

# Annotation guidelines for implicit arguments

## 1. Introduction

We are interested in implicit arguments that take the form of unstated premises or conclusions. More specifically, our focus is on arguments that have one or more missing components; such arguments are called enthymemes. We annotate short texts, tweets, which may contain one or more enthymemes—usually just one. We only annotate the presence or absence of a part of the argument, either a premise or a conclusion, which was left implicit. Let us clarify the types of arguments we are interested in.

An enthymeme is a type of argument in which one or more of the premises or the conclusion are not explicitly stated in the text, for instance the enthymeme “*I am hungry. Let's go see grandma*” can be reconstructed as such, where premise 1 is the missing component in the original enthymeme,:

1. **Premise 1 (implicit):** Grandma gives us food when we visit.
  2. **Premise 2 (explicit):** I am hungry. (*I need food*)
  3. **Conclusion (explicit):** Therefore, we should go see grandma.
- (1)

In (1) premise 1 is left implicit. Another example: “*Immigrants moved to my neighbourhood last year. I don't feel safe anymore.*”

4. **Premise 1(implicit):** When immigrants move into a particular area, it becomes less safe.
  5. **Premise 2 (explicit):** Immigrants moved to my neighbourhood last year.
  6. **Conclusion (explicit):** I don't feel safe anymore.
- (2)

From (1) and (2), we can see that the missing component — the element we are interested in for this resource — can be either:

- a *clause-like proposition* such as “All grandmas have food,”  
Have\_Food(all\_grandmas) or
- an *inference rule* such as “If immigrants move into a particular area, then it becomes less safe,” hasImmigrants(area) -> Less\_Safe(area)  
(which can also be restated as the clause-like proposition “Immigrants are dangerous.” areDangerous(all\_immigrants))

## 2. Label set

Given that we only annotate the presence or absence of missing premise or conclusion we have three labels : 1) *implicit\_premise* 2) *implicit\_conclusion* 3) *none*.

The whole tweet is annotated. Annotations would therefore look like this:

<i>tweet</i>	<i>implicit_argument</i>
Immigrants moved to my neighbourhood last year. I don't feel safe anymore.	implicit_premise
When immigrants move into a particular area, it becomes less safe. Immigrants moved to my neighbourhood last year.	implicit_conclusion
All men are mortal. Socrates is a man. Therefore, Socrates is mortal.	none

*Table 1 : Sample annotations*

## 3. Annotation guidelines

### 3.1 Identifying persuasive missing components

The missing component may either be intentionally implied by the author, in the sense that the climactic point of the argument is precisely what is left unstated, like in example (4) below. Alternatively, the missing content may not be consciously

processed or held, but rather naturally assumed, like common knowledge, in order to serve as the basis for making a different point such as in (5).

"If you are a genuine asylum seeker why have you not sought asylum in the first safe country that you arrived in?[..]"

(4)

- **Conclusion (implicit):** You are not a genuine asylum seeker.

"I don't want to get the COVID vaccine because one day I want to have babies"

(5)

- **Premise (implicit):** The COVID vaccine causes infertility.

In both cases, it is impossible to determine with absolute certainty whether the author intended to convey a particular message or not. But regardless of whether the missing component is the result of a conscious rhetorical choice—the strategic use of an enthymeme as a persuasive device—, we are looking for enthymemes that fit the following definition:

Enthymemes that can potentially:

*"influence other people's convictions and choices and, ultimately, their behaviour."*

- (Lombardi et al., 2020)

or

*"manipulate the audience's opinion or perception of a state of affairs"*

- (Macagno, 2022)

These definitions indicate that we are specifically interested in statements that express a stance or opinion about values, beliefs, or attitudes regarding a particular state of affairs.

As the context of a given discourse narrows to certain related topics, communities emerge where the same implicit premises are shared. Within these communities, specific clusters of assumptions become so common that they no longer need to be

stated and function as shared background knowledge or widely accepted truths. Enthymemes emerge most prominently in the discourse of such communities, making it necessary to identify the relevant topics.

Within the scope of this resource, our analysis focuses on identifying missing premises/conclusions in discourse that (1) addresses the topics listed below and (2) expresses a stance (for or against something, can't be neutral).

For each topic, we outline potential stances or opinions associated with it. The list is illustrative and not exhaustive.

## Immigration

### **Topic:** Refugee integration and employment

- Immigration shows the UK is an attractive place to work and study.
- Supporting refugee employment and integration is desirable.
- Open borders and expanded migrant rights are harmful to the working class.
- Refugees are a potential danger and threat.
- Radical left Democrats (US) are as responsible for taking in immigrants.
- The idea that immigrants strengthen the destination country is false.
- Welsh children should come before migrants.
- Taxpayer money shouldn't fund college for illegal immigrants.
- Migrants drive down working-class wages.

### **Topic:** Border security and immigration control

- Maintaining secure borders is important and commendable.
- Immigration, border control, and repatriation of illegal immigrants should be closely monitored.
- Uncontrolled immigration is undesirable.
- Detering illegal immigration is firm but fair.
- Illegal migrants should not enter or remain in Europe or the UK.
- Migrant smugglers can save lives.
- Migrant smugglers reduce inequality despite their exploitative role.
- Twitter censors people who report the "truth" about illegal immigration.

### **Topic:** Immigration levels and Brexit

- Immigration is too high, and Brexit is seen as the solution.
- Brexit will end mass migration
- Capitalists want to replace Europeans with non-European migrants.

### **Topic:** Immigration Policy

- The Labour party prioritizes votes over immigration control.
- The Labour party is inconsistent and no longer cares about the working class
- Leaders support open borders to protect their leadership position.
- Supporting UKIP is the way to stop illegal immigration.
- Immigration rules should treat UK and EU citizens equally and fairly.
- Traditional Labour voters won't accept open-door migration.

### Covid-19

#### **Topic:** COVID-19 vaccination mandates

- Vaccine mandates are wrong / unjustified.
- Democrats are disconnected from public opinion on COVID-19 mandates policies.
- Vaccines increase the risk of hospitalization.
- Those who oppose or fail to implement COVID-19 vaccination or mask mandates are not genuinely pro-life.
- Liberals are hypocritical in their stance on bodily autonomy during COVID-19.
- Supporting vaccine mandates contradicts the principle of 'my body, my choice'.
- COVID-19 vaccine trials are scientifically unreliable.
- People who say they were forced to get vaccinated are ignorant.

#### **Topic:** Vaccine deployment and institutional opportunism / corruption

- Vaccines are prepared and deployed opportunistically to coincide with disease outbreaks
- Public officials acted misleadingly regarding the effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines.
- Vaccine-injured people are unjustly silenced and should be allowed to speak about vaccine harms.
- Twitter censors information critical of COVID-19 vaccines to protect financial interests.
- Pharma manipulates vaccine data.
- The vaccine industry profits from recurring vaccines.
- Vaccine efficacy claims based on hope are deceptive

### **3.2 Essential Annotation Criteria for Enthymemes**

Given that enthymemes are prevalent in natural language, almost anything can be enthymeme. Therefore, to minimize annotation subjectivity and redundancy, we restrict our annotations to enthymematic structures that meet the following criteria:

1. The missing component (premise or conclusion) should fit the definition in 3.1. It should express a stance concerning the topics listed above. (More details in 4.4)
2. Only enthymemes where at least two of the premises share a term, are annotated.
3. The fully reconstructed enthymemes should present a scheme/argument such as the one suggested in section 5.
4. At least two argument segments (a premise and a conclusion / two of the premises) must be explicit. (More details in 4.5). You cannot reconstruct more than one implicit proposition to support your reconstruction. You are only allowed to reconstruct one. You can only add more implicit premises if you consider them to be commonsense (as in Section 4.1). If a second implicit proposition is NOT commonsense or not a very likely inference from what is explicit in the text, then it cannot be added.

### **3.3 Annotation procedure proposal**

1. From reading the tweet, speculate what statement is implied. Do you think the author is suggesting something? Does their argument depend on an unstated idea, bias, or assumption?
2. Identify which explicit argument segment can fulfill the function of either premise or conclusion which would support (or be supported) by the possibly implied statement in the previous step.

3. Not every explicit text, statement, or proposition in the tweet needs to be included in your reconstruction. You can ignore any text that does not contribute to it.
4. Based on the argument segments (conclusion and the supporting premises) identified in the previous step, reconstruct a *scheme* that explains how the premises provide support for the conclusion.
5. Check the conditions in 3.1 and 4

## Extended Annotation Guidelines

### 4. None or when to NOT annotate

We begin by listing cases where one might be tempted to incorrectly annotate the presence of an implicit statement. While there are many ways to imply something, the listed below tempting cases are not true enthymemes, or are only superficially similar to them. Identifying and excluding such cases helps us clarify and disambiguate our core annotation criteria described in Section 3.2.

#### 4.1 *Very likely inferences, re-assertion, circular or tautological arguments*

The cases we mention here are difficult because they involve some form of argumentation based on common sense, which may tempt us to reconstruct a premise or conclusion that seems important to annotate but should not be. Although it may feel like the reconstructed statement is an implicit part of the enthymeme, we must ask ourselves whether it really adds something significant and different from what is already present in the text. Below we provide grouped examples of such cases that we do **not** annotate, in other words, reconstructed implicit statements that are not of interest to us.

##### *Very likely common-sense inferences*

These cases are what we call *very likely common-sense inferences* (Zhang et al., 2017). Examples include:

- “John is sending an email” → “John is connected to the internet.” (NOT an implicit statement)
- “Read our article here: ...” → “Some people may want to read our article.” (NOT an implicit statement)

### *Circular variations of arguments from goal or value*

In our dataset, such inferences often take the form of variations on *arguments from goal or value*, such as:

- “We support X, therefore we do X.”
- “We support X, therefore X is good.”
- “We do X, therefore X is good.”

In these cases, statements like “*We do X*,” “*X is good*,” and “*We support X*” express roughly the same meaning. Therefore, we do **not** annotate examples such as:

- “We support the New Plan for Immigration.” → “The New Plan for Immigration is good.” (NOT an implicit statement)
- “We are deterring people smugglers’ activities.” → “Deterring people smugglers’ activities is worth supporting.” (NOT an implicit statement)

Let’s now look at an at in practice example:

#### **Tweet text :**

*“False claims damage our already overwhelmed and abused asylum system, and our ability to help the truly vulnerable...”*

()

#### **Possible premise (not annotated) :**

- Conclusion (implicit) : We should stop false claims.

Here, we might be tempted to annotate an implicit conclusion derived from the common-sense argumentation scheme “If X is harmful, then we should stop X.” This falls under the category described above as *circular variations of arguments from goal or value*, and therefore we do not annotate it.

A useful tip for recognizing when **not** to annotate these cases is the **absence** of a second intermediate variable/term. For example, in the scheme “X is good, Y helps achieve X, therefore we should support Y,” annotation is possible because of the second intermediate variable Y, as shown in the example below.

**Tweet text :**

*“Deterring the plans of illegal people smugglers is essential to controlled immigration. We should support all plans to stop them.”*

()

**Argument segments and Possible Scheme :**

- **P1 (implicit):** Controlled immigration is desirable
- **P2 :** Deterring the plans of illegal people smugglers is essential to controlled immigration
- **Conclusion :** We should support all plans to stop them.

***Very likely logical negative implicit consequences***

These cases involve an unstated negated proposition that follows from what is explicitly said. In these cases, the negative outcome is not explicitly stated, but it is logically implied by the event or statement described. Examples include:

- “The goalkeeper made an incredible save” → “There was no goal.” (NOT an implicit statement)
- “He left home” → “He is not home anymore.” (NOT an implicit statement)
- “He said he took out the trash but he lied” → “The trash is still here.” (NOT an implicit statement)

## **4.2 Rhetorical questions**

Implicit statements conveyed through rhetorical questions differ from those found in enthymemes: they are not part of any argumentation scheme and do not present actual arguments. Therefore, we do not annotate them.

When we encounter a rhetorical question, we assume the reconstructed statement (see below), “*How much longer will we allow it to go on?*” → “*We should not allow this to continue,*” to be explicit.

**Tweet text :**

*“A total failure by the Home Office. The Tories have failed on immigration year after year. How much longer will we allow it to go on?”*

()

**Possible premise (not annotated) :**

- Premise/conclusion(implicit) : We should not allow this to continue.

### **4.3 Coreference and anaphora**

All implicit content that can be reconstructed by resolving anaphoras and recovering full propositions is not annotated. Every segment is to be regarded as if all its anaphoric references (including ellipses) were resolved – so the segments are mentally 'completed' (Peldszus et al, 2016).

**Tweet text:**

*“Immigrants moved to south London. Last night on TV, the prime minister has announced that their activities are considered dangerous.”*

**Possible premise (not annotated) :**

- Premise/conclusion(implicit) : Immigrants carry out activities considered dangerous.

Another example :

**Tweet text:**

*“Besides, only those who have some knowledge and who would like to commemorate visit such places. They do not need a piece of contemporary architecture on crying walls.”*

**Possible premise (not annotated) :**

- Premise/conclusion(implicit) : Well-informed visitors have no need for a piece of contemporary architecture on crying walls.

#### 4.4 Reconstruction of neutral statements

It can happen that the missing statement we reconstruct is neutral. Even if the reconstruction feels satisfying and completes the enthymeme we have been trying to interpret, if the stance of the reconstructed statement is neutral or unrelated to the topics listed in Section 3 (Covid and Immigration), the entire tweet should be annotated as **None**. Let's look at some examples.

##### **Tweet text:**

*“Boris Johnson is saying what the audience wants to hear in order to get elected. Nobody knows where he really stands on HS2, Heathrow expansion and immigration let alone Brexit.”*

()

##### **Possible premise (not annotated) :**

- **P1 (implicit, not annotated):** If a politician says whatever the audience wants to hear then they don't know their position on matters..
- **P2:** Boris Johnson says whatever the audience wants to hear.
- **Conclusion:** Boris Johnson positions are unknown.

In the example above, although premise P1 could be part of a perfectly acceptable reconstruction, the statement itself is a general observation about politicians and does not express a committed stance concerning our topics of interest. While the tweet as a whole discredits Boris Johnson and thus takes an explicit stance against this particular politician, the reconstructed statement P1 remains neutral and general. Since we are only interested in the stance-taking quality of implicit statements, we do not annotate this case.

**!** To contrast with this example, we present below a very similar case that, this time, should be annotated as a missing premise.

##### **Tweet text:**

*“Immigrants moved into my neighborhood, it is not safe anymore.”*

##### **Possible premise:**

- **P1 (implicit):** If immigrants move into your neighborhood, it will not be safe anymore.
- **P2:** Immigrants moved into my neighborhood
- **Conclusion:** It is not safe anymore.

#### 4.5 Less than 2 explicit argument segments

Some tweets are very short and contain only a single statement or proposition, from which we might be tempted to infer an implicit stance or statement. However, to reconstruct an enthymeme in such cases, we would need to infer two or more implicit statements to form a valid argument. When multiple statements must be reconstructed to complete the enthymeme, but only one argument segment is explicit in the tweet, we do not annotate it.

##### **Tweet text:**

*“Our national police are working hard on a new plan to stop illegal people smugglers.”*

(4)

##### **Possible premise:**

- **P1 (implicit, not annotated):** Stopping illegal people smugglers is desirable
- **P2:** Our national police are working hard on a new plan to stop illegal people smugglers.
- **Conclusion (implicit, not annotated):** We appreciate the police's new plan.

In the example above, we might be tempted to reconstruct P1 and the conclusion from the explicit premise P2 by applying an *argument from goal* scheme “X is desirable, Y helps achieve X, therefore we should support Y.” However, only P2 is explicit, and the tweet does not state that we should support the police action or that the police action is desirable. Therefore, since only one argument segment is explicit, we annotate the tweet as **None**.

! *Loaded language*

Things can get a bit trickier when a tweet uses “loaded language”, words that trigger automatic value judgments and thus convey a particular stance. For example, if the tweet reads “*Our national police are **heroically** working hard on a new plan to stop illegal people smugglers,*” the “loaded” adverb *heroically* invites a value judgment and implies the conclusion “We appreciate the police’s new plan.” In this case, this conclusion derived from the value judgment is considered explicit, meaning that two argument segments are explicitly present in the sentence containing the loaded word, that is P2 (Y helps achieve X) and conclusion (Y is desirable). As a result, the premise P1 can be reconstructed and annotated.

### ! *Proposition unpacking*

In some cases, very short sentences may contain more than one explicit proposition. In the following case, two explicit propositions can be derived, and they can serve a purpose in reconstructing an implicit premise. We have to look out for such cases and make sure we don’t miss the missing premise.

#### **Tweet text:**

*“Sam is the only migrant who is polite”*

(4)

#### **Possible premise:**

- **P1 (implicit):** Most immigrants are impolite.
- **P2:** Sam is polite.
- **Conclusion :** He is an exemption.

## 5. Examples of schemes

An enthymeme can only exist if an argument is being made. Any attempt to make an argument necessarily involves using some kind of tentative argument scheme. Therefore, if we believe there is an enthymeme, we should be able to reconstruct the type of scheme we think is operating in the background of the tweet.

For the argument scheme free-text box, the goal is to write the kind of scheme you think is at work in the argument. It doesn't have to be a formally defined scheme. Argument mining researchers propose taxonomies of different schemes<sup>1</sup>, but not all tweet authors follow valid formal schemes. Some rely on fallacies<sup>2</sup>, which may appear as arguments but are shallow and easily defeasible. Still, fallacies can be seen as presenting a kind of scheme.

As a result, the number of possible schemes is very large. Our goal is not to select the "correct" scheme, or label the fallacy being committed. Instead, the goal is simply to reconstruct the type of scheme we believe the author is using to make their argument.

### 5.1. Argument from Values / Moral Judgment

#### ABSTRACT FORM

<b>P1</b>	Action <i>A</i> violates moral principle <i>P</i>
<b>P2</b>	Agent <i>X</i> performed action <i>A</i>
<b>Conclusion</b>	Therefore, Agent <i>X</i> acted wrongly / should be condemned

#### EXAMPLE

<b>EXAMPLE TWEET</b> <i>"But you can mandate a fucking useless vaccine and strip me of my rights??? you should go to jail."</i>	
<b>P1</b>	<b>[IMPLICIT]</b> <i>Mandating useless vaccines and stripping rights is morally wrong</i>
<b>P2</b>	You mandated a useless vaccine and stripped me of my rights
<b>Conclusion</b>	You are acting wrongly / should be condemned

---

<sup>1</sup> (Walton, Reed, & Macagno, 2011, *Argumentation Schemes*) :  
<https://turfutoday.com/library/pdfs/discourse/waltonarguments.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> (Bennett, n.d., *Logically Fallacious: The Ultimate Collection of Over 300 Logical Fallacies*)  
: <https://turfutoday.com/library/pdfs/discourse/falacies.pdf>

## 5.2. Argument from Inconsistent Commitment

### ABSTRACT FORM

<b>P1</b>	Agent A now claims / supports principle <i>P</i>
<b>P2</b>	Agent A previously violated or denied principle <i>P</i>
<b>P3</b>	Previously violating <i>P</i> while now claiming <i>P</i> is hypocritical
<b>Conclusion</b>	Therefore, Agent A is hypocritical / inconsistent

### EXAMPLE

<b>EXAMPLE TWEET</b> <i>"Where was 'the right to make the best decisions for your health' when your administration was compelling pregnant women to take experimental vaccines, hypocrite?"</i>	
<b>P1</b>	Agent A now claims the right to make health decisions is important
<b>P2</b>	Agent A previously compelled pregnant women to take experimental vaccines
<b>P3</b>	<b>[IMPLICIT]</b> <i>Forcing experimental vaccines violates the right to make health decisions</i>
<b>Conclusion</b>	Agent A is hypocritical

---

## 5.3. Argument from False Claim

### ABSTRACT FORM

<b>P1</b>	Actor A claims that <i>X</i> causes or signals <i>Y</i>
<b>P2</b>	<i>X</i> does not cause or signal <i>Y</i> ; the connection is false
<b>Conclusion</b>	Therefore, Actor A is misleading or manipulating the audience

### EXAMPLE

<b>EXAMPLE TWEET</b> <i>"The anti-vaccine movement is gaslighting the population by suggesting wide teaching CPR and widespread availability of AEDs is somehow linked to the dangers of vaccinations."</i>	
<b>P1</b>	The anti-vaccine movement claims CPR/AED availability is linked to vaccine dangers
<b>P2</b>	<b>[IMPLICIT]</b> <i>There is no link between CPR/AEDs and vaccine dangers</i>
<b>Conclusion</b>	The anti-vaccine movement is gaslighting the population

---

## 5.4 Argument from Consequences

### ABSTRACT FORM

<b>P1</b>	Party <i>P</i> supports policies <i>X</i>
<b>P2</b>	Policies <i>X</i> are harmful to group <i>G</i>
<b>Conclusion</b>	Therefore, Party <i>P</i> has abandoned / harmed group <i>G</i>

### EXAMPLE

<b>EXAMPLE TWEET</b> <i>"@UKLabour have completely abandoned the working class. A vote for #labour is a vote for: open borders, depressed wages, votes for migrants, an NHS open to the entire world."</i>	
<b>P1</b>	Labour supports: open borders, depressed wages, votes for migrants, NHS open to the world
<b>P2</b>	<b>[IMPLICIT]</b> <i>These policies are harmful to the working class</i>
<b>Conclusion</b>	Labour has abandoned the working class

## 5.5 Argument from Sign / Classification

### ABSTRACT FORM

<b>P1</b>	Category <i>C</i> exhibits characteristics <i>X</i>
<b>P2</b>	Agent <i>A</i> exhibits characteristics <i>X</i>
<b>Conclusion</b>	Therefore, Agent <i>A</i> belongs to / is acting like category <i>C</i>

### EXAMPLE

<b>EXAMPLE TWEET</b> <i>"When your country turns communist and the 'authorities' lie to you and force you to take a 'vaccine' — State operated communist Twitter does this to silence truth."</i>	
<b>P1</b>	<b>[IMPLICIT]</b> <i>Communist states lie, force medical interventions, and silence dissent</i>
<b>P2</b>	Current authorities lie, force vaccines, and silence dissent (via Twitter)
<b>Conclusion</b>	Your country has turned communist

---

## 5.6 Argument from Means to Goal

### ABSTRACT FORM

<b>P1</b>	Goal $G$ is good / necessary
<b>P2</b>	Action $A$ promotes or achieves $G$
<b>Conclusion</b>	Therefore, action $A$ is good / necessary

### EXAMPLE

<b>EXAMPLE TWEET</b> <i>"The UK needs to end mass immigration and become self-sufficient in skills."</i>	
<b>P1</b>	The UK needs to become self-sufficient in skills
<b>P2</b>	<b>[IMPLICIT]</b> <i>Ending mass immigration helps the UK become self-sufficient in skills</i>
<b>Conclusion</b>	The UK needs to end mass immigration

## 5.7. Argument from Evaluation / Standards

### ABSTRACT FORM

<b>P1</b>	Standard $S$ requires condition $C$ for $X$ to be acceptable
<b>P2</b>	$X$ does not meet condition $C$
<b>Conclusion</b>	Therefore, $X$ is unacceptable / should not be trusted

### EXAMPLE

<b>EXAMPLE TWEET</b> <i>"Believe in traditional vaccines after they have been tried and tested for 7-10 yrs. Do not believe in gene-therapy rolled out experimentally WITHOUT Informed consent."</i>	
<b>P1</b>	<b>[IMPLICIT]</b> <i>You should only trust vaccines tested for 7-10 years</i>
<b>P2</b>	This vaccine has not been tested for 7-10 years; it is experimental
<b>Conclusion</b>	Do not believe in this vaccine

---

## 5.8 Argument from Substitution

### ABSTRACT FORM

<b>P1</b>	We have <i>Y</i> (substitute)
<b>P2</b>	<i>Y</i> produces the same effect as <i>X</i>
<b>Conclusion</b>	Therefore, you do not need <i>X</i>

### EXAMPLE

<b>EXAMPLE TWEET</b> <i>"Who needs access to abortions when you have the vaccines?!"</i>	
<b>P1</b>	You have the vaccines
<b>P2</b>	<b>[IMPLICIT]</b> <i>Vaccines cause the same outcome as abortions (infertility/miscarriage)</i>
<b>Conclusion</b>	You do not need access to abortions (sarcasm)

## 5.9 Argument from Danger

### ABSTRACT FORM

<b>P1</b>	If Agent <i>A</i> can perform harmful action <i>X</i> , then <i>A</i> cannot be trusted / must be stopped
<b>P2</b>	Agent <i>A</i> can perform harmful action <i>X</i>
<b>Conclusion</b>	Therefore, Agent <i>A</i> cannot be trusted / must be stopped

### EXAMPLE

<b>EXAMPLE TWEET</b> <i>"Medical system: whom can be fully trusted today? Unethical doctors, DENTISTS, agents and police can insert a chip into you with a handshake! With injections, vaccines, any operations, a nano-sized chip can be put in a person's body for entire life!"</i>	
<b>P1</b>	<b>[IMPLICIT]</b> <i>If medical professionals can implant chips in people, they cannot be trusted</i>
<b>P2</b>	Doctors, dentists, and agents can insert chips via handshakes, injections, and vaccines
<b>Conclusion</b>	The medical system cannot be fully trusted

