and the most successful. [HR38.9] Indeed, **respect for human rights is essential to lasting peace and sustained economic growth – goals which Americans share** with people all over the world.”

HR38.9 (*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes*)(*writer, Powell, on=implicit, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium, ES=essential*)(*writer, Powell, Americans, on=goals, onlyfactive=no, strength=low*)

In HR38.3 and HR38.7, Powell is acting as spokesperson for America and Americans. Even so, separate nested levels are annotated for these sources.

d. [HR38.19] State Department officials were asked by reporters how the U.S. could reconcile its scathing human rights criticisms of countries such as Uzbekistan, while at the same time making them key allies in the war on terrorism. [HR38.20] **Lorne Craner, assistant secretary of state for human rights, democracy, and labor, said that by working with such nations, Washington hopes to help them change for the better.**

HR38.20 (*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes*)(*writer, Lorne Craner, on=said onlyfactive=yes*)(*writer, Lorne Craner, Washington, on=hopes, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium, ES=for the better*)

Similar to Powell in HR38.3 and HR38.7, Craner is a spokesperson, in this example speaking for Washington. As before, they are treated as separate sources.

e. [PNG1.20] The strife began in the early hours of Saturday morning when shots were fired to stop loyal personnel at Moem barracks putting out a deliberately lit fire which gutted a military intelligence and administration block. [PNG1.21] The National newspaper reported that there were shouts of “Sutim ol ofisas, sutim ol ofisas (shoot the officers, shoot the officers)”. [PNG1.22] Attempts to put out a second fire in a communications centre several hours later were again blocked and the building was destroyed.

[PNG1.23] **“I am very disappointed - the buildings have nothing to do with their demands,” Colonel Ur said.**

PNG1.23 (*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes*)(*writer, Colonel Ur, on=said, onlyfactive=yes*)(*writer, Colonel Ur, Colonel Ur, on=am very disappointed, onlyfactive=no, strength=high*)

In PNG1.23, there is both a speech event and a private state attributed to Colonel Ur, with the private state nested inside the speech event. For cases like these, we follow the syntax to determine the nested source. According to the writer, Colonel Ur said something. The nested source is (writer, Colonel Ur). According to the writer, according to Colonel Ur, Colonel Ur is very disappointed. The nested source is (writer, Colonel Ur, Colonel Ur).

3 Significant-and-particular private states and speech events

From the Instructions for Annotating Opinions in Newspaper Articles, there are three criteria that must be satisfied before annotating a private state or speech event. In summary, the three criteria are:

C1 – a significant portion of the contents of the private state or speech event must be given

C2 – the private state or speech event must exist

C3 – the noun phrase referring to the source (if there is one) of the private state or speech event must be referential

Please refer to the instructions for complete descriptions of these three criteria.

3.1 Criteria C1

3.1.1 Examples on insignificant private states and speech events

Below are examples sentences where we do not introduce a nested source because we are not given a significant portion of the contents of the private state or speech event. In each sentence, there is a private state or speech event that is referred to, but for which no detail is given.

a. [HR6.1] As usual, the US State Department published its annual report on human rights practices in world countries last Monday. [HR6.2] And as usual, **the portion about China contains little truth and many absurdities, exaggerations and fabrications.**

HR6.2 (*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=no, strength=high, ES=and as usual, little truth, many absurdities, exaggerations and fabrications, neg - > report*)

In this example, the U.S. report is referred to when the author give us his opinion, but the actual contents of the report are missing. From our world knowledge, we know that the report is likely criticizing China's human rights and that the author thinks these criticisms are untrue. However, based on the last sentence alone, it is just as possible that the report may have praised China's improving human rights, and that the author thinks this view of the report is untrue, absurd, and exaggerated. Because we are not told what the report says, there is no nested level introduced for the report in this sentence.

b. [HR16.6]) The report is generally quite frank and its wording strong, but it proposes no corrective action.

(*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium, ES=generally quite frank, wording strong*)

As in the previous example, we are not told what the report says, but only that in the author's opinion it is frank with strong wording. Also, when the writer tells us that the report "proposes no corrective action," he is in fact telling us about what the report did not say, rather than what the report did say. As with HR6.2, there is no nested level for the report in this sentence.

c. [HR6.4] "The United States was slandering China again," said Xirao-Nima, a professor of Tibetan history at the Central University for Nationalities. [HR6.5] It has no right to issue such a false human rights report, experts said.

HR6.4 (*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes*)(*writer, Xirao-Nima, on=said, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium, ES=slandering, neg - > United States*)

HR6.5 (*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes, E=N*)(*writer, experts, on=said, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium*)

Similar to HR6.2 and HR16.6, in these two sentences we are given the opinions of Xirao-Nima and experts toward what the United States said in its human rights report, but we are not told what the U.S. or the report actually said.

d. [HR6.11] “underline It somewhat softens its tone in the China human rights report. But it nevertheless uses human rights issues to slander China,” CSSHR President Zhou Jue said.

(*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes*)(*writer, Zhou, on=said, onlyfactive=no, strength=high, ES=somewhat softens its tone, nevertheless, slander, neg - > United States*)

The implicit agent here that “somewhat softens its tone” is the United States, but we do not annotate a nested level for the U.S. Within the sentence, we are only told the topic and that there is a change in the level of negativity being expressed by the U.S. This is not enough to introduce a nested level.

e. [HR6.15] After a visit to Tibet in 2000, the Italian parliamentary delegation issued a press communique agreeing that the development of Tibet is **far better than what has been reported by some Western media**.

(*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes*)(*writer, delegation, on=agreeing, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium, ES=far better*)

This example is similar to HR6.11. There is a speech event here whose source is “some Western media,” but no specifics are given other than something was reported, and that the Italian delegation thinks the reality is better than the report.

f. [HR16.23] The US is planning to extend military aid to several countries in the alliance to enable them to root out terrorists without using US forces. [HR16.24] **Such wishful thinking** risks making the US an accomplice in the destruction of human rights.

HR16.23 (*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=uncertain, strength=low, ES=root out*)(*writer, US, on=planning, onlyfactive=no, strength=low*)

HR16.24 (*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=no, strength=high, ES=such wishful thinking, risks, accomplice, destruction of human rights*)

In sentence HR16.24, “such wishful thinking” is an anaphora referring to the private state referenced by the US planning in sentence HR16.23. This is a case where know from context what is the private state referred to in HR16.24, but in that sentence it is not detailed. Thus, we do not introduce a nested level for the US in HR16.24.

3.1.2 Counter example

In contrast, consider the following example:

[HR37.5] Russian officials from President Vladimir Putin on down have portrayed the conflict in Chechnya as a war against international terrorists.

[HR37.6] **U.S. officials have partially endorsed that view**, pointing to rebel leaders such as Shamil Basayev and the Jordanian-born Omar Ibn al Khattab, who are believed to have financial and other ties to Osama bin Laden’s al-Qaida terrorist network.

HR37.6 (*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes*)(*writer, U.S officials, on=have partially endorsed, onlyfactive=no, strength=low*)(*writer, implicit, on=are believed, onlyfactive=no, strength=low*)

Here, the question is whether to include a nested source for U.S. officials in sentence HR37.6. If the sentence were only, “U.S. officials have partially endorsed that view.” the view of the U.S. officials would only have been referred to, and we would not have introduced a nested level. However, in this case when the sentence is considered as a whole, there is enough information given that we do in fact annotate a nested source for U.S, officials.

3.2 Criteria C2

3.2.1 Non-existent private states and speech events

In the examples below, there are private state or speech events that are referred to, but that do not actually exist because of a conditional or because of a negation. We do not annotate a nested level for these non-existent private state or speech events.

a. [HR16.21] To prove that human rights are important ammunition in the battle against terror, then, the US must attack terrorism to make human rights matter to these countries. [HR16.22] **If, however, US President George W. Bush still believes in the supremacy of human rights,** he must not forget the breeding ground for terrorists that exists within the anti-terrorist alliance.

HR16.22 (*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=no, strength=high, ES=supremacy, must not, breeding ground*)

This sentence is conditional, “If US President George W. Bush still believes ...” Because the private state for Bush is inside the conditional expression, we do not introduce a nested level for Bush.

b. [HR38.26] Craner admits that some governments – such as China and Uzbekistan – have used the war on terrorism as a pretext to crack down on domestic political opponents. [HR38.27] But he says some of them also realize that to achieve prosperity and to build long-term ties with the U.S., they will have to respect human rights and embrace democracy. [HR38.28] “I’m also being pleasantly surprised by the number of governments – like I said, **if they’re going to get their economies on a sound footing, and they want a real relationship with us,** they’re going to have to start addressing these issues.”

HR38.26 (*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes*)(*writer, Craner, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes, ES=like I said, if, have to*)(*writer, Craner, Craner, on=being pleasantly surprised, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium*)

Again, the phrase containing the private state, “they want a real relationship with us,” is part of the conditional introduced by “if they’re going to get,” so a nested source is not annotated for the source “they.”

c. [HR16.25] **If** the US, which claims to be the world’s policeman, is incapable of looking beyond US interests or of practicing the universal values of human rights, democracy and peace, underline then shouldn’t the international community reconsider the role played by the UN, or learn from the way the European parliament works?

(writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=no, strength=high, ES=claims, world's policeman, incapable, universal values, shouldn't)(writer, US, on=claims, onlyfactive=no, strength=low)

The source, “international community,” is embedded within a conditional if-then phrase, so we do not introduce a nested level.

d. [HR16.10] US activities, meanwhile, **show no sign of promoting** the universal values of democracy, human rights and peace. (violates N1)

(writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium)

Under many circumstances, we would include a private state for “promoting.” However, in this sentence the phrase is in fact negative. The activities “show no signs of promoting.” Because of this, there is no nested level for US activities.

3.3 Criteria C3

3.3.1 Non-referential sources

These first examples include non-referential sources that we would not annotate.

a. [HR16.14] The human rights report poses a substantial challenge to the US interpretation of good and evil. [HR16.15] Put simply, what we are seeing is the naked pursuit of US interests. [HR16.16] **No one who has ever studied realist political science** will find this surprising.

HR16.16 *(writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium, ES=no one who has ever, surprising)*

The non-referential source in this example is “No one who has ever studied realist political science” in HR16.16.

b. [HR10.6] “We think this is an example of the United States using human rights as a pretext to interfere in other countries’ internal affairs,” Kong said. [HR10.7] “We have repeatedly stressed that no double standard should be employed in the fight against terrorism,” he added. [HR10.8] Beijing blames Uighur separatists for bombings and assassinations, and says they are linked directly to Osama bin Laden, the prime suspect in the September 11 attacks

on New York and Washington. [HR10.9] “By practicing double standard on human rights and minorities’ issues, the United States will definitely be **despised and opposed by all righteous people in the world.**”

HR10.6 (*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes*)(*writer, Kong, onlyfactive=no, strength=high, ES=double standard, definitely, despised and opposed, all righteous people in the world, neg - > US*)

The non-referential source in this example is “all righteous people in the world” in HR10.9.

For contrast, consider the following example where we do not introduce a nested source, but for a different reason than the above two examples:

c. [HR37.1] The Foreign Ministry said Thursday that it was “surprised, to put it mildly” by the U.S. State Department’s criticism of Russia’s human rights record and objected in particular to the “odious” section on Chechnya. [HR37.2] “underline One gets the impression that its writers simply used old drafts, as if nothing had happened in either Russia or the United States in recent years, as if the events of Sept. 11, 2001 had not occurred and the international community had not closed ranks in the battle against terrorism,” the ministry said in a statement.

HR37.2 (*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes*)(*writer, ministry, on=said, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium, ES=one gets the impression, simply, as if ... as if, neg - > report*)

Although the “One” from “One gets the impression” is both explicit and referential, we do not introduce a new nested source for it because, as it is used in this sentence, it does not refer to another person than the speaker. The phrase “One gets the impression” is similar to the phrases “It seems to me” and “It appears to me.” So, the source of the private state for “gets the impression” is simply (writer). We do not introduce (writer, One) as a nested source.

subsubsection Vague Sources These next examples have sources that may seem non-referential, but they are just really vague. We do include nested levels for these sources.

a. [HR38.23] Craner acknowledges that **many people** fear human rights issues will take a back seat to fighting terrorism in the Bush administration, but he says human rights are, in fact, a key part of that fight – a lesson, he suggested, that many in the White House had learned from bad experiences during the Cold War.

(writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes)(writer, Craner, on=acknowledges, onlyfactive=yes) (writer, Craner, many people, on=fear, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium, ES=take a back seat)(writer, Craner, on=says, onlyfactive=yes)(writer, Craner, on=suggested, onlyfactive=no, strength=low)(writer, Craner, many in the While House, on=lesson ... learned onlyfactive=no, strength=low)

Here, the sources “many people” and “many in the White House” may seem non-referential, but they are, in the speakers mind, referring to specific people that presumably Craner knows about.

b. [HR16.12] “I have been to Tibet many times. I have seen the truth there, which is very different from what some US politicians with ulterior motives have described,” said Xirao-Nima, who is a Tibetan. [HR6.13] **Some Westerners who have been there** have also seen the ever-improving human rights in the Tibet Autonomous Region, he added.

HR16.13 (writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes)(writer, Xirao-Nima, on=added, onlyfactive=no, strength=low, ES=ever-improving)(writer, Xirao-Nima, Some Westerners, on=seen the ever-improving human rights, onlyfactive=no, strength=low)

Again, “Some Westerners” is very vague, but it does refer to specific people.

c. [HR37.8] The Foreign Ministry said that the State Department pronouncement on Chechnya reflected the efforts of **“certain circles” in the United States that object** to the new U.S.-Russian partnership against international terrorism.

(writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes)(writer, Foreign Ministry, on=said, onlyfactive=no, strength=low)(writer, Foreign Ministry, “certain circles”, on=object, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium, neg)

Here, the source “certain circles” does get annotated.

d. [HR6.33] “underline Those that want to secede from the nation and engage in terrorist activities are terrorists, not any particular ethnic group,” said Ma Dazheng, director of the Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region’s Development Research Institute at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences.

(writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes)(writer, Ma, on=said, onlyfactive=no, strength=low, ES=not any particular, neg - > those that want to secede from the nation)(writer, Ma, Those that want to secede from the nation, on=want, onlyfactive=no, strength=low)

Ma is referring to a specific group of people with the source, “Those that want to secede from the nation ...”

3.3.2 Sources inferred from context

In each of the following examples, there is a private state or speech event with a source that is unstated in a particular sentence, but that can be inferred from the context. We do annotate a nested level for these sources because they meet all the criteria for annotating a private state or speech event.

a. [HR16.11] Six months have passed since Sept. 11 and the focus of US anger has turned to countries that have been labeled “rogue nations” and members of an “axis of evil.” [HR16.12] The US anti-terrorist alliance has become the embodiment of two-sided justice. [HR16.13] **“If you’re not with us, you’re against us.”**

HR16.13 *(writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes)(writer, US anti-terrorist alliance, on=implicit, onlyfactive=no, strength=medium, ES=If youre not with us, you’re against us.)*

In sentence HR16.13, the source of the quoted speech is not given. However, we know from the previous sentence that the source of speech event represented by the quoted speech is the “US anti-terrorist alliance.”

b.[HR38.11] While Russia is heavily criticized for reports of violence against civilians in its war in Chechnya, it generally fares better than Central Asian nations such as Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, and especially Turkmenistan, a country the report says allowed its people absolutely no political participation. [HR38.12] Belarus, under authoritarian President Alyaksandr

Lukashenka, is also singled out as being grossly remiss on human rights and democracy.

HR38.12 (*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes*)(*writer, report, on=implicit, onlyfactive=no, strength=high, ES=grossly remiss*)

In sentence HR38.12, the author is still talking about what the report said, even though he doesn't explicitly name it. The implication is "singled out in the report."

c. [HR10.5] "We think this is an example of the United States using human rights as a pretext to interfere in other countries' internal affairs," Kong said. [HR10.6] "We have repeatedly stressed that no double standard should be employed in the fight against terrorism," he added. [HR10.7] Beijing blames Uighur separatists for bombings and assassinations, and says they are linked directly to Osama bin Laden, the prime suspect in the September 11 attacks on New York and Washington. [HR10.8] **"By practicing double standard on human rights and minorities' issues, the United States will definitely be despised and opposed by all righteous people in the world."**

HR10.8 (*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes*)(*writer, Kong, on=implicit, onlyfactive=no, strength=extreme, ES=double standard, definitely, despised and opposed, all righteous people in the world, neg - > US*)

In the last sentence, the writer does not indicate who he is quoting, but we know from the context it is Kong.

3.3.3 Implicit Sources

In each of the following examples, there is a private state or speech event that is significant enough to annotate; however, the source of the private state or speech event is not stated anywhere in context. Although the source may be unstated, the source still exists in the world, and we annotate the nested level.

[HR37.5] Russian officials from President Valdimir Putin on down have portrayed the conflict in Chechnya as a war against international terrorists. [HR37.6] U.S. officials have partially endorsed that view, pointing to rebel leaders such as Shamil Basayev and the Jordanian-born Omar Ibn al Khat-tab, **who are believed to have financial and other ties to Osama bin Laden's al-Qaida terrorist network.**

HR37.6 (*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes*)(*writer, U.S officials, on=partially endorsed, onlyfactive=no, strength=low*)(*writer, implicit, on=are believed, onlyfactive=no, strength=low*)

Here, we introduced a nested source with the name “implicit” for “who are believed to have financial and other ties ...”

4 Difficult onlyfactive examples

a. [HR38.7] In presenting the report – which does not include an assessment of the United States itself – Powell said it is in U.S. interests to promote freedom and democracy because they bring about prosperity and stability and kill the impetus for terrorism. [HR38.8] “Experience has shown that countries which demonstrate high degrees of respect for human rights are also the most secure and the most successful.”

HR38.8 (*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes*)(*writer, Powell, on=implicit onlyfactive=no, strength=low, ES=most, most*)

In sentence 38.8 above, because of “Experience has shown”, your inclination may be to make the nested level for Powell. However, this is not just factive – Powell is using it to support his argument. Because of this, the nested level for Powell is marked onlyfactive=no.

b. [HR37.5] Russian officials from President Vladimir Putin on down have portrayed the conflict in Chechnya as a war against international terrorists.

(*writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes*)(*writer, Russian officials, on=have portrayed, onlyfactive=no, strength=low*)

The annotators discussed at length the use of “portrayed” at the level of the writer. In the context of the article where this sentence appeared, it was appropriate to have onlyfactive=yes at the level of the writer, as there was very little slant on the part of the author. However, if it had appeared in a different article, say an editorial, it’s possible the onlyfactive=no would have been appropriate.

c. [HR6.7] “The United Nations has held the high goal of protecting human rights,” Jin said.

(writer, on=implicit, onlyfactive=yes)(writer, Jin, on=said, onlyfactive=no, strength=low, ES=high goal)(writer, Jin, UN, on=has held the high goal, onlyfactive=no, strength=low)

Again, this example was discussed at length. Here, it is presented as fact and it is not disputed that the United Nations has the goal of protecting human rights. However, Jin’s description of the goal as being a “high” goal was the source of the discussion. The decision was that “high” was a significant enough evaluation for the level for Jin to be tagged *onlyfactive=no*. Without the “high”, the level for Jin would be *onlyfactive=yes*.

5 Acknowledgement

This work was performed, in part, in support of the Northeast Regional Research Center (NRRC) which is sponsored by the Advanced Research and Development Activity (ARDA), a U.S. Government entity which sponsors and promotes research of import to the Intelligence Community which includes but is not limited to the CIA, DIA, NSA, NIMA, and NRO. 13